

Primljeno / Received
17-09-2022 / 2022-09-17Prihvaćeno / Accepted
08-04-2025 / 2025-04-08

Dino Pečaver

Koncept perifernih područja u istraživanjima ruralnoga prostora – pregled i evaluacija na primjerima

The Concept of Peripheral Areas in Rural Research: Review and evaluation with examples

Rad daje pregled istraživanja o perifernim ruralnim prostorima. Sukladno temi rad izdvaja brojne nedostatke ili probleme, odnosno izazove u načinu na koji se ovaj termin upotrebljava i što njegova upotreba donosi prostornoplanskom razvoju definiranih perifernih područja kohezijske politike ujednačavanja razvoja unutar Europske unije. Istraživanjem periferija susrećemo se s nejasnošću i problematičnom prirodom toga izraza, stoga je cilj ovoga rada da se on razjasni te se redefinišu uloge unaprijed definiranim i unificiranim modelima razvoja za periferna ruralna područja koja po strukturi ipak nisu homogena već heterogena. Metodološki se analiziraju različita poimanja i značenja perifernih ruralnih prostora s ciljem sinteze u razvojni koncept perifernoga ruralnog prostora. Teorijsku bazu analize čine recentna znanstvena promišljanja. Problemsko područje samo je po sebi heterogena kategorija, stoga postoji potreba za dubinskim analizama, uključujući nove primjenjive tipologije, kako bi se obuhvatili trenutni procesi u ruralnim područjima i prilagodile strategije, potpore i politike specifičnim lokalnim razvojnim potrebama usuglašavajući pristupe *odozdo prema gore* i *odozgo prema dolje*. Logičan nastavak rada suvremeni su pristupi istraživanju perifernih ruralnih područja te njihove implikacije na razvojne mogućnosti problemskih područja.

Ključne riječi: istraživački pristupi, marginalna područja, periferija, ruralni prostor

This paper provides an overview of research on peripheral rural areas. Accordingly, the paper identifies numerous shortcomings, problems, and challenges in the way this term is used and what its use brings to spatial planning development of defined peripheral areas, of the cohesion policy for equalizing development within the European Union. When researching peripheries, we encounter the ambiguity and problematic nature of this term, therefore the aim of this paper is to clarify it and redefine the roles of pre-defined and unified development models for peripheral rural areas which are, by structure, not homogeneous but heterogeneous. Methodologically, various understandings and meanings of peripheral rural spaces are analyzed with the aim of synthesizing them into a developmental concept of peripheral rural space. The theoretical basis of the analysis consists of recent scientific reflections on the topic of rural periphery. The problem area is itself a heterogeneous category, so there is a need for in-depth analysis, including new applicable typologies, to encompass current processes in rural areas and adapt strategies, support, and policies to specific local development needs by harmonizing *bottom-up* and *top-down* approaches. The logical continuation of this paper are contemporary approaches to the research of peripheral rural areas and their implications for the development possibilities of such problem areas.

Key words: research approaches, marginal areas, periphery, rural space

Uvod

Ruralna područja oduvijek su bila prostori promjene oblikovani društveno-ekonomskim čimbenicima (Defilippis, 2005; Lukić, 2010; Woods, 2005; 2011) i njihovim fluktuacijama, novim tehnologijama i inovacijama, novim migracijskim tokovima i političkim mijenama (Matuskova i Rousova, 2016). Istraživanja ruralnoga prostora često kreću od pitanja njegova definiranja i izdvajanja. Sukladno tomu, rane tipologije ruralnoga prostora zasnivane su na urbano-ruralnoj dihotomiji prostora (Plüschke-Altöf, 2016) u smislu shvaćanja strogoga razdvajanja urbanoga od ruralnoga (Steinführer i Reichert-Schick, 2018). Posljednjih desetljeća sve se više naglašava heterogenost ruralnih područja pri čemu na važnosti dobivaju tipološki pristupi razlikovanja ruralnih područja (Lukić, 2012), gdje su ruralne periferije jedna od važnijih kategorija. Periferije su prostorno rubni dijelovi teritorija i društva što ih obilježava rubnost u socijalno-gospodarskom i u kulturnom smislu. U perifernim regijama ruralno gospodarstvo često karakteriziraju velike udaljenosti, ograničena lokalna potražnja, smanjena poslovna baza, gospodarstvo temeljeno na prirodnim resursima i ograničena ponuda naprednih usluga za poslovne subjekte tercijarnih i kvartarnih djelatnosti (García-Cortijoa, 2019). Sadržajno sličan pojmu (ruralnih) periferija jest pojam marginalnih područja čija je glavna karakteristika prema Pelcu (2012) to da su odvojena od centra i ovisne o sebi. Marginalnost se najčešće očituje u socijalnom i ekonomskom aspektu. Pri razmatranju koncepta marginalnosti potreban je oprez s obzirom na to da pojedina područja koja se nalaze na periferiji ne moraju nužno biti marginalna, već mogu biti razvijenija od onih područja u centru (Horvat i Toskić, 2017). Unatoč povezanosti pojmova periferije i marginalnih područja oni se ipak znatno razlikuju. Glavna distinkcija proizlazi iz položaja u odnosu na jezgru pa se prema tome marginalna područja mogu nalaziti na periferiji, no mogu biti i u urbanom centru (Dery i dr., 2012).

Ipak, periferije ne moraju biti isključivo rubovi teritorija država i društava. U recentnim se istraživanjima vrlo često koristi izraz *unutarnje periferije* (De Toni i dr., 2021; Nolte, 1991) kao noviji koncept koji se razlikuje od uobičajena geografskoga pojma periferije (Kühn, 2015) s obzirom na to da se temelji na obilježjima i perifernosti i marginalnosti (Co-

Introduction

Rural areas have always been spaces of change shaped by socio-economic factors (Defilippis, 2005; Lukić, 2010; Woods, 2005; 2011) and their fluctuations, new technologies and innovations, new migration flows, and political changes (Matuskova and Rousova, 2016). Research on rural space often starts with the question of its definition and delineation. Accordingly, early typologies of rural space were based on the urban-rural dichotomy of space (Plüschke-Altöf, 2016), in terms of understanding the strict separation of urban from rural (Steinführer and Reichert-Schick, 2018). In recent decades, the heterogeneity of rural areas has been increasingly emphasized, with typological approaches to differentiating rural areas gaining importance (Lukić, 2012), whereby rural peripheries are one of the more important categories. Peripheries are spatially marginal parts of territory and society, characterized by marginality in socio-economic and cultural terms. Often in peripheral regions, the rural economy is characterized by large distances, limited local demand, reduced business base, an economy based on natural resources, and limited supply of advanced services for business entities in tertiary and quaternary activities (García-Cortijoa, 2019). Conceptually similar to the concept of (rural) peripheries is the concept of marginal areas, whose main characteristic, according to Pelc (2012), is that they are separated from the center and depend on themselves. Marginality is most often manifested in social and economic aspects. When considering the concept of marginality, one needs to be careful given that certain areas located on the periphery do not necessarily have to be marginal, but can be more developed than those areas in the center (Horvat and Toskić, 2017). Despite the connection between the concepts of periphery and marginal areas, they still differ significantly. The main distinction arises from their position in relation to the core, so according to that, marginal areas can be located on the periphery, but they can also be in the urban center (Dery et al., 2012).

However, peripheries do not have to be exclusively the edges of state territories and societies. In recent research on peripheries, the term *inner peripheries* is often used (De Toni et al., 2021; Nolte, 1991) as a newer concept that differs from the usual geographical concept of periphery (Kühn, 2015), as it is based

pus, 2001). S jedne strane, unutarnje periferije, kao osjetljiva područja koja pokrivaju ruralnu Europu, karakterizira udaljenost i loša dostupnost usluga od općega interesa, a s druge strane, povezane su specifičnim socioekonomskim obilježjima, nepovoljnim demografskim trendovima i starenjem stanovništva, društvenom isključenošću, niskim gospodarskim potencijalom i/ili ekonomskim padom te slabom teritorijalnom kohezijom (Copus i dr., 2008; De Toni i dr., 2021).

Važnost istraživanja perifernih i/ili marginalnih ruralnih područja jest u tome što obuhvaćaju veliki dio stanovništva i teritorija Europske unije. Ti su teritoriji izuzetno važni za pružanje dobara i usluga te upravljanje prirodnim i poluprirodnim okolišem. Periferna/marginalna područja uopće obuhvaćaju gotovo jednu trećinu stanovništva EU-a i pružaju bitne koristi stanovništvu u urbanim sredinama putem proizvodnje hrane i bogatstva vodnim resursima, bioraznolikošću te prirodnom i kulturnom baštinom (Bastian i dr., 2010; Popović i dr., 2017). Osim toga, u mnogim su zemljama ruralna područja općenito pokazala novu prostorno-ekonomsku dinamiku koja predstavlja kontrast s tradicionalnom dihotomijom urbano – ruralno (Akgün i dr., 2015). Također, migracije iz ruralnih u urbana područja koje su prevladavale u prošlosti nadopunjene su kretanjima iz urbanih u ruralna područja te se u njima susreću recentniji procesi suburbanizacije, kontraurbanizacije ili naturbanizacije (Vaishar, 2020). S obzirom na navedene recentne trendove i promjene u načinu promatranja ruralnih područja i ruralnih periferija postavlja se pitanje na koji način ta područja mogu biti atraktivna, inovativna i razvijena, a pritom ostati u okvirima održivoga razvoja (Akgün i dr., 2015).

Cilj je rada razmotriti različite koncepte ruralnih periferija u odnosu na marginalna područja na osnovi literature, pregledati i vrednovati pristupe istraživanju ruralnih periferija, navesti odabrane primjere modela razvoja ruralnih perifernih područja te donijeti zaključke o važnosti periferija kao heterogenih područja specifičnih modela razvoja. Analitički i pregledni prikaz literature navedene problematike strukturiran je kroz pet glavnih pojmova: periferija, marginalno područje, ruralni prostor, istraživački pristupi te modeli razvoja.

on characteristics of both peripherality and marginality (Copus, 2001). On one hand, inner peripheries, as sensitive areas covering rural Europe, are characterized by distance and poor accessibility to services of general interest and, on the other hand, they are associated with specific socio-economic features, unfavorable demographic trends and an aging population, social exclusion, low economic potential and/or economic decline, and weak territorial cohesion (Copus et al., 2008; De Toni et al., 2021).

The importance of researching peripheral and/or marginal rural areas lies in the fact that they encompass a large part of the population and territory of the European Union. These territories are extremely important for providing goods and services and managing natural and semi-natural environments. Peripheral/marginal areas in general encompass almost one-third of the EU population and provide essential benefits to urban populations through food production and wealth in water resources, biodiversity, and natural and cultural heritage (Bastian et al., 2010; Popović et al., 2017). Moreover, in many countries, rural areas in general have shown new spatial-economic dynamics that present a contrast to the traditional urban-rural dichotomy (Akgün et al., 2015). Also, migrations from rural to urban areas that prevailed in the past have been supplemented by movements from urban to rural areas, and they encounter more recent processes of suburbanization, counter-urbanization, or naturbanization (Vaishar, 2020). Given these recent trends and changes in the way rural areas and rural peripheries are observed, the question arises as to how these areas can become more attractive, innovative, and developed while remaining within the framework of sustainable development (Akgün et al., 2015).

The aim of this paper is to consider different concepts of rural peripheries in relation to marginal areas based on literature, review and evaluate approaches to the research of rural peripheries, list selected examples of development models for rural peripheral areas, and come to useful conclusions regarding the importance of peripheries as heterogeneous areas with specific development models. The analytical and review presentation of the literature on the mentioned issues is structured into five main concepts: periphery; marginal area; rural space; research approaches; and development models.

RAZLIČITA TUMAČENJA POJMA PERIFERIJA I MARGINALNIH PODRUČJA

Struktura istraživanja nalaže definiranje pojmova perifernih i marginalnih područja između kojih, unatoč sadržajnoj sličnosti, ipak postoje stanovite razlike (Pelc, 2012). Tako npr. međudržavna granica može utjecati na proces marginalizacije. Strože i manje propusne granice pojačavaju negativne procese i mogu generirati marginalizaciju unutar periferne regije (Pelc, 2010; Tišma i dr., 2018). Pojmove periferije i marginalnih područja prije svega treba razmotriti iz različitih uglova. U prvom se redu oni često koriste za označavanje područja koja se promatraju kao rubna. Perpar (2014) definira rubna ruralna područja kao dio globalnoga gospodarstva koji je najmanje pogođen urbanizacijom. Kao rezultat toga karakterizira ih izrazito difuzan obrazac distribucije stanovništva i gospodarske aktivnosti te različita razina rubnosti koja se temelji na njihovoj udaljenosti od tržišta i dostupnosti različitim uslugama. Jedan od elemenata koji se razmatra u definiranju samih rubnih prostora (Depraz, 2016) unutar veće cjeline jest, na primjer, njihov položaj izvan glavnih prometnih i razvojnih putova (Lukić i dr., 2009), pri čemu se bilježi nedostatak autohtone/prirodne razvojne snage, a istodobno su ta područja zanemarena od političkih struktura. Fizičko-geografska ograničenja (Toskić i dr., 2014), poput pristupačnosti ili topografskih obilježja, mogu biti uključena u definiranje rubnih područja, ali potrebno ih je promatrati iz socijalne perspektive: kako ih ljudi ocjenjuju, na koji način se osjećaju ograničenima te u kojoj mjeri se olakšava ili ometa ljudsko djelovanje (von Braun i Gatzweiler, 2014). Istraživanja marginalnosti odnosno perifernosti usredotočena su na mnogo različitih tema s obzirom na obuhvat i vrstu rubne regije kojom se određeno istraživanje bavi (Dery i dr., 2012; Malikova, 2013; Markuszewska, 2015).

Mnogi autori svojstvo perifernosti i nerazvijenosti, uključujući nizak ljudski kapital, potencijalno smatraju sinonimima s marginalnošću teritorija (Kubeš i Chvojková, 2020; Dery i dr., 2012). No, u različitim istraživanjima mogu se iščitati razlike u tumačenju ovih pojmova. Matuskova i Rousova (2016) inicijalno razlikuju pojmove

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CONCEPT OF PERIPHERY AND MARGINAL AREAS

The structure of the research requires defining the concepts of peripheral and marginal areas among which, despite their similarities, there are definite differences (Pelc, 2012), for example, an international border can influence the process of marginalization. Stricter and less permeable borders intensify negative processes and can generate marginalization within a peripheral region (Pelc, 2010; Tišma et al., 2018). The concepts of periphery and marginal areas should primarily be considered from different angles. First, they are often used to denote areas that are viewed as marginal. Perpar (2014) defines marginal rural areas as part of the global economy that is least affected by urbanization. As a result, they are characterized by an extremely diffuse pattern of population distribution and economic activity and different levels of marginality based on their distance from markets and access to various services. One of the elements considered in defining marginal spaces (Depraz, 2016) within a larger whole is, for example, their position outside main transport and development routes (Lukić et al., 2009), whereby there is a lack of indigenous/natural development force; at the same time, these areas are neglected by political structures. Physical-geographical limitations (Toskić et al., 2014), such as accessibility or topographical features, can be included in defining marginal areas, but they need to be viewed from a social perspective, i.e. how people evaluate them, how they feel limited, and to what extent human action is facilitated or hindered (von Braun and Gatzweiler, 2014). Research on marginality or peripherality focuses on many different topics given the scope and type of marginal region that a particular study deals with (Dery et al., 2012; Malikova, 2013; Markuszewska, 2015).

Many authors consider the characteristics of peripherality and underdevelopment, including low human capital, to be potentially synonymous with the marginality of territory (Kubeš and Chvojková, 2020; Dery et al., 2012). However, differences in the interpretation of these concepts can be discerned in various studies. Matuskova and Rousova (2016) initially differentiated between the concepts of geometric, social, and economic peripheries, while

geometrijske, društvene i ekonomske periferije, dok pojam marginalnost promatraju kao izoliranost teritorija u vidu pojmova izolirana regija ili mrtvi kut. Marginalna područja definiraju se kao istaknuta rubna područja ili periferije koje su zahvaćene potpunom izolacijom (Kušar i Bobovnik, 2019), a koja nisu orijentirana na proizvodnju niti integrirana u tržište. Pelc (2006) smatra da marginalna područja leže na marginama sustava ili izvan sustava. Općenito, marginalnost možemo definirati kao kompleks nepovoljnih obilježja (osobito društvenog aspekta), a marginalno područje kao ono koje karakterizira ranjivost i nejednaki uvjeti za pojedince ili čitave zajednice, a koje uzrokuju, između ostalih, ekološki, etnički, socijalni, demografski, ekonomski, kulturološki, politički i geometrijski čimbenici (Horvat i Toskić, 2017; Pelc, 2006 i 2010; Zsilincsar, 2014; Pelc., 2017). Na to se nadovezuje tvrdnja da će regije s manje ili više izraženim elementima marginalnosti vjerojatno privući interes geografskih istraživanja u područjima identifikacije marginalnih pojedinaca ili društvenih skupina (Gurung i Kollmair, 2015; Pelc, 2012). Tvrdnje koje prethodno opisuju marginalna područja s izrazito negativnom konotacijom u kontekstu društvenih obilježja posebno se razilaze s definicijom klasične periferije za koju je izrazito važan prostorni, odnosno položajni aspekt.

Potrebno je istaknuti da periferni položaj često, na prirodan način, ima ključnu ulogu u pokretanju procesa marginalizacije (Markuszewska, 2015) jer su prostorno udaljena područja sklona nerazvijenosti i slabijim društveno-ekonomskim uvjetima (Depraz, 2016). Sokol (2001) ima slični, ali modificirani koncept gdje se polumarginalna i marginalna područja nazivaju superperiferijom, pri čemu se izdvaja više tipova. Pojam superperiferije pojavljuje se u posttranzicijskom razdoblju.

Osim rubnosti, značenje klasične periferije ima društvene, političke i ekonomske konotacije, često postaje sinonimom za marginalizaciju, ekonomski nedostatak, nedostatak tehnološke infrastrukture i političku slabost (Cunder, 2007). Vrlo često takvo se područje u literaturi naziva ruralnom idilom (turistički dojam ugođe) što je djelomično krivo razumijevanje (Lukić, 2010), ali je i jedan od

they viewed the concept of marginality as territorial isolation in terms of the concepts of an isolated region or dead corner. Marginal areas are defined as prominent marginal areas or peripheries that are affected by complete isolation (Kušar and Bobovnik, 2019), and are neither oriented towards production nor integrated into the market. Pelc (2006) believes that marginal areas lie on the margins of a system or outside of it. Generally, marginality can be defined as a complex of unfavorable characteristics (especially in social aspects), and a marginal area as one characterized by vulnerability and unequal conditions for individuals or entire communities, caused by, ecological, ethnic, social, demographic, economic, cultural, political, and geometric factors (Horvat and Toskić, 2017; Pelc, 2006 and 2010; Zsilincsar, 2014; Pelc, 2017). This is followed by the observation that regions with more or less pronounced elements of marginality will likely attract the interest of geographical research in the areas of identification of marginal individuals or social groups (Gurung and Kollmair, 2015; Pelc, 2012). Claims that previously described marginal areas with extremely negative connotations in the context of social characteristics, strongly diverge from the definition of the classic periphery, for which the spatial or positional aspect is extremely important.

It should be emphasized that a peripheral position often, naturally, plays a key role in initiating the process of marginalization (Markuszewska, 2015) because spatially distant areas are prone to underdevelopment and weaker socio-economic conditions (Depraz, 2016). Sokol (2001) had a similar but modified concept where semi-marginal and marginal areas are called superperipheries, thereby distinguishing several types. The concept of superperiphery appears in the post-transition period.

Besides marginality, the meaning of the classic periphery has social, political, and economic connotations, often becoming synonymous with marginalization, economic disadvantage, lack of technological infrastructure, and political weakness (Cunder, 2007). Very often such an area in literature is called a rural idyll (a concept popular among tourists) which is partly a misunderstanding (Lukić, 2010), but is also one of the possible discourses in explaining what rural means. Accordingly, examples

mogućih diskursa u objašnjenju što znači ruralno. Sukladno tomu navode se primjeri razumijevanja ruralne periferije kao političkoga, ekološkoga (bogatstvo biološke raznolikosti), gospodarskoga (prevladavajuća poljoprivredna djelatnost) i sličnih oblika razumijevanja. Periferije su fizički i društveni prostori male socijalne gustoće zbivanja, što pak ima za posljedicu relativno nizak stupanj ukupne socijalne energije (Lay, 1998). Stoga se na periferijama ne mogu zbivati velike i brze promjene.

Istraživanja se često zasnivaju na odnosu periferija i metropolitanskih središta (Kebza, 2018; Guzal-Dec et al., 2019), odnosno periferija i urbanih centara razvoja gdje se definira novi pol razvojnog osi. Osim toga, razlikuju se pojmovi periferije i procesa periferizacije. Dok se periferija može promatrati kao pojam koji podrazumijeva udaljenost od jezgre, proces periferizacije obuhvaća generiranje periferija kroz društvene odnose i njihove prostorne implikacije (Kühn, 2015).

Razumijevanje pojma periferije koje u obzir uzima funkcionalne i prostorne odnose uključuje više aspekata: geometrijski, ekološki, socijalni, ekonomski, kulturni i politički (Kebza 2018; Kluza, 2020). Vezano uz prethodno razumijevanje, znanstvenici često izdvajaju tri temeljne grupe nepovoljnoga položaja periferije: uzročne, nepredviđene i povezane (Kebza 2018; Copus, 2001) koje predstavljaju načine nastanka periferija: određenim uzrokom, nepredviđenom ekonomskom/ekološkom situacijom ili povezanosti odlučujućih čimbenika razvoja. Nadogradnja prethodno izrečenog očituje se u sljedećem: definiraju se tri općenite (idealizirane) kategorije ruralnih područja: I. područja usluge središta/jezgre, II. umjerena industrijska područja, III. periferna ruralna područja (Kebza, 2018; Hospers, 2003).

Različite definicije periferija uključuju, dakle, gledišta na periferije kao rijetko naseljena područja definirana geometrijskom udaljenosti od centra (Kauppila, 2011) ili kao područja koja nisu uspješno prošla integracije u dominantne strukture i procese (Mauz, 2007). Raznim definicijama ruralne periferije stvoren je teorijski heterogeni skup studija u kojoj se udaljenost (geometrijska ili vremenska) i nerazvijenost (nizak kapital, even-

of understanding the rural periphery as political, ecological (wealth of biodiversity), economic (predominant agricultural activity), and similar forms of understanding are cited. Peripheries are physical and social spaces of low social density of events, which results in a relatively low degree of total social energy (Lay, 1998). Therefore, large-scale, rapid changes cannot occur on the peripheries.

Research is often based on the relationship between peripheries and metropolitan centers (Kebza, 2018; Guzal-Dec et al., 2019), or peripheries and urban centers of development where a new pole of the development axis is defined. In addition, the concepts of periphery and the process of peripheralization are distinguished. While the periphery can be viewed as a concept that implies distance from the core, the process of peripheralization encompasses the generation of peripheries through social relations and their spatial implications (Kühn, 2015).

The concept of periphery takes into account functional and spatial relationships and includes several aspects: geometric; ecological; social; economic; cultural; and political (Kebza 2018; Kluza, 2020). Related to the previous understanding, scientists often distinguish three basic groups of unfavorable positions of the periphery: causal; unforeseen; and connected (Kebza 2018; Copus, 2001) which represent ways of creating peripheries: by a certain cause; an unforeseen economic/ecological situation; or a connection of decisive development factors. The aforementioned aspects can be further divided into three general (idealized) categories of rural areas: I) service areas of the center/core; II) moderate industrial areas; and III) peripheral rural areas (Kebza, 2018; Hospers, 2003).

Different definitions of peripheries include, therefore, views of peripheries as sparsely populated areas defined by geometric distance from the center (Kauppila, 2011) or as areas that have not successfully passed integration into dominant structures and processes (Mauz, 2007). Various definitions of rural periphery have created a theoretically heterogeneous set of studies in which distance (geometric or temporal) and underdevelopment (low capital, possible instability, deprivation, backwardness) are not separated in the definition process. Generally,

tualna nestabilnost, deprivacija, zaostalost) ne razdvajaju pri njezinu definiranju. Općenito, nedostaju nam jasne definicije i dosljedna terminologija za korištenje. Širina pojma periferije nastala je i zbog izbjegavanja onoga što biti periferan podrazumijeva u različitim prostornim razmjerima i razvojnim procesima koji se razmatraju (Pugh i Dubois, 2021; Kluza, 2020; Perpar, 2014). Često su se u radovima krajem 20. stoljeća navodili alternativni pojmovi za periferiju kao npr. riječ udaljeno, zaostalo, ruralno ili marginalno. Iz toga je proizašla potreba sustavnoga pristupa istraživanju periferija kao geografskoga konstrukta (Pugh i Dubois, 2021).

Iako su periferne regije izrazito heterogene (npr. u smislu kompetencija, specijalizacije, veličine i/ili raznolikosti), postoji tendencija da se takve regije tretiraju kao homogene i kao regije kojima nedostaju endogeni resursi kao što su znanje, kapital i infrastruktura (Nilsen i dr., 2023).

Ipak, unatoč tomu što se i marginalna i periferna ruralna područja promatraju kroz zavisni položaj u odnosu na jezgru, niz istraživanja u recentnom razdoblju pokazuju mogućnost drukčijega razumijevanja ovih pojmova. Umjesto negativnih konotacija pojmova perifernosti i marginalnosti naglasak se stavlja na nove, često pozitivne, razvojne puteve određenoga prostora korištenjem vlastitih resursa (Tani i dr., 2016; Dadashpoor i Somayeh Ahani, 2019). Perifernim ruralnim područjima dana je prilika da razmotre svoj položaj, pri čemu se atributi koji su donedavno smatrani nepovoljnim sada vrednuju kao nove mogućnosti u pozitivnom smislu. Pritom nedostaci u prostoru zapravo mogu postati razvojne prednosti, kao npr. specifičnost graničnoga prostora, turistički i resursni potencijali i sl. (Hedlund, 2016). Izolacija i daljina predstavljaju mir i prepoznatljivost, ruralnost se smatra načinom kontakta s prirodom (Cremer-Schultea i Dissart, 2015), a tradicionalni životni stil temelj je iskustva baštine (Figueiredo, 2009).

U sljedećem dijelu rasprave razmatraju se primjeri iz određenih zemalja. Odabrani primjeri upućuju na to kako se tumačenja perifernoga ruralnog prostora koriste u izdvajanju od urbanoga i kao takva su funkcionalni doprinosi primjerenijem

clear definitions and consistent terminology, for use in this case, are lacking. The breadth of the concept of periphery has also grown in scope due to avoiding what being peripheral implies in the different spatial scales and development processes being considered (Pugh and Dubois, 2021; Kluza, 2020; Perpar, 2014). Often, in papers from the late 20th century, alternative terms for periphery were used, such as the words remote, backward, rural, or marginal. From this arose the need for a systematic approach to researching peripheries as a geographical construct (Pugh and Dubois, 2021).

Although peripheral regions are extremely heterogeneous (e.g. in terms of competencies, specialization, size, and/or diversity), there is a tendency to treat such regions as homogeneous and as regions lacking endogenous resources such as knowledge, capital, and infrastructure (Nilsen et al., 2023).

However, despite the fact that both marginal and peripheral rural areas are viewed through a dependent position in relation to the core, a series of research in the recent period shows the possibility of a different understanding of these concepts. Instead of negative connotations of the concepts of peripherality and marginality, emphasis is placed on new, often positive, development paths of a given space via the use of its own resources (Tani et al., 2016; Dadashpoor and Somayeh Ahani, 2019). Peripheral rural areas have been given the opportunity to reconsider their position, whereby attributes that were until recently considered unfavorable are now valued as new possibilities in a positive sense. Thereby, disadvantages in space can actually become development advantages, such as the specificity of a border space, tourist and resource potentials, etc. (Hedlund, 2016). Isolation and distance represent peace and recognizability; rurality is considered a way of contact with nature (Cremer-Schultea and Dissart, 2015), and the traditional lifestyle is the foundation of the heritage experience (Figueiredo, 2009).

In the next part of the discussion, examples from specific countries are considered. The selected examples indicate how interpretations of peripheral rural space are used in distinguishing from urban space and, as such, are a functional contribution to more appropriate planning of the development of

planiranju razvoja heterogenih administrativnih jedinica. Razlog odabira primjera definiran je jasnom problematikom ruralnih periferija s analitičkom distinkcijom u prostoru određene zemlje, odnosno države. Stoga je često proces zaostajanja niza perifernih ruralnih područja u gospodarskom i demografskom razvoju uzročno-posljedično povezan s nodalno-funkcionalnom organizacijom države kao glavnim čimbenikom uravnoteženoga i usmjerenoga regionalnoga razvoja (Nejašmić i dr., 2018). U konačnici, sukus definiranja ruralnih periferija vrlo je različit u pojedinim zemljama te se koristi nerijetko i pojam marginalnosti. Iako određene zemlje nemaju klasične definirane periferije u ruralnom prostoru, ipak u međunarodno priznatim granicama zemalja postoje deprivirana ruralna područja. S obzirom na element granice ističu se njezine dvije suprotne mogućnosti, odnosno pozitivne i negativne konotacije periferije, pri čemu pozicija na granici predstavlja i priliku ili u razvojnom smislu nepovoljni položaj u odnosu na središte (Tišma i dr., 2018; Perpar, 2014; Miosga, 2008; Pelc 2010).

Bavljenje tematikom ruralnih periferija, osobito unutar zemalja Europske unije te onih zemalja koje spadaju u razvijeni dio Europe a nisu dio EU-a, vrlo je specifičan i ovisi o nizu okolnosti proučavanja periferija, a koje mogu biti povijesne, geopolitičke, gospodarske, kulturološke i sl.

Primjer slojevitog načina prikaza ruralne periferije jesu prostorne tipologije. Primjerice, poljski znanstvenici koriste prostornu tipologiju (gmina¹) (Kebza, 2018; Bański i Mazur, 2016) koja se zasniva na konceptu polova rasta, jezgra – periferija, pri čemu se ta komponenta periferije referira na graničnu periferiju, periferiju užitka (turizam, prirodna i kulturna baština) te unutarnju periferiju koju definira ispodprosječno razvijeno područje koje nije ni blizu (vektorska udaljenost) administrativne granice. Često se postavlja pitanje o jednakosti i učinkovitosti određenih područja u vidu demografske i gospodarske moći teritorijalnih jedinica prostorno bliže ili dalje od urbanih centara. Istovremeno su prisutni procesi koji se preklapaju unutar periferija kao što su npr. kon-

heterogeneous administrative units. The reason for selecting examples is defined by the clear problem of rural peripheries with analytical distinction in the space of a given country or state. Therefore, the fact that a series of peripheral rural areas lag behind in economic and demographic development is often causally linked to the nodal-functional organization of the state as the main factor of balanced and directed regional development (Nejašmić et al., 2018). Ultimately, the definition of rural peripheries is very different in different countries, and the concept of marginality is also often used. Although certain countries do not have classically defined peripheries in rural areas, there are still deprived rural areas within internationally recognized borders. Given the element of the border, two opposite possibilities stand out, i.e. positive and negative connotations of the periphery, whereby the position on the border represents both an opportunity or, in terms of development, an unfavorable position in relation to the center (Tišma et al., 2018; Perpar, 2014; Miosga, 2008; Pelc 2010).

Dealing with the topic of rural peripheries, especially within member states of the European Union and other countries that belong to the developed part of Europe but are not part of the EU, is very specific and depends on a series of conditions, which can be historical, geopolitical, economic, cultural, etc.

An example of a complex way of depicting rural periphery is spatial typologies. For example, several Polish scientists have used spatial typology (Gmina¹) (Kebza, 2018; Bański and Mazur, 2016), which is based on the concept of growth poles, i.e. core – periphery, whereby this component of the periphery refers to the border periphery, the periphery of pleasure (tourism, natural and cultural heritage), and the inner periphery defined by a below-average developed area that is far from (vector distance) to the administrative border. The question is often raised about the equality and efficiency of certain areas in terms of demographic and economic power of territorial units spatially closer to or further from urban centers. At the same time, there are processes that overlap within peripheries such as: convergence

and divergence of resources (convergence in terms of striving towards a certain value, or increasing it, and divergence in terms of moving away from the development axis) and concentration and diffusion of population (Sikorski et al., 2020).

Furthermore, Hedlund (2016) presents a typology based on socio-economic variables in which the Norrland Region in Sweden is distinguished, which is perceived as a peripheral rural region; remote, backward, a region with a high unemployment rate, with characteristics of dependency, depopulation, and low levels of education. Furthermore, an interesting perspective of discourse on peripheral areas is linked again to the Norrland Region (Nilsson and Lundgren, 2015) whereby the question is raised of how the Norrland Region, which is sparsely populated and deprived, will develop in the long-term, from the perspective of political action on the development of the periphery. Generally, in Scandinavian countries, peripheries like Norrland are often distinguished based on ecological value, whereby the potential of natural and cultural heritage along with the policy of regional growth often stabilizes the development of a deprived region or periphery (Etxano, 2012).

Examining the relationship between 'rural peripherality' and 'tourist transition' is dealt with by Salvatore et al. (2018) to describe ongoing transformations within the tourism supply in rural areas (Popescu, 2014), emphasizing the importance that these concepts acquire in theoretical debate and in policy-making. Based on the classification of peripheral areas provided by the Italian strategy for internal areas (*The National Strategy for Inner Areas (SNAI; Italian: Strategia nazionale per le aree interne)*), the authors undertook a detailed statistical analysis at the municipal level, considering tourism as an important driver of socio-economic changes (Salvatore et al., 2018). A management model based on the expression *transition management* is presented as a practical means for guiding these processes. The case study in the research of Salvatore et al. (2018) was conducted through participatory research and offered an opportunity to overcome existing management practices and the realization that transition can lead peripheral areas towards a new conceptualization beyond the idea of marginality.

¹ Gmina je osnovna jedinica administrativne podjele Poljske, slična općini.

¹ Gmina is the basic unit of territorial division in Poland, similar to a municipality.

SUVREMENI PRISTUPI ISTRAŽIVANJU I RAZVOJU PERIFERNIH RURALNIH PODRUČJA

Definicije ruralnih područja predmet su brojnih akademskih radova. Npr. model jezgra –periferija zastario je s obzirom na recentna socioekonom-ska gibanja 21. stoljeća te se preferira korištenje otvorenijega pristupa. Nastajanjem nove ruralne paradigme (Nørgaard, 2011), pri čemu su fokus prostori, a ne sektori te investicije, a ne subvencije, jasno se preferira uravnotežen regionalni razvoj. Čini se da je razgraničenje i razlikovanje ruralnih područja u regionalnim tipologijama ključno pitanje povezano s konceptom razvojne politike EU-a, usmjeravajući konkretne instrumente pomoći u ovoj kategoriji područja. U tom kontekstu važno je primijeniti pristup koji je specijaliziran ili prilagođen za pojedine vrste ruralnih područja da bi se stvorili odgovarajući uvjeti za diversifikaciju razvojnih pravaca.

U sljedećim poglavljima ovoga rada analiziraju se perspektive, percepcija i razvojni izazovi odabranih primjera izdvajanja ruralnih perifernih područja u državama EU-a. U nastavku rada izdvajaju se različiti pristupi istraživanju i razvoju perifernih ruralnih područja. Analiza istraživanja relevantne literature uključuje sljedeće elemente: teorijske pristupe, metodologiju, svrhu pregledanih istraživanja, načine kako se pristupa razvoju ovih područja te modele razvoja.

Kriteriji i pristupi u istraživanju i izdvajanju perifernih ruralnih područja

Nerijetko se tipologije ne izrađuju samo za statističke potrebe, nego za praktičnu primjenu u političkom upravljanju i procesima donošenja odluka. Politike lokalnoga razvoja i prostorno planiranje (Lukić i Obad, 2016), postupci prikupljanja podataka i statističke analize često se temelje na postojećim tipologijama (Bański, 2010). Kod potrebe za izradu specifičnih, primjenjivih tipologija (Beyazli i dr., 2017) često se koristi klaster analiza s multidimenzionalnim pristupom problematici (Nejašmić i Mišetić, 2010; Ottomano, 2016). Zbog toga je potpuno legitimno predlaganje novih tipologija ruralnih područja (Weifeng i Li, 2020).

CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF PERIPHERAL RURAL AREAS

Definitions of rural areas are the subject of numerous academic papers. For example, the core-periphery model has become outdated given the recent socio-economic trends of the 21st century, and a more open approach is preferred. With the emergence of a new rural paradigm (Nørgaard, 2011), where the focus is on spaces rather than sectors, and investments rather than subsidies, balanced regional development is clearly preferred. It seems that the delimitation and differentiation of rural areas in regional typologies is a key issue related to the EU's development policy concept, directing specific aid instruments to this category of areas. In this context, it is important to apply an approach that is specialized or adapted for specific types of rural areas in order to create appropriate conditions for the diversification of development directions.

In the following sections of this paper, perspectives, perceptions, and development challenges of selected examples of peripheral rural areas in EU member states are analyzed. The paper continues by highlighting different approaches to research and development of peripheral rural areas. The analysis of relevant literature research includes the following elements: theoretical approaches, methodology, purpose of reviewed research, ways of approaching the development of these areas, and development models.

Criteria and approaches in research and identification of peripheral rural areas

Typologies are often created not only for statistical purposes but for practical application in political governance and decision-making processes. Local development policies and spatial planning (Lukić and Obad, 2016), data collection procedures, and statistical analyses are often based on existing typologies (Bański, 2010). With the need for specific, applicable typologies (Beyazli et al., 2017), cluster analysis is often used in a multidimensional approach to the issue (Nejašmić and Mišetić, 2010; Ottomano, 2016). For this reason, proposing new typologies of rural areas is completely legitimate (Weifeng and Li, 2020).

Ove tipologije, kao teorijski i praktični prijedlozi, pokušavaju pratiti ruralna područja koja se brzo mijenjaju. Odabrani su radovi na specifičnom ruralnom prostoru različitih razumijevanja periferije (resursna, turistička, granična i sl.) (Argent, 2016). Upravo spomenuto različito razumijevanje periferija ruralnoga prostora, odnosno tipologija, prikazano je analizom odabranih radova.

Odabir kriterija na temelju kojih je napravljena analiza u nastavku zasniva se na načinima izdvajanja perifernih ruralnih područja. Načini se razlikuju ovisno o području i temi koja se obrađuje, naime nit vodilja su elementi socioekonomske strukture te percepcija ruralne periferije koji su se kvantitativno prikazali u obliku varijabli kako bi se dobile nedvosmislene varijacije tipologija. No, valja imati na umu da tipologije nisu jedini element prepoznavanja periferija u prostoru, već su to multidimenzionalni pogledi zašto su ruralne periferije u konačnici i nastale, stoga je odabran i obrađen takav niz recentne literature u sljedećem odlomku.

Periferna ruralna područja vrlo su često tema istraživanja u područjima država bivšega istočnog bloka gdje su te razlike razvojne centralne osovine i rubnih prostora vrlo izrazite, stoga pregled odabrane literature započinje tim područjem istraživanja. Bański i Mazur (2016) izradili su tipologiju ruralnih područja Poljske koja se može koristiti kao instrument teritorijalne politike. Metodološki postupak uzima u obzir tri aspekta: dinamiku razvoja, ekonomsku strukturu i prometnu dostupnost. Samim time implicira se konstruktivno rješenje za modele razvoja sa specifičnim pristupom teritorijalnoj razvojnoj politici. Izraženi nedostatak su rezultati analize koji se generalno teško interpretiraju. Detaljnijom analizom specifičnoga prostora bavi se Kebza (2018) istražujući proces periferizacije rubnih područja analizom pokrajine Zapadno Pomorje (Zachodniopomorskie) u Poljskoj. Naglasak stavlja na odnos između perifernih područja i glavnih metropolitanskih/urbanih područja na tom prostoru. Prikazuju se skalarni (kao binarni, samo s negativnim ili pozitivnim predznakom) i vektorski podatci o odabranim pokazateljima u 2005. i 2015. za GMINA (komune, teritorijalne jedinice NUTS 5). Glavni

These typologies, as theoretical and practical proposals, attempt to track rapidly-changing rural areas. Papers on specific rural spaces with different understandings of periphery (resource, tourism, border, etc.) have been selected (Argent, 2016). This varied understanding of rural space peripheries, or typology, is presented via the analysis of selected papers.

The selection of criteria on which the following analysis is based focuses on how to identify peripheral rural areas. The methods differ depending on the area and topic being addressed; the guiding principle is elements of socio-economic structure and the perception of rural peripheries that have been quantitatively presented in the form of variables, in order to obtain unambiguous variations of typologies. However, it should be kept in mind that typologies are not the only element used for recognizing peripheries in space, rather multidimensional views of why rural peripheries ultimately emerged; accordingly, a series of recent literature on this topic has been selected and processed in the following section.

Understandably, peripheral rural areas are very often the subject of research in areas of former *Eastern Bloc* countries where the developmental differences between central axes and peripheral spaces are very pronounced, so the review of selected literature begins with this area. Bański and Mazur (2016) created a typology of rural areas in Poland that can be used as an instrument of territorial policy. Their methodological approach takes into account three aspects: development dynamics; economic structure; and transport accessibility. This implies a constructive solution for development models with a specific approach to territorial development policy. A pronounced shortcoming is that the results of the analysis are generally difficult to interpret. Kebza (2018) dealt with a more detailed analysis of a specific area, investigating the process of peripheralization of border areas by analyzing the West Pomeranian Voivodeship (Zachodniopomorskie) in Poland. They emphasized the relationship between peripheral areas and major metropolitan/urban areas in that space. Scalar (as binary, only with negative or positive signs) and vector data on selected indicators in 2005 and 2015 for GMINA (communes, NUTS 5 territorial units) are presented. The main

je pokazatelj kompozitnoga tipa te je temeljen na izračunatim podatcima, a služi kao osnova za kategorizaciju metropolitanskih, „poluperifernih” i perifernih područja koji su dodatno definirani na osnovi svojih unutrašnjih svojstava i položaja u regiji. Iako korištenje većih teritorijalnih jedinica ima prednost pristupa boljim statističkim podatcima, pristup koji se ovdje primjenjuje trebao bi pružiti detaljniji uvid u regionalnu socioekonomsku strukturu. Osnovni je nedostatak istraživanja u korištenju maloga broja pokazatelja.

Uvjetovani sličnim geopolitičkim procesima istraživanja, Pociūtė-Sereikienė i Kriaučiūnas (2018) bave se utvrđivanjem glavnih promjena sustava u Litvi 1990-ih i njegovim učincima na periferna područja. Korišteni su podatci i informacije prikupljene tijekom terenskih izlazaka u periferna ruralna područja diljem zemlje. Rezultati istraživanja omogućili su da se predvidi „centralno-periferna” prostorna struktura kao jedan od glavnih čimbenika koji će u bliskoj budućnosti utjecati na regionalni razvoj u Litvi. Vidljiv je nedostatak ovoga rada u tome što tema gospodarstva nije spominjana te je osnovni problem u proučavanju periferija taj što teritorij postaje centar zanimanja, a ne stanovnici koji ga čine. Dok npr. u sljedećem istraživanju autor Pociūtė-Sereikienė (2019) prikazuje sve veće dihotomije središta i periferije s naglaskom na Litvu kao posljedicu izražene polarizacije središte – periferija pri čemu mnoge europske zemlje bilježe brz rast kapitala gradova i značajan pad na rubnim ruralnim područjima i u bivšim regionalnim središtima. Naglašava se da sve veću polarizaciju treba promatrati kao složen fenomen pod utjecajem socioekonomskih, demografskih, lokacijskih i drugih čimbenika. Prednost je ovoga modela istraživanja što se može primijeniti na područja slične pozadine, pogotovo u državama koje su bile u socijalizmu pa tranziciji i kapitalizmu te se samim time pokazala izrazita važnost geopolitičkih odluka na svim razinama.

Skandinavski istraživači predstavljaju način istraživanja koji se više oslanja na socijalno-ekonomsku dinamiku u istraživanju, stoga je kao primjer Hedlund (2016) izradio socioekonomske tipologije ruralne Švedske analizom dostupne literature i statističkih podataka. Koristio se oda-

indicator is of a composite type and is based on calculated data, serving as a basis for categorizing metropolitan, semi-peripheral, and peripheral areas that are further defined based on their internal properties and position in the region. Although using larger territorial units has the advantage of accessing better statistical data, the approach applied here should provide a more detailed insight into the regional socio-economic structure. The main shortcoming of the research is the use of a small number of indicators.

Conditioned by similar geopolitical research processes, Pociūtė-Sereikienė and Kriaučiūnas (2018) dealt with identifying the main system changes in Lithuania in the 1990s and their effects on peripheral areas. Data and information collected during field trips to peripheral rural areas throughout the country were used. Research results made it possible to predict that the “central-peripheral” spatial structure would be one of the main factors influencing regional development in Lithuania in the near future. A visible shortcoming is that the topic of the economy is not mentioned in this paper, and the basic problem with studying peripheries is that the territory itself becomes the center of interest, rather than the residents who live in it. While in the next paper, the author Pociūtė-Sereikienė (2019) showed increasing center-periphery dichotomies with an emphasis on Lithuania as a consequence of pronounced center-periphery polarization, whereby many European countries recorded rapid growth of cities and significant decline in peripheral rural territories and former regional centers. It is emphasized that increasing polarization should be viewed as a complex phenomenon influenced by socio-economic, demographic, locational, and other factors. As an advantage, this research model can be applied to areas with a similar background, especially in countries that underwent a transition from socialism to capitalism, thus showing the extreme importance of geopolitical decisions at all levels.

Scandinavian researchers present a research method that relies more on socio-economic dynamics in research, so as an example, Hedlund (2016) created socio-economic typologies of rural Sweden by analyzing available literature and statistical data. He used a selection of eleven (11) variables (so-

birom jedanest (11) socioekonomskih i demografske varijabla specifičnih za lokalna obilježja koja pružaju važan uvid u heterogenost ruralnih područja. Ističu se nedostaci kao što su npr. subjektivnost u odabiru varijabli (presumpcija), puno rezultiranih tipova perifernoga ruralnog, čime se dodatno gubi točnost i smislenost cijele tipologije. Nilsson i Lundgren (2015) istražuju kako se regija Norrland kao periferija koristi i stvara u političkoj retorici. Identificiraju se dominantne logike koje su počivale na različitim diskursima i utjecale na procese oblikovanja značenja, opisuju se kako su argumenti, koji se razlikuju ideološki i/ili koriste različite diskurse, naglasili zajedničko gledanje na Norrland kao ruralno, udaljeno i problematično područje. U samoj analitičkoj podlozi nedostatak je u kompleksnom kvantitativnom načinu prikazivanja opisnih (kvalitativnih) obilježja.

Za razliku od prethodnih, Nørgaard (2011) razmatra u svom radu izazove, budućnost i mogućnosti u ruralnim i perifernim područjima u Danskoj te se utvrđuje moguća neusklađenost između različitih politika, reformi i strategija u odnosu na izazove tih područja. Kaže da je nova ruralna paradigma razvijena tamo gdje su ključni elementi usredotočeni na mjesta, a ne na sektore i na ulaganja, a ne na poticaje, naglašavajući potrebu za oslanjanjem na lokalne prednosti i kvalitetu – učinkovita promjena načina razmišljanja gdje se periferija razvojno oslanja na vlastite vrijednosti (resursne, okolišne, kulturne i sl.). Kao nedostatak istraživanja ističe se da se nova ruralna paradigma često ne odnosi na realne probleme i potrebe.

Kao rezime periferije ruralnoga prostora izdvajaju se dva znanstvena rada koja se odnose na perceptivnu važnost ruralne periferije. Prema tome Steinführer i Reichert-Schick (2018) u svom radu definiraju kako akteri u određenim ruralnim područjima utvrđuju i eventualno revaloriziraju endogene potencijale i prepoznaju nove resurse svojih regija. Ističe se pojam *inner peripheries*, ali u europskom kontekstu, te su njihovom konceptualizacijom specifična glavna obilježja unutarnjih periferija kao što su npr. položaj na rubu ili između središnjih područja, pad glavne gospodarske aktivnosti, demografski pad i gubi-

cio-economic and demographic) specific to local characteristics that provide important insight into the heterogeneity of rural areas. Shortcomings are highlighted, such as: subjectivity in the selection of variables (presumption) and many resulting types of peripheral rural areas, which further loses the accuracy and meaningfulness of the entire typology. Nilsson and Lundgren (2015) investigate how the Norrland Region, as a periphery, is used and created in political rhetoric. Dominant logic based on different discourses that influenced meaning-formation processes are identified, describing how arguments, which differ ideologically and/or use different discourses, emphasized a common view of Norrland as a stagnant, rural, remote, and problematic area. In the analytical foundation itself, there is a shortcoming in the complex quantitative manner of presenting descriptive (qualitative) characteristics.

Unlike the previous papers, Nørgaard (2011) considered the challenges, future, and possibilities in rural and peripheral areas in Denmark, and identified a possible mismatch between various policies, reforms, and strategies in relation to the challenges of these areas. He says that a new rural paradigm has been developed, wherein key elements are focused on places rather than sectors and on investments rather than incentives, emphasizing the need to rely on local advantages and qualities – an effective change in thinking where the periphery relies on its own values (resource, environmental, cultural, etc.) for development. A shortcoming of the research is the fact that the new rural paradigm often does not address real problems and needs.

As a summary of the periphery of rural space, two scientific papers stand out that relate to the perceptual importance of the rural periphery. Accordingly, Steinführer and Reichert-Schick (2018) defined how actors in certain rural areas determine and eventually revalue endogenous potentials and recognize new resources in their regions. The term inner peripheries is highlighted, in a European context, and their conceptualization specifies the main characteristics of inner peripheries such as: position on the edge of or between central areas; decline in primary economic activity; demographic decline; and loss of local identity. As a negative part of the paper review, rural peripheries are often viewed as

tak lokalnoga identiteta. Kao negativan dio pregleđa rada, ruralne periferije često se promatraju kao prostorni ostatci u razvojnom smislu te gledajući iz geografske, socijalne i prostornoplane perspektive to je problematična socijalno-prostorna kategorija.

Willett i Lang (2017) također, za razliku od prethodno analiziranih u ovom dijelu rada, ne prikazuju način izrade tipologije niti modela razvoja, već percepciju pojma periferizacije u socijalnom kontekstu te djelovanje principa regionalizacije uz teoriju odnosa jezgre i periferije. Zbog druge domene i svrhe istraživanja, gdje je identitet periferije obilježen socijalnim konceptom, a nadograđuje se teritorijem, rad je ostavljen zadnji za prikaz. U njemu se nameće pitanje: „Kako postati periferijom ili ostati periferijom!?” kroz klasično razmatranje strukturalnih odnosa i pristupa (ekonomski i upravljanje/politika) preko pojmova identifikacije kao što su npr. ruralnost, slaba dostupnost, niska razina inovacija, ljudskoga i socijalnoga kapitala). Postojeća infrastruktura (komunikacijska odnosno prometna) može samo djelomice objasniti zašto neke regije ne reagiraju na infrastrukturne injekcije, dok se druge razvijaju same od sebe.

Zaključno razmišljanje o sustavno navedenim kriterijima i pristupima svodi se na istinsku raznolikost poimanja ruralne periferije i u konačnici njezino vrednovanje. Odabrana literatura produkt je sinteze povijesno-geografskoga razvoja zemalja, osobito bivšega istočnog komunističkog bloka s donekle sličnim povijesno-geografskim razvojem Hrvatske te percepcijom prostora u vidu ruralne periferije, gdje su potrebni kvalitativni i kvantitativni kriteriji za njezino definiranje.

Pregledom odabranih tipologija te kriterija i pristupa izdvajanja perifernih ruralnih područja i same važnosti koncepta *središte-periferija* poblize se definira kako ruralne periferije nastaju i nestaju u vremenu, kroz određena tematska pitanja, kao npr.

- A. Kako akteri u određenim ruralnim područjima utvrđuju i eventualno revaloriziraju endogene potencijale? (Lay, 1998)
- B. Koju ulogu u tim procesima imaju vanjski akteri, lokalno stanovništvo i drugi dionici?

spatial remnants in terms of development, and from a geographical, social, and spatial planning perspective, this is a problematic socio-spatial category.

Willett and Lang (2017), unlike previously analyzed papers in this section, did not present a way to create a typology or development model, rather a perception of the concept of peripheralization in a social context and the operation of the principle of regionalization along with the theory of core-periphery relations. Due to the different domain and purpose of research, the identity of the periphery is characterized by a social concept, and is built upon territory. Throughout the paper, an intrusive question is posed: “*How to become a periphery or remain a periphery!?*”; which the authors explore via classical consideration of structural relations and approaches (economic and governance/politics) and identification concepts such as: rurality, poor accessibility, low level of innovation, human and social capital. Existing infrastructure (communication or transport) can only partially explain why some regions do not respond to infrastructure injections, while other similar regions develop on their own.

The concluding thought on systematically listed criteria and approaches comes down to the true diversity of understanding rural periphery and ultimately its evaluation. The selected literature is a product of the synthesis of historical-geographical development of countries, especially the former Eastern Bloc with somewhat similar historical-geographical development to Croatia and perception of space in terms of rural periphery, where qualitative and quantitative criteria are needed to define it.

By reviewing selected typologies and criteria and approaches to identifying peripheral rural areas and the importance of the *center-periphery* concept itself, we find that it is more closely defined as how rural peripheries arise and disappear over time, via certain thematic issues, such as:

- A. How do actors in certain rural areas determine and possibly revalue endogenous potentials? (Lay, 1998);
- B. What role do external actors, local population, and other stakeholders play in these processes?;

C. Koji je utjecaj na europsku, nacionalnu i regionalnu politiku s obzirom na nastajanje i nestajanje periferija? (Hodge i Midmore, 2008; Ward i Brown, 2009)

D. Koje prepreke još postoje kako bi se prevladali strukturalni gospodarski, socijalni i prostorni nedostaci? (Nejašmić i dr., 2018).

Izdvajanje ruralne periferije može imati svoje prednosti i nedostatke. Demonstracija prednosti uviđa se kao npr. fokus na potrebama (specifične potrebe ruralne periferije što može rezultirati ciljanim pristupom i prilagođenim programima razvoja), povećanjem resursa (dodatni resursi i sredstava za poticanje razvoja, infrastrukture ili javnih usluga) te održivosti u vidu implementacije modela razvoja prilagođenih specifičnostima ruralnih perifernih područja.

Istodobno se spominju nedostaci u vidu izolacije područja koja ima negativan utjecaj na demografsku strukturu, rizika od nejednakosti u raspodjeli resursa između različitih regija što može izazvati napetosti i neravnotežu te administrativnih izazova koji uključuju upravljanje i koordinacije usmjerenih politika i programa na razini periferije.

Važno je pronaći ravnotežu između jakosnih obilježja ruralnih perifernih područja i potencijalnih negativnih učinaka nejednakosti. Zbog toga se svaka tipologija i pristup definiranju ruralnih periferija unutar spomenutih država razlikuje u načinu što se njome želi postići kao mogući odgovor na razvojne probleme prostora. Odabrane tipologije nerijetko predstavljaju mehanizam prepoznavanja prostornih nejednakosti u funkciji specifičnoga modela razvoja.

Modeli razvoja perifernih ruralnih područja

Modeli razvoja perifernih ruralnih područja izrazito su kompleksna tematika. Često suvremeno stanje socioekonomskoga okruženja ruralnih područja odražava probleme koji ometaju stabilan razvoj. Takvo se stanje može donekle objasniti ključnim slomom modela razvoja ruralnih područja koji se dogodio u prošlom stoljeću kao rezultat transformacije ekonomske paradigme u agrarnoj sastavnici gospodarstva.

C. What is the impact on European, national, and regional policy with regard to the emergence and disappearance of peripheries? (Hodge and Midmore, 2008; Ward and Brown, 2009);

D. What obstacles still exist to overcome structural economic, social, and spatial disadvantages? (Nejašmić et al., 2018)

The identification of rural periphery can have its advantages and disadvantages. Advantages are recognized as, for example: focus on needs (specific needs of rural periphery which can result in a targeted approach and customized development programs), increase of resources (additional resources and funds to encourage development, infrastructure, or public services), and sustainability in terms of implementing development models adapted to the specificities of rural peripheral areas.

At the same time, disadvantages are mentioned in terms of isolation of areas which has a negative impact on demographic structure, risk of inequality in resource distribution between different regions which can cause tensions and imbalance, and administrative challenges that include management and coordination of targeted policies and programs at the periphery level.

It is important to find a balance between the strengths of rural peripheral areas and the potential negative effects of inequality. Therefore, each typology and approach to defining rural peripheries within the mentioned countries differs in what it aims to achieve as a possible response to the developmental problems of the space. Selected typologies often represent a mechanism for recognizing spatial inequalities in the function of a specific development model.

Models of Development for Peripheral Rural Areas

Models of development for peripheral rural areas are an extremely complex topic. Often, the contemporary state of the socioeconomic environment of rural areas reflects problems that hinder stable development. This situation can be somewhat explained by the key breakdown of the rural development model that occurred in the past century as a result of the transformation of the economic paradigm in the agricultural component of the economy.

Rješenja upravljanja definiranim regijama mogu biti u vidu konvergencije i izjednačenja procesa polarizacije ili koncentracija, kako se ističe u literaturi, *otoka oporavka u prostoru* ili efekt prelijevanja inovacija iz polova.

Bánski (2010) kaže da su najučinkovitiji razvojni elementi periferija investiranja u noduse i zone aktivnosti te inovacije. *Tunel-efekt* pojam je koji je definiran u perifernom području gdje potencijalno razvojne osi ostaju samo tranzitne. Spomenuti efekt vrlo se često aktualizira kod prometnih veza.

Potencijali i strategije unutarnjeg/endogenetskog razvoja često su nejasni, osobito u periferijama gdje nedostaje moć i inovacija (Kühn, 2015). Aktivacijom endogenoga potencijala razvija se kompetitivna prednost za periferne regije na regionalnoj i lokalnoj razini (Bański i Mazur, 2016). Pritom je poželjan individualizirani pristup regijama i njihovo učinkovito korištenje, pogotovo preko EU alata kohezijske politike i ruralnoga razvoja.

Kako bi teorijski pristupi i praktični zaključci bili dobro utemeljeni, primijenjene su određene znanstvene metode (indukcija, dedukcija, hipotetičko-deduktivne i ostale) za oblikovanje praktičnih modela razvoja kojima se koristila Merenkova i dr. (2019). Pri provođenju analize i kasnijoj sintezi modela korišteni su određeni dodatni specifični metodološki postupci (analiza, sinteza, odabir).

Nerijetko su elementi izdvajanja određenih modela razvoja rezultat reakcije nacionalnoga gospodarstva u tržišnim promjenama, odnosno prikazuju se reciprocitetom isključivo poljoprivrednoga stanovništva u odnosu na ostale proizvodne ili uslužne sektore djelatnosti (Pociūtė-Sereikienė i Kriaučiūnas, 2018).

Odabirom relevantnih razvojnih modela cilj je prikazati različite primjere reakcije ruralnoga prostora na gospodarska gibanja, odnosno otpornost ruralne periferije u tržišnih utrci. Kriterij odabira temeljen je na postojećim modelima razvoja nastalima na temelju određene vrijednosti na ruralnom prostoru. Odabir najbitnije odrednice diversifikacije ruralnoga gospodarstva, odnosno modela razvoja izvršen je metodom analiziranja podataka i aktivnosti koje su specifične za ruralna područja, kao što je npr. istraživanje poljoprivredne proi-

Management solutions for defined regions can be in the form of convergence and equalization of polarization processes or concentration, as highlighted in the literature, *islands of recovery in space* or the spillover effect of innovations from poles.

Bánski (2010) stated that the most effective development elements of peripheries were investments in nodes and zones of activity, and innovations. *The tunnel effect* is a concept defined in a peripheral area where potentially developmental axes remain only transitional. This effect is very often actualized in transport connections.

Potentials and strategies of internal/endogenous development are often unclear, especially in peripheries where power and innovation are lacking (Kühn, 2015). By activating endogenous potential, a competitive advantage for peripheral regions is developed at the regional and local level (Bański and Mazur, 2016). An individualized approach to regions and their effective use is desirable, especially via EU cohesion policy tools and rural development.

For theoretical approaches and practical conclusions to be well-founded, certain scientific methods (induction, deduction, hypothetical-deductive and others) were applied for shaping practical development models used by Merenkova et al. (2019). When conducting analysis and synthesis of models, certain additional specific methodological procedures were used (analysis, synthesis, selection).

Often, elements of distinguishing certain development models are the result of the national economy's reaction to market changes, or they are shown by the reciprocity of exclusively agricultural population in relation to other production or service sectors (Pociūtė-Sereikienė and Kriaučiūnas, 2018).

By selecting relevant development models, the aim is to show different examples of a rural space's reaction to economic movements or the resilience of the rural periphery in the market race. The selection criterion is based on existing development models created on the basis of a certain value in rural space. The selection of the most important determinant of rural economy diversification, or development model, was carried out by analyzing data and activities specific to rural areas, such as re-

zvodnje, ruralne radne snage, infrastrukture i drugih karakteristika povezanih s ruralnim okruženjem, da bi se završnom dijelu ovoga rada ostvarili početni ciljevi postavljeni prilikom istraživanja. Navedene vrijednosti proizašle iz prethodno navedenih analiza određenom odabranom aktivnosti iz skupa modelira se suvremeni razvoj u nekom razdoblju.

Slijedi prikaz modela razvoja odabran na temelju postojećih modela koji su nastali na temelju kvantitativnih i kvalitativnih podataka. Sistematizacija modela usredotočena je na identifikaciju ključnih dionika u prostoru te aktivnosti kojima se bave, a mogu usmjeriti razvoj predmetnoga prostora definiran kao ruralna periferija.

I. Osnovni modeli ruralnog razvoja

- Modeli uzročno-posljedične veze koji odražavaju različite društvene i ekonomske procese ruralnih područja, možemo ih nazvati modelima pozitivnoga tipa.
- Industrijski model kao okvir koji poistovjećuje ruralni razvoj s općom modernizacijom poljoprivrednoga i agroindustrijskoga kompleksa (Plüschke-Altöf, 2017).
- Redistributivni model temelji se na koncepciji smanjenja jaza između degradiranih i razvijenih ruralnih područja kroz financijsku potporu redistribucije putem izravnih naknada, uz davanje bespovratnih sredstava, koje neutraliziraju negativne učinke na strukturnu transformaciju ruralnoga gospodarstva (poticaji) (Šimleša, 2012).
- Teritorijalni model vođen je okvirom ruralnoga razvoja koji je izravno povezan sa složenim korištenjem raznolika resursnoga potencijala uz integraciju proizvodnje na lokalnoj razini (Koči-Pavlaković, 1996).

II. Nacionalni modeli ruralnoga razvoja (Pociūtė-Sereikienė i Kriaučiūnas, 2018)

- Model razvoja poljoprivrede – sektorski model. Model razvoja koji prihvaćaju države koje vode politiku razvoja često kroz intenzivan usmjereni razvoj niza poljoprivrednih monokultura.

search on agricultural production, rural workforce, infrastructure, and other characteristics related to the rural environment, in order to achieve the initial goals set during the research in the final part of this paper. The stated values resulting from the aforementioned analyses are modeled by selected activity from the set of contemporary development in a certain time period.

The following is a presentation of the development model, selected on the basis of existing models that were created based on quantitative and qualitative data. The systematization of models focuses on identifying key stakeholders in the space and the activities they engage in, which can direct the development of the subject area that has been defined as rural periphery.

I. Basic models of rural development

- Cause-and-effect models that reflect different social and economic processes of rural areas can be called positive type models.
- The industrial model is a framework that equates rural development with the general modernization of the agricultural and agro-industrial complex (Plüschke-Altöf, 2017).
- The redistributive model is based on the concept of reducing the gap between degraded and developed rural areas via financial support for redistribution through direct compensation, which neutralizes negative effects while providing grants for the structural transformation of the rural economy (incentives) (Šimleša, 2012).
- The territorial model is guided by a rural development framework that is directly related to the complex use of diverse resource potential with the integration of production at the local level (Koči-Pavlaković, 1996).

II. National models of rural development (Pociūtė-Sereikienė and Kriaučiūnas, 2018)

- Agricultural development model - sectoral model. A development model accepted by countries that pursue development policy (often) via intensive directed development of a series of agricultural monocultures.

III. Model multifunktionalnosti ruralnih područja – osnova diversificiranoga ruralnog gospodarstva (Popescu, 2014)

- ruralna područja, kao prostorne i teritorijalne cjeline, tretiraju se kao složen socioekonomski sustav koji uključuje višenamjenske i međusobno povezane sastavnice: društvene (ruralna naselja, ruralno stanovništvo, društveno okruženje i infrastruktura), ekonomske (zemlja, proizvodnja i kućanstvo, poslovni subjekti, radna snaga) i ekološke (prirodni uvjeti i reprodukcija okoliša) (Ray, 2006)
- naglasak na sveobuhvatnom razvoju ruralnih područja zbog njihove multifunktionalnosti koja može potaknuti gospodarski razvoj poljoprivrednih djelatnosti, proširiti ljudski kapital, poboljšati životni standard i stanje okoliša (Ricci i dr, 2019).

IV. Model diversificiranoga gospodarskog razvoja ruralnih područja

- razvoj ruralnih područja ne bi trebao biti monofunktionalan u korist jedne gospodarske grane (u većini slučajeva poljoprivrede) koja se ne može tretirati kao glavni izvor zapošljavanja i zarade ruralnog stanovništva
- temelj predloženoga modela jest struktura gospodarstva ruralnih područja (multifunktionalnost) i razina diversifikacije (stvarno stanje razvojnoga potencijala) (Zsótér, 2020)
- razvoj novih vrsta gospodarskih aktivnosti uključenih u sustav društvenih usluga usmjerenih na zadovoljavanje potreba ruralnoga stanovništva
- društveni razvoj ruralnih područja u skladu sa socijalno usmjerenim kriterijima kao što su npr. stopa zaposlenosti ruralnoga stanovništva, prosječna mjesečna plaća, životni standard.

Ruralni prostor ima složenu ekonomsku i socijalnu strukturu koju čini niz različitih aktivnosti: poljoprivreda, obrtništvo i poduzetništvo, industrija, trgovina i usluge (Lukić, 2012). Istodobno, važna je i njegova uloga međuzone koja osigurava djelomičnu obnovu prirode odnosno okoliša nuž-

III. Model of multifunctionality of rural areas - the basis of a diversified rural economy (Popescu, 2014)

- Rural areas, as spatial and territorial units, are treated as a complex socio-economic system that includes multifunctional and interconnected components: social (rural settlements, rural population, social environment and infrastructure); economic (land, production and household, business entities, workforce); and ecological (natural conditions and environmental reproduction) (Ray, 2006);
- Emphasis on the comprehensive development of rural areas due to their multifunctionality, which can stimulate economic development of agricultural activities, expand human capital, improve living standards and environmental conditions (Ricci et al., 2019).

IV. Model of diversified economic development of rural areas

- The development of rural areas should not be monofunctional at the expense of one or more economic branches (in most cases agriculture), which cannot be treated as the main source of employment and income for the rural population;
- The basis of the proposed model is the structure of the economy of rural areas (multifunctionality) and the level of diversification (actual state of development potential) (Zsótér, 2020)
- Development of new types of economic activities included in the system of social services aimed at meeting the needs of the rural population;
- Social development of rural areas in accordance with socially-oriented criteria such as employment rate of rural population, average monthly salary, and standard of living.

Rural space has a complex economic and social structure consisting of a series of different activities: agriculture; crafts and entrepreneurship; industry; trade; and services (Lukić, 2012). At the same time, its role as an inter-zone that ensures partial restoration of nature or environment necessary for

nu za ekološku ravnotežu iako je obnova vrlo često posljedica sukucije antropogene cjeline jer se nerijetko nalazi u demografski depriviranom području. Naposljetku, ruralni prostor, osobito periferni, ima sve važniju ulogu prostora za odmor i slobodno vrijeme.

U heterogenim perifernim ruralnim prostorima administrativne granice općina i upravnih gradova često onemogućavaju spoznavanje geografske stvarnosti (Lukić, 2010; Perpar, 2014). Upravo su razvojne strategije na nacionalnoj razini usmjerene isključivo na pravno definirane granice općina i gradova premda vrlo često status grada čini velika većina ruralnoga prostora te izrazite periferije (Lukić, 2012). U suglasju ili nesuglasju sa strategijama kako realizirati određeni model razvoja ruralne periferije ako je unaprijed predefiniран a u konačnici neprimjenjiv na većini prostora? Odačnim modelima razvoja treba pristupiti specifično i kao takve ih primijeniti. Naravno, modeli razvoja vrlo često zastarijevaju pa tamo gdje je zamišljena intervencija države oni se mogu remodelirati ili spustiti na niže razine upravljanja prostorom. Perspektivni modeli ruralnoga razvoja te modeli multifunktionalnosti ruralnih područja modeli su podložni promjenama i predstavljaju relativno brza rješenja jer ne uključuju strukturne promjene stanovništva u depriviranim područjima, već koriste prednosti određenih resursa k cjelovitijem razvoju.

Provedba modela razvoja u ruralnoj periferiji mora imati cilj s jasnom primjenom jer proces implementacije nije kratkoročan, već je u naravi dugoročan i kao takav poboljšava negativne razvojne procese.

ZAKLJUČAK

Ovaj je rad prepleten različitim konceptima ruralnih periferija na osnovi recentne literature. Pritom su analizirani i vrednovani pristupi istraživanju ruralnih periferija koji su prikazani kao odabrani primjeri istraživačkih modela te modela razvoja ruralnih perifernih područja čime se potencira važnost periferija kao heterogenih područja sa specifičnim mogućnostima modela razvoja.

Koncept perifernih područja u istraživanjima ruralnoga prostora – pregled i evaluacija na primjerima

The concept of peripheral areas in rural research: Review and evaluation with examples

ecological balance is important, although restoration is very often a consequence of the gravitation of anthropogenic units because it is often found in demographically deprived areas. Finally, rural space, especially peripheral, has an increasingly significant role as a space for rest and leisure.

In heterogeneous peripheral rural spaces, administrative boundaries of municipalities and administrative cities often prevent the understanding of geographical reality (Lukić, 2010; Perpar, 2014). Development strategies at the national level are exclusively focused on legally defined boundaries of municipalities and cities, although administrative units very often consist of a large majority of rural space and extreme peripheries (Lukić, 2012). Regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with the presented strategies, how can a certain model of rural periphery development be realized if it is predefined in advance and ultimately inapplicable to most of the space? The selected development models should be approached specifically and applied as such. Of course, development models often become outdated, so where state intervention is envisioned, they can be remodeled or 'tailored' to lower levels of spatial management. Perspective models of rural development and models of multifunctionality of rural areas are models that are subject to change and represent relatively quick solutions because they do not include structural changes of the population in deprived areas, rather they use the advantages of specific resources for more comprehensive development.

The implementation of development models in a rural periphery must have a goal with clear application because the implementation process is not short-term, rather it is inherently long-term and, as such, improves negative development processes.

CONCLUSION

This paper explores different concepts of rural peripheries based on recent literature. The approaches to rural periphery research that are presented as selected examples of research models and development models of rural peripheral areas were analyzed and evaluated, emphasizing the importance of peripheries as heterogeneous areas with specific possibilities for development models.

Analitički i pregledan prikaz literature o navedenoj temi strukturiran je oko pet glavnih pojmova: periferija, marginalnost, ruralni prostor, istraživački pristupi te modeli razvoja. Identificirani su izazovi u dosadašnjem teorijsko-metodološkom pojmu *periferija* unutar ruralne geografije te su navedeni recentni razvojni modeli zbog svoje primjene na slična ili specifična područja ruralne periferije.

Kao dokaz promjene ruralnih prostora sve je veća urbanizacija i intenziviranje socioekonomskih procesa u dostupnijim područjima koja se nalaze u blizini većih mjesta, dok se s druge strane suprostavlja sve veća marginalizacija perifernih područja koja su izrazito depopulacijska i ekonomski nerazvijena.

U radu se protežu ključna pitanja koja u konačnici definiraju različitost u poimanju perifernih područja kao i razlike u promatranju obilježja i resursa analiziranih primjera perifernih ruralnih područja. Naime, vrlo često se radi o udaljenim, pa čak i izoliranim područjima, no takva područja ne isključuju mogućnost sadržavanja određenih elemenata endogenoga razvoja kao što su npr. obilježja prirodne i kulturne baštine, bogatstvo primarnih resursa, granični status periferije koji može postati razvojna poluga u odnosu na veću administrativnu cjelinu i sl.

Analiza primjera istraživanja na temu ruralne periferije ovoga rada pokazuje da predmetna problematika implicira specifičan sustav izdvajanja, odnosno prepoznavanja tipova perifernoga ruralnog prostora koji pak rezultiraju specifičnom mogućnošću razvoja. Dihotomna podjela ruralnih područja, temeljena na stupnju razvoja i aktualnim procesima, jedna je od najčešćih i najjednostavnijih klasifikacija u tipologiji ruralnih područja (Drobnjaković, 2019; Perlin i dr., 2010). Rastuća unutarnja diversifikacija ruralnih područja, koja se uočava u cijelom svijetu, pridonosi povećanoj složenosti u perifernim područjima.

Teoretski, potrebno je povećati razumijevanje nedovoljno istraženih perifernih područja te uspostaviti integriranu i prostorno osjetljivu teoriju perifernosti i održivoga gospodarskog razvoja (Čavrak, 2003; Grinciuc, 2019). Kao što je ra-

The analytical and review presentation of the literature on these issues is structured through five main concepts: periphery; marginality; rural space; research approaches; and development models. *Challenges* in the current theoretical-methodological concept of peripheries within rural geography have been identified, and recent development models have been listed for application to similar or specific areas of rural periphery.

As proof of the change in rural spaces, there is increasing urbanization and intensification of socio-economic processes in more accessible areas located near larger places, while on the other hand, there is increasing marginalization of peripheral areas that are extremely depopulated and economically underdeveloped.

The paper extends key questions that ultimately define the diversity in understanding peripheral areas, as well as differences in observing the characteristics and resources of analyzed examples of peripheral rural areas. Very often these are remote or even isolated areas, but such areas do not exclude the possibility of containing certain elements of endogenous development such as characteristics of natural and cultural heritage, richness of primary resources, border status of the periphery (which can become a development aid in relation to a larger administrative unit), etc.

The analysis of research examples on the topic of rural periphery in this paper shows that the subject matter implies a specific system of identification, or recognition of types of peripheral rural space, which in turn result in specific development possibilities. The dichotomous division of rural areas, based on the degree of development and current processes, is one of the most common, but simplest, classifications in the typology of rural areas (Drobnjaković, 2019; Perlin et al., 2010). The growing internal diversification of rural areas, which is observed worldwide, contributes to increased complexity in peripheral areas.

Theoretically, it is necessary to increase our understanding of insufficiently researched peripheral areas and establish an integrated and spatially sensitive theory of peripherality and sustainable economic development (Čavrak, 2003; Grinciuc,

zjašnjeno u glavnom dijelu ovoga rada, implikacije teorijsko-metodoloških pristupa ili rješenja relevantni su za politiku, odnosno upravljačke mehanizme i razvojnu praksu, čime postajemo odgovorni na koji način prenijeti saznanja prostornoplanskim dionicima, npr. realnim konceptima, alatima i znanjem, kako bi oni uspješno oblikovali održiva periferna ruralna gospodarstva u budućnosti. Svakako, da bi se dogodio održivi gospodarski razvoj na periferiji, potrebna je veća uključivost onih koji odlučuju, osobito na političkoj razini.

Unatoč tomu što su takve opcije u određenoj mjeri u skladu s budućim strategijama EU-a, predloženi analitični skup saznanja o temi ruralne periferije mogao bi biti koristan za bolje fokusiranje i potporu učinkovitoj provedbi intervencija ruralnoga razvoja. Na lokalnoj razini vrlo je važna procjena glavnih vrijednosti i potreba ruralne periferije, čime se jasno određuju prioriteti specifičnih aktivnosti planiranja predmetnoga prostora s ciljem poboljšanja konkurentnosti u sektorima poljoprivrede i šumarstva, održivom korištenju resursa (resursne periferije), prilagodbi klimi, tehnološkoj inovativnosti i lokalnoj povezanosti.

U konačnici, koordinacija između lokalnih zahtjeva ili inicijativa odozdo prema gore (*bottom-up*) i nacionalnih/regionalnih politika odozgo prema dolje (*top-down*) korisna je za bolje usmjerenje resursa u skladu sa specifičnim prostornim karakteristikama te predstavlja temelj neoendogenoga razvoja. Stoga trenutno prostorno planiranje treba kontekstualizirati provedbu mjera uzimajući u obzir lokalne potrebe i prostorne resurse u okviru pojma ruralne periferije.

Ruralna periferija nije samo prostor, već prostor koji čine ljudi i izrazito je važan u gospodarskom poimanju razvoja zemlje.

2019). As clarified in the main part of this paper, the implications of theoretical-methodological approaches or solutions are relevant for policy, i.e. management mechanisms and development practice, making us responsible for the transfer of knowledge to spatial planning stakeholders, e.g. real concepts, tools, and knowledge, so that they can successfully shape sustainable peripheral rural economies in the future. Certainly, for sustainable economic development to occur on the periphery, greater involvement of decision-makers, especially at the political level, is needed.

Despite the fact that such options are to some extent in line with future EU strategies, the proposed analytical set of knowledge on the topic of rural periphery could be useful for better focusing and supporting the effective implementation of rural development interventions. At the local level, it is very important to assess the main values and needs of the rural periphery, which clearly determines the priorities of specific planning activities of the subject space with the aim of improving competitiveness in the agricultural and forestry sectors, sustainable use of resources (resource peripheries), climate adaptation, technological innovation, and local connectivity.

Ultimately, coordination between local demands or *bottom-up* initiatives and national/regional *top-down* policies is useful for better directing resources in accordance with specific spatial characteristics and represents the foundation of neo-endogenous development. Therefore, current spatial planning should contextualize the implementation of measures, taking into account local needs and spatial resources within the concept of rural periphery.

Rural periphery is not just a space, but a space made up of people and is extremely important in the economic perception of a country's development.

- Akgün, A. A., Baycan, T., Nijkamp, P., 2015: Rethinking on Sustainable Rural Development, *European Planning Studies* 23 (4), 678-692.
- Argent, N., 2016: Rural geography I: Resource peripheries and the creation of new global commodity chains, *Progress in Human Geography* 41 (6), 1-10.
- Bański, J., Mazur, M., 2016: Classification of rural areas in Poland as an instrument of territorial policy, *Land Use Policy* 54, 1-17.
- Bański, J., 2010: Dilemmas for Regional Development in the Concepts Seeking to Develop Poland's Spatial Structure, *Regional Studies* 44 (5), 535-549.
- Bastian, O., Neruda, M., Filipová, L., Machová I., Leibenath, M., 2010: Natura 2000 Sites as an Asset for Rural Development: The German-Czech Ore Mountains Green Network Project, *Journal of Landscape Ecology* 3 (2), 41-58.
- Beyazli, D., Aydemir, S., Melih Öksüz, A., Özlü, S., 2017: Rural typology with and inductive approach, *Int J Environ Res* 11, 225-241.
- Popović, T., Relja, R., Gutović, T., 2017: Aktualnost ruralne sociologije: problematiziranje održivosti „prostora iza“, u: Bušljeta Tonković, A., Holjevac, Ž., Brlić, I., Šimunić N.: *Koga (p)održava održivi razvoj? Prinosi promišljanju održivosti ruralnih područja u Hrvatskoj*, Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, 71-94.
- Matuskova, A., Rousova, M., 2016: The Impact of Marginalization and Globalization in the Czech-German-Austrian Mountain Borderland in the Former Iron Curtain Area, in: Chand R., Leimgruber, W. (eds.): *Globalization and Marginalization in Mountain Regions; Assets and Challenges in Marginal Regions*, Springer Nature, Cham – Switzerland, 55-73.
- Pelc, S., 2017: Marginality and Marginalization, in: Chand, R., Nel, E., Pelc, S. (eds.): *Societies, Social Inequalities and Marginalization, Marginal Regions in the 21st Century*, Springer Nature, Cham – Switzerland, 13-28.
- Copus, A., Psaltopoulos, D., Skuras, D., Terluin, I., Weingarten, P., 2008: Approaches to Rural Typology in the European Union, JRC Scientific and Technical Reports, *Office for Official Publications of the European Communities*, Luxembourg, 134.
- Copus, A. K., 2001: From Core-periphery to Polycentric Development: Concepts of Spatial and Aspatial Peripherality, *European Planning Studies* 9 (4), 539-552.
- Cremer-Schulthea, D., Dissart, J. C., 2015: Evaluating rural development in French Regional Nature Parks, *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 58 (3), 383-403.
- Cunder, T., 2007: The role of rural development policy in environmental and land management in Slovenia, *Journal of Central European Agriculture* 8 (2), 237-242.
- Čvrak, V., 2003: Održivi razvoj ruralnih područja Hrvatske, *Zbornik Ekonomskog fakulteta u Zagrebu* 1 (1), 61-77.
- Dadashpoor, H., Ahani, S., 2019: A conceptual typology of the spatial territories of the peripheral areas of metropolises, *Habitat International* 90, 1-15.
- De Toni, A., Vizzarri, M., Di Febbraro, M., Lasserre, B., Noguera, J., Di Martino, P., 2021: Aligning Inner Peripheries with rural development in Italy: Territorial evidence to support policy contextualization, *Land Use Policy* 100, 1-14.
- Defilippis, J., 2005: Hrvatska u ruralnom prostoru Europe, *Sociologija i prostor: časopis za istraživanje prostornoga i sociokulturnog razvoja* 43 (4) (170), 823-836.
- Dery, S., Leimgruber, W., Zsilincsar, W., 2012: Understanding Marginality: Recent Insights from a Geographical Perspective, *Hrvatski geografski glasnik* 74 (1), 5-18.
- Drobnjaković, M., 2019: Methodology of typological classification in the study of rural settlements in Serbia, *J. Geogr. Inst. Cvijic* 69 (2), 157-173.
- Etxano, I., 2012: New Insights into the Assessment of Protected Areas – Integrating Rural Development, *Rural Development – Contemporary Issues and Practices*, Solagberu Adisa, R., InTech, Rijeka, 75-98.
- Figueiredo, E., 2008: Imagine there's no rural – the transformation of rural spaces into nature's conservation places in Portugal, *European Urban and Regional Studies* 15 (2), 159-171.
- García-Cortijo, C., Castillo-Valero, J. S., Carrasco, I., 2019: Innovation in rural Spain. What drives innovation in the rural-peripheral areas of southern Europe?, *Journal of Rural Studies* 71, 114-124.
- Depraz, S., 2016: European rural peripheries revalued: Governance, actors, impacts, in: Grabski-Kieron U., Mose I., Reichert-Schick A., Steinführer A.: *European rural peripheries revalued: Governance, actors, impacts*, LIT Verlag Münster, 2-30.
- Grinciuc, L., 2019: Dimension of sustainable development and the way of approach in rural area, *Economica* 2 (108), 66-78.
- Gurung, G. S., Kollmair, M., 2005: Marginality: Concepts and their Limitations, *IP6 Working Paper* 4, 1-21.
- Guzal-Dec, D., Zwolińska-Ligaj, M., Zbucki, Ł., 2019: The potential of smart development of urban-rural communes in peripheral region (a case study of the Lublin Region, Poland), *Miscellanea Geographica. Regional Studies on Development*, 23 (2), 85-91.
- Hedlund, M., 2016: Mapping the Socio-economic Landscape of Rural Sweden: Towards a Typology of Rural Areas, *Regional Studies* 50 (3), 460-474.
- Hodge, I., Midmore P., 2008: Models of Rural Development and Approaches To Analysis Evaluation And Decision-Making, *Économie rurale—Agricultures, alimentations, territoires*, 307, 23-38.
- Horvat, Z., Toskić, A., 2017: Marginalnost kao znanstveno-istraživačka tema u geografiji – s osvrtom na Međimurje, *Podravina: časopis za multidisciplinarna istraživanja* 16 (32), 159-171.
- Hospers, G. J., 2003: Localization in Europe's periphery: tourism development in Sardinia, *European planning studies* 11 (6), 11-14.
- Kaupilla, P., 2011: Cores and peripheries in a northern periphery: a case study in Finland, *Fennia* 189 (1), 20-31.
- Kebza, M., 2018: The development of peripheral areas: The case of West Pomeranian Voivodeship, Poland, *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 26 (1), 69-81.
- Kluza, K., 2020: When rural boroughs turn into inner peripheries: a link between their socioeconomic characteristics and distance to large cities, *Regional Studies, Regional Science* 7 (1), 75-91.
- Koči-Pavlaković, V., 1996: Regionalni ekonomski razvoj graničnih krajeva: Teorijske osnove i modeli, *Geografija u funkciji razvoja Hrvatske, Hrvatsko geografsko društvo*, 351-358.
- Kubeš, J., Chvojková, A., 2020: Back to peripheries based on remoteness. Human capital in the peripheral municipalities of South Bohemia, *Journal of Rural Studies* 79, 116-124.
- Kühn, M., 2015: Peripheralization: Theoretical Concepts Explaining Socio-Spatial Inequalities, *European Planning Studies* 23 (2), 367-378.
- Kušar, S., Bobovnik, N., 2019: Razvojna problematika obmejnih problemskih područja, u: Demografske spremembe in regionalni razvoj, ZRC SAZU, Geografski inštitut Antona Melika, 13-27.
- Miosga, M., 2008: Implications of spatial development policies at European and national levels for border regions The case of Germany, in: *Cross-border Governance and Sustainable Spatial Development Mind the Gaps!* (ur. Leibenath, M., Korcelli-Olejniczak, E., Knippschild, R.), Springer, Berlin, 15-31.
- Lukić, A., 2010: O teorijskim pristupima ruralnom prostoru, *Hrvatski geografski glasnik* 72 (2), 49-75.
- Lukić A., 2012: Mozaik izvan grada – tipologija ruralnih i urbaniziranih naselja Hrvatske, *Meridijani*, Samobor, 256.
- Lukić A., Obad, O., 2016: New Actors in Rural Development: The LEADER Approach and Projectification in Rural Croatia, *Sociologija i prostor* 54 (1), 71-90.
- Lukić, A., Opačić, V. T., Zupanc, I., 2009: The other side of the Zagreb – Rijeka motorway; socio-geographic implications in the rural periphery of Croatia, *Društvena istraživanja* 18 (1-2), 153-173.
- Máliková, L., 2013: Theoretical and methodological aspects of identifying marginal rural areas in the Slovak and Czech studies, *Zbornik príspevkov medzinárodnej konferencie doktorandov MendelNet 2013*, Agronomická fakulta, Mendelova Univerzita, Brno, 459-464.
- Markuszewska, I., 2015: Rural area marginalisation: searching for tendencies. Case study: the Western fringes of Poland, *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series* 29, 75-91.
- Merenkova, I., Smyslova, O., Kokoreva, A., 2019: Development models of rural areas: theoretical approaches and formation specificity, *IOP Conf Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 341, 1-9.
- Mauz, I., 2007: Regional Development and the French National Parks: The Case of the Vanoise National Park, in: Mose, I. (ed.): *Protected Areas and Regional Development in Europe Towards a New Model for the 21st Century*, Ashgate Publishing, Hampshire, England, 115-129.
- Nejašmić I., Mišetić, R., 2010: Sintetični pokazatelj demografskih resursa: doprinos tipologiji hrvatskoga prostora, *Hrvatski geografski glasnik* 72 (1), 49-60.
- Nejašmić, Š., Radeljak, Kaufmann, P., Lukić, A., 2018: Potencijali hrvatske krške periferije iz perspektive studenata Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, *Hrvatski geografski glasnik* 80 (2), 83-109.
- Nilsen T., Grillitsch, M., Hauge, A., 2023: Varieties of periphery and local agency in regional development, *Regional Studies* 57 (4), 749-762.
- Nilsson, B., Lundgren, A. S., 2015: Logics of rurality: Political rhetoric about the Swedish North, *Journal of Rural Studies* 37, 85-95.
- Nolte, H., 1991: Internal Peripheries in Europe, u: *Internal Peripheries in European History* (ur. Nolte, H.), Musterschmidt, Göttingen, 5-29.
- Nørgaard, H., 2011: Futures of rural and peripheral areas – Challenges, strategies and policies, *Danish Journal of Geoinformatics and Land Management* 46 (1), 81-95.
- Ottomano Palmisano, G., Govindan, K., Boggia, A., Loisi, R. V., De Boni, A., Roma, R., 2016: Local Action Groups and Rural Sustainable Development. A spatial multiple criteria approach for efficient territorial planning, *Land Use Policy* 59, 12-26.
- Pelc, S., 2006: Geographical marginality in Slovenia from the point of demographical indicators, *Revija za geografiju* 2 (1), 121-132.
- Pelc, S., 2010: Peripherality and marginality of Slovenian border areas along the Italian border, *Geographical Marginality as a global issue* 1, 96-113.
- Pelc, S., 2012: Geographical marginality as research topic in Slovenian Geography, *Geografski vestnik* 84 (1), 209-217.
- Perlin, R., Kučera, Z., Kučerová, S. R., 2010: A Typology of Rural Space in Czechia according to its Potential for Development, *Geografie* 115 (2), 161-187.
- Perpar, A., 2014: Ključni dejavniki razvojne uspešnosti podeželskih območij v Sloveniji, doktorska disertacija, 1-200.
- Plüschke-Altöf, B., 2017: The Question of Responsibility: (De-)Peripheralising Rural Spaces in Post-Socialist Estonia, *European Spatial Research and Policy* 24 (2), 59-75.
- Plüschke-Altöf, B., 2016: Rural as Periphery Per Se? Unravelling the Discursive Node, *Sociální studia / Social Studies* 13 (2), 11-28.
- Pociūtė-Sereikienė, G., 2019: Peripheral regions in Lithuania: the results of uneven development, *Regional Studies, Regional Science* 6 (1), 70-77.
- Pociūtė-Sereikienė, G., Kriaučiūnas, E., 2018: The Development of Rural Peripheral Areas in Lithuania: The Challenges of Socio-Spatial Transition, *European Countryside* 10 (3), 498-515.
- Popescu, A.-C., 2014: Tourism Development in a Rural Periphery. Case Study: the Sub-Carpathians of Oltenia, *Journal of Settlements and Spatial Planning*, Special Issue 3, 53-64.
- Pugh, R., Dubois, A., 2021: Peripheries within economic geography: Four “problems” and the road ahead of us, *Journal of Rural Studies* 87 (7), 267-275.
- Ray, C., 2006: Neo-Endogenous Rural Development in the EU, u: Cloke, P., Marsden, T., Mooney, P. (eds.): *The Handbook of Rural Studies*, Sage, London, 278-291.
- Ricci, A., Biggeri, M., Ferrannini, A., 2019: Integrated local development in Mediterranean marginal territories: The case studies of Casentino (Italy), Algarve (Portugal) and Corse (France), *REGION – Journal of ERS* 6 (1), 1-16.
- Lay, V., 1998: Glavne dimenzije i inicijalna uporišta oživljavanja periferija: socijalni akteri, razvojne ideje i lokalni resursi, u: Rogić, I., Štambuk, M. (ur.): *Duge sjene periferije: prinosi revitalizaciji hrvatskoga ruba*, Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar – Biblioteka Zbornici, knj. 4, Zagreb, 18-26.
- Salvatore, R., Chiodo, E., Fantini, A., 2018: Tourism transition in peripheral

- rural areas: Theories, issues and strategies, *Annals of Tourism Research* 68, 41-51.
- Sikorski, D., Latocha, A., Szymtykie, R., Kajdanek, K., Miodońska, P., Tomczak, P., 2020: Functional changes in peripheral mountainous areas in east central Europe between 2004 and 2016 as an aspect of rural revival? Kłodzko County case study, *Applied Geography* 122, 1-14.
- Sokol, M., 2001: Central and Eastern Europe a Decade After the Fall of State Socialism: regional dimensions of transition processes, *Regional Studies* 35 (7), 645-655.
- Steinführer, A., Reichert-Schick, A., 2018: European rural peripheries revalued? Introduction to this volume, European rural peripheries revalued: governance, actors, impacts. *Münster: LIT (Rural areas: Issues of local and regional development, 1)*, 1-12.
- Šimleša D., 2012: Snažiti regionalne kapacitete društvenog razvoja te iskoristiti posebnosti i raznolikost hrvatskih regija, u: Lay, V., Šimleša, D. (ur.): *Nacionalni interesi razvoja Hrvatske kroz prizmu koncepta održivog razvoja*, Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, 55-65.
- Tani, Y., Hashimoto, S., Ochiai, M., 2016: What makes rural, traditional, cultures more sustainable? Implications from conservation efforts in mountainous rural communities of Japan, *Landscape Research* 41 (8), 892-905.
- Tišma, S., Jurin, K., Čermak, J., 2018: Obstacles to Cross-Border Cooperation – Case of Croatia and Hungary, *European Journal of Geography* 9 (2), 116-133.
- Toskić, A., Njegač, D., Orešić, D., 2014: Zumberak: A marginal region in Zagreb's peri-urban fringe // *PECSRL 2014, 26th session of the Permanent European Conference for the Study of the Rural Landscape, Unraveling the Logics of Landscape / PECSRL 2014* Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Vaishar, A., Štastná, M., Zapletalová, J., Nováková, E., 2020: Is the European countryside depopulating? Case study Moravia, *Journal of Rural Studies* 80, 567-577.
- von Braun, J., Gatzweiler, F. W., 2014: *Marginality. Addressing the Nexus of Poverty, Exclusion and Ecology*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 388.
- Ward, N., Brown D. L., 2009: Placing the Rural in Regional Development, *Regional Studies* 43, 1237-1244.
- Weifeng, Z., Li, Z., 2020: On Rural Typologies with Neural Network Method: Case Study on Xining Region, *Journal of Regional and City Planning* 31 (1), 12-24.
- Willett J., Lang T., 2017: Peripheralisation: A Politics of Place, Affect, Perception and Representation, *Sociologia Ruralis* 58 (2), 258-275.
- Woods, M., 2005: *Rural Geography – Processes, Responses and Experiences in Rural Restructuring*, SAGE Publications, London, 330.
- Woods, M., 2011: *Rural*, Routledge, New York, 326.
- Zsilincsar, W., 2014: Administrative Reform as a Tool in Fighting Communal Marginality, *Hrvatski geografski glasnik* 76 (1), 27-40.
- Zsótér, B., Illés, S., Simonyi, P., 2020: Model of Local Economic Development in Hungarian Countryside, *European Countryside*, 12 (1), 85-98.