

I.V. Mishchenko*  , V.V. Mishchenko 

Altai State University, Russia, Barnaul

*e-mail: mis.iv@mail.ru

DIFFERENTIATED APPROACH TO FUNCTIONING AND DEVELOPMENT OF SINGLE-INDUSTRY TOWNS IN KAZAKHSTAN

The article is devoted to the development of a differentiated approach to assessing the development of single-industry towns. This type of territory, taking into account the dependence on the city-forming enterprise, is most affected by external (crises) and internal factors (the proximity of the territorial system to the center (core) of regional development). The object of the study is single-industry towns of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The purpose of the study is to identify the features of the development of various types of single-industry towns based on their distance from the center (large city). The research hypothesis – proximity to the center (large city) is a significant factor in the development of single-industry towns and it should be taken into account when planning their development. Tasks: to consider the essence and main approaches to the concept of a single-industry city; develop a typology of single-industry towns based on their center-peripheral position; verify the proposed method at single-industry towns of the Republic of Kazakhstan; highlight the peculiarities of the development of various types of single-industry towns; develop practical proposals for the development of single-industry towns of various types. The authors proposed an approach to the distribution of single-industry towns along the center-periphery axis and the isolation of single-industry towns of the near, middle and far periphery.

Key words: Keywords: single-industry towns, typology, socio-economic development, center-periphery.

И.В. Мищенко*, В.В. Мищенко

Алтай мемлекеттік университеті, Ресей, Барнаул қ.

*e-mail: mis.iv@mail.ru

Қазақстандағы моноқалалардың жұмыс істеуі мен дамуын саралау тәсілі

Мақала моноқалалардың дамуын бағалаудың сараланған тәсілін әзірлеуге арналған. Аумақтың бұл түрі қала құраушы кәсіпорынға тәуелділікті ескере отырып, сыртқы (дағдарыстар) және ішкі факторлардың (аумақтық жүйенің аймақтық даму орталығына (ядросына) жақындығы) ең көп әсер етеді. Зерттеу объектісі Қазақстан Республикасының моноқалалары болып табылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – орталықтан (ірі қаладан) қашықтығына қарай моноқалалардың әртүрлі түрлерінің даму ерекшеліктерін анықтау. Зерттеу гипотезасы – орталыққа (ірі қалаға) жақындық – моноқалаларды дамытудың маңызды факторы болып табылады және оларды дамытуды жоспарлау кезінде ескерілуі тиіс. Міндеттері: моноқала ұғымының мәні мен негізгі тәсілдерін қарастыру; моноқалалардың типологиясын олардың орталық-перифериялық жағдайын негізге ала отырып әзірлеу; Қазақстан Республикасының моноқалаларында ұсынылған әдістемеге тексеру жүргізу; моноқалалардың әртүрлі типтерін дамыту ерекшеліктерін бөліп көрсету; әртүрлі типтегі моноқалаларды дамыту жөнінде тәжірибелік ұсыныстар әзірлеу. Авторлар «орталық-периферия» осі бойынша моноқалаларды бөлу; жақын, орта және алыс шеткі моноқалаларды бөлу тәсілін ұсынды. Әдістеме – моноқалалардың жекелеген түрлерін олардың даму ерекшеліктерін анықтау үшін олардың әлеуметтік-экономикалық дамуының әртүрлі көрсеткіштерімен қиылысуды көздейді. Бұл бөлінген аумақтардың әлеуметтік-экономикалық дамуын жоспарлау бойынша тәжірибелік ұсыныстар беруге мүмкіндік берді. Олардың мәні ынталандырушы (аумақтардың өсу нүктелерін іздеу) және өтемдік (жақын және орта және алыс шеткі моноқалалардың әлеуметтік дамуындағы айырмашылықтардың төмендеуі) саясатының айырмашылығын ажыратып береді.

Түйін сөздер: моноқалалар, типология, әлеуметтік-экономикалық даму, орталық-периферия.

И.В. Мищенко*, В.В. Мищенко

Алтайский государственный университет, Россия, г. Барнаул

*e-mail: mis.iv@mail.ru

Дифференцированный подход к функционированию и развитию моногородов Казахстана

Статья посвящена разработке дифференцированного подхода к оценке развития моногородов. Данный тип территорий, учитывая зависимость от городообразующего предприятия, в наибольшей степени подвержены влиянию внешних (кризисы) и внутренних факторов (близость территориальной системы к центру (ядру) регионального развития). Объектом исследования являются моногорода Республики Казахстан. Цель исследования – выявление особенностей развития различных типов моногородов исходя из их отдаленности от центра (крупного города). Гипотеза исследования – близость к центру (крупному городу) является существенным фактором развития моногородов, и он должен учитываться при планировании их развития. Задачи: рассмотреть сущность и основные подходы к понятию моногород; разработать типологию моногородов исходя из их центр-периферийного положения; провести верификацию предложенной методики на моногородах Республики Казахстан; выделить особенности развития различных типов моногородов; разработать практические предложения по развитию моногородов различных типов. Авторами был предложен подход распределения моногородов по оси «центр-периферия» и выделение моногородов ближней, средней и дальней периферии. Методика предполагает пересечение выделенных типов моногородов с различными показателями их социально-экономического развития для определения особенностей их развития. Это позволило дать практические рекомендации по планированию социально-экономического развития выделенных типов территорий. Их суть сводится к разграничению политики стимулирующей (поиск точек роста территорий) и компенсирующей (снижение различий в социальном развитии моногородов ближней и средней и дальней периферии).

Ключевые слова: моногорода, типология, социально-экономическое развитие, центр-периферия.

Introduction

The modern economy is distinguished by the special dynamics of the events taking place in it. Similar processes have a negative impact on territorial development. These processes are especially acute in cities with monospecialization, which are closely dependent on the level of enterprise development.

The formation and support of single-industry cities during all periods of their development was a strategic vector of the post-Soviet countries policy, since the industries themselves, which operated in single-industry cities, had a great long-term significance for them. Despite significant support from state bodies, today this type of cities is faced with many challenges and problems: the liquidation of the city-forming enterprise, the outflow of the population, the neglect of the city's life support infrastructure, the deterioration of the criminal situation in these territories (Uzakova, 2022:105; Junussova, 2021:221; Esengel'din, 2017: 23). Solving these problems requires a balanced policy towards these territories. We believe that it should be based on a differentiated approach to various kinds of single-industry towns, taking into account the peculiarities of their socio-economic development. One of these features is the proximity

of the territory to the agglomeration and large cities. The big city assumes the presence of a developed social infrastructure (schools, universities, hospitals), places of employment, opportunities for leisure, while remote territories often do not have such advantages.

For a long time, individual productions and enterprises were the leading factor in the formation and development of cities in various regions of Kazakhstan, as well as the economic development of the respective territories.

The collapse of the USSR became a challenge for the development of single-industry cities in the countries of the post-Soviet space. Close production ties were broken. The difficult economic situation in Kazakhstan in the 90-s, the crisis of 2008 and the unstable political situation of 2020 affected primarily its enterprises, educational institutions, health care, and housing, and therefore had a negative impact on the development of single-industry cities.

Such population centers (single-industry cities) require the creation of a special meth Such population points (single-industry towns) require the creation of a special methodology for assessing their development. We believe that it should be based on such determinants as the centripetal law of the development of territorial systems. Proximity

to large cities (development centers) creates certain favorable conditions for the development of nearby territories, including single-industry towns. For their social development, such significant investments are no longer required. While remote territories need significant resources from government agencies to build social infrastructure.

Literature review

The content of the concept of “single-industry cities”, however, as well as the criteria for its selection, there is no single opinion and a certain approach. For the first time, studies devoted to single-industry cities appeared in foreign economic literature (Innis, 1936: 205; Arrington, 1966: 720; Crawford, 1995: 75).

G.M. Lappo considers the terms “monofunctional cities” and “monoprofile cities” as synonyms, highlighting as a criterion the dominant type of activity (Lappo, 2012: 54).

A number of Russian regional scientists combine the concept of “single-industry city” with the term “city-factory”, which suggests the existence of a significant connection between the functioning of an urban settlement and a large enterprise located on his territory. Together with that, dependence on the enterprise, according to I.D. Turgel is a weak point of these territories, as they are very difficult to adapt to changes in the external and internal environment (Turgel, 2005: 27). She, studying the specifics of the formation of Ural cities, uses the term “monospecialized cities”, noting the complete dependence of the life support of their population on factories.

Most researchers use the following quantitative criteria: at the enterprises of the dominant branch of the city, either more than 50% of the total (or only industrial) production volume is produced, or more than 25% of the economically active population is employed (Zubarevich, 2012: 83).

According to the official data of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Postanovlenie), cities with a population of 10 to 200 thousand people belong to this category of territories (as a rule, these are small cities, with a population of up to 100 thousand people.). The economy of these cities is based on a large enterprise (usually extractive specialization) with a volume of production of more than 20% of the citywide volume and employment of over 20% of the total employed population. They also include cities in which city-forming enterprises work partially or have suspended activities. According to Nurlanova N.K., monotowns of Kazakhstan have

their own specifics. So, in addition to small towns (numbering up to 100 thousand people), single-industry towns in Kazakhstan include medium-sized cities (Nurlanova, 2016: 202).

In other words, a single-industry city is a settlement, established at a city-forming enterprise with the purpose of providing production with labor resources. Monospecialization of settlements is an effective form of production organization in the medium term, so single-industry cities have spread all over the world.

Taking into account the above, a city can be called a mono-profile city if the following features are present:

- presence of one or two or three enterprises of the same type or enterprises of one technological chain of a single production process;
- the remoteness of the city from other large settlements, which does not allow residents to exercise the right to choose one or another form of life;
- almost complete dependence of the city budget on the city-forming enterprise;
- a similar composition of residents in terms of professional orientation (Lipsic, 2005: 71.).

In our research, we assume that the basis for the analysis of the socio-economic development of single-industry towns should be a differentiated approach. The main question is what should be the basis for their typology.

The most frequently used approach in the classification of single-industry cities is the definition of the specialization of a city-forming enterprise (type of economic development), which means the city itself. Thus, city-forming enterprises can have production (processing and mining) and non-production specialization (research centers and satellite cities) (Omarova, 2019:138; Nurlanova, 2016: 205; Turgel, 2023: 56).

The territories of the industrial development zone are recognized as traditional territories for the placement of single-industry cities. In this group, there are the least socially prosperous single-industry cities of metallurgy and machine-building, often having only one large enterprise as a town-forming enterprise and at the same time remote from multifunctional urban centers (Magill, 1964: 29).

Small enterprises can also be located in the single-industry city. According to representatives of the western school, the development of mono-industry territories depends on the state of small business (Birch, 1987:7; Cooper, 1966:169; Crawford, 1995:46; Houghton., 2004:235). This is related to the ability of small businesses to quickly adapt to new conditions and technologies. For

example, in Netherlands, where in the early 70-s of the last century, an acute crisis in traditional sectors of the economy contributed to the creation of the concept of economic transformation of the region by the development of technological enterprises in the sphere of small business. Later, this region became a kind of technological center.

According to a number of authors, both the state and business structures influence the development of a monotown. So, in West Virginia (USA), whose monotowns were based on the chemical industry, the state actively stimulated small business. Using various kinds of benefits and preferences as a regulatory tool, they ensured an influx of investments and the active participation of small businesses in the development of single-industry towns. Similar opts were widely used by authorities in other countries of the world (Beshiri, 2001:11; Poblan, 1996:29).

In the raw material development zone, there is a large part of single-industry cities, the specialization of which is connected with the primary processing of raw materials. In the Republic of Kazakhstan, these include 20 (75%) of 27 single-industry towns.

The non-production group includes cities that lie in the agglomeration zone of development. Monotowns of this belt are satellite cities of large agglomerations. This allows single-industry towns to enjoy the advantages of a nearby large city – the presence of a developed social infrastructure (schools, universities, hospitals, theaters, clubs, etc.), places of employment, etc. As an example, the project “G4 City” in Kazakhstan can be cited. Its main idea is the decentralization of large cities (Klemenkova, 2012).

There are also single-industry city’s scientific centers. As a rule, they are created in the form of closed administrative-territorial formations and serve enterprises of the military and nuclear industry. Their specialization shows that the most important information constituting the state secret is now concentrated on their territory, and high-risk objects are located, which are the targets of subversive attempts by various subjects of security threats.

Research methodology

The article uses materials of theoretical and practical studies of domestic and foreign scientists in the field of territorial systems research.

We have proposed an author’s methodology to differentiating single-industry towns. It is based on the distribution of single-industry towns depending on the proximity (remoteness) of a large city-

center. Such cities have a significant impact on the development of the periphery. As we noted earlier, they have a powerful economic base, a developed network of socio-cultural infrastructure. These cities, as rules, have a developed network of medium-sized special and higher institutions, they are centers for medical care, as well as for the cultural and everyday services of territories close to them. Zone of active influence of the city – center – up to 50 km.

This approach makes it possible to identify the essential signs of the development of single-industry cities of different types and to use them in the development of the policy of social and economic development: stimulating and compensatory type.

The methodological basis of the initial work is the position expressed by J. Friedman and V. Alonso says that the periphery is not a homogeneous field. It has the following structure: the inner region (closer) closely connected with the nucleus, which receives the last impulse for development; external (distal), on which the nucleus practically has no serious influence (Friedmann, 1964:175).

Thus, it is proposed to highlight the following single-industry cities:

1. Near periphery (or semi-periphery) – the center is a large city with a radius of 0-50 km.
2. Middle periphery – the center of development is a large or medium city (regional center) – the radius of influence is up to 150 km.
3. Far periphery (autonomous) – there is no urban development center within a radius of 151 km to 500 km.

The authors used a similar approach to classify rural areas in Russia (Mishchenko,2014: 5). The methodology for assessing the socio-economic development of single-industry towns of the near, middle and far periphery is a two-step procedure. At the first step, private classifications of single-industry towns were built according to a particular indicator. At the second step, there was an intersection of private classifications with their typology according to the center-peripheral position. Based on inductive, deductive and official statistical data, verification of the territorial structure of single-industry towns, using synthesis, made it possible to distinguish the distinctive identified groups’ features.

Results and discussions

Analysis of the socio-economic development of centrally peripheral types of single-industry towns

Let us apply the centro-periphery typology to single-industry towns in the Republic of Kazakhstan (tab. 1).

Table 1 – Classification of single-industry towns in the Republic of Kazakhstan by category due to the remoteness from the regional center

№	Single-industry city (officially)	Region	Distance to the regional centre	Population in 2022, thousand people	Availability of roads, airport
Near periphery – 1 category (0-50 km)					
	Abai	Karaganda	30	14,1	8 kilometers to the railway
	Aksu	Pavlodar	40	51,6	Railway
	Zhezkazgan	Ulytauskaya	0	91,6	Railway
	Ken	Kostanay	46	124,0	Railway
	Saran	Karaganda	25	43,8	highway only
	Satbaev	Ulytauskaya	19	69,8	highway only
	Tekeli	Zhetysuskaya	40	33,2	Beginning of the railway
	Temirtau	Karaganda	33	171,9	Railway
	Shakhtinsk	Karaganda	50	58,4	28 kilometers to the railway
Middle periphery – category 2 (51 – 150 km)					
	Aksay	West Kazakhstan	145	36,4	Railway
	Zhangaozen	Mangistau	148	147,9	Beginning of the railway
	Karatau	Zhambyl	65	28,5	Beginning of the railway
	Kurchatov	Abai	138	10,5	Beginning of the railway
	Lisakovsk	Kostanay	113	15,7	Railway
	Ridder	East Kazakhstan	130	52,1	Railway
	Serebryansk	East Kazakhstan	77	7,1	Railway
	Khromtau	Aktobe	93	29,9	Beginning of the railway
	Ekibastuz	Pavlodar	146	129,0	Railway
Far periphery – category 3 (151 – 500 km)					
	Altai	East Kazakhstan	479	36,1	Beginning of the railway
	Arkalyk	Kostanay	454	38,4	Railway
	Balkhash	Karaganda	380	77,9	Airport
	Zhanatas	Zhambyl	178	25,6	Railway
	Zhitikara	Kostanay	217	42,6	Railway
	Karajal	Ulytauskaya	275	18,4	Railway
	Kentau	Turkestan	190	74,5	Railway
	Kulsary	Atyrau	230	63,1	Railway
	Stepnogorsk	Akmola	255	67,9	Highway

Note: compiled by the author according to official data of the Bureau of National Statistics of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan

In Kazakhstan, out of 27 single-industry towns, according to our calculations, 9 of them are located at a distance of more than 150 km from the administrative and spatial center. We assigned this category of settlements the 3rd category – the most difficult, budget-expensive. Such autonomy requires more money for social policy and transport infrastructure. These cities contribute a large

percentage to GDP growth, the country's revenues, so the needs of national development require more consideration of their interests, up to targeted investment projects in the budget, in the policies of special state banks.

Cities located at a distance of 51 km to 150 km are the second category. The economic interests of their functioning make it possible to have not very

large investments in various infrastructure facilities, but the situation in them will worsen if this is completely ignored.

The 27 single-industry towns in Kazakhstan were home to 1.559 million people in 2022, or 7.85% of the country's population. A total of 430,000 square metres of housing was built for them during the year. All of them (except Balkhash city) produced industrial output worth 5,346.7 billion tenge. During the year, 29.3 billion tenge was spent on environmental activities, the elimination of garbage pollution, which is clearly not enough in modern conditions.

In total, 80.81 thousand organizations and enterprises are engaged in small and medium-sized businesses in single-industry towns. Of the features of research activities in single-industry towns, the city of Kurchatov should be noted: 5 institutes out of all 20, which are located in the single-industry towns of the country, worked there (Byuro nacional'noj statistiki).

For the analysis, the following indicators were selected for 2022: the volume of industrial production, population, the number of small and medium-sized businesses, maintenance costs for maintaining the social infrastructure of the territories, housing commissioning, and the number of educational institutions.

As follows from Table 2, there is a certain relationship between the central peripheral situation of the city and the level of its industrial production. Thus, every second region of the near periphery is characterized by a relatively high level of industrial production, among the middle regions – every fifth region; and among the areas of the far periphery – such are generally absent. On the contrary, territories with extremely low levels of development are most represented among the areas of the far periphery and the middle areas (44% each). Among the areas of the near periphery, there are 11%.

Table 2 – Distribution of single-industry towns of the Republic of Kazakhstan with different centro-peripheral position in terms of industrial production, million tenge

Volume of industrial production, million tenge	Near periphery	Middle periphery	Far periphery
High (over 200 million)	Zhezkazgan Temirtau Rudny Aksu	Aksai Ekibastuz	
Average (100-200 million)	Satpaev	Ridder	Stepnogorsk Karajal
Low (100 – 10 million)	Tekeli Shakhtinsk Saran	Karatau Lisakovsk	Zhanatas Zhitikara Kentau
Extremely low (less than 10 million)	Abay	Zhanaozen Kurchatov Serebryansk Khromtau	Altai Arkalyk Balkhash Kulsary

Table 3 – Distribution of single-industry towns of the Republic of Kazakhstan with different central peripheral situation by population, thousand people

Population, thousand people	Near periphery	Middle periphery	Far periphery
High (over 100 thousand)	Temirtau Rudny	Ekibastuz Zhanaozen	
Average (99 thousand – 50)	Zhezkazgan Satpaev Aksu Shakhtinsk	Ridder	Stepnogorsk Balkhash Kentau Kulsary
Low (below 50 thousand)	Tekeli Saran Abay	Karatau Aksai Khromtau Kurchatov Serebryansk Lisakovsk	Zhanatas Zhitikara Altai Arkalyk Karajal

Table 3 shows, that about 60% of single-industry towns of the middle and far periphery have a population of less than 50 thousand people. Only a third of the cities of the near periphery have a population of less than 50 thousand.

Small and medium-sized enterprises seek mainly to remote localities. This is because small businesses are more adoptive to changing conditions. And the absence of large competitors is one of the incentives for small businesses SME.

Table 4 – Distribution of single-industry towns of the Republic of Kazakhstan with a different central peripheral position by the number of small and medium-sized businesses, thousand units

Small and medium-sized enterprises.	Near periphery	Middle periphery	Far periphery
High (over 5 thousand)	Rudny	Ekibastuz Zhanaozen	Balkhash Kentaу Kulsary
Average (5-2 thousand)	Aksu Saran Temirtau	Ridder Khromtau	Stepnogorsk Altai Zhanatas
Low (below 2 thousand)	Tekeli Abay Satpaev Shakhtinsk Zhezkazgan	Karatau Aksai Kurchatov Serebryansk Lisakovsk	Zhitikara Arkalyk Karajal

Table 5 – Distribution of single-industry towns of the Republic of Kazakhstan with various central and peripheral provisions on housing and communal services expenses, billion tenge

Utility costs	Near periphery	Middle periphery	Far periphery
High (over 30 billion)	Rudny Temirtau	Ekibastuz	
Average (1-3 billion)	Aksu	Ridder Aksai Zhanaozen	Stepnogorsk Kulsary
Low (below 1 billion)	Tekeli Abay Satpaev Shakhtinsk Zhezkazgan Saran	Karatau Khromtau Kurchatov Serebryansk Lisakovsk	Zhitikara Arkalyk Karajal Altai Kentaу Zhanatas

The distribution of expenses for the maintenance of housing and communal services indicates the presence of common problems for all single-industry towns – a low level of costs for the maintenance of housing and communal services (Table 5). According to a number of authors, one of the key problems in the development of single-industry towns is the unsatisfactory state of engineering and social infrastructure. Water, sewerage, heat and electric networks are 70-90% worn out (Esengel'din, 2017: 22)

According to Table 6, all types of single-industry towns are characterized by a low volume of housing introduced in 60% and more of cases. This is due to

the low attractiveness of single-industry towns for the general population. They rarely introduce new homes. Often people rent housing and work there on a rotational basis

Therefore, differences in the socio-economic development of the center-peripheral types of single-industry towns are insignificant in terms of most of the indicators under consideration. In other words, the socio-economic problems of the development of single-industry towns in the Republic of Kazakhstan are, as a rule, of a “cross-cutting” nature; differences between the central-peripheral types of districts are manifested in the degree of severity (acuteness) of problems.

Table 6 – Distribution of single-industry towns of the Republic of Kazakhstan with a different central peripheral position by the volume of housing commissioned, sq. m

Housing commissioning	Near periphery	Middle periphery	Far periphery
High (over 30 thousand)	Rudny Temirtau Aksu	Ekibastuz Aksai	Kulsary
Average (10-30 thousand)	Saran Zhezkazgan	Karatau Lisakovsk	Balkhash Zhanatas
Low (1-10 thousand.)	Abay Shakhtinsk		Stepnogorsk Zhitikara Arkalyk
Extremely low (less than 1,000)	Satpaev Tekeli	Khromtau Kurchatov Ridder Serebryansk Zhanaozen	Altai Karajal Kentau

We have identified the features of the socio-economic development of single-industry towns located near large cities. Among them;

- relatively high population density;
- a relatively high level of production volumes

These indicators can be considered as criteria that determine the place of a single-industry town on the “center-periphery” scale. The data in the context of the selected groups in terms of production volumes differ especially vividly. In this group the cities with the highest volumes of industrial production are located (Zhezkazgan, Temirtau, Rudny, Aksu).

As the post-Soviet development over 30 years shows, the capitals of the regions, their agglomerations have great advantages in financing the social sphere, many of whose facilities were previously run by large enterprises. Therefore, cities located at a distance of up to 50 km from the center of the region have the best conditions for life. The presence of personal vehicles partially removes the issue of housing, treatment, education and others. Such single-industry towns can spend less on social and economic policy, and allocate more budget investments for balanced development, innovation, etc.

It should be noted, that currently most single-industry towns have problems with backbone enterprises. Significant investments in equipment modernization are needed. The owner, as a rule, is aimed at maximizing profits with minimal investment. Despite the support of enterprises by the state, it is clearly insufficient for intensive development of enterprises. Inefficient management system has led to high debts of enterprises to banks and suppliers.

Belief, the main task of the authorities with regard to the majority of city-forming enterprises is to preserve and modernize production. For this purpose, it is necessary, taking into account, the new realities of global and domestic economic development, to analyze the activities of such companies, assess their contribution to the country’s economy, and develop a whole range of measures to support them: financial support, bank guarantees, subsidies, restructuring of tax debts, placement of preferential government contracts. The authorities must create the necessary infrastructure to make the territories attractive to investors, as well as create special tax regimes for business representatives. Private capital will follow the state capital, so it is necessary to create high-quality roads, conduct telephone communications and the Internet, lighting, heating on the territory of all single-industry towns.

As for social policy, special attention should be paid to monocities in the middle and far periphery. Expenditures on social guarantees and construction of social infrastructure in these territories should be increased, creating equal living conditions for the population

Conclusion

Therefore, verification of the territorial structure of single-industry towns as a whole confirmed its legitimacy. The designated area types vary in terms of production and manpower. Monotowns for the most part belong to the periphery of regional development. The exception is single-industry towns near agglomerations and large cities, as well as closed-type single-industry towns (Kurchatov). This

is explained by the laws of the development of the economic space: any center draws on the resources of the periphery (labor and capital). According to the study, monotowns of the near periphery have an advantage in labor resources. Capital goes where there are competitive advantages. Therefore, large investment projects are observed not only near megacities, but also in remote areas.

When forming programs for the socio-economic development of single-industry towns, authorities should take into account these features of the development of the economic space. A differentiated approach to single-industry towns of different types need to use. Thus, in relation to the middle and far periphery, a compensating social policy should be

pursued, aimed at reducing the differences between near and more distant single-industry towns. And economic policy should boil down to the search for competitive advantages of all single-industry towns without exception and the creation by the authorities of the necessary infrastructure for investors.

Source of financing

This research has been funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (BR18574200 «The revival of monotowns in the conditions of the creation of New Kazakhstan on the basis of territorial marketing»)

References

1. Arrington L. J. (1966) The company town in the American West. *The American Historical Review*, vol. 72, pp. 719–740.
2. Beshiri R. (2001). Employment structure in rural and small town Canada: the primary sector. *Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin*, vol. 2, pp. 10-17.
3. Birch D. L. (1989) Who Creates Jobs? *Public Interes*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 3–14.
4. Cooper A. C. (1966) Small companies can pioneer new products. *Harvard Business Review*. vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 162–179.
5. Friedmann J., Alonso W. (1964) Regional Development as a Policy Issue . Cambridge (Mass.). pp.174 – 179.
6. Haughton G., Hunter C. (2004). Sustainable cities. *Regional Policy and Development Series*. vol. 7. London: Regional Studies Association and Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 233–243.
7. Innis H. A., Lower A.R. (1936) Settlement and the mining frontier. Settlement and the Forest Frontier in Eastern Canada. Toronto, Macmillan of Canada, pp. 170–407.
8. Junussova M., Beimisheva A. (2021) Monotowns of Kazakhstan: Development Challenges and Opportunities . *Kazakhstan's Developmental Journey*. pp. 211-247.
9. Landis P.H. (1958) Three iron mining towns: A study in cultural change. Edwards brothers, Incorporated, 210 P.
10. Magill D. W. (1964) Migration and occupational mobility from a nova scotia coal mining town. 84 P.
11. Omarova A.T., Shokhan R., Khoich A., Grelo M.F., Srailoval G.N. Social and economic development of monotowns in Kazakhstan // Вестник Карагандинского университета. № 1(93). 2019. с 137-142.
12. Poblán J. (1996). Processes of Suburbanization and its Effects on the Finances of Cities in West Germany: The Example of Bremen and the Surrounding Communities. *Environment and Planning : Government and Policy*, vol. 1, pp. 25–37.
13. Teulings C.N., Ossokina I.V. (2015) Welfare Benefits of Agglomeration and Worker Heterogeneity. *CESifo Working Paper Series 4939*, 2014. CESifo Group Munich, pp. 1–38.
14. Turgel I., Panzabekova A, Antonova I. (2023) Hidden Single-Industry Towns in Transition *Landmarks for Spatial Development* , pp. 53-72.
15. Uzakova Sh. T., Ospanova A. D., Uzak G. T (2022) Features of regional development projects problems: analysis based on central Kazakhstan monotowns . *Central Asian economic review*, vol.2, pp.104-115.
16. Бюро национальной статистики Агентства по стратегическому планированию и реформам Республики Казахстан. [Электронный ресурс]. URL <https://old.stat.gov.kz/region/247783/dynamic>
17. Есенгельдин Б. С. Мухамедиева Г. М. Роль моногородов в социально-экономическом развитии регионов Республики Казахстан // Conference “Problems and prospects of development of economy and management”, Prague, 03–04.12.2017, с. 19-23.
18. Зубаревич Н. В. Регионы России: неравенство, кризис, модернизация. М.: Независимый институт социальной политики, 2010. с. 82–86.
19. Клеменкова К. G4 City – города-спутники. Идея идеальных маленьких городков будоражит умы / Страна и мир. Казахстанский общественно-политический еженедельник [Электрон. ресурс]. № 44 (486). 2012. – [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://sim.kz/obshhestvo/g4-citygoroda-sputniki.html>. – Дата доступа: 05.05.2012.
20. Лаппо Г. М. Города России. Взгляд географа. М.: «Новый хронограф», 2012. 180 с.
21. Липсиц И.В. Монопрофильные города и градообразующие предприятия. Аналитическое исследование проблемы градообразующих предприятий и моногородов в национальном масштабе / под ред.; Экспертный институт. — М.: Юридическая литература, 2005. — 115 с.
22. Мищенко И.В., Троцкий А.Я. Пространственное развитие сельской периферии: методология и основные результаты исследования // Региональная экономика: теория и практика. № 45. 2014. с.2-16.

23. Нурланова Н.К. Города как точки роста экономического пространства Казахстана: тенденции и перспективы развития // Проблемы развития территории. № 5 (85), 2016. с. 201-208.
24. Постановление Правительства Республики Казахстан от 16 ноября 2018 года № 767 «Об утверждении Государственной программы развития регионов до 2020 года» // Информационно-правовая система нормативных правовых актов РК. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P1800000767>
25. Тургель И.Д. Моноспециализированный город: теория и практика стратегического управления социально-экономическим развитием. – Екатеринбург: Уральская государственная горно-геологическая академия, 2005. 167 с.

References

1. Arrington L. J. (1966) The company town in the American West. *The American Historical Review*, vol. 72, pp. 719–740.
2. Beshiri R. (2001). Employment structure in rural and small town Canada: the primary sector. *Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin*, vol. 2, pp. 10-17.
3. Birch D. L. (1989) Who Creates Jobs? *Public Interes*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 3–14.
4. Byuro nacional'noj statistiki Agentstva po strategicheskemu planirovaniyu i reformam Respubliki Kazahstan [Bureau of National Statistics of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan.]. [Elektronnyj resurs]. URL <https://old.stat.gov.kz/region/247783/dynamic>
5. Cooper A. C. (1966) Small companies can pioneer new products. *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 162–179.
6. Esengel'din, B. S. Muhamedieva G. (2017) M. Rol' monogorodov v social'no-ekonomicheskom razvitiy regionov Respubliki Kazahstan. [The role of single-industry towns in the socio-economic development of the regions of the Republic of Kazakhstan] *Conference "Problems and prospects of development of economy and management"*, Prague, pp. 19-23.
7. Friedmann J., Alonso W. (1964) Regional Development as a Policy Issue. Cambridge (Mass.). P.174 – 179.
8. Houghton G., Hunter C. (2004) Sustainable cities. *Regional Policy and Development Series*, vol. 7. London: Regional Studies Association and Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 233–243.
9. Innis H. A., Lower A.R. (1936) Settlement and the mining frontier. Settlement and the Forest Frontier in Eastern Canada. Toronto, Macmillan of Canada, pp. 170–407.
10. Junussova M., Beimisheva A.(2021) Monotowns of Kazakhstan: Development Challenges and Opportunities. *Kazakhstan's Developmental Journey*, pp. 211-247.
11. Klemenkova K. (2012) G4 City – goroda-sputniki. Ideya ideal'nyh malen'kih gorodkov budorazhit umy [G4 City – satellite cities. The idea of ideal small towns excites minds] *Strana i mir. Kazahstanskij obshchestvenno-politicheskij ezhenedel'nik* [Elektron. resurs]. vol. 44 (486) – URL: <http://sim.kz/obshhestvo/g4-citygoroda-sputniki.html>.
12. Landis P.H. (1958) Three iron mining towns: A study in cultural change. *Edwards brothers, Incorporated*, 210 P.
13. Lappo G. M. (2012) Goroda Rossii. Vzglyad geografa [Cities of Russia. Geographer's view] M.: «Novyj hronograf», 180 P.
14. Lipsic I.V. (2005) Monoprofil'nye goroda i gradoobrazuyushchie predpriyatiya. Analiticheskoe issledovanie problemy gradoobrazuyushchih predpriyatij i monogorodov v nacional'nom masshtabe [Single-profile cities and city-forming enterprises. Analytical study of the problem of city-forming enterprises and single-industry towns on a national scale] Ekspertnyj institut. — M.: YUridicheskaya literature, 115 P.
15. Magill D. W.(1964) Migration and occupational mobility from a nova scotia coal mining town, 84 P.
16. Mishchenko I.V., Trockovskij A.Ya. (2014) Prostranstvennoe razvitie sel'skoj periferii: metodologiya i osnovnye rezul'taty issledovaniy [Spatial development of the rural periphery: methodology and main results of the study] *Regional'naya ekonomika: teoriya i praktika*, vol. 45, pp. 2-16.
17. Nurlanova N.K. (2016) Goroda kak tochki rosta ekonomicheskogo prostranstva Kazahstana: tendencii i perspektivy razvitiya [Cities as growth points of Kazakhstan's economic space: trends and development prospects]. *Problemy razvitiya territorii*, vol. 5 (85), pp. 201-208.
18. Omarova A.T., Shokhan R., Khoich A., Grelo M.F., Srailoval G.N. (2019) Social and economic development of monotowns in Kazakhstan. *Bulletin of Karaganda* , vol. 1 (93), pp. 137-142
19. Poblán J. (1996). Processes of Suburbanization and its Effects on the Finances of Cities in West Germany: The Example of Bremen and the Surrounding Communities. Environment and Planning . *Government and Policy*, vol. 1, pp. 25–37.
20. Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva Respubliki Kazahstan ot 16 noyabrya 2018 goda № 767 «Ob utverzhdenii Gosudarstvennoj programmy razvitiya regionov do 2020 goda» [Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan of November 16, 2018 No. 767 “On Approval of the State Program for the Development of Regions until 2020 “] *Informacionno-pravovaya sistema normativnyh pravovyh aktov RK*. [Elektronnyj resurs]. URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P1800000767>
21. Teulings C.N., Ossokina I.V. (2015) Welfare Benefits of Agglomeration and Worker Heterogeneity. CESifo Working Paper Series 4939, 2014. CESifo Group Munich, pp. 1–38.
22. Turgel I., Panzabekova A, Antonova I. (2023) Hidden Single-Industry Towns in Transition *Landmarks for Spatial Development*, pp. 53-72
23. Turgel' I.D. (2001) Monospecializirovannyj gorod: teoriya i praktika strategicheskogo upravleniya social'no-ekonomicheskim razvitiem [Monospecialized city: theory and practice of strategic management of socio-economic development] Ekaterinburg: Ural'skaya gosudarstvennaya gorno-geologicheskaya akademiya, 167 p.
24. Uzakova Sh. T., Ospanova A. D., Uzak G. T (2022) Features of regional development projects problems: analysis based on central Kazakhstan monotowns . *Central Asian economic review*, №2, pp.104-115.
25. Zubarevich N. V.(2010) Regiony Rossii: neravenstvo, krizis, modernizaciya [Regions of Russia: inequality, crisis, modernization.] M.: Nezavisimyj institut social'noj politiki, pp. 82–86.