Turdimambetov Izimbet Rakhmetovich, DSc.

Professor of Economic and Social geography Department

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Nukus, Uzbekistan

Oteuliev Medetbay Orinbaevich, PhD.

Acting as associate professor of Economic and social geography Department

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Nukus, Uzbekistan

Urazbaeva Sevara

Researcher of Economic and social geography Department

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Nukus, Uzbekistan

TERRITORIAL CLASSIFICATION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDICATORS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF THE POPULATION IN THE REGION

Abstract. Measuring the quality of life is currently at the forefront of various fields of science. Despite the great interest in quality of life and many attempts to measure it, there is no methodologically sound and generally accepted way of measuring life. Quality of life remains a controversial concept that can be measured in different ways: analysis of one or more factors of quality of life (material well-being and GDP per capita), using objective and subjective measures, created collective indicators.

Keywords: quality of life, well-being, indicator, population, districts

The problem of quality of life includes the issue of indicators (indicators), with the help of which researchers try to measure this complex social phenomenon [1,4,5]. Some researchers believe that the quality of life is a multi-component phenomenon, which cannot be homogenized and measured using a single indicator. At the same time, various assumptions have been put forward to measure the quality of life: from survey methods, research that reveals the assessment by individuals and groups of their position in society, their level of satisfaction with their position, to complex schemes

_____

and models based on a number of specific factors that describe the quality of life methods [2,3].

An important aspect of the quality of life of the population is determined by the standard of living of the population, that is, economic conditions. The following 15 indicators reflecting the economic conditions of the quality of life of the residents of the administrative-territorial units of the Republic of Karakalpakstan were used in the study (Table 1).

The criteria in this list reflect the average amount of income of the residents of the Republic of Karakalpakstan from various sources, their purchasing power, the price of the most necessary food products, and some parameters of poverty. In the assessment of the quality of life of the residents of the regions according to the relevant indicators, the data of the General Directorate of Statistics of the Republic of Karakalpakstan, the General Directorate of the Central Bank of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the General Directorate of Family and Community Support of the Republic of Karakalpakstan and the Ministry of Housing and Communal Services of the Republic of Karakalpakstan were used.

The data was obtained as of the end of 2020. The prices of food products were studied as a result of selective observations in farmers' markets in the administrative centers of the city of Nukus and 16 rural districts of the republic, and their average values were calculated in the region. Then, the average monthly salary calculated by the statistical authorities in the region was divided into the relevant prices. These indicators were taken into account during the direct evaluation process.

The indicators of the regions according to each evaluation criterion were divided by the average indicator of the Republic of Karakalpakstan and relative coefficients were determined. It should be noted that most of the criteria in the economic bloc (12 out of 15) have a positive character, that is, the higher their quantitative value, the more positive the material conditions of the population's living. However, such indicators as the share of working-age population, debt for communal services per capita, and the share of the population included in the «Temir daftar», on the contrary, have a negative character, that is, their high values indicate a low standard of living of the population.

_____

Table 1. Classification of the districts of the Republic of Karakalpakstan according to the economic indicators of the quality of life of the population

№	Administrative-territorial units	Average monthly salary		Average pension amount		Number of small business entities (per 1,000 population)		Share of working-age population of those who went abroad to work			Retail turnover per capita	
		A thousand sums	Coefficient of relativity	A thousand sums	Coefficient of relativity	In unity	Coefficient of relativity	%	Coefficient of relativity	Reverse coefficient	A thousand sums	Coefficient of relativity
1	Nukus city	3034,5	1,27	926,8	1,15	16,6	1,21	10,4	0,95	1,06	6628,0	1,92
2	Amudarya	1794,7	0,75	702	0,87	10,3	0,75	12,1	1,10	0,91	2208,1	0,64
3	Beruni	1764,9	0,74	770,6	0,96	12,0	0,88	13,5	1,23	0,81	2862,2	0,83
4	Bozatau	1818,3	0,76	752,4	0,93	18,4	1,34	6,4	0,58	1,72	1811,6	0,52
5	Kegeyli	1996,8	0,84	756	0,94	12,0	0,88	10,4	0,95	1,06	2182,8	0,63
6	Muynak	1835,2	0,77	850,3	1,05	18,3	1,34	6,1	0,55	1,80	1524,0	0,44
7	Nukus	2319,9	0,97	870,1	1,08	24,4	1,78	9,0	0,82	1,22	2157,7	0,62
8	Takhiatas	2436,8	1,02	873,1	1,08	8,9	0,65	11,6	1,05	0,95	2033,9	0,59
9	Takhtakupir	1790,5	0,75	808	1,00	15,0	1,09	5,8	0,53	1,90	3556,6	1,03
10	Tortkul	1919,5	0,81	728,7	0,90	16,1	1,18	11,3	1,03	0,97	2778,5	0,80
11	Khodjeli	2075,9	0,87	750,5	0,93	9,1	0,66	8,8	0,80	1,25	5401,5	1,56
12	Chimbay	2007,8	0,84	768,3	0,95	10,7	0,78	12,9	1,17	0,85	2221,1	0,64
13	Shomanay	1958	0,82	776,9	0,96	14,3	1,04	7,4	0,67	1,49	2457,8	0,71
14	Ellikkala	2009,8	0,84	798,7	0,99	12,7	0,93	14,9	1,35	0,74	2234	0,65
15	Kanlikul	1825,2	0,77	797,9	0,99	18,7	1,36	8,2	0,75	1,34	2931,1	0,85
16	Karauzak	1841,9	0,77	801,1	0,99	18,2	1,33	7,3	0,66	1,51	3532,2	1,02
17	Kungrad	2889,6	1,21	952,9	1,18	10,7	0,78	11,4	1,04	0,96	3623,6	1,05
18	**Karakalpakstan Republic**	**2383,4**	**1,00**	**806,4**	**1,00**	**13,7**	**1,00**	**11,0**	**1,00**	**1,00**	**3455,90**	**1,00**

_____

№	Administrative-territorial units	Volume of paid services per capita		Accounts receivable for utilities per capita			Population included in the "Temir daftar"			Amount of deposits in banks per capita		Employment rate (relative to working-age population)	
		A thousand sums	Coefficient of relativity	A thousand sums	Coefficient of relativity	Reverse coefficient	Per mille	Coefficient of relativity	Reverse coefficient	Sum	Coefficient of relativity	%	Coefficient of relativity
1	Nukus city	8621,5	2,53	192,87	1,16	0,86	0,24	2,18	0,46	1272139,3	3,37	75	1,15
2	Amudarya	1728,9	0,51	106,65	0,64	1,56	0,05	0,45	2,20	194714,6	0,52	63	0,97
3	Beruni	1732,1	0,51	141,31	0,85	1,18	0,06	0,55	1,83	321815,5	0,85	64	0,98
4	Bozatau	1224,8	0,36	136,44	0,82	1,22	0,19	1,73	0,58	0	0,00	60	0,92
5	Kegeyli	1745,4	0,51	160,6	0,96	1,04	0,08	0,73	1,38	127295,4	0,34	75	1,15
6	Muynak	2603,2	0,76	156,39	0,94	1,07	0,21	1,91	0,52	170884,3	0,45	64	0,98
7	Nukus	2687,1	0,79	200,85	1,20	0,83	0,07	0,64	1,57	113505,6	0,30	68	1,05
8	Takhiatas	2157	0,63	159,29	0,95	1,05	0,17	1,55	0,65	195700,4	0,52	70	1,08
9	Takhtakupir	2558,2	0,75	87,63	0,53	1,90	0,19	1,73	0,58	132437,8	0,35	56	0,86
10	Tortkul	2347,7	0,69	161,94	0,97	1,03	0,05	0,45	2,20	230556	0,61	59	0,91
11	Khodjeli	2338,3	0,69	295,65	1,77	0,56	0,09	0,82	1,22	200581,4	0,53	59	0,91
12	Chimbay	1735,8	0,51	122,43	0,73	1,36	0,06	0,55	1,83	99995,7	0,26	65	1,00
13	Shomanay	1667,8	0,49	126,21	0,76	1,32	0,06	0,55	1,83	98788,9	0,26	57	0,88
14	Ellikkala	1777,3	0,52	150,91	0,90	1,11	0,14	1,27	0,79	130568,5	0,35	66	1,02
15	Kanlikul	1710,7	0,50	121,37	0,73	1,37	0,09	0,82	1,22	111571,2	0,30	62	0,95
16	Karauzak	2301,4	0,67	109,6	0,66	1,52	0,07	0,64	1,57	106502,2	0,28	61	0,94

| 17 | Kungrad | 6782,3 | 1,99 | 283,39 | 1,70 | 0,59 | 0,05 | 0,45 | 2,20 | 349148 | 0,92 | 67 | 1,03 |
| 18 | **Karakalpakstan Republic** | **3412,0** | **1,00** | **166,83** | **1,00** | **1,00** | **0,11** | **1,00** | **1,00** | **377500** | **1,00** | **65** | **1,00** |

the continuation of the table

№	Administrative-territorial units	The amount of products that can be purchased for 1 person with an average monthly salary (kg)										Sum of coefficients	Ranking position	The level
		Wheat flour (local, first class)		Cottonseed oil		Beef		Sugar		Potatoes				
		Kg	Coefficient of relativity	Liter	Coefficient of relativity	Kg	Coefficient of relativity	Kg	Coefficient of relativity	Kg	Coefficient of relativity			
1	Nukus city	905,8	1,44	168,6	1,27	51,4	1,28	319,4	1,31	674,3	1,41	21,68	1	High
Districts:														
2	Amudarya	366,3	0,58	105,6	0,79	31,2	0,77	149,6	0,61	358,9	0,75	13,19	10	Low
3	Beruni	578,7	0,92	107	0,80	28,2	0,70	207,6	0,85	320,9	0,67	13,52	8	Low
4	Bozatau	505,1	0,80	101	0,76	31,9	0,79	186,5	0,76	427,8	0,89	12,38	15	Low
5	Kegeyli	487	0,77	99,8	0,75	31,9	0,79	210,2	0,86	399,4	0,84	12,77	14	Low
6	Muynak	601,7	0,95	99,2	0,75	33,4	0,83	166,8	0,68	319,2	0,67	13,07	13	Low
7	Nukus	672,4	1,07	132,6	1,00	37,1	0,92	237,9	0,97	515,5	1,08	15,25	3	Average
8	Takhiatas	459,8	0,73	141,3	1,06	45,1	1,12	249,9	1,02	487,4	1,02	13,17	11	Low
9	Takhtakupir	606,9	0,96	102,3	0,77	34,8	0,86	193,6	0,79	358,1	0,75	14,35	5	Average
10	Tortkul	436,3	0,69	109,7	0,82	30,7	0,76	207,5	0,85	365,6	0,76	13,99	6	Low
11	Khodjeli	461,3	0,73	120,3	0,90	33,2	0,82	218,5	0,89	437	0,91	13,46	9	Low
12	Chimbay	483,8	0,77	105,7	0,79	32,4	0,80	211,3	0,86	422,7	0,88	13,16	12	Low

13	Shomanay	435,1	0,69	105,8	0,80	31,3	0,78	200,8	0,82	356	0,74	13,64	7	Low
14	Ellikkala	502,5	0,80	111,7	0,84	33,5	0,83	211,6	0,87	446,6	0,93	12,19	16	Low
15	Kanlikul	507	0,80	98,7	0,74	29,2	0,72	187,2	0,77	365	0,76	13,46	9	Low
16	Karauzak	603,9	0,96	100,9	0,76	31,8	0,79	204,7	0,84	350,8	0,73	14,69	4	Average
17	Kungrad	760,4	1,21	165,1	1,24	52,5	1,30	275,2	1,13	550,4	1,15	17,95	2	High
18	**Karakalpakstan Republic**	**630,5**	**1,00**	**133**	**1,00**	**40,3**	**1,00**	**244,5**	**1,00**	**478,1**	**1,00**	**15,00**		

In order to ensure that all indicators in the block are analysed in the same direction during the statistical calculation process, and as a result, in order to provide an integrated assessment, the inverse value of the coefficients of relativity determined in the cross-section of regions for these 3 indicators was calculated, and those numbers were used in the final calculations.

After determining the relativity coefficients in the cross-section of regions for all indicators and the reverse coefficients in necessary cases, the sum of 15 coefficients was found in the cross-section of each district and city of Nukus. Based on this digital indicator, the ranking of territorial units was released.

Since the national average value for all criteria is equal to 1.00, the sum of the relative coefficients determined by 15 evaluation criteria of administrative territorial units was compared with 15. Areas with an integral indicator equal to the range of 14-16 should be assessed as having an average level of economic conditions for the quality of life of the population, areas with less than 14 - at a low level, and areas with a value higher than 16 - at a high level. The city of Nukus (21.68) and Kungrad district (17.95) are at a high level, the districts of Nukus (15.25), Karauzak (14.69) and Takhtakupir (14.35) are at a medium level, and Tortkul (13.99), Shomanay (13.64), Beruni (13.52), Khodjeli (13.46), Kanlikul (13.46), Amudarya (13.19), Takhiatas (13.17), Chimbay (13.16), Muynak (13.07), Kegeyli (12.77), Bozatau (12.38) and Ellikkala (12.19) districts are at a low level (Table 1). It can be seen that compared to the average level of the Republic of Karakalpakstan, the economic (material) living conditions of the population are rated high only in 2 regions and medium in 3 regions, and low in most administrative-territorial units (12 out of 17). This situation indicates that regional differences in the standard of living of the population in the region are quite significant.

References:

1. Susniene, D., & Jurkauskas, A. The Concepts of Quality of Life and Happiness - Correlation and Differences. Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics (3), 2009, – P. 58-66.

_____

2. Turdimambetov I.R, Madreymov A., Pauditsova E., Oteuliev M.O., Bekanov K.K. Influence of harmful environmental factors on the rate of incidence of children in Karakalpakstan. Central Asian journal of the geographical researches. No 3-4, 2021, – P. 55-63.

3. Turdimambetov I.R., Uzaqbaev Q.K., Oteuliev M.O. Territorial formation of the education system in improving the quality of life of the population of the Republic of Karakalpakstan // Экономика и социум. 2020. №12 (79). ISSN 2225-1545. P. 276-279. (11.00.00; Мустақил давлатлар ҳамдўстлиги мамлакатлари нашрлари, №11.).

4. Veenhoven, R. Apparent Quality of Life in Nations. How Long and Happy People Live. Social Indicators Research (71), 2005, – P. 61-68.

5. Violeta Pukeliene, Viktorija Starkauskiene. Quality of Life: Factors Determining its Measurement Complexity. Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics, 22(2), 2011, – P. 147-156.