Taylor & Francis
Online

Regional Studies ›
Volume 49, 2015 - Issue 4

1,184 Views | 53 CrossRef citations to date | 7 Altmetric

Policy Debates: Edited by Fiona Wishlade

In Tandem for Cohesion? Synergies and Conflicts between Regional and Agricultural Policies of the European Union

Riccardo Crescenzi, Fabrizio De Filippis & Fabio Pierangeli

Pages 681-704 | Received 19 Apr 2011, Accepted 22 Mar 2014, Published online: 24 Sep 2014

Cite this article https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2014.946401

Check for updates

Sample our Geography Journals
>> Sign in here to start your access to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article | Figures & data | References | Citations | Metrics
Reprints & Permissions | Read this article | Share

Abstract

Crescenzi, R., De Filippis, F. and Pierangeli, F. In tandem for cohesion? Synergies and conflicts between regional and agricultural policies of the European Union, Regional Studies. The paper analyses the financial allocations from the regional, rural development and agricultural policies of the European Union in order to assess their territorial coordination and synergies with the objective of territorial cohesion. Regression analysis is used to uncover the link between funds and territorial disadvantage for the 1994–2013 period. The analysis reveals that both coordination and compatibility with territorial cohesion have not always improved in response to major policy reforms. The territorial 'vocation' of overall community spending is weakly linked to its distribution among different policies, but it crucially depends upon appropriate 'place-based' allocation mechanisms.

Crescenzi, R., De Filippis, F. and Pierangeli, F. [illegible] 1994 [illegible] 2013 [illegible] [illegible]“[illegible]”[illegible] [illegible]“[illegible]”[illegible]

Crescenzi, R., De Filippis, F. et Pierangeli, F. En tandem en faveur de la cohésion? Les synergies et les conflits entre les politiques régionale et agricole de l'Union européenne, Regional Studies. L'article analyse l'affectation budgétaire au titre des politiques régionale, rurale et agricole de l'Union européenne afin d’évaluer leur coordination sur le plan territorial et les synergies visant à promouvoir la cohésion. On emploie une analyse de régression pour dévoiler le lien entre les fonds et le désavantage territorial pour la période allant de 1994 jusqu’à 2013. L'analyse laisse voir que la coordination et la compatibilité avec la cohésion territoriale ne se sont pas toujours améliorées en réponse aux grandes réformes politiques. La ‘vocation’ territoriale des dépenses communautaires globales est faiblement liée à son affectation entre les différentes politiques, mais elle dépend avant tout de l'adéquation des mécanismes de distribution ‘adaptés au milieu’.

Crescenzi, R., De Filippis, F. und Pierangeli, F. Im Tandem für die Kohäsion? Synergien und Konflikte zwischen der Regional- und Agrarpolitik der Europäischen Union, Regional Studies. In diesem Beitrag werden die finanziellen Zuweisungen der Regionalpolitik, der Politik für ländliche Entwicklung und der Agrarpolitik in der Europäischen Union analysiert, um ihre territoriale Koordination und die Synergien mit dem Ziel der territorialen Kohäsion zu bewerten. Anhand einer Regressionsanalyse wird der Zusammenhang zwischen den Fonds und der territorialen Benachteiligung für den Zeitraum von 1994 bis 2013 verdeutlicht. Aus der Analyse geht hervor, dass sich sowohl die Koordination als auch die Kompatibilität mit der territorialen Kohäsion aufgrund der größeren politischen Reformen nicht immer verbessert haben. Die territoriale ‘Berufung’ der Gesamtausgaben der Gemeinschaft steht in einem schwachen Zusammenhang zu ihrer Aufteilung unter den verschiedenen Politiken, hängt aber entscheidend von geeigneten ‘ortsbasierten’ Zuweisungsmechanismen ab.

Crescenzi, R., De Filippis, F. y Pierangeli, F. ¿En tándem para la cohesión? Sinergias y conflictos entre las políticas regionales y agrícolas de la Unión Europea, Regional Studies. En este artículo analizamos las asignaciones financieras de la política regional, la política para el desarrollo rural y la política agrícola de la Unión Europea para evaluar su coordinación territorial y sus sinergias con el objetivo de la cohesión territorial. A

partir de un análisis de regresión explicamos el vínculo entre los fondos y la desventaja territorial para el periodo entre 1994 y 2013. Este análisis indica que tanto la coordinación como la compatibilidad con la cohesión territorial no siempre han mejorado ante importantes reformas políticas. La ‘vocación’ territorial del gasto comunitario en general tiene un vínculo débil con su distribución entre las diferentes políticas, pero depende fundamentalmente de los mecanismos adecuados de asignación ‘según el lugar’.

European Union | European policies | Regions | Regional policy | Rural development | Common Agricultural Policy

□□ | □□□□ | □□ | □□□□ | □□□□ | □□□□□□

Union européenne | Politiques européennes | Régions | Politique régionale | Aménagement rural | Politique agricole commune

Europäische Union | Europäische Politiken | Regionen | Regionalpolitik | Ländliche Entwicklung | Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik

Unión Europea | Políticas europeas | Regiones | Política regional | Desarrollo rural | Política Agrícola Común

JEL classifications:

C24 | O18 | R11 | R58

Acknowledgements

Riccardo Crescenzi is the author to whom all correspondence should be addressed. The authors are grateful to participants at the seminars held in Rome, Cetraro, Macerata, Ferentillo and Bled for their comments to earlier drafts of this paper. The authors are solely responsible for any errors contained in the paper.

Funding

Financial support received from the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (Scientific Research Programs of National Relevance 2007 on European Union policies, economic and trade integration processes and WTO negotiations) is gratefully acknowledged.

Notes

1. In this document the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was given the objective to deliver ‘a territorially and environmentally balanced EU agriculture within an open economic environment’ (European Commission, 2010b, p. 4). The recently approved CAP reform remains a compromise between the ‘traditional’ sectoral focus of this policy and its ‘new’ rationale based on the support for public goods generated by agricultural activities (e.g. environmental or land protection) (European Commission, 2013b). Notwithstanding the hybrid nature of its objectives, the CAP 2014–20 has further reinforced its territorial and environmental scope.

2. Reg. (EC) No. 1782/2003.

3. Alternative definitions for the spatial weights matrix are possible: k-nearest-neighbours weighting or other binary matrices (rook and queen contiguity matrices). The use of different methods generated qualitatively similar results to those presented in the paper.

4. The inclusion of an additional PCA component into the regression models was tested as a robustness check with no significant impact on the results of the analysis reported in the paper.

5. The stationarity of the variables was tested preliminarily: the tests confirmed the stationarity of the series, allowing the PCA analysis on the panel dataset to be implemented and assuring the comparability of the index across programming periods.

6. Regions in Belgium, Germany and the UK are classed at NUTS-1 level, while Denmark, Ireland and Luxembourg have no sub-national divisions; the remaining EU-15 member states expenditure have been classified at the NUTS-2 level.

7. Reg. (EC) No. 1290/2005.

8. Data are available from the rural development plans (RDPs) of the EU-15 (http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/countries/index_en.htm).

9. See http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/countries/index_en.htm/.

10. The Cohesion Fund has not been included in the databank as its resources are allocated at the national level.

11. The imbalance in the UK's contribution position led to the Fontainebleau Agreement (1984) and the determination of a permanent rebate of its contribution towards the Community budget.

12. This is especially true for Austria and Finland, which in 2005 accounted for 72% and 100% respectively of the utilized agricultural area (UAA) (IEEP, 2006).

13. The choice of a fixed-effects approach is justified on both conceptual and empirical grounds. From the conceptual point of view, the regions included in the dataset cannot be considered as a 'random sample' of the EU regions (Wooldridge, 2002, p. 251; Mundlak, 1978). In addition, the individual components cannot be considered as uncorrelated with the explanatory variables as assumed in a random-effects approach. From the empirical standpoint, the Hausman test confirms that fixed-effects estimation has to be preferred over random effects. The F-test for the joint significance of individual effects also confirms the high significance of the regional fixed effects. In the dataset the cross-sectional dimension is significantly larger than the time dimension (the explanatory variables cover the period 1993–2006). In this context, the low time-series variability of the dataset a priori prevents non-stationarity from affecting the estimates through spurious correlation. The hypothesis of stationarity is confirmed by three different unit root tests for panel data (the Im–Pesaran–Shin, augmented Dickey–Fuller and Phillips–Perron tests), which, as expected, reject the hypothesis of non-stationarity at conventional significance levels.

14. The authors thank an anonymous referee for raising this relevant point.

15. The results presented in Table 5 are computed with the 'spreg' command for STATA.

16. The estimation of SAR models produces very similar results. SARAR models are preferred here as more general.

17. The estimations are computed by means of the user-written STATA command 'xsmle' developed by Hughes et al. (2012) on the basis of Paul Elhorst's and Michael Pffermayr's Matlab code.

18. Including: amounts paid to producers of cereals, oilseeds and protein (COP) crops and energy crops payments; amount of premiums received by COP producers obliged them to set aside part of their land – such land may, however, be used for certain non-food crops; and all other farm subsidies on field, horticultural and permanent crops.

19. Including: any subsidies on dairy products; all farm subsidies received for cattle other than dairy cows in production; any subsidies on sheep/goat milk products; and all other farm subsidies on other livestock or livestock products.

20. Including: a single farm payment; a single area payment; and an amount resulting from the application of modulation to the first €5000 or less of direct payments.

21. The detailed table is available from the authors upon request.

Related Research Data

The Effectiveness of Structural Policy in the European Union: An Empirical Analysis for the EU-15 in 1995-2001*
Source: JCMS Journal of Common Market Studies
Introduction to Spatial Econometrics
Source: Unknown Repository
On the Pooling of Time Series and Cross Section Data
Source: Econometrica
Europe Against Poverty: Second Report of the European Programme of Pilot Schemes and Studies to Combat Poverty, COM (79) 537 final, Commission to the Council, Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, 1979. 124 pp. n.p.
Source: Journal of Social Policy
Distribution of regional income and regional funds in Europe 1989–1999: An exploratory spatial data analysis
Source: The Annals of Regional Science
Endogenous Processes in European Regional Growth: Convergence and Policy

Related research

People also read | Recommended articles | Cited by 53

Undermining the Principle of Concentration? European Union Regional Policy and the Socio-economic Disadvantage of European Regions >

Riccardo Crescenzi
Regional Studies
Published online: 23 Apr 2009

Unpacking the growth impacts of European Union Cohesion Policy: transmission channels from Cohesion Policy into economic growth >

Peter Berkowitz et al.
Regional Studies
Published online: 1 Apr 2019

Information for

Authors

R&D professionals

Editors

Librarians

Societies

Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Corporate access solutions

Help and information

Help and contact

Newsroom

All journals

Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

Sign me up

Copyright © 2026 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy

Cookies Terms & conditions Accessibility

Registered in England & Wales No. 01072954
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG

Taylor & Francis by informa