

Nataliia Smochko

PhD (Geography), Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Tourism and Geography

e-mail: natazak@ukr.net, ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2440-5737>

Mukachevo State University, 26 Uzhhorodska str., Mukachevo, 89608, Ukraine

MONODEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TERRITORIAL SYSTEMS: THEIR TERRITORIAL STRUCTURE TRANSFORMATION

The article reveals a retrospective analysis of the concept of «agrarian territorial system» and clarifies the essence of the concept of "mono-agrarian territorial system". The features of their formation in the theory of social geography have been presented. It has been determined that the issue of research of agrarian territorial systems was actively paid attention by scientists of different branches of knowledge. However, the study of agricultural systems was carried out in the generalization of the behavior of the studied object to the process of monodevelopment. In this case, the digital expression of the process of monodevelopment as the dynamics of absolute data of a certain type, characterizing the highest level of generalization has been presented, as a rule, as an additional characteristic of the object of study.

It has been proved that in the normative legal acts of Ukraine defining the essence of the concept of «rural area» there was a disordered heterogeneous, often contradictory conceptual and terminological apparatus. It is characterized by chaos and inconsistency in the process of its use in research and management. The development of rural areas due to the peculiarities of their development as monosystems of different hierarchical level has been considered. The development itself has been outlined as monodevelopment. It has been determined that any numerical characteristic of the territory is the starting point of a specific process of monodevelopment that takes place within it. Even without dynamic data, but comparing the starting points of the various processes of monodevelopment, we can assume how they proceed in the analysed area. Of great importance is the study of monoprocesses (generalized at the regional level) related to the use of natural resources of agricultural production, in particular the analysis of indicators of the value of agricultural products; the cost of agricultural products sold by enterprises; the number of employees in Ukraine in general and in agriculture, forestry and fisheries in particular; use of agricultural products.

We proved that for full coverage of the characteristics of rural development is not enough to study the course of a single monoprocess within it, or several processes, but it is important to study them against the background of the territorial structure of agricultural systems that will make it possible to understand the nature of their development as mono process and identify features of formation agrarian territorial formations as monosystems. For the first time the category «monoagrarian locality» has been applied and its essence has been revealed.

Key words: rural territory, rural area, agrarian territorial system, mono agrarian territorial system, mono agrarian locality, monoprocesses.

Наталія Смочко. МОНОРОЗВИТОК АГРАРНИХ ТЕРИТОРІАЛЬНИХ СИСТЕМ: ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ЇХ ТЕРИТОРІАЛЬНОЇ СТРУКТУРИ

У статті розкрито ретроспективний аналіз поняття «аграрна територіальна система» та уточнено сутність поняття «моноаграрна територіальна система», наведено особливості їх формування в теорії суспільної географії. Визначено, що питанню дослідження аграрних територіальних систем активно приділяли і приділяють увагу вчені різних галузей знань. Однак вивчення аграрних систем здійснювалося в умовах генералізації поведінки досліджуваного об'єкту до процесу монорозвитку. При цьому, вченими цифровий вираз процесу монорозвитку як динаміка абсолютних даних певного виду, що характеризують найвищий рівень генералізації, подавався, як правило, як додаткова характеристика об'єкту дослідження.

Доведено, що в нормативно-правових актах України поняття «сільська територія» носить невпорядкований різномірний, часто суперечливий характер, що проявляється в незручності його використання як при здійсненні наукових досліджень, так і в практиці господарювання. В статті розглянуто розвиток сільських територій як моносистем різного ієрархічного рівня, а сам процес їх розвиток окреслено як монорозвиток. Визначено, що будь-яка числова характеристика територій є точкою відліку перебігу конкретного процесу монорозвитку, що відбувається в її межах, тобто навіть не маючи динамічних даних, але порівнюючи точки відліку перебігу різних процесів монорозвитку, можемо припустити, як вони протікають на аналізованій території. Відповідно величезне значення має вивчення монопроцесів (генералізованих на регіональному рівні), а саме: аналіз показників вартості виробленої продукції сільського господарства; вартості продукції сільського господарства, реалізованої підприємствами; кількості найманих працівників в Україні загалом і в сільському, лісовому та рибному господарстві зокрема; використання виробленої сільськогосподарської продукції.

В ході дослідження доведено, що для повноцінного висвітлення особливостей розвитку сільських територій недостатньо вивчити перебіг якогось одного монопроцесу в її межах, чи навіть кількох процесів. Але важливо вивчати їх на тлі територіальної структури аграрних систем, що дасть можливість зрозуміти сутність їх розвитку як монопроцесу і виявити особливості формування аграрних територіальних утворень як моносистем. Вперше застосовано категорію «моноаграрний локалітет», розкрито її сутність.

Ключові слова: сільська територія, сільська місцевість, аграрна територіальна система, моноаграрна територіальна система, моноаграрний локалітет, монопроцеси.

Наталія Смочко. МОНОРАЗВИТИЕ АГРАРНЫХ ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНЫХ СИСТЕМ: ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ ИХ ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОЙ СТРУКТУРЫ

В статье раскрыто ретроспективный анализ понятия «аграрная территориальная система» и уточнена сущность понятия «моноаграрная территориальная система», приведены особенности их формирования в теории общественной географии. Определено, что вопросу исследования аграрных территориальных систем активно уделяли и уделяют внимание ученые разных областей знаний. Однако изучение аграрных систем осуществлялось в условиях генерализации поведения исследуемого объекта к процессу моноразвитку. При этом, учеными цифровое выражение процесса моноразвитку как динамика абсолютных данных определенного вида, характеризующие высокий уровень генерализации, подавался, как правило, как дополнительная характеристика объекта исследования.

Доказано, что в нормативно-правовых актах Украины понятие «сельская территория» носит неупорядоченный разнородный, часто противоречивый характер, что проявляется в неудобстве его использования как при осуществлении научных исследований, так и в практике хозяйствования. В статье рассмотрено развитие сельских территорий как моносистемы различного иерархического уровня, а сам процесс их развития обозначен как моноразвитие. Определено, что любая числовая характеристика территории является точкой отсчета течения конкретного процесса моноразвития, что происходит в ее пределах, то есть даже не имея динамических данных, но сравнивая точки отсчета течения различных процессов моноразвития, можем предположить, что они протекают на анализируемой территории. Согласно этому, огромное значение имеет изучение монопроцессов (генерализованных на региональном уровне), именно: анализ показателей стоимости продукции сельского хозяйства; стоимости продукции сельского хозяйства, реализованной предприятиями; количества наемных работников в Украине в целом и в сельском, лесном и рыбном хозяйстве в частности; использования произведенной сельскохозяйственной продукции.

В ходе исследования доказано, что для полноценного освещения особенностей развития сельских территорий недостаточно изучить ход какого-то одного монопроцесса в ее пределах, или нескольких процессов. При этом, важно изучать их на фоне территориальной структуры аграрных систем, что позволит понять сущность их развития как монопроцесс и выявить особенности формирования аграрных территориальных образований как моносистем. Впервые применено категорию «моноаграрный локалитет», раскрыто ее сущность.

Ключевые слова: сельская территория, сельская местность, аграрная территориальная система, моноаграрная территориальная система, моноаграрный локалитет, монопроцессы.

Problem's statement. In the context of modern challenges to geographical science related to the complexity and change of the geosystem content, the analysis and improvement of the organization, structure, patterns of development of complex geosystems - territorial social systems becomes relevant. It makes up the modern geographical space characterized by constant transformations in the territorial organization of society. There is a constant search for optimal forms, structures, and models of territorial system organization, as well as the study of social and geographical processes under the influence of which they are transformed.

Despite the importance of forming territorial systems at different hierarchical levels, so far, the problem of monofunctionalities and prerequisites for the principles of formation of territorial monosystems has not been reflected in fundamental studies of social geography, due, on the one hand, the novelty of this area, on the other study of monofunctional cities (as a basic category of mono-development) by different scientific schools. Accordingly, the mono-development of agrarian territorial systems and the transformation of their structure in the field of view of scientists did not take place.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. The development of agrarian territorial systems has been actively studied and is being studied by scientists in various fields of knowledge. But especially actively agrarian territorial systems were studied first in economic and social geography, and later in social geography in the works of A. Vashchenko, G. Balabanov, M. Biletsky, M. Vlach, I. Gorlenko, J. Zhupansky, L. Zastavetskaya, O. Zastavetskaya, F. Zastavny, V. Zakharchenko, R. Ivanukh, S. Ishchuk, M. Knysh, P. Maslyak, V. Nagirna, J. Oliynyk, M. Palamarchuk, O. Palamarchuk, M. Pistun, I. Pushkar, V. Rudenko, L. Rudenko, D. Stechenko, M. Fashchevsky, O. Shabli, P. Shishchenko, V. Shchabelska, R. Yazynina, T. Yasnyuk and

others.

It was in the 50-60s of the twentieth century, when with the development of economic geography as a science of location of production, including agricultural production, the ideas about specialized agro-industrial and other integrated economic-territorial complexes, economic nodes, territorial-economic systems, economic-geographical and socio-territorial complexes were actively developed. Scientists of the Sector of Geography of the USSR Academy of Sciences substantiated the basics of economic-geographical complexology, proposed the main aspects of system-structural analysis of the production-territorial complex (VTK - sectoral, functional, and territorial). They were later improved and supplemented by organizational and managerial one. Then such concepts-categories as "functional structure", "territorial structure", "branch integration", "agro-industrial territorial system", "agrarian-territorial complex", "interbranch territorial system" and a few others entered scientific circulation [7].

And in the 70s of the twentieth century in economic and social geography, the geographical scientific school of M. Palamarchuk was developed. It was gradually enriched by research of a socio-geographical nature. The active formation of the theory of modern social geography began. It acquired the features of a complex character. These achievements were used by M. Palamarchuk and his students in revealing the essence of the agro-industrial complex, the conditions and factors of its formation and patterns of development. The basic laws of complex formation in the country were developed, the typology of agro-industrial complex (hereinafter - AIC) was substantiated, as well as the theory of functional and territorial structures of agro-industrial complexes was developed, the essence of agro-industrial integration investigated separate specialized and integrated agro-industrial complex. At that time, the laws of develop-

ment and territorial organization of agro-industrial complexes and production-territorial systems in the field of production and processing of various types of agricultural products were revealed, specialized plant and livestock complexes were comprehensively studied. In addition, the classification of agro-industrial complexes according to various criteria was carried out. Experts note that the period of 75-85 years of the twentieth century was the most productive in the study of agriculture [7].

Of course, at that time, economists and regional economists played a major role in the study of agrarian territorial systems, i.e., scientists in those fields of knowledge that are most related to economic and social geography and social geography in general.

In the XX-XXI centuries the issue of research of agrarian territorial systems has been actively paid and is being paid attention to by scientists, economists and regional economists, namely: V. Andriychuk, E. Boyko, V. Borshchevsky, F. Vazhynsky, L. Vorkun, S. Vasylchak, P. Haidutsky, Yu. Gubeni, M. Dolishniy, D. Domanchuk, I. Zalutsky, I. Kyrylenko, O. Krysalny, M. Kropyvka, V. Krupin, I. Kulish, V. Lipchuk, E. Mayovets, O. Mazurenko, M. Malik, V. Mesel-Veselyak, B. Panasyuk, H. Prytula, I. Prokopa, P. Sabluk, V. Tregobchuk, A. Tretyak, R. Trinko, M. Khorunzhiy, V. Chemeris, G. Cherevko, J. Shevchuk, L. Shepotko, V. Yurchyshyn, K. Yakuba, I. Yatsiv and other researchers. The analysis of the works of the above-mentioned scientists allowed us to conclude that the substantiation of complex formation, typology of agro-industrial complex, development of the theory of functional and territorial structures of agro-industrial complexes, research of agro-industrial integration, typological study of agro-industrial complexes, territorial organization of agro-industrial complexes and production-territorial systems in the field of production and processing of various types of agricultural products, research of specialized crop and livestock complexes, development of classification of agro-industrial complexes according to various criteria, as well as study of other phenomena generalization of the behavior of the studied object to the process of monodevelopment. But this technique was used at the highest level of generalization mainly as verbal and was confirmed at this level, usually by one indicator. The verbal result of generalization was shown as something familiar, clear to all, and its true meaning as a course of the process of monodevelopment remained latent. In this case, the digital expression of the monodevelopment process as the dynamics of absolute data of a certain type, characterizing the highest level of generalization, was presented, as a rule, as an additional characteristic of the object of study.

The purpose of the research. Many well-known Ukrainian scientists and geographers, in particular M. Baransky, I. Dudnik, O. Zastavetskaya, S. Ishchuk, L. German, Ya. Oliynyk, M. Palamarchuk, V. Petlin, O. Topchiev, O. Sabers and others studied territorial systems in geographical space at different stages of development of social geography. In their works, each scientist tried to improve the existing theoretical basis for defining territorial systems as socio-geographical systems in general, and our task to establish as a monodevelopment of agricultural territorial systems can be

presented, reflected, understood through the transformation of their territorial structure as a generalized process of monodevelopment.

The results of the research. To establish how the mono-development of agrarian territorial systems can be presented, reflected, understood through the transformation of their territorial structure as through a generalized process of mono-development, we must first understand what we mean by "agrarian territorial system". It should be noted that the concept of "agrarian territorial system" is replaced in the legal field of Ukraine by the concept of "rural area". Of course, we could ignore that. But we must consider the fact that any science must respond to the demands of practice and really reflect the true situation. Of course, this also applies to social geography. If in the practice of management, the concept of "rural territory" is widespread, it is expedient to consider how close it is or far from the concept of "agrarian territorial system". We consider different definitions of the essence of the concept of "rural area" in the regulations of Ukraine (Table 1).

The data in Table 1 show that in our time there is a disordered heterogeneous in the regulations of Ukraine, often contradictory conceptual and terminological apparatus. The concepts of "rural area", "village" are not filled with a clear meaning, often have a double meaning, which adds confusion and omissions in their use both in research and in business practice.

Obviously, in almost all regulations in defining the essence of the concepts denoted by the above terms, priority is given to the functional approach, which is expressed in terms of the share of employment in agriculture, it is emphasized that it should exceed the share of employment in industry. But, in general, considering the highest level of generalization, it is latently considered that the rural area should include all those areas that are not urban. It is interesting that in the EU countries the interpretation of rural areas is like the understanding of this concept in Ukraine. This is emphasized in various literature sources, in the monograph of the staff of the Institute of Regional Studies named after M. Dolishny "Carpathian region: current issues and prospects for development. Vol. 4. Rural areas" [5; p.21].

That is why the concept of "rural area", "village" is important to consider due to the peculiarities of their development as monosystems of different hierarchical levels, and the development itself to be described as monodevelopment. This will make it possible to re-evaluate the individual, distinguishing it from the general, and to predict its behavior in the future. Note that scientists on an intuitive level have done this before. For example, consider the statement contained in the scientific report "Agrarian and rural development for growth and renewal of the Ukrainian economy" edited by Corresponding Member NAS of Ukraine O. Borodina and Dr. of economical sciences O. Shubravska: "Agriculture is traditionally an important component of the domestic economic complex. Trends and prospects for the development of the industry are determined by the general state of the national economy, which, in turn, is significantly affected by the dynamics of the main indicators of agricultural activity."

Table 1

*Defining the essence of the concept of "rural area" in normative legal acts of Ukraine **

Name of regulations	The essence of the concept of "rural area", according to the legal act	Signs of rural areas as mono-territories, i.e., monosystems
Law of Ukraine "On the priority of social development of the village and agro-industrial complex in the national economy" (from 17.10.1990 № 400-XII).	Rural areas are identified with rural areas.	In practice, it is a question of linking the problems of rural development to the agro-industrial complex, that is obviously, the peculiarities of the coexistence of different types of monosystems are considered.
Law of Ukraine "On planning of territorial infrastructure of rural areas" (from 07.04.2005)	Rural area is an area where the share of the rural population in its total population exceeds 15-50%.	Rural territory is divided into 1) clearly defined rural area - the share of rural population in its total population exceeds 50%; 2) rural areas - the share of rural population is 15-50% of the population.
Law of Ukraine "On Agriculture" (from 10.08.2011)	Rural territory is a set of rural settlements and adjacent agricultural lands (lands), historically formed within the legally defined boundaries, which combines administrative-territorial (villages, rural settlements, village councils) and territorial-functional (agricultural production, processing products, its storage and sale) belonging to the creation of appropriate working and living conditions and ensuring food security of the country.	In fact, it is a latent combination of monosystems of different hierarchical levels and different types.
Law of Ukraine "On Stimulating the Development of Regions" (dated September 8, 2005, № 2850-IV)	A rural area is an area in which the share of those employed in agriculture exceeds the share of those employed in industry.	The rural area is considered, in essence, as a monosystem of the local level with specific parameters.
Law of Ukraine "On the basic principles of state agricultural policy for the period up to 2015" (dated 18.10.2005, № 2982-IV)	The document declares the integrated development of rural areas and the solution of social problems in rural areas as one of the strategic goals of the state agricultural policy.	The main components of such development are: development of social infrastructure; regulation of demographic processes, stimulating the development of depressed areas; equalization of living conditions of urban and rural population; increase employment, etc.
"State target program for the development of Ukrainian villages for the period up to 2015" (dated 15.09.2007, № 1158)	The concept of "Ukrainian village" is identified with the concept of "rural area".	Rural development issues include their social security, engineering infrastructure, use of natural resources, agro-industrial production, land management and environmental safety, problems of depression, etc.
The only comprehensive strategy and action plan for the development of agriculture and rural areas in Ukraine for 2015-2020	A rural development policy has been declared that will consider local needs and stimulate local initiatives. At the same time, there is no definition of "rural area", but such terms as "agriculture" and "rural area" are actively used.	Realistic strategic concept and general principles of reforming the agricultural sector for the period 2015-2020 to increase its competitiveness and promote sustainable development of rural areas in accordance with international and European standards.
"Concept of the national program of sustainable development of rural areas until 2020" (dated 03.02.2010, №121-r.)	There is no clear definition of the category "rural area" in the Concept, although it is obvious that they are identified with the areas where agriculture and agricultural processing, rural social sphere (demography, unemployment, motivation to work, labor migration, poverty, social infrastructure) are located. , village ecology, etc.	Identification of local territorial multifunctional monosystems.

* Compiled by the author

It is obvious that here the agriculture development of a certain territory (state of Ukraine) is considered as a monoproduct, the course of which depends on other monoproducts (for example, the development of the national economy) [1, p.15]. Our conclusion is confirmed by the following phrase from the same report: "Specifics of agricultural production, namely: the nature of products (consumed en masse), belonging to the primary sector of the economy (subject to significant price fluctuations), dependence on weather conditions, provokes crop volatility, gross fees and profitability of producers), determines in a given period the direction and degree of influence of the industry on the macroeconomic situation in the country "[1, p.15].

The "Unified Comprehensive Strategy and Action

Plan for Agriculture and Rural Development in Ukraine for 2015-2020", which is based on the "Sustainable Development Strategy" Ukraine - 2020 "" defines a "long-term concept of agricultural and rural development", which allows we can say that in this case we consider two separate processes of mono-development at a high (national) level of generalization: "agricultural development" and "rural development", which depend on the course of other mono-processes [4; 15].

Similarly, the processes of mono-development in rural areas are considered at the regional level. In this case, any analysis is always preceded by a general description of the region. We describe for example the Carpathian region of Ukraine (Table 2).

Table 2

*General characteristics of the Carpathian region **

(dates on 01.01.2020)

Territory	Territory, thousand of km ²	Number of available populations, thousand of people	Including		The fraction of urban population, %
			urban, thousand of people	rural, thousand of people	
Transcarpathian region	12,8	1253,8	465,9	787,9	37,2
Ivano-Frankivsk region	13,9	1368,1	606,8	761,3	44,4
Lviv region	21,8	2512,1	1534,0	978,1	61,1
Chernivtsi region	8,1	901,6	390,5	511,1	43,3
Carpathian region	56,6	6035,6	2997,2	3038,4	49,7
Ukraine	603,5	41902,4	29139,3	12763,1	69,5
<i>Part of the Carpathian region in Ukraine, 6 %</i>	<i>9,4</i>	<i>14,4</i>	<i>10,3</i>	<i>23,8</i>	-

* Calculated by the author according to the State Statistics Service of Ukraine [10]

Any numerical characteristic of the territory is the starting point of a particular process of monodevelopment that takes place within it. Even without dynamic data but comparing the starting points of different processes of monodevelopment, we can assume how they proceed in the analysed area (eg, the Carpathian region) or its parts (regions of the Carpathian region). If we consider that the Carpathian region occupies an area of 9.4% in Ukraine, and 14.4% of the total population and 23.8% of the rural population live in it, which indicates a higher density of the existing population and a much higher density of the rural population, than the average in Ukraine. This is a kind of confirmation that some monodemographic processes have retained their specificity in the Carpathian region to this day and the identification of that specificity requires consideration of each process of monodevelopment.

The study of monoproducts related to the use of natural resources of agricultural production is also of great importance. For example, according to the State Statistics Service and the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine, which are given in the scientific report "Agrarian and rural development for growth and renewal of the Ukrainian economy" in the country as a whole there is:

- agricultural mastery of the territory - more 70%;
- ploughing of lands - almost 54% (scientifically substantiated level: up to 35-40%);
- ecologically unstable land use, steady tendency of deterioration of soil quality: their acidification (14%), salinization and salinization (4%), overcompaction (about 39%), dehumidification (43%);
- annual negative balance of all batteries;
- about a third of arable land is under threat of water and wind erosion;
- water deficit management [1, p.16].

In the Carpathian region, attention should be paid to floods, which cause environmentally unsustainable land use, increased threat of water erosion and more. But, in general, as noted by V. Yakubiv, in the Carpathian region there are initial resource reserves necessary for the establishment of efficient agricultural production it concerns the provision of agricultural land, fixed assets and labour [18].

Very often the rural areas of a particular region are characterized by the value of agricultural products, which, if taken over several years at comparable prices, is also a process of mono-development, generalized at the regional level. We presented and analysed the following data (Table 3).

Table 3

Agricultural products **(at constant prices in 2016, UAH million)*

Territory	Farms of all categories		
	agricultural products	including	
		<i>crop products</i>	<i>livestock products</i>
Agricultural products for 2013			
Transcarpathian region	8812,6	4623,5	4189,1
Ivano-Frankivsk region	12590,1	6682,6	5907,5
Lviv region	19763,2	12434,9	7328,3
Chernivtsi region	10206,6	6797,8	3408,8
Carpathian region	51372,5	30538,8	20833,7
Ukraine	613429,4	463558,5	149870,9
Part of the Carpathian region in Ukraine	8,4	6,6	13,9
Agricultural products for 2014			
Transcarpathian region	8811,6	4773,5	4038,1
Ivano-Frankivsk region	13395,2	7358,5	6036,7
Lviv region	20868,8	13702,1	7166,7
Chernivtsi region	10644,8	7328,4	3316,4
Carpathian region	53720,4	33162,6	20557,9
Ukraine	626925,1	477747,4	149177,7
Part of the Carpathian region in Ukraine	8,6	6,9	13,7
Agricultural products for 2015			
Transcarpathian region	8369,0	4551,3	3817,7
Ivano-Frankivsk region	12775,9	6912,3	5863,6
Lviv region	20237,4	13198,5	7038,9
Chernivtsi region	9684,9	6438,5	3246,4
Carpathian region	51067,2	31100,6	19966,6
Ukraine	596832,8	453016,9	143815,9
Part of the Carpathian region in Ukraine	8,6	6,9	13,9
Agricultural products for 2016			
Transcarpathian region	8092,4	4613,8	3478,6
Ivano-Frankivsk region	12979,0	7483,7	5495,3
Lviv region	20741,0	13860,9	6880,1
Chernivtsi region	9674,4	6489,6	3184,8
Carpathian region	51486,8	32448,0	19038,8
Ukraine	634433,1	494461,9	139971,2
Part of the Carpathian region in Ukraine	8,1	6,6	13,6
Agricultural products for 2017			
Transcarpathian region	8214,3	4527,2	3687,1
Ivano-Frankivsk region	13512,3	8070,7	5441,6
Lviv region	22029,3	14926,9	7102,4
Chernivtsi region	10197,8	7082,4	3115,4
Carpathian region	53953,7	34607,2	19346,5
Ukraine	620475,6	480157,0	140318,6
Part of the Carpathian region in Ukraine	8,7	7,2	13,8
Agricultural products for 2018			
Transcarpathian region	8781,1	4768,9	4012,2
Ivano-Frankivsk region	13685,5	8153,7	5531,8
Lviv region	22818,7	15522,3	7296,4
Chernivtsi region	10722,6	7631,7	3090,9
Carpathian region	56007,9	36076,6	19931,3
Ukraine	671294,0	529347,5	141946,5
Part of the Carpathian region in Ukraine	8,3	6,8	14,0

* Calculated by the author according to the State Statistics Service of Ukraine [10]

Analysis of the monoprocess "agricultural products (at constant prices in 2016, UAH million)" in the Carpathian region allows us to conclude that, despite slight annual fluctuations in the period 2013-2018, its production remained stable, as well as the share production of the Carpathian region in Ukraine in general.

No less important is the analysis of sold products on the background of manufactured. Although we do not provide all the data for the same years as the production of agricultural products and give the cost of agricultural products sold by enterprises only in 2019 (Table 4), we can only state that in this case the situation is similar to with the production of agricultural products.

Table 4

*Cost of agricultural products sold by enterprises in 2019 **

Territory	The total cost		Including			
	UAH million	in% until 2018	crop products	in% until 2018	livestock products	in% until 2018
Transcarpathian region	798,9	83,3	706,0	82,8	92,9	87,7
Ivano-Frankivsk region	6276,2	104,6	4035,7	126,2	2240,5	80,0
Lviv region	11628,8	102,5	7977,4	104,8	3651,4	97,7
Chernivtsi region	2178,2	92,9	1519,4	86,8	658,8	111,0
Ukraine	409306,7	103,8	340463,2	105,1	68843,5	97,7

* Calculated by the author according to the State Statistics Service of Ukraine [10]

The process of mono-development such as the number of employees in Ukraine in general and in agriculture, forestry and fisheries is extremely important and indicative (Table 5). Its analysis allows us to build several hypotheses about labour productivity, its equipment, the availability of jobs in the agricultural sector and so on.

However, it should be noted that according to experts, as of July 2018, the agro-industrial complex of

Ukraine employs a total of 3 million people. At the same time, some of them believe that "the share of agricultural production in the structure of Ukraine's economy, if its state support is continued, may increase from 18% to 25%. For 6 months of 2018, the growth of agricultural production was 11.4%, and the average monthly salary in agriculture in January-May 2018 - 6524 hryvnia, which is 24.5% higher than the same period last year "[17].

Table 5

*Number of employees in Ukraine in general and in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries in particular **

Years	Number of employees in Ukraine in total, persons	In% until 2010	Number of employees in agriculture, forestry and fisheries (according to CVED-2010), persons	In% until 2010	The fraction of employees in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries from all employees in Ukraine, in %
2010	7836443	100.0	724820	100.0	9.2
2011	7712429	98.4	711019	98.1	9.2
2012	7577595	96.7	697816	96.3	9.2
2013	7285562	92.3	652133	89.9	9.0
2014	6192987	79.0	596039	82.2	9.6
2015	5778120	73.7	569383	78.6	9.9
2016	5713871	72.9	583428	80.5	10.2
2017	5714585	72.9	558157	77.0	9.8
2018	5870601	74.9	545763	75.3	9.3
2019	6241889	79.6	535012	73.8	8.6

* Calculated by the author according to the State Statistics Service of Ukraine [10]

Of great importance for understanding the peculiarities of the development of agriculture is the study of such a monoprocess as "the use of agricultural products". If we take into account that according to state statistics for 8 months of 2018, about 77% of Ukrainian agricultural exports are raw materials, and the annual harvest of Ukraine – an average of 60 million tons of grain, of which 40 million tons are exported as raw materials, it is obvious that Ukraine loses the opportunity to employ 26.6 thousand people a year and loses 4.8 trillion. UAH GDP [12].

This conclusion is especially important for the Carpathian region, where, as evidenced by the above materi-

al, the rural population predominates, and the share of agricultural production in Ukraine in recent years is more than 8% of its production in Ukraine.

The above data and their analysis allow us to conclude that for a full coverage of the peculiarities of rural development is not enough to study the course of any one monoprocess within it, or even several processes. Along with the consideration of the concepts of "rural territory", "rural area", "village" and their assessment due to the peculiarities of the processes of monodevelopment as monosystems of different hierarchical levels, it is important to ask about the structure of the above territorial entities. Thus, in the monograph "Carpathian

region: current issues and prospects for development: a monograph in 8 volumes / NAS of Ukraine. Institute for Regional Studies; Science. ed. V.S. Tailors. – Lviv, 2013. – Volume 4. Rural territories", performed at the Institute of Regional Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, although it is noted that in general, most legal documents devoted to the research uses a territorial and sectoral approach to rural development. Thus, it is latently confirmed that the territorial structure remains out of the attention of managers and researchers of many fields of knowledge. It is specified that these documents, first, are dominated by either territorial binding on several grounds, or sectoral, according to which the problems of rural development are inextricably linked with the functioning of the agro-industrial complex [5, p.8]. However, territorial affiliation is only a location, and the territorial structure of agricultural systems is an element of the socio-geographical landscape as one of the main features of the territory. Only against the background of the territorial structure of agrarian systems it is possible to understand the essence of their development as a monoprocess and to reveal the peculiarities of the formation of agrarian territorial formations as monosystems.

In fact, the issue of the territorial structure of both rural areas and agrarian territorial systems is covered very poorly in the regulatory field. For example, the "Unified Comprehensive Strategy and Action Plan for Agriculture and Rural Development in Ukraine for 2015-2020" focuses on the need to "improve the operational activities of food chain participants", to build and modernize the production, warehousing and processing potential of the industry and logistics infrastructure", "empowering Ukrainian agricultural business and increasing its competitiveness" and even "developing diversified and innovative production structures" and attracting foreign investment, but practically no mention of the territorial structure of rural areas or agricultural territorial systems [4].

Thus, the task set above by the text (to establish as a mono-development of agrarian territorial systems can be presented, reflected, understood through the transformation of their territorial structure, which in turn can be presented as a generalized process of mono-development) requires, first, clarification of "mono-agrarian territorial system".

Note that the concept of "mono-agrarian territorial system" is consonant with the concepts introduced into social geography by various scholars to denote the primary territorial indivisible parts of society. Yes, E. Alayev calls such a primary indivisible territorial part of society a simplex and defines it as the primary elementary object of socio-geographical research [2, p.54]. O. Topchiev uses the term "operational territorial unit" to denote such objects [16, p.125], and A. Skopin – "locality" [13, p.116]. G. Podgrushny allows the use of the term "locality", but clarifies the essence of the concept, which is denoted by this term, emphasizing that the locality is a kind of "cell" of public space and at the same time acts as a local projection of the component structure of the region. its main blocks, represented at their elementary primary level (local society, specific economic and natural resources, etc.). In his opinion, depending on the spe-

cialization of the economy (the type of economic activity that forms it) localities can be resource-producing, agricultural, industrial, transport and communication, service, information, etc. [10, p.51]. The scientist notes that the sites are combined based on a common engineering infrastructure of the territories of societies, direct and indirect links between economic objects and thus form different sizes and functional types of settlements, which are local forms of territorial organization of society [10, p.51].

In his opinion, depending on the specialization of the economy (the type of economic activity that forms it) localities can be resource-producing, agricultural, industrial, transport and communication, service, information, etc. [10, p.51]. The scientist notes that the sites are combined based on a common engineering infrastructure of the territories of societies, direct and indirect links between economic objects and thus form different sizes and functional types of settlements, which are local forms of territorial organization of society [10, p.51].

But before we continue this point, we note that the issue of studying agricultural territorial systems as important system-specific objects of socio-geographical science has been on the agenda since the middle of the last century. For a long time they were studied as agro-industrial complexes. There was even a branch of social geography, which was called "geography of the agro-industrial complex". It was briefly described in the reference literature as "a branch of economic and social geography that studies the agro-industrial complex in the territorial aspect: patterns of development, structure, forms of concentration of production and differences" Ukrainian scientist V. Nagirna [6].

V.Nagirnaya emphasizes that "the geography of agriculture includes the location and location of its main areas: agriculture, which forms the raw material of agriculture (production of grain, sugar beets, sunflowers, fruits and vegetables, meat and milk, etc.); processing of agricultural raw materials by types of production: granulated sugar, flour, canned fruits and vegetables, oil, meat and dairy products, etc. (main centers, their raw material areas, forms of economic activity); procurement, storage, transportation and sale of agricultural products; production of means of agro-industrial production, its maintenance (production of agricultural machines and equipment for the processing industry, production of plant protection products, information, scientific, educational, advertising, consulting activities)" [6]. We would like to add that the focus of geography of the agro-industrial complex is its territorial organization. In addition, if we consider the production of equipment, machinery, information, scientific research, etc., it is obvious that the agro-industrial complex extends to cities, where such production is mainly concentrated, with its subsystems and elements.

Livestock complexes and, ultimately, any other aspects of rural development related to the most diverse activities within them, i.e. within the most diverse agricultural systems, have been studied in a similar way.

Note that the agro-industrial complex is studied by other fields of knowledge. It is often seen as "part of the economy, which combines the production of agricultural products, its agricultural processing, logistics of the vil-

lage". At the same time, emphasis is placed on the fact that the agro-industrial complex unites industries that produce means of production and maintenance of the complex, as well as industries for storage, processing, and sale of agricultural products [14].

But, even in this case, scientists often use the intuitive study of monoprocesses of formation and development of agricultural territorial systems.

It is the use of mono-development processes that should be the basis for determining the agrarian territorial system in general and the "mono-agrarian territorial system" in particular. In this case, it is necessary to consciously choose a monoprocess - a function (feature), which should be accepted as fundamental in this case.

If a relatively small territorial system of the local level has one function (feature) associated with agricultural production, then we can call such a system a mono-agricultural territorial system or based on the terminology of G. Pidgrushny as a mono-agricultural locality.

The definition of mono-agricultural territorial systems is not only theoretical for the further development of socio-geographical science, but also of great practical importance, as it will allow a more balanced approach to the functional zoning of the territory at the local level and offer effective measures for use of such territorial entities, taking into account the laws and patterns of their development as socio-geographical territorial systems, as well as to provide for the complication of their structure as a result of violation of mono-agrarianism.

Mono-agrarian territorial systems can be considered as territorial systems of another hierarchical level (regional, national), if agricultural production in them in terms of output or other indicators exceeds all other industries. But in today's world there are almost no such systems.

Of course, we can ask the question or talk about the conditional monoagrarian nature of individual territorial systems at a particular hierarchical level for a particular function or feature, but solving this question requires in-depth large-scale research. In the conditions of fleeting changes in all spheres of public life nowadays such question is very difficult for the decision. After all, there is a constant transformation of mono-agricultural systems in connection with the acceleration and intensification of certain factors, primarily such as the adoption of certain regulations. Various researchers have repeatedly written about this. Thus, L. Gazuda and N. Yaremchuk in the article "Dynamics of agricultural production in Ukraine and the Carpathian region" note that the impetus for transformational changes in the process of agrarian reform was the adoption of the Decree of the President of

Ukraine "On urgent measures to accelerate reform agricultural sector of the economy", and their effectiveness was an increase in the number of households and, accordingly, a decrease in the number of agricultural enterprises through their reorganization [3, p.43; 11].

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. From the results of our study, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. The use of the method of generalization to identify and study the monoprocesses of development that occur in territorial systems of different hierarchical levels is widespread, but it is carried out intuitively and unconsciously not only in various fields of knowledge that study the agricultural sector, but also in social geography, in which the method of generalization is the most common and most widely used. At the current stage of development of socio-geographical science, it is important to consciously use the analysis of monoprocesses that occur in the agricultural sector.

2. Conscious use of development feature reflection of research object (agrarian territorial systems) gives the chance to outline in the most general features the main signs or the most general tendencies of their development without which it is impossible to construct hypotheses concerning a condition and perspective behavior of agrarian territorial systems to their study.

3. The study of individual monoprocesses of studied object development does not allow to analyze all possible development aspects of agrarian territorial systems and features of agrarian territorial monosystem formation, therefore it is necessary to study as many monoprocesses as possible when studying various agrarian monosystems. The experience gained during this study allows us to state that the number of studied monoprocesses related to the object of study determines the generalization of the scientific idea about the object and its probable behavior in the future.

4. In isolating and studying the monoprocesses of agrarian territorial system development, special attention should be paid to those monoprocesses that actively influence the structure of agrarian territorial systems and even determine it. Without knowledge of the agricultural territorial system structure, it is impossible to predict their long-term development.

5. We believe that if a relatively small territorial system of the local level has one function (feature) associated with agricultural production, then such a system can be called a mono-agricultural territorial system or based on the terminology of G. Pidgrushny as mono-agricultural locality.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Аграрний і сільський розвиток для зростання та оновлення української економіки: наукова доповідь / за ред. чл.-кор. НАН України Бородіної О.М., д-ра екон. наук Шубравської О.В.; НАН України, ДУ «Ін-т екон. та прогнозів. НАН України». – К., 2018. – 152 с.
2. Алаев Э.Б. Социально-экономическая география: понятийно-терминологический словарь / Э.Б. Алаев. – М.: Мысль, 1983. – 350 с.
3. Газуда Л.М. Динаміка розвитку аграрного виробництва в Україні та областях Карпатського регіону / Л.М. Газуда, Н.В. Яремчук // Економічний вісник Запорізької державної інженерної академії. – Запоріжжя, 2016. – №6-1(06) – С.43.

4. Єдина комплексна стратегія та план дій розвитку сільського господарства та сільських територій в Україні на 2015-2020 роки / Міністерство аграрної політики та продовольства України [Електронний ресурс]: – Режим доступу: <http://minagro.gov.ua/node/16025>
5. Карпатський регіон: актуальні проблеми та перспективи розвитку : монографія у 8 томах / НАН України. Інститут регіональних досліджень; наук. ред. В.С. Кравців. – Львів, 2013. – Том 4. Сільські території / відп. ред. В.В. Борщевський. – 2013. – 344 с. (Серія «Проблеми регіонального розвитку»). – С. 8.
6. Нагірна В.П. Географія АПК / В.П. Нагірна // Енциклопедія сучасної України [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://esu.com.ua/search_articles.php?id=29109
7. Напрямки досліджень в українській соціально-економічній географії у 70-ті роки ХХ століття [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.geograf.com.ua/istoriya-sg/500-napryamki-doslidzen-v-ukrajinskij-sotsialno-ekonomichnij-geografiji-u-70-ti-roki-khkh-stolittya>
8. Оприлюднили детальний аналіз 8 програм держпідтримки АПК [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://agropolit.com/news/13847-oprilyudnili-detalniy-analiz-8-mi-program-derzpidtrimki-apk>
9. Організаційно-економічні механізми інноваційного розвитку сільських територій Карпатського регіону. Аналітична записка / Національний інститут стратегічних досліджень [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/regionalniy-rozvitok/organizaciyno-ekonomichni-mekhanizmi-innovaciyogo-rozvitku>
10. Офіційний сайт державної служби статистики. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/>
11. Підгрушний Г.П. Сутність категорії «територіальна організація суспільства» / Г.П. Підгрушний [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://dspace.nbu.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/71259/13-Pidgrushny.pdf?sequence>
12. Про невідкладні заходи щодо прискорення реформування аграрного сектора економіки / Указ Президента України від 3 грудня 1999 р. № 1529/99 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1529/99>.
13. Скільки коштує розпочати в Україні агробізнес «з нуля» / Національний промисловий портал. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://uprom.info/news/agro/skilki-koshuye-rozpochati-v-ukrayini-agrobiznes-z-nulya/>
14. Скопин А.Ю. Введение в экономическую географию: учебник / А.Ю. Скопин. – М.: ВЛАДОС, 2001. – 272 с.
15. Солошонок А.Л. Результати діяльності олійно-жирового підкомплексу України / А.Л. Солошонок // Продуктивність агропромислового виробництва: науково-практичний збірник Українського науково-дослідного інституту продуктивності агропромислового комплексу (НДІ «Укראгропромпродуктивність») Міністерства аграрної політики України. – 2008. – № 11. – с. 112-114.
16. Стратегія сталого розвитку «Україна – 2020». Указ Президента України від 12.01.2015 р. № 5/2015. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/5/2015>.
17. Топчієв О.Г. Суспільно-географічні дослідження: методологія, методи, методики: навч. посібник / О.Г. Топчієв. – Одеса: Астропринт, 2005. – 632 с.
18. У разі продовження держпідтримки частка агропрому в економіці України може зрости до 25% [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://uprom.info/news/agro/u-razi-prodovzhennya-derzpidtrimki-chastka-agropromu-v-ekonomitsi-ukrayini-mozhe-zrosti-do-25/>
19. Якубів В.М. Аграрне виробництво в Карпатському регіоні: передумови і перспективи розвитку / В.М. Якубів // Електронний журнал «Ефективна економіка», № 3, 2009. – Режим доступу: <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=71>

References:

1. Borodina, O.M., & Shubravska, O.V. (2018). Ahrarnush i silskysh rozvytok dlya zrostannya ta onovlennya ukrainskoi ekonomiky: naukova dopovid [Agrarian and rural development for growth and renewal of the Ukrainian economy: a scientific report]. DU «In-t ekon. ta prohnozuv. NAN Ukrayiny». K., 152 p. [in Ukrainian].
2. Alaev, E.B. (1983). Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya geografiya: ponyatiyno-terminologicheskii slovar [Socio-economic geography: a conceptual and terminological dictionary]. Moscow: Mysl, 350 p. [in Russian].
3. Hazuda, L.M., & Yaremchuk, N.V. (2016). Dynamika rozvytku ahrarnoho vyrobnytstva v Ukrayini ta oblastiakh Karpatskoho regionu [Dynamics of agricultural production development in Ukraine and regions of the Carpathian region]. *Ekonomichnyy visnyk Zaporizkoyi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademii*. Zaporizhzhya, 6(1), p. 43. [in Ukrainian].
4. Yedyna kompleksna stratehiya ta plan diy rozvytku silskoho gospodarstva ta silskykh terytoriy v Ukraini na 2015-2020 roky [The only comprehensive strategy and action plan for the development of agriculture and rural areas in Ukraine for 2015-2020]. Ministerstvo ahrarnoyi polityky ta prodovolstva Ukrainy. Retrieved from <http://minagro.gov.ua/node/16025> [in Ukrainian].
5. Kravtsiv, V.S. (2013). Karpatskyi region: aktualni problemy ta perspektyvy rozvytku: monohrafiya u 8 tomakh [Carpathian region: current issues and prospects: a monograph in 8 volumes]. NAN Ukrainy. Instytut regionalnykh doslidzhen. *Tom 4. Silski terytorii (Seriya «Problemy regionalnoho rozvytku»)*. Lviv, p.8 [in Ukrainian].

6. Nahirna, V.P. Geografiya APK [Geography of agro-industrial complex]. Entsyklopediya suchasnoyi Ukrainy. Retrieved from http://esu.com.ua/search_articles.php?id=29109 [in Ukrainian].
7. Napryamky doslidzhen v ukrainskiy sotsialno-ekonomichniy geografii u 70-ti roky XX stolittya [Research directions in Ukrainian socio-economic geography in the 70s of the twentieth century]. Retrieved from <http://www.geograf.com.ua/istoriya-sg/500-napryamki-doslidzhen-v-ukrajinskij-sotsialno-ekonomichnij-geografiji-u-70-ti-roki-khkh-stolittya> [in Ukrainian].
8. Oprilyudnyly detalnyi analiz 8 prohram derzhpidtrymky APK [Published a detailed analysis of 8 programs of state support for agro-industrial complex]. Retrieved from <https://agropolit.com/news/13847-oprilyudnili-detalnyi-analiz-8-mi-program-derjpidtrimki-apk> [in Ukrainian].
9. Orhanizatsiyno-ekonomichni mekhanizmy innovatsiynoho rozvytku silskykh terytoriy Karpatskoho regionu. [Organizational and economic mechanisms of innovative development of rural areas of the Carpathian region]. Analitichna zapyska. Natsionalnyi instytut stratehichnykh doslidzhen. Retrieved from <https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/regionalniy-rozvitok/organizaciyno-ekonomichni-mekhanizmi-innovaciynogo-rozvitku> [in Ukrainian].
10. Ofitsiyniy sayt derzhavnoi sluzhby statystyky [Official website of the State Statistics Service]. Retrieved from <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/> [in Ukrainian].
11. Pidhrushnyi, H.P. Sutnist katehori «terytorialna orhanizatsiya suspilstva» [The essence of the category «territorial organization of society»]. Retrieved from <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/71259/13-Pidgrushny.pdf?sequence> [in Ukrainian].
12. Pro nevidkladni zakhody shchodo pryskorennya reformuvannya ahrarnoho sektora ekonomiky [About uncomplicated come in schodo accelerated reform of the hangarnoho sector of the economy]. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy vid 3 hrudnya 1999 r. № 1529/99. Retrieved from: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1529/99>. [in Ukrainian].
13. Skilky koshtue rozpochaty v Ukraini ahrobiznes «z nulya» [How much does it cost to start an agribusiness in Ukraine «from scratch»]. Natsionalnyi promyslovyi portal. Retrieved from <https://uprom.info/news/agro/skilki-koshtuye-rozpochati-v-ukrayini-agrobiznes-z-nulya/> [in Ukrainian].
14. Skopin, A.Yu. (2001). Vvedenie v ekonomicheskuyu geografiyu: uchebnik [Introduction to Economic Geography: A Textbook]. M.: VLADOS, 272 p. [in Russian].
15. Soloshonok, A.L. (2008). Rezultaty diyalnosti oliyno-zhyrovoho pidkompleksu Ukrainy [Results of Activity of Oil and Fat Subcomplex of Ukraine]. *Produktyvnist ahropromysloвого vyrobnytstva: naukovopraktychnyi zbirnyk Ukrainskoho naukovo-doslidnogo instytutu produktyvnosti ahropromysloвого kompleksu (NDI «Ukrahropromproduktyvnist») Ministerstva ahrarnoi polityky Ukrainy – Productivity of Agro-Industrial Production: Scientific and Practical Collection of the Ukrainian Research Institute of Productivity of the Agro-Industrial Complex (Research Institute «Ukragropromprovproductivity») of the Ministry of Agrarian Policy of Ukraine*, 11, pp.112-114 [in Ukrainian].
16. Stratehiya staloho rozvytku «Ukraina – 2020» [Strategy of sustainable development «Ukraine – 2020»]. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy vid 12.01.2015 r. № 5/2015. Retrieved from <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/5/2015> [in Ukrainian].
17. Topchiev, O.H. (2005). Suspilno-geografichni doslidzhennya: metodologiya, metody, metodyky [Human geographical researches: methodology and methods]. Odesa: Astroprint, 632 p. [in Ukrainian].
18. U razi prodovzhennya derzhpidtrymky chastka ahropromu v ekonomitsi Ukrainy mozhe zrosty do 25% [In the case of continued state support, the share of agriculture in the economy of Ukraine may increase to 25%]. Retrieved from: <http://uprom.info/news/agro/u-razi-prodovzhennya-derzhpidtrimki-chastka-agropromu-v-ekonomitsi-ukrayini-mozhe-zrosty-do-25/> [in Ukrainian].
19. Yakubiv, V.M. (2009). Ahrarne vyrobnytstvo v Karpatskomu regioni: peredumovy i perspektyvy rozvytku [Agricultural production in the Carpathian region: prerequisites and prospects for development]. *Elektronnyi zhurnal «Efektyvna ekonomika»*, № 3. Retrieved from <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=71> [in Ukrainian].

Надійшла до редколегії 19.11.2020 р.

Про автора:

Наталія Смочко – кандидат географічних наук, доцент кафедри туризму і географії, Мукачівський державний університет, вул. Ужгородська, 26, м. Мукачево, Закарпатська область, 89608, Україна, natazak@ukr.net, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2440-5737>

Об авторе:

Наталія Смочко – кандидат географических наук, доцент кафедры туризма и географии, Мукачевский государственный университет, ул. Ужгородская, 26, г. Мукачево, Закарпатская область, 89608, Украина, natazak@ukr.net, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2440-5737>