UDC 911.3(477.46)](045)

Andriy Maksyutov
candidate of pedagogical sciences,
Senoir lecturer of department of geography, geodesy and land management,
Pavlo Tychina Uman state pedagogical university
andriy.maksyutov@udpu.edu.ua, ORCID: 0000-0002-5486-634X

GEO-CULTURAL REGIONALIZATION OF THE CHERKASK REGION

Abstract. The article highlights modern approaches to the analysis of the process of geocultural regionalization of the spatial development of Ukraine and the influence of globalization on changing the essence of the concepts of space and territory. It has been established that in the conditions of modern realities and aggravation of conflict, focusing research attention on the trends of spatial development of Ukraine will enable to analyze the phenomena of regional asymmetry, to propose ways to minimize the imbalances that arise on this basis, and to develop algorithms for strengthening the consolidation of society.

It has been proven that geocultural regionalization is not only a conceptual reference, but also a methodological toolkit for understanding the past and building modern models of spatial development of Ukraine, and therefore the problem geo-cultural regionalization of space and territorial transformations should constantly be in the focus of the state's regional policy, as well as in the epicenter of national strategic tasks and priority directions of Ukraine's development.

It has been established that geocultural studies of the territory of Ukraine and its individual regions are an urgent problem of the state's regional policy. The essence of geographical research in the field of culture is to determine the spatial-temporal differentiation of cultural phenomena, which in turn has a positive effect on the territorial organization of society. The article proves the necessity formation of a holistic system of geocultural research with the aim of identifying geocultural regions, regions and districts of Ukraine. It has been established that geocultural zoning is a system of interrelationships of such aspects of society and the

environment that have a direct impact on the population in defined spatial, temporal and geographical coordinates.

The article identifies theoretical aspects and characterizes the features of geocultural regionalization of the Cherkasy region, determines the factors affecting the territorial organization of the cultural complex of the Cherkasy region.

Key words: geography of culture and religion, sphere of culture, geocultural space, geocultural district, geocultural regionalization, geocultural research, principles and criteria of zoning, Cherkasy region.

Максютов Андрій/ ГЕОКУЛЬТУРНА РЕГІОНАЛІЗАЦІЯ ЧЕРКАСЬКОЇ ОБЛАСТІ

Анотація. Встановлено, що геокультурні дослідження території України та її окремих регіонів є актуальною проблемою регіональної політики держави. Сутність географічних досліджень сфери культури полягає у визначенні просторово-часової диференціації культурних явищ, що в свою чергу позитивно впливає на територіальну організацію суспільства.

У статті доведено необхідність формування цілісної системи геокультурних досліджень з метою виокремлення геокультурних регіонів, областей і районів України. Встановлено, що геокультурне районування – це система взаємозв'язків таких аспектів суспільства і навколишнього середовища, які мають безпосередній вплив на населення у визначених просторових, часових та географічних координатах.

У статті виявленні теоретичні аспекти та проведено характеристику особливостей геокультурної регіоналізації Черкаської області, визначенні фактори, що впливають на територіальну організацію комплексу культури Черкащини.

Ключові слова: географія культури та релігії, сфера культури, геокультурний простір, геокультурний район, геокультурна регіоналізація, геокультурні дослідження, принципи і критерії районування, Черкаська область.

Relevance of the research topic. Modern geopolitical events and the

situation are marked by deep and unique changes in the socio-political, geopolitical, religious and geocultural life of the planetary community, which are associated with large-scale processes of spontaneous transformation of the system of human relations, values and social structures, the aggravation of contradictions between globalization processes, a radical change in the worldview of an individual and the problem of human survival as a biological species and the main bearer of the planetary mind.

The geography of culture has recently been actively developing in Ukraine. At the same time, it is one of the least studied branches of social geography in our country in both theoretical and practical aspects, therefore it needs deep and comprehensive study, in particular, at the regional level [2, p. 133].

Without geocultural studies of the territory of Ukraine and its individual regions, it becomes problematic to develop issues of the state's regional policy and improve the territorial organization of society, primarily the social sphere, on this basis. The essence of geographical research in the field of culture consists in determining the spatio-temporal differentiation of cultural phenomena, which to one degree or another have always been present in the research of various geographical sciences that used a cultural approach [14, p. 349]. To date, there are relatively few publications on cultural-geographical (or geocultural) topics.

This is the least studied both in theoretical and applied, and in practical terms, the link of social and economic geography. There is still no more or less established approach to the question of the object and subject of cultural geography research, the content and structure of this discipline, its place in the system of geographical sciences [1, p. 464]. This is due to the fact that, firstly, cultural geography is a science is at the stage of formation, and secondly, the sphere of culture and the category "culture" itself are complex systemic formations, therefore the concepts that reveal their content are usually multifaceted. That is why today higher education institutions, secondary schools and other social institutions face the task of forming an integrated system of geocultural research with the aim of identifying geocultural regions, regions and districts.

Analysis of the latest research and publications on the research topic. A review of literary sources on this subject only for the past 20 years allows us to conclude that the interest of scientists in learning the essence and future development of geocultural research has significantly increased [5, p. 18]. Such interest on the part of geographers is related to the need to analyze existing gaps in these studies.

On the other hand, it is quite natural for geographers to seek knowledge of their existence, since it is geography that has unique approaches and appropriate tools [8, p. 200]. In the American and European geographical schools, the concept of geocultural zoning was introduced by Kaer K. Among the numerous geocultural studies, it is necessary to mention the fundamental works of Jackson J. B., Cosgrova D. [6].

Numerous studies of leading Ukrainian scientists are devoted to issues related to the geocultural regionalization of Ukraine: Shablii O. [13], Topchiev O. [11], Shevchuk L. [14], Pistun M. [7], Ripka O. [8], Rovenchak I. [9, 10], Volovik V. [1] and others. All these scientists point out the indisputable importance of researching the regional features of the development of the geography of culture and its influence on the level and quality of life of the population.

That is why, today, the study of the cultural geography of Ukraine in the regional aspect (in our case, on the example of the Cherkasy region) is a very relevant direction of socio-geographic scientific research [10]. However, the analysis of the scientific literature testifies to the insufficiency of the study of the problem of geocultural regionalization of Ukraine.

Despite the widespread use of the concept of "geoculture" in modern scientific literature, it is not developed and is currently experiencing the period of its formation, formation and development. Domestic philosophical and cultural thought, contributing to the formation of Ukrainian statehood, must explain to itself, to Ukrainian politicians and citizens, the principles of the development and content of the strategy geopolitical behavior of our state in the confrontation between East and West, to determine material and spiritual priorities, unforeseen risks and shortcomings or threats of its entry into the structure of the European community [4,

p. 181]. This issue became especially relevant against the background of the military intervention of the Russian Federation. Despite all the tragedy of the current situation, russian-Ukrainian the war played a key role in the formation of Ukrainian identity and geocultural affiliation, which in turn affected changes in the hierarchy of values of Ukrainian society.

The purpose and objectives of the research consists in identifying theoretical aspects and conducting an analysis of the peculiarities of geocultural regionalization of the Cherkasy region, determining the factors affecting the territorial organization of the cultural complex of the Cherkasy region.

Research methods and materials. Cartographic materials, statistical data and stock sources were used during the research. General scientific methods are also used: analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization. When carrying out the research, special and interdisciplinary methods were used: historical and political, graphic and other methods.

Presentation of the main material with justification of the obtained scientific results. Geocultural zoning, in its primary meaning, is a process of finding and distinguishing different territorial systems that have common features. Geocultural zoning, in turn, can stimulate not only the administrative function, but also is an effective means of reflecting the territorial differentiation of public needs [9, p. 56]. In our opinion, geocultural situation is a system of interrelationships of such aspects of society and the environment that have a direct impact on the population in defined spatial, temporal and geographical coordinates.

Based on the works of Druzhinin A. [2], Pistuna M. [7], Kisil N. [3], Volovyk V. [1], Lyubitseva O. [4, 5] and research in the field of social geography the following principles of geocultural zoning of the territory of the Cherkasy region are defined: the principle of territorial integrity of geographical areas; the principle of unity of socio-geographic zoning and political-administrative system; the principle of perspective development of the territory; the principle of historicity, which involves taking into account the historical development of this territory; principle social efficiency, which involves solving social tasks and problems, the main of

which should be improving the life of the population of the region, improving the territorial organization [3, p. 101].

From the listed principles, there is a need to define the main criteria of geocultural zoning: the probability of the formation of new local geocultural formations; the level of development of functional component and territorial structure; the level of development of existing centers and nodes of service to the population of the region.

The principles and criteria of zoning and the geocultural situation of the Cherkasy region are best reflected by such indicators as: birth rate, death rate, and natural increase; level of socio-economic development of the region; ecological situation and development of the sphere of culture [12, p. 197].

The principles, criteria and indicators listed by us are the basis of the geocultural zoning of the territory of the Cherkasy region. We singled out four geocultural regions: 1) northern (centered in Zolotonosha); 2) central (with the center in the city of Cherkasy); 3) southern (centered in Zvenigorodka); 4) south-western (centered in the city of Uman). We have created (Picture. 1) to reflect the geocultural regionalization of the Cherkasy region.



Picture. 1. Geocultural regionalization of the Cherkasy region (Compiled by the author)

The Northern Geocultural District is a district of Cherkasy region in Ukraine. The administrative center is the city of Zolotonosha. The area of the covered territory is 4246.1 km², which is 20.3% of the area of the region, the population is 140.2 thousand persons. The smallest district of the region in terms of area and population.

We included: Zolotonyska communiti, Drabivska, Chornobayivska settlements, Velikokhutirska, Voznesenska, Helmyazumska, Zorivska, Irkliivska, Novodmytrivska, Pishchanska, Shramkivska rural territorial communities.

The distribution of the population of the localities of the district by native language is given in Table 1 (data from the 2001 census).

Table 1. Distribution of the population of the district by language [6].

Language	Number of persons	Percentage
Ukrainian	164314	96,52%
Russian	5100	3,00%
Armenian	275	0,16%
Belarus	172	0,10%
Roma	99	0,06%
Romanian	83	0,05%
Hungarian	38	0,02%
Other/Not specified	154	0,09%
Together	170235	100%

The district has access to the Kremenchug Reservoir, occupying the majority of the left bank of the Cherkasy. The northernmost district of the region. It borders Cherkasy district to the southwest and west, Boryspil district of Kyiv region to the northwest and north, Lubensky district of Poltava region to the north and northeast, and Kremenchutsky district of the same region to the southeast.

The Southern Geocultural District is a district of Cherkasy region in Ukraine. The administrative center is the Zvenyhorodka. The area of the covered territory is 5,278.5 km², which is 25.2% of the area of the region, the population is 200,700.

persons. It ranks second among the regions of the region in terms of area, and third in terms of population.

We included in the district: Vatutinsk, Zvenigorodsk, Talnivsk, Shpolyansk, Vilshansk, Yerkivsk, Katerynopilsk, Lysyansk, Steblivsk settlement, Buzhansk, Vinohradsk, Vodyanitsk, Lypyansk, Matusivsk, Mokrokalihirsk, Selishchensk, Shevchenkivsk rural territorial communities.

South-western geocultural district. The administrative center is the city of Uman. The area of the covered territory is 4,528.3 km² (21.6% of the area of the region), the population is 254,200 Persons. It ranks third among the regions of the region in terms of area and second in terms of population.

We included the following geocultural districts: Zhashkivska, Monastyrishchanska, Umanska, Khristynivska, Babanska, Butska, Mankivska settlement, Bashtechkivska, Dmytrushkivska, Ivankivska, Ladyzhynska, Palanska rural territorial communities.

Table 2. Administrative and territorial structure of the South-Western geocultural district [11].

Community	Area, km²	Population, thousand persons	Center	Number of settlements
Baban settlement community	275,1	6566	Babanka	12
Bashtechkivska village community	179,4	4026	Bashtechk	8
Butka settlement community	190,1	5176	Butk	8
Dmytroshkiv village community	311,4	9535	Dmitrushki	12
Zhashkiv city community	724,9	28912	Zashkiv	28

Ivankiv village community	154,7	4310	Ivanka	6
Ladyzhinsk village community	322,3	10337	Ladyzhinka	11
Mankiv settlement community	477,3	17912	Mankivka	19
Monastryshchensk city community	719,2	34413	Monastery	41
Palan village community	482,6	14789	Palanka	18
Uman city community	67,2	83191	Uman	2
Khrystynivska city community	607,4	32241	Khrystynovka	34
Baban settlement community	275,1	6566	Babanka	12

The Central Geocultural District is a district of the Cherkasy Region. The administrative center is the city of Cherkasy. The area of the geocultural district is 6,878.0 km², which is 32.9% of the area of the region, the population is 597,000 Persons. The largest district of the region both in terms of area and population.

It included: Horodyschenska, Kamianska, Kanivska, Korsun-Shevchenkivska, Smilianska, Cherkasska, Chigyrinska, Balakleivska, Bereznyakivska, Bilozirska, Bobrytska, Budyschenska, Leskivska, Liplyavska, Medvedivska, Mykhailivska, Mliivska, Moshnivska, Nabutivska, Rotmistrivska, Ruskopolyanska, Sagunivska, Stepanetska, Stepankivska, Ternivska, Chervonoslobidska rural territorial communities.

Within the oblast, the district is bordered by Zolotonskyi district in the east and northeast, and Zvenigorodskyi district in the west and southwest. In addition, it borders in the north and northwest with Obukhiv district of Kyiv region, in the north

with Boryspil district of Kyiv region, in the northeast with Kremenchutsky district of Poltava region (border completely runs along the surface of the Kremenchug Reservoir), in the east with Oleksandriysky district of Kirovohrad region, and in the south with Kropyvnytskyi and Novoukrainsky districts of the same region, which in turn affected the geocultural situation of the Central geocultural district.

The district is mainly located on the Right Bank, occupying the entire coastline of the Kaniv Reservoir and the right bank section of this line f the Kremenchug Reservoir of the Dnipro within the Cherkasy Region. On the Left Bank, there is only the territory of the Liplyavsk village community, which also has access to the Kremenchug Reservoir.

The Cherkasy region became one of the "pilot regions" in terms of reforming the socio-economic sector. Geocultural zoning of the territory of the Cherkasy region is a product of the analysis of the functional-component and functional-territorial structures of the regional complex in the conditions of a specific historical and geographical situation. The development and implementation of an effective concept for the further development of the national complex should be carried out on the basis of taking into account the geocultural zoning of regional regions. In the conditions of the transformational processes of the economy of Ukraine, from the standpoint of new progressive guidelines of social development, the geocultural complex of the Cherkasy region needs the introduction of a fundamentally new model of territorial organization. She should be based on: taking into account the peculiarities of geocultural zoning; a clear demarcation of the specialization of individual territorial elements of the cultural complex; maximum support in the central core (Cherkasy), historical-geographical, social and geo-economic functions of interregional and international importance; intensive development of additional, complementary and relieving functions in the peripheral zone.

The achievement of complex and proportional development of the Cherkasy region is based on the formation of a highly efficient market of services, the powerful development of communication and information support of the sub-systems of the districts, the spread of complementarity and functional connectivity of individual

territorial entities and entities united into geocultural districts. Such the approach will contribute to the balanced development of the Cherkasy region as one of the elements of the national economy, as well as strengthen the processes of geocultural integration.

Conclusions. Cherkasy region is a vast and fertile land, beckoning with the cozy coolness of forests, quiet ponds, the greatness of the people's spirit and the sincerity of human hearts. Cherkasy region has nurtured and presented to the world outstanding personalities who glorify this great land with their efforts and talent. The rich history of Cherkasy region "tells" about the finds of Trypil, Chernyakhiv, Bilogrud cultures, Scythian weapons and Sarmatian gold, monuments of the Cossack era. The beauty of Cherkasy region is unique cultural, historical, architectural, natural monuments, spiritual shrines, but not all of them are well known in Ukraine and beyond.

One of the main means of popularizing the geocultural movement in Cherkasy region is tourist expeditions, excursions and hikes. It was revealed that geocultural studies of the territorial organization of the Cherkasy region are the main ones in the system of socio-geographic research. Territorial organization of the Cherkasy region is subject to a number of laws (such as the dependence of the level of development and the structure of the sphere of culture on the level of development and placement of the productive forces of society; territorial differentiation; concentration and integration into the structure of the regional economic complex) and must comply with the principles of regional integrity, balance, proportionality, comprehensiveness, social efficiency and optimal availability Four geocultural regions were selected: the northern one (centered in Zolotonosha); 2) central (with the center in the city of Cherkasy); 3) southern (centered in Zvenigorodka); 4) south-western (centered in the city of Uman).

It was established that the development and functioning of the geocultural and territorial organization of the Cherkasy region depend on a number of factors, which can be conditionally divided into internal and external. The main internal factors influencing the geocultural situation in modern conditions are economic, socio-

demographic, historical, natural and others. The leading place among them is occupied by demographic and economic factors. The external factors that have a significant impact on the development of the region should be included in the first place globalization process. It has been proven that the promising direction of Cherkasy region development at the state and regional levels is the introduction of geocultural innovations into the activities of certain industries and cultural institutions, as well as the development of cultural and religious tourism in the region.

The scientific novelty. It was found that the results of the study can be used by teachers to organize the educational process, namely the study of the native region by student youth, directly in the process of conducting professional practices in the disciplines of the geographical cycle. Geocultural regionalization is not only a conceptual reference, but also a methodological toolkit for understanding the past and building modern models of spatial development of Ukraine, and therefore the problems of geocultural regionalization of space and territorial transformations should constantly be in the focus of the state's regional policy

Bibliography:

1. Воловик В.М. Етнокультурні ландшафти: регіональні структури і природокористування: монографія. Вінниця: Вінницька міська друкарня, 2013. 464 с.

2. Дружинін А.О. Геокультурна регіоналізація: навч. посіб. Київ: Лоно. 2000. 133 с.

3. Кисіль Н.М. Соціально-культурна сфера: територіальна організація та особливості розвитку (на матеріалах Львівської області): автореф. дис. … к. економ. н.: спец. 08.10.01 «Розміщення продуктивних сил і регіональна економіка». Львів, 2002. 101 с.

4. Любіцева О.О. Географія культури: питання відродження й становлення. *Географія наука і освіта в Україні*: матер. ІІ Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. (Київ, 26-27 березня 2003 р.). Київ: ВГЛ «Обрії», 2003. с. 181–182.

5. Любіцева О.О. Стан геокультурних досліджень в Україні. *Вісник Київ. ун-ту. Серія Географія*. Київ: ВЦ «Київський ун-т», 1999. Вип. 45. с. 16– 18.

6. Максютов А.О. Географія культури та релігій: навч. посіб. Умань: Візаві. 2023. 107 с.

7. Пістун М.Д. Основи теорії суспільної географії: навч. посіб.. Київ: Вища школа, 1996. 231 с.

8. Ріпка О. Географія культури як напрямок суспільної географії. *Часопис соціально-економічної географії: Міжрегіональний збірник наукових праць*. Харків: Харків. ун-т, 2007. Вип. 2 (1). С. 200–207.

9. Ровенчак І.І. До питання історико-географічного районування України. Адміністративнотериторіальний устрій України крізь призму інтересів регіонів та держави. Матр. Міжрег. наук.-практ. конф. (Харків, березень 1994). Харків, 1994. С. 56–57.

10. Ровенчак І.І. До проблеми інтегрального геокультурного районування України. *Проблеми географії України*. Матер. наук. конф. (Львів, 25 – 27 жовтня 1994 р.). Львів: Львів. ун-т, 1994. С. 238–239.

11. Топчієв О.Г. Основи суспільної географії: підруч. для студ. геогр. спец. вищ. навч. закл. Одеса: Астропринт, 2009. 544 с.

12. Флінта Н.І. Культурно-освітній комплекс регіону і його територіальна організація (на матеріалах Тернопільської області): дис. … к. геогр. н.: спец. 11.00.02 «Економічна та соціальна географія». Київ, 2005. 197 с.

13. Шаблій О.І. Соціально-економічна географія України: навч. посіб. Вид. 2-е, перероб. і доп. Львів: Світ, 2000. 680 с.

14. Шевчук Л.Т. Соціальна географія: навч. посіб.. Київ: Знання, 2007. 349 с.

References:

1. Volovyk V.M. (2013). Etnokulturni landshafty: rehionalni struktury i pryrodokorystuvannia: monohrafiia. Vinnytsia: Vinnytska miska drukarnia. 464 s. [In Ukrainian].

2. Druzhynin A.O. (2000). Heokulturna rehionalizatsiia: navch. posib. Kyiv: Lono. 133 s. [In Ukrainian].

3. Kysil N.M. (2002). Sotsialno-kulturna sfera: terytorialna orhanizatsiia ta osoblyvosti rozvytku (na materialakh Lvivskoi oblasti): avtoref. dys. … k. ekonom. n.: spets. 08.10.01 «Rozmishchennia produktyvnykh syl i rehionalna ekonomika». Lviv. 101 s. [In Ukrainian].

4. Liubitseva O.O. (2003). Heohrafiia kultury: pytannia vidrodzhennia y stanovlennia. *Heohrafiia nauka i osvita v Ukraini*: mater. II Mizhnar. nauk.-prakt. konf. (Kyiv, 26-27 bereznia 2003 r.). Kyiv: VHL «Obrii». s. 181–182. [In Ukrainian].

5. Liubitseva O.O. (1999). Stan heokulturnykh doslidzhen v Ukraini. *Visnyk Kyiv. un-tu. Seriia Heohrafiia*. Kyiv: VTs «Kyivskyi un-t». V. 45. s. 16–18. [In Ukrainian].

6. Maksiutov A.O. (2023). Heohrafiia kultury ta relihii: navch. posib. Uman: Vizavi. 107 s. [In Ukrainian].

7. Pistun M.D. (1996). Osnovy teorii suspilnoi heohrafii: navch. posib.. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola. 231 s. [In Ukrainian].

8. Ripka O. (20070. Heohrafiia kultury yak napriamok suspilnoi heohrafii. *Chasopys sotsialno-ekonomichnoi heohrafii*: Mizhrehionalnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Kharkiv: Kharkiv. un-t. V. 2 (1). C. 200–207. [In Ukrainian].

9. Rovenchak I.I. (1994). Do pytannia istoryko-heohrafichnoho raionuvannia Ukrainy. *Administratyvnoterytorialnyi ustrii Ukrainy kriz pryzmu interesiv rehioniv ta derzhavy*. Matr. Mizhreh. nauk.-prakt. konf. (Kharkiv, berezen 1994). Kharkiv. S. 56–57. [In Ukrainian].

10. Rovenchak I.I. (1994). Do problemy intehralnoho heokulturnoho raionuvannia Ukrainy. *Problemy heohrafii Ukrainy*. Mater. nauk. konf. (Lviv, 25 – 27 zhovtnia 1994 r.). Lviv: Lviv. un-t. S. 238–239. [In Ukrainian].

11. Topchiiev O.H. (2009). Osnovy suspilnoi heohrafii: pidruch. dlia stud. heohr. spets. vyshch. navch. zakl. Odesa: Astroprynt. 544 s. [In Ukrainian].

12. Flinta N.I. (2005). Kulturno-osvitnii kompleks rehionu i yoho terytorialna orhanizatsiia (na materialakh Ternopilskoi oblasti): dys. … k. heohr. n.: spets. 11.00.02 «Ekonomichna ta sotsialna heohrafiia». Kyiv. 197 s. [In Ukrainian].

13. Shablii O.I. (2000). Sotsialno-ekonomichna heohrafiia Ukrainy: navch. posib. Vyd. 2-e, pererob. i dop. Lviv: Svit. 680 s. [In Ukrainian].

14. Shevchuk L.T. (2007). Sotsialna heohrafiia: navch. posib. Kyiv: Znannia. 349 s. [In Ukrainian].