ПЛЕНАРНІ ДОПОВІДІ

UDC 911.3

G. Dragica[1], Đ. Bojan[2]
[1]dgataric@gef.bg.ac.rs, [2]bojandjercan@yahoo.co.uk
[1]University of Belgrade, Faculty of Geography, Belgrade, The Republic of Serbia
[2]University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Novi Sad, The Republic of Serbia

MODELS FOR DISTINGUISHING URBAN SYSTEMS

Knowledge of daily urban systems, which, given the size of the gravity area, can be divided into daily, regional, national, international and global, as well as their characteristics, is extremely important in the geographical and spatial study of the world [1]. The daily urban system consists of the city and that part of its environment with which the interaction occurs due to the circulation of people, goods and information. In other words, it is a space where there is intense mobility of the population in relation to the place of residence – the place of performing other socio-geographical functions [2].

The term urban system was introduced into the scientific literature by the famous Greek urbanist Doxyadis in 1967 [3], and later used the same term by the Anglo-Saxon geographer Berry [4]. Since then, the study of hierarchical, spatial and temporal urban systems, as their main features, has received increasing attention, especially in developed countries, where the process of urban deconcentration is becoming more prominent. Accordingly, there have been several attempts both in the world and in the Serbian scientific community to accurately define the daily urban system and determine the model which can be used in order to distinguish it from a hierarchical and spatio-temporal aspect. However, harmonization or unified model for allocating daily urban systems still does not exist in the world. Very often, in the scientific literature, the local urban system identifies with the local labor market, and consequently, at different intervals, the spatial-functional organization of urban systems changes, on the one hand, and they can be seen as cause-and-effect related to changes in the economic base of urbanization, on the other. Much attention was paid to the daily urban system between 1970 and 1990. The foundations of urban systems theory are laid out by Kristaller. The basic premise of Crystaller's central place theory is that he smallest settlement within an urban system will be able to offer only those services that meet the day-to-day need and consumption of the population, i.e. work centrality is determined by the influence of the functions of the centers of work on the daily mobility of the population. Past experience in exploring the spatial-demographic and functional components of daily urban systems indicates that the indicators of daily population migration are the most relevant ones for model development. Accordingly, there are numerous models in the study and design of urban systems. William Peterson's daily migration of the population is related to the action of attractive-repulsive factors that affect their dispersion [5]. Vilbor Zelinski

places daily migration in the context of models of stage alignment, synchronization and successive socio-historical and socio-economic structural changes with changes in the natural and spatial movement of the population [6]. Karl Bolte links daily migration, in a model on the interdependence of spatial and social mobility of the population, with the developmental stages and the spatial implication of urbanization [7]. In addition, there is a Klingbayl model that treats daily population migration as an indicator of the existence of functional thresholds, which divides it into 1) migration stable, i.e. functionally developed and 2) migration labile or functionally underdeveloped [8].

One of the key issues, or questions that many scholars face, is how large a demographic city should be and how its interaction with the environment should be determined. In practice, it is often considered that a city with more than 50,000 inhabitants and at least 20,000 jobs can be the nucleus of a daily urban system, and its interaction with the environment can be determined based on the extent of daily migration. In the United States, more than 170 daily urban systems have been established and boundaries have been taken as the ultimate boundaries of daily urban systems. The territory of Great Britain as well as Western Europe was similarly divided. The development of daily urban systems in the mid-developed countries is also drawing attention among a number of scientists [1].

For the isolation and planning of daily urban systems in Serbia, Professor Dragutin Tosic proposed a model, supplemented by indicators on daily migration of population based on central functions, which is of complementary nature and compatible with the methodologies of previous research. He especially emphasized the importance of daily movement of the population in defining the modalities and variants of the spatial-temporal manifestation of functional-urban regions. In determining daily urban systems based on the function of work, according to the model developed by Dragutin Tosic, it is necessary to determine its demographic components, as follows: "ratio of number of people of core daily urban systems and settlements with which daily interaction takes place, number of employees in the center and the share of daily migrants in it, the number of workers residing in settlements that provide daily migrants on a daily basis, as well as the share of daily migrants in it, the percentage of daily migrants in the total number of workers in settlements providing daily migrants, the number of daily migrant workers at the origin of work, the percentage of daily migrants in the center of work out of the total number of daily migrants in the place of residence, and the percentage of daily migrants who travel to the center of work each day out of the total number of place of residence workers.

He identified four areas based on the intensity of daily migrants: 1. Intensive impact zone from which more than 70% of employees migrate daily to the center of work, 2. Strong impact zone from which 50-70% of employees migrate to the center of work daily, 3. Medium impact zone from which 30-50% of employees migrate to the center of work daily, 4. Areas of lesser influence from which less than 30% of employees travel to the center of work daily, and 5. Periphery of the daily urban system from whose settlements less than 5% of employed workers migrate to its centers of work per day" [9, p. 228-229]. Similar models for separating the daily

urban system have been used in Croatia, Slovenia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. This model for distinguishing the daily urban systems proposed by Dragutin Tosic was used to design functional areas in the Serbian Spatial Plan, then to create a series of Regional ones: South Pomoravlje, Timok region, Western Serbia, etc. As well as local plans. The following authors published many studies of the urban systems developed using this method: Srboljub Stamenkovic, Dragica Gatarić, Nikola Krunić, Marija Nevenić et al., whose results can be useful in integrated planning.

Acknowledgement: The paper is the result of research projects 176017 and 176020, which are financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

References: *1 Vresk, M. (2002). Grad i urbanizacija. Zagreb: Školska knjiga. 2. Goodall, B., (1987). Dictionary of Human Geography. London: Penguin, pp. 111. 3. Doksijadis, K.A. (1982). Čovek i grad. Beograd: Nolit, 242. 4. Berry, B. (1967). Metropolitan Area Definition: A Re-evaluation of Concept and Statistical Practice. Working paper no. 28, Washington. 5 Petersen, W. (1958). A General Typology of Migration, American sociological Review, vol. 23, pp. 256–266. 6. Zelinsky, W. (1971). The hypothesis of the mobility transition, Geographical Review, vol. 61, pp. 219–349. 7. Bolte, K.M. (1969). Vertikale Mobilität, Handbuch der empirischen Sozialforschung, von R. Köning, Bd. 2. Stuttgard. 8. Klingbeil, D. (1969). Zur Sozialgeographicsher Theorie und entfassung des Taglichen Berrspandelns, Geographische Zeitschtrift, H. 2, pp. 108–131, Wiesbaden. 9. Tošić, D. (2012). Principi regionalizacije. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu – Geografski fakultet, 189.*

UDC 338.484.6

Z.T. Imrani
zaur_imrani@mail.ru
The Institute of Geography after academician H.A. Aliyev, Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences H. Javid street 115, Az 1143, Baku, Azerbaijan Republic

METHODICAL BASIS OF TOURISM-RECREATIONATION RESOURCES AND THEIR REGIONALISATION

Introduction. At present, the potential of the regions is studied using different approaches, and their effectiveness is evaluated in order to achieve sustainable social and economic development. Tourism has been one of the fastest growing sectors of the non-oil sector in recent years. Thus, tourism has great potential, which promotes regional development based on the use of local resources, improves infrastructure, and serves as an additional source of income for the population. In the broadest sense, tourism is a tool that influences the formation of the state budget, the improvement of villages and towns, the preservation of historical and architectural monuments, and the development of small and medium-sized businesses.

Analysis. Today, one of the most important tasks facing each country is to increase employment and reduce unemployment by identifying ways for effective use of labour resources in addressing current socio-economic problems. From this perspective, with the development of tourism it is possible to create new jobs, thereby