

KONSTANTIN
PRESLAVSKY
UNIVERSITY
SHUMEN



ШУМЕНСКИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
“ЕПИСКОП КОНСТАНТИН ПРЕСЛАВСКИ”

VI Научна конференция с международно участие
ГЕОГРАФИЯ,
РЕГИОНАЛНО РАЗВИТИЕ И ТУРИЗЪМ
Посветена на 60-годишнината от началото на обучението
по география във висшето образование в Шумен

8 – 10 ноември 2024

СБОРНИК С РЕЗЮМЕТА

VI Scientific conference with international participation
GEOGRAPHY,
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM
Dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the beginning of training
in geography in higher education in Shumen

8 – 10 November 2024

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

Университетско издателство „Епископ Константин Преславски“

ШУМЕН
2024

KONSTANTIN
PRESLAVSKY
UNIVERSITY
SHUMEN



ШУМЕНСКИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
“ЕПИСКОП КОНСТАНТИН ПРЕСЛАВСКИ”

VI Научна конференция с международно участие

**ГЕОГРАФИЯ,
РЕГИОНАЛНО РАЗВИТИЕ И ТУРИЗЪМ**

Посветена на 60-годишнината от началото на обучението по
география във висшето образование в Шумен

8 – 10 ноември 2024

СБОРНИК С РЕЗЮМЕТА

VI Scientific conference with international participation

**GEOGRAPHY,
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM**

Dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the beginning of training in
geography in higher education in Shumen

8 – 10 November 2024

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

Университетско издателство „Епископ Константин Преславски“

ШУМЕН
2024

VI Научна конференция с международно участие *География, регионално развитие и туризъм, Шумен 2024*
VI Scientific conference with international participation *Geography, regional development and tourism, Shumen 2024*

Сборникът се издава с финансовата подкрепа на Фонд „Научни изследвания“, Проект № КП-06-МНФ/37 от 12.08.2024 г.

РЕДАКЦИОНЕН КОЛЕКТИВ:
EDITORIAL TEAM:

проф. д-р Светла СТАНКОВА
Prof. Svetla STANKOVA, PhD

проф. д-р Дора КАБАКЧИЕВА
Prof. Dora KABAКCHIEVA, PhD

ISBN 978-619-201-793-4

Университетско издателство „Епископ Константин Преславски“
2024

СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ	3
ПЛЕНАРНА СЕСИЯ	18
PLENARY SECTION	18
60 ГОДИНИ ОТ ПОСТАВЯНЕТО НА НАЧАЛОТО НА ГЕОГРАФИЯТА В ШУМЕНСКИЯ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ.....	18
<i>Димитър Владев</i>	18
60 YEARS OF THE BEGINNING OF GEOGRAPHY AT SHUMEN UNIVERSITY.....	19
<i>Dimitar Vladev</i>	19
БЪЛГАРИЯ НА ПРЕХОДА КЪМ УСТОЙЧИВО РАЗВИТИЕ – ГЛОБАЛНИ, КОНТИНЕНТАЛНИ, НАЦИОНАЛНИ И РЕГИОНАЛНИ АСПЕКТИ	19
<i>Марин Русев</i>	19
BULGARIA ON THE TRANSITION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – GLOBAL, CONTINENTAL, NATIONAL AND REGIONAL ASPECTS	20
<i>Marin Rusev</i>	20
ВАЖНИ МОТИВАЦИОННИ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ ЗА РАЗВИТИЕТО НА ТУРИЗМА В ОБЩИНА ПРИЛЕП	21
<i>Цане Котески, Светлана Попова, Георги Петкоски</i>	21
SIGNIFICANT MOTIVE CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TOURISM IN PRILEP MUNICIPALITY.....	22
<i>Cane Koteski, Svetlana Popova, Gjorgji Petkqski</i>	22
35 ГОДИНИ БЪЛГАРИЯ В АНТАРКТИДА	23
<i>Христо Пимпирев</i>	23
35 YEARS OF BULGARIA IN ANTARCTICA.....	24
<i>Hristo Pimpirev</i>	24
СЕКЦИЯ „АКТУАЛНИ АСПЕКТИ НА РЕГИОНАЛНИТЕ ИЗСЛЕДВАНИЯ“	26
CURRENT ASPECTS OF REGIONAL SURVEYS SECTION	26
ПРИСПОСОБЯВАНЕ КЪМ КРЪГОВАТА ИКОНОМИКА И ЗЕЛЕНИЯ ПРЕХОД: НАДЕЖДНА ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ЗА ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛИЗМА И РЕГИОНАЛНОСТТА	26
<i>Резеар Колай, Екатерина Арабска, Камен Петров, Петър Борисов</i>	26
FITTING THE CIRCULAR ECONOMY AND THE GREEN TRANSITION: RELIABLE INFORMATION ON INSTITUTIONALISM AND REGIONALITY.....	27

ЗДРАВНА ИНФРАСТРУКТУРА – ГЕОГРАФСКИ АСПЕКТИ	77
<i>Клара Костадинова</i>	77
HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE – GEOGRAPHICAL ASPECTS	77
<i>Klara Kostadinova</i>	77
СИТУАЦИОНЕН АНАЛИЗ НА АВТОМОБИЛНАТА И ЖЕЛЕЗОПЪТНАТА ТРАНСПОРТНА ПОДСИСТЕМА НА БЪЛГАРИЯ: РЕГИОНАЛНИ АСПЕКТИ И СРАВНИТЕЛНИ ПРЕДИМСТВА	78
<i>Емел Билялова</i>	78
SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE ROAD AND THE RAIL TRANSPORT SUBSYSTEM OF BULGARIA: REGIONAL ASPECTS AND COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES	79
<i>Emel Bilyalova</i>	79
ГЕОГРАФСКИ АСПЕКТИ НА РУСКО-УКРАИНСКИЯ КОНФЛИКТ (ГЕОГРАФСКО ПОЛОЖЕНИЕ)	80
<i>Мирослав Кацаров</i>	80
GEOGRAPHICAL ASPECTS OF THE RUSSIAN – UKRAINIAN CONFLICT (GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION)	81
<i>Miroslav Katsarov</i>	81
BULGARIAN YOUTH, GRADUATES OF THE STATE VETERINARY SCHOOL IN TOULOUSE, FRANCE (1888-1913)	82
<i>Rositsa Angelova</i>	82
РАЗВИТИЕ НА ИНФРАСТРУКТУРАТА НА ИСТАНБУЛ	83
<i>Лейля Шефкъ</i>	83
INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT OF ISTANBUL	84
<i>Leylya Shefka</i>	84
СЕКЦИЯ „ТУРИЗЪМ“	85
TOURISM SECTION	85
ТЕНДЕНЦИИ В РАЗВИТИЕТО НА ТУРИЗМА В РЕПУБЛИКА МАКЕДОНИЯ И РЕПУБЛИКА КОСОВО	85
<i>Фатон Шериф, Арта Зимери Асани, Зия Зимери</i>	85
TOURISM DEVELOPMENT TRENDS IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO	86
<i>Faton Sherifi, Arta Zimeri Asani, Zija Zimeri</i>	86
ТЕНДЕНЦИИ В РАЗВИТИЕТО НА ГРАДСКИЯ ТУРИЗЪМ СЛЕД ПАНДЕМИЯТА ОТ COVID 19	86

<i>Красимир Левков, Велико Великов</i>	86
TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CITY TOURISM AFTER THE COVID 19 PANDEMIC.....	87
<i>Krasimir Levkov, Veliko Velikov</i>	87
ПРИРОДЕН ПОТЕНЦИАЛ НА ИЗТОЧНИЯ РЕГИОН В КОСОВО	87
<i>Перпарим Кахили, Цане Котески</i>	87
NATURAL POTENTIAL IN THE EASTERN REGION OF KOSOVO	88
<i>Perparim Qahili, Cane Koteski</i>	88
СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКИ МАРКЕТИНГ В ТУРИСТИЧЕСКОТО ПРЕДПРИЕМАЧЕСТВО	89
<i>Флорим Асани, Фатон Хазирай, Неритан Туркешу</i>	89
STRATEGIC MARKETING IN TOURIST ENTERPRISES.....	89
<i>Florim Asani , Faton Haziraj, Neritan Turkeshi</i>	89
ПРЕДИЗВИКАТЕЛСТВА В ТУРИЗМА – МЕДИАЦИЯТА КАТО НОВ НАЧИН ЗА РЕШАВАНЕ НА СПОРНИ ОТНОШЕНИЯ В ТУРИЗМА.....	90
<i>Светлана Попова, Цане Котески</i>	90
CHALLENGES IN TOURISM-MEDIATION AS A NEW WAY OF SOLVING DISPUTES IN TOURISM	91
<i>Svetlana Popova, Cane Koteski</i>	91
ЗАЩИТЕНИТЕ ТЕРИТОРИИ В РАЙОН РИЛА – ПИРИН – СЪВРЕМЕННО СЪСТОЯНИЕ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ЗА РАЗВИТИЕ НА ТУРИЗМА	92
<i>Севджан Сабриева</i>	92
PROTECTED AREAS IN THE RILA – PIRIN - CURRENT STATE AND PROSPECTS FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT.....	93
<i>Sevdjan Sabrieva</i>	93
СЪВРЕМЕННИ СПЕЦИФИКИ НА ТУРИЗМА В ЮЖНА КОРЕЯ.....	94
<i>Ваня Василева, Айтен Исмаил</i>	94
MODERN SPECIFICS OF TOURISM IN SOUTH KOREA.....	95
<i>Vanya Vasileva, Ayten Ismail</i>	95
РОЛЯТА НА МАНАСТИРИТЕ И ЦЪРКВИТЕ В ОБЩИНИТЕ ПРИЛЕП, КРУШЕВО, ДОЛНЕНИ И КРИВОГАШТАНИ В ТУРИЗМА И РЕГИОНАЛНОТО РАЗВИТИЕ	95
<i>Георги Петкоски, Цане Котески</i>	95
THE ROLE OF MONASTERIES AND CHURCHES IN THE MUNICIPALITIES OF PRILEP, KRUSHEVO, DOLNENI, AND KRIVOGASHTANI IN TOURISM AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT	96

<i>Gjorgji Petkoski, Cane Koteski</i>	96
АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИ ОБЕКТИ В ОБЩИНИТЕ ПРИЛЕП, КРУШЕВО, ДОЛНЕНИ И КРИВОГАЩАНИ КАТО ПОТЕНЦИАЛ ЗА РАЗВИТИЕ НА ТУРИЗМА	97
<i>Цане Котески, Георги Петкоски</i>	97
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES IN THE MUNICIPALITIES OF PRILEP, KRUSHEVO, DOLNENI, AND KRIVOGASHTANI AS TOURISM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL	98
<i>Cane Koteski Gjorgji Petkoski</i>	98
РАЗВИТИЕ НА УСТОЙЧИВ ТУРИЗЪМ В СЕЛСКИТЕ РАЙОНИ	99
(ПО ПРИМЕРА НА ОБЩИНА КОТЕЛ)	99
<i>Дора Кабакчиева, Георги Ангелов</i>	99
DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM IN RURAL AREAS (FOLLOWING THE EXAMPLE OF KOTEL MUNICIPALITY)	100
<i>Dora Kabakchieva, Georgi Angelov</i>	100
ВЪЗДЕЙСТВИЕТО НА ПРАКТИКИТЕ ЗА УПРАВЛЕНИЕ НА ЧОВЕШКИТЕ РЕСУРСИ ВЪРХУ РАБОТАТА НА СЛУЖИТЕЛИТЕ	100
<i>Арбьореша Керими, Фидан Керими</i>	100
THE IMPACT OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE	101
<i>Arbëresha Qerimi, Fidan Qerimi</i>	101
ИНТЕГРАЦИЯТА НА „ЧУЖДО“ И „СВОЕ“ КАТО НАЧИН ЗА ПОДОБРЯВАНЕ НА МЕЖДУКУЛТУРНАТА КОМУНИКАЦИЯ В СЪВРЕМЕННИТЕ СОЦИОКУЛТУРНИ РЕАЛНОСТИ В ТУРИСТИЧЕСКАТА ИНДУСТРИЯ	102
<i>Наталия Краско</i>	102
THE INTEGRATION OF THE „FOREIGN“ INTO THE „NATIVE“ AS A MEANS OF IMPROVING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIOCULTURAL REALITIES OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY	102
<i>Natalia Krasko</i>	102
ВЪЗМОЖНОСТИ ЗА ВЪВЕЖДАНЕ НА ИНСТРУМЕНТИ НА ЛИЙН В ХОТЕЛ	103
<i>Зина Христова</i>	103
OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPLEMENT LEAN TOOLS IN A HOTEL	103
<i>Zina Hristova</i>	103
МЕТОДИЧЕСКИ ПОДХОД ЗА ОРГАНИЗИРАНЕ НА ИНСЕНТИВ ТУРИЗЪМ	104
<i>Зина Христова</i>	104
METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO ORGANIZING INCENTIVE TOURISM	104

АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИ ОБЕКТИ В ОБЩИНИТЕ ПРИЛЕП, КРУШЕВО, ДОЛНЕНИ И КРИВОГАШТАНИ КАТО ПОТЕНЦИАЛ ЗА РАЗВИТИЕ НА ТУРИЗМА

Цане Котески, Георги Петкоски

Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ в Штип, Северна Македонија

Клучови думи: археологија, општини, туризъм, развитие

Резюме

Общините Прилеп, Крушево, Долнени и Кривогаштани все още не са напълно използвали своя значителен потенциал за развитие на туризма, особено по отношение на богатото си археологическо наследство. Тези региони притежават значителен брой археологически обекти, които, ако бъдат правилно развити и популяризирани, могат значително да повишат туристическата привлекателност и цялостното развитие на општините. Археологическият туризъм е съществен двигател както за икономическия растеж, така и за културното развитие в тези области. Тези обекти не са просто исторически паметници; те представяват уникални културни съкровища, които могат да привлекат широка гама от посетители – както местни, така и международни туристи. За да се отключи пълният им потенциал обаче, е

необходима задълбочена оценка на тяхната историческа, културна и икономическа стойност, както и на способността им да допринесат за регионалното развитие. Основната цел на планирането на туризма в тези општини е не само да подобрят съществуващите условия, но и да разработи устойчива и дългосрочна визия за растеж. Тези археологически активи се разглеждат като критични елементи в по-широк регионален контекст. Правилната валоризация на тези обекти е от основно значение за тяхното интегриране в динамичен и адаптивен туристически продукт, специално съобразен с нуждите и очакванията на съвременните туристи. Чрез съгласуване на стратегиите за популяризиране на туризма с разнообразните интереси на съвременните посетители, разглежданите општини могат да предложат ангажиращо, информативно и обогатяващо културно преживяване, насърчавайки местния и регионалния растеж, като същевременно осигуряват дългосрочно устойчиво развитие.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES IN THE MUNICIPALITIES OF PRILEP, KRUSHEVO, DOLNENI, AND KRIVOGASHTANI AS TOURISM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Cane Koteski Gjorgji Petkoski

Goce Delchev University of Stip, North Macedonia

Key words: archaeological, municipalities, tourism, development

Abstract

The municipalities of Prilep, Krushevo, Dolneni, and Krivogashtani have not yet fully harnessed their considerable tourism development potential, particularly when it comes to their rich archaeological heritage. These regions possess a significant number of archaeological sites that, if properly developed and promoted, could greatly boost the tourism appeal and overall development of these municipalities. Archaeological tourism is an essential driver of both economic growth and cultural promotion in these areas. These sites are not merely historical landmarks; they represent unique cultural treasures that can attract a wide variety of visitors, including both domestic and international tourists. To fully unlock their potential, a detailed and comprehensive inventory of these archaeological sites must first be conducted.

This should be followed by an in-depth assessment of their historical, cultural, and economic value, as well as their capacity to contribute to regional development. The overarching goal of tourism planning in these municipalities is to not only improve existing conditions but also to develop a sustainable and long-term vision for growth. These archaeological assets are regarded as critical components

of the broader regional context, providing key insights into the area's historical narratives and cultural evolution. Proper valorization of these sites is fundamental to their integration into a dynamic and adaptable tourism product, specifically tailored to meet the needs and expectations of modern tourists. By aligning tourism promotion strategies with the diverse interests of contemporary visitors, these municipalities can provide an engaging, informative, and culturally enriching experience, fostering local and regional growth while ensuring long-term sustainable development.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES IN THE MUNICIPALITIES OF PRILEP, KRUSHEVO, DOLNENI, AND KRIVOGASHTANI AS TOURISM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

**Cane Koteski
Gjorgji Petkoski**

^aFaculty of Tourism and Business Logistics, Goce Delcev University, Stip, 2000, North Macedonia

^aFaculty of Tourism and Business Logistics, Goce Delcev University, Stip, 2000, North Macedonia

Abstract

The municipalities of Prilep, Krushevo, Dolneni, and Krivogashtani have not yet fully harnessed their considerable tourism development potential, particularly when it comes to their rich archaeological heritage. These regions possess a significant number of archaeological sites that, if properly developed and promoted, could greatly boost the tourism appeal and overall development of these municipalities. Archaeological tourism is an essential driver of both economic growth and cultural promotion in these areas. These sites are not merely historical landmarks; they represent unique cultural treasures that can attract a wide variety of visitors, including both domestic and international tourists. To fully unlock their potential, a detailed and comprehensive inventory of these archaeological sites must first be conducted.

This should be followed by an in-depth assessment of their historical, cultural, and economic value, as well as their capacity to contribute to regional development. The overarching goal of tourism planning in these municipalities is to not only improve existing conditions but also to develop a sustainable and long-term vision for growth. These archaeological assets are regarded as critical components of the broader regional context, providing key insights into the area's historical narratives and cultural evolution. Proper valorization of these sites is fundamental to their integration into a dynamic and adaptable tourism product, specifically tailored to meet the needs and expectations of modern tourists. By aligning tourism promotion strategies with the diverse interests of contemporary visitors, these municipalities can provide an engaging, informative, and culturally enriching experience, fostering local and regional growth while ensuring long-term sustainable development.

Keywords: Archaeological, municipalities, tourism, development

Резюме:

Общините Прилеп, Крушево, Долнени и Кривогаштани все още не са напълно използвали своя значителен потенциал за развитие на туризма, особено по отношение на богатото си археологическо наследство. Тези региони притежават значителен брой археологически обекти, които, ако бъдат правилно развити и популяризирани, могат значително да повишат туристическата привлекателност и цялостното развитие на тези общини. Археологическият туризъм е съществен двигател както за икономическия растеж, така и за културното развитие в тези области. Тези обекти не са просто исторически паметници; те представляват уникални културни съкровища, които могат да привлекат широка гама от посетители, включително както местни, така и международни туристи. За да се отключи пълният им потенциал, трябва първо да се проведе подробен и изчерпателен инвентар на тези археологически обекти.

След това трябва да последва задълбочена оценка на тяхната историческа, културна и икономическа стойност, както и на способността им да допринасят за регионалното развитие. Основната цел на планирането на туризма в тези общини е не само да подобри съществуващите условия, но и да разработи устойчива и дългосрочна визия за растеж. Тези археологически активи се разглеждат като критични елементи в по-широкия регионален контекст, осигуряващи ключови прозрения в историческите наративи и културната еволюция на района. Правилната валоризация на тези обекти е от основно значение за тяхното интегриране в динамичен и адаптивен туристически продукт, специално съобразен с нуждите и очакванията на съвременните туристи. Чрез съгласуване на стратегиите за популяризиране на туризма с разнообразните интереси на съвременните посетители, тези общини могат да предложат ангажиращо, информативно и културно обогатяващо преживяване, насърчавайки местния и регионалния растеж, като същевременно осигуряват дългосрочно устойчиво развитие.

Ключови думи: археология, общини, туризъм, развитие

Introduction

Archaeological sites and artifacts form the foundation of history, culture, and cultural heritage as a whole. They serve as tangible evidence of the civilizational achievements of the municipalities of Prilep, Krushevo, Krivogashtani, and Dolneni. These sites are simultaneously attractions that define this region as a recognizable tourist destination. Therefore, they are a central theme in presenting the values of cultural tourism. Tourism products abound with motifs from this type of cultural heritage. In such systematizations of archaeological heritage, it is important to highlight the cultural, aesthetic, historical, or other properties and values. The role of archaeology as cultural heritage in tourism is continuously advancing. This stems from the demand for flexibility in tourism offerings and the desire to break the rigidity of traditional tourism products. This leads to the establishment of a balance between tourism supply and demand. Proper tourism valorization of archaeological sites, artifacts, and structures implies cultural and tourism valorization of heritage. This involves enriching culture and history with elements significant for their use in tourism. It is essential to properly assess the interaction between heritage and tourists, as the final outcome is their experiences and impressions. Therefore, the interpretation of archaeological wealth is crucial, as it generates positive experiences for tourists. It is important to avoid treating archaeological sites solely as valuable objects that tourists must visit without considering the complexity of their experience of these values.

Archaeological sites should be interwoven with elements of living culture. Modern tourists perceive this heritage as part of so-called living culture, meaning they are interested in traditions, ways of life, folklore, gastronomy, and specific historical aspects of these municipalities. Tourists want to be in contact with local residents, creating conditions for more impressive experiences. Therefore, the tourism offerings that include elements of archaeological heritage must meet the interests and needs of tourists. This way, these municipalities will become destinations that offer tourists various activities, nurture local traditions, and adapt their offerings to the needs and demands of tourists. Archaeological sites, as part of tourism products, will be able to succeed in the tourism market. Archaeological heritage in tourism represents a component of the complex cultural product. However, this product is highly intricate, and its main components are: access to the attraction and the first visual perception, physical appearance and condition of conservation, accessibility, presentation and interpretation of cultural resources, availability of audiovisual and other supplementary materials and events, and the hospitality of staff. All of this should be in line with quality promotional materials and information on websites, which create the initial expectations of tourists regarding the quality of archaeological sites as cultural resources.

1. Methodological Framework of the Research

The methodology addresses resolving issues that determine the use of archaeological sites as spatial elements for tourism development. In this context, the analysis includes approaches necessary for the proper and rational assessment of these values.

In order to gain a critical understanding of the current situation and provide a vision for development in this regard, research will focus on the role these cultural values have played in tourism over the past period. The research should also provide insights into the state of organization and equipment at tourist information points located near archaeological sites and assess the level of signage and visualization of tourism content, as well as their connection within a unified system. These research activities aim to evaluate the area in accordance with the abundance of diverse tourism values related to the archaeological wealth of the municipalities of Prilep, Krushevo, Krivogashtani, and Dolneni. These studies will determine cultural routes as part of the organization of the predispositions of the area as a gravitational structure for tourist movements. The basic premise is that understanding the predispositions of archaeological routes and their logistical equipment can be utilized in the creation of tourism policies related to the gravitational influences of attractions and their surroundings. Therefore, the spatial scope of the research is clearly defined. Namely, these municipalities have continuous connectivity, mutual contact, and polyvalence.

It is essential to review past strategies, their implementation, and application. Furthermore, a critical approach is necessary toward what has not been realized, yet was part of development plans, programs, and activities within the framework of established values. The research activities include reviewing literature and documents that address issues related to tourism and archaeological wealth. This group of documents includes: the National Tourism Development Strategies of the Republic of North Macedonia, which serves as a foundational document in this regard; the Spatial Plan of the Republic of Macedonia; development programs for the planning regions of North Macedonia; the Action Plan for the Implementation of the Strategy for Balanced Regional Development of the Republic of North Macedonia; and the development programs for the Pelagonija Planning Region.

2. Discussion – Conditions and Characteristics

The natural conditions and geographical position of the municipalities of Prilep,

Krushevo, Krivogashtani, and Dolneni make them a continuous spatial unit. From a tourism perspective, this is a functional tourist destination rich in archaeological sites and artifacts. Archaeological research indicates that human existence in this area dates back to ancient times. This is evidenced by findings from the Neolithic and Eneolithic periods, while Pelagonia itself also shows traces of Paleolithic presence. Numerous archaeological sites have been discovered, and many still hide the secrets of life that once thrived here. The discovery of archaeological sites in these municipalities is of great importance to tourism, as they possess remarkable attractive features. First and foremost, these sites contain significant attractive properties. The archaeological finds in this area serve as the basis for documenting Pelagonia's historical past. Tourists are even drawn to the legends associated with these sites, which are set within a specific historical context. Even the most ordinary objects located in these municipalities hold attractive qualities. A particular archaeological artifact, such as a stone or piece of wood, can acquire tourist significance. Even when such simple markers are absent, the space itself, as a site, can possess significant attributes. Archaeological sites, even when the artifacts have been removed, are attractive to visitors as landmarks that remind them of cultural and historical heritage.

The Prilep Field, where the oldest civilizations once existed or where battles were fought during the creation of a state or significant decisions were made, holds monumental significance as a tourist attraction. This means that even when the artifacts have been transferred to exhibition spaces, such as museums and galleries, there is still an interest among tourists in exploring the remnants of ancient cultures through archaeological materials displayed in museum collections or in the open environment (M. Kolaric, D. Pavlovic, 1975). The cultural and historical figures from this region, documented through archaeology, also hold significant importance as contributors to economic and cultural development (N. Marinovski, 2015). These occurrences and relationships, as testimonies of the past, attract tourists, fulfilling both educational and cultural functions. The greater the monumentality, the higher the tourist value.

Archaeological sites also possess important aesthetic qualities. The appearance of mosaics forms the basis of these tourism values. The intense aesthetic appeal of these sites often makes them standalone attractions while simultaneously enhancing the content of tourist stays, serving as a complementary component in tourism offerings. In addition to aesthetic and notable attractive qualities, some archaeological sites in these municipalities have curious elements. This is derived from their uniqueness. The style and typological characteristics of these sites are unparalleled. Each site is unique and, in this sense, not only rare but also unrepeatable. In the context of tourism offerings, each of these sites stands out as a distinctive feature.

3. Discussion – Differentiation of Archaeological Sites

The archaeological sites in the municipalities of Prilep, Krushevo, Krivogashtani, and Dolneni represent significant tourism potential. They are scattered throughout the entire area under analysis, and their number is impressive. To fully comprehend the value of these sites, it is necessary to consider their diversity, which includes spatial distribution, chronological origin, and their value as epochal assets. Therefore, their differentiation is based on these criteria. Primarily, we are dealing with sites from the Neolithic and Eneolithic periods, the Bronze and Iron Ages, the Early Antiquity and Hellenistic periods, Roman settlements, fortifications, roads, and individual finds; Roman burial sites, sacred objects, and individual finds; Late Antiquity and Early Christian settlements, fortifications, and mines; Late Antiquity and Early Christian necropolises, sacred objects, and individual finds; and Medieval settlements, fortifications, roads, necropolises, sacred objects, and individual finds.

3.1 Neolithic and Eneolithic Sites

Research on prehistory in the municipalities of Prilep, Krushevo, Krivogashtani, and Dolneni has a long tradition. These studies have been conducted continuously, indicating the scientific significance attributed to this period in archaeology. Archaeological sites in the Pelagonia region provide evidence of life dating back to the older Stone Age (Paleolithic) or around 6,000 BCE (I. Mikulčić, 1984).

Although no traces of the Paleolithic have been found in these municipalities, as the oldest findings of the Stone Age, the area is rich in Neolithic sites and artifacts, indicating that the first traces of civilization emerged in the early VI to IV millennium BCE. The excellent strategic position of the Prilep Field allowed this area to be inhabited from prehistoric times and through subsequent historical periods, including the Hellenistic, Roman, and Medieval periods (A. Mitkoski, D. Temalkoski). The Eneolithic period marks a transition from the Neolithic to the Metal Ages. This period spans from the end of the IV to the III millennium BCE. The findings from this era enrich the prehistory of this region. The abundance of finds from this era is impressive. Such a presence stems from the fact that this area allowed people to engage in agricultural activities in the vast plain and livestock farming in both the plain and its surroundings. This abundance also stems from the opportunities provided by the flatlands, where tools and equipment for farming began to emerge in Pelagonia. It is noteworthy that in the mountainous areas where the municipality of Krushevo is located, Neolithic and Eneolithic sites are absent. This is confirmed by the inventory we conducted, which can be presented. Their systematization is provided in the following table.

Tab. number 1. Sites from the Neolithic and Eneolithic times

Prilep	Krushevo	Krivogashtani	Dolneni
Markovi Kuli, Varosh, Caricina Livada, Vitolishte, Golema Niva-Zerenca, Volkovo, Tumba, Dolgaec, Prchinoga, Dune, Tumba Zagorani, Lozja, Zapolozhani, Oreova Bara, Zapolozhani, Krushkova Niva, Smolani, Pesherani, Oreovec, Ali Chair, Prilep, Bolnica-Uchitelsko Uchilishte, Prilep, Dolno Sadovo, Prilep, Kamenica, Prilep, Ramni Dol, Prasad, Kutlino, Rakle, Ridot Rakle, Staro Gumno, Rakle, Bakarno Gumno, Chepigovo, Chuka, Topolchani, Ridot, Troyaci	Vrbjanska Chuka, Slavej Krusheanska Chuka, Vrbjani, Popadinca-Devet Slogovi, Vrbjani	Gradishte, Debreshte Mogila, Senokos, Leshishte Nebregovo, Chuka Lazhani, Prisoj, Kutleshevo	Lambichic, Desovo, Stari Lozja, Vranche

Source: Archaeological Map of the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2002.

From Table 1, it can be observed that civilization in this area has deep roots, even though traces of the Paleolithic period have not been found. This is confirmed by the Neolithic and Eneolithic sites. Their presence is noted in all municipalities, except for Krushevo, where these periods are not marked by archaeological findings. The municipality of Prilep evidently has the largest number of sites, followed by Dolneni and Krivogashtani. The number and concentration of these sites position Prilep as a municipality with priority tourism characteristics. It is also important to note that the presence of these archaeological sites in rural municipalities forms a significant foundation for the development of cultural tourism, in combination with rural and agri-tourism.

3.2 Bronze and Iron Age Sites

Bronze marks the beginning of metal usage as a major achievement in historical terms. The discovery of bronze and iron artifacts suggests that Pelagonia, especially the municipalities of Prilep, Krivogashtani, and Dolneni, represent regions with a long-standing civilizational continuity. “The introduction of metal into human life brought about significant changes in the organization of the ancient tribal community. Discovering ore, processing it to obtain metal, and further refining the metal into usable items—tools, weapons, and jewelry—required mastering many complex processes, giving humans new preoccupations. The need for the exchange of raw materials or finished products grew increasingly important. Trade evolved from the necessary exchange of goods between the previously Neolithic settlements into a way of earning and a new economic sector. Craftsmanship developed further. People began to divide into farmers and herders, craftsmen, and traders. On the other hand, the search for ore deposits brought about an uncertain time of frequent conflicts between tribes and the need to strengthen defense and military organization. Settlements were often built on hills suitable for defense and control of neighboring areas. Some of these later turned into towns with defensive walls” (M. Vasileva, 2005). These developmental characteristics with anthropogenic dimensions form the foundation for creating tourism offerings, which are successfully linked to the archaeological sites and artifacts, increasing the attractiveness of these municipalities for visits from both domestic and international tourists.

Tab. number 2. Finds from the Bronze and Iron Age

Prilep	Krushevo	Krivogashtani	Dolneni
Kaldarma, Varoš, Zagrad, Varoš, House of Gjoševi, Varoš, House of M. Mantov, Varoš, Markovi Kuli, Varoš, Popadin Dol, Varoš, Svetec, Varoš, Slo, Varoš, Gradište, Veprčani, Padarnica, Kruševica, Stragata, Kruševica, Kasarni, Prilep, Hospital-Teacher's School, Prilep, Bezisten Prilepec, Sivec, Prisad, Rakida, Trojaci, Bara, Čanište, Bakarno Gumno, Čepigovo		Tumba, Borotino, Tumba Vođani, Čukarčina, Vrbjani, Čukarče Momiroško, Vrbjani, Tumba-Čair, Pašino Ruvci	Visoj, Belo Pole, Gradište, Debrešte

Source: Archaeological Map of the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2002.

Table 2 illustrates that the highest concentration and distribution of sites from the Bronze and Iron Ages are found in the municipality of Prilep, as well as the presence of Neolithic and Eneolithic periods. Unlike the presence of Neolithic and Eneolithic periods, in second place is the municipality of Krivogaštani, and in third place is Dolneni. Such findings are absent only in the municipality of Kruševo. However, this does not significantly change the regional potential, as the conditions for tourism development based on such attractive factors have similar characteristics. They merely complement the foundation for using the oldest findings for tourism, local and regional, economic, and social development of these spatial units and their regional coverage.

3.3. Sites from the Early Antique and Hellenistic Periods

Sites from the Early Antique and Hellenistic periods represent distinctive attractions that enable the rise of tourism. This wealth falls into the group of resources that follow the trend of tourism development in contemporary conditions. Through them, the affirmed tourist values and sites with monumentality, rare within the framework of civilization, should be realized. For this reason, there is a continuous interest in discovering new attractive forms and content with which this spatial unit is rich, and which can have a notable place in tourism development. Activating the tourism potentials is a primary concern for the participants in the preparation and implementation of spatial solutions. The mere mention of the Early Antique and Hellenism represents a factor that should be put into function to enrich the tourist offer and products in these municipalities. The distribution by municipalities and sites is given in Table 3.

Tab. number 3. Sites from the Early Antique and Hellenistic Periods

Prilep	Krushevo	Krivogashtani	Dolneni
Spanica, Bonče Staro Bonče, Bonče Crkvište, Bonče, Kaldarma, Prilep, Markovi Kuli, Varoš, Mečkina Dupka, Varoš, Pod Kuli, Varoš, Stolišta – Pazalka, Veprčani, Petočna Voda, Volkovo, Kaj Češmata, Zagorani, Temnik – Otsproti, Kalen, Kave, Kruševica, School, Podmol, In the village, Polčište, Krklari, Prilep, Bezisten, Prilepec, Korita, Prilepec, Markov Zid, Prilepec, Sivec, Prasad, Gumenje Treskavec, Zlatovrv, Treskavec	Manastirište Bučin, Hill, Bučin, Raičeica, Svetomirani	Bela Crkva, Krivogaštani	Markov Čardak, Belo Pole, Petočna Voda, Brailovo, Gramađe, Gorno Selo, Gradište, Debrešte, Gjupsko Kale, Slepče

Source: Archaeological Map of the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2002.

In Table 3, the inventory of sites from the Early Antique and Hellenistic periods is presented. These sites illustrate the advanced civilization in these regions. It should be noted that, even in this context, the highest concentration of sites is in the municipality of Prilep. The

municipality of Dolneni ranks second in the presence of archaeological sites from this period. Interestingly, the oldest findings in the municipality of Kruševo, based on current research, date back to this time, with three sites. In the municipality of Krivogaštani, this period is marked by only one site. This indicates that the distribution is diffuse, and in this regard, the municipality of Prilep holds the greatest potential for developing cultural tourism. However, the discovered wealth across the entirety of these municipalities should not be overlooked as a potential.

3.4. Roman-era Sites

Roman-era sites are the most prevalent in the municipalities covered by this analysis. This suggests that the Roman civilization forms a foundation upon which scientific treatment of tourism, based on these potentials, has solid characteristics. Tourism provides the best way to utilize the results of previous archaeological research to elaborate on the role and significance it holds in setting developmental priorities.

The developmental value of the findings from the Roman period is multidimensional in terms of their presence and regional and local distribution. Accordingly, the realization of these intentions should involve the systematization of characteristics with a clear approach to the specific values for tourism development.

Roman-era sites in the municipalities of Prilep, Kruševo, Krivogaštani, and Dolneni are represented in the form of settlements, fortifications, roads, burials, sacred objects, and individual findings. This indicates that different forms can be used in a specific way to conceptualize their presentation and inclusion in the tourism offer and their participation in regional development. This systematization is presented in Table 4.

Tab. number 4. Roman-era Sites

Municipality of Prilep
<p>Settlements, fortifications, roads, individual finds: Gorni Lozja, Bešiste, Crkvište, Bonče, Brevčina, Varoš, Kabanja, Varoš, Zavir – Sreden Breg, Veprčani, Vljakova Česma, Vitolište, Gorna Reka – Prteva Livada, Vitolište, Cemeteries Sv. Ilija, Vitolište, Gjerek, Vitolište, Moklište, Vitolište, Polenite, Vitolište, Čarčina Niva, Vitolište, Šuplivec, Vitolište, Galičanska Rudina, Galičani, Krkulka, Dren, Selište, Dren, Gramađe - Golem Dol, Dunje, Malevo Selo – Ligurasa, Dunje, Božinica, Kadino Selo, Gramađe, Kalen, Kave, Kruševica, Tumba – sred selo, Mazučiste, Kutra Nikodin, Oreovačka Reka, Oreovec, Pešterica, Oreovec, Gramađe, Peštani, Grmot, Peštani, Peštera Peštani, Crkvište, Peštani, Pavla Čuka, Podmol, Tamburdžieva Niva, Polčište, Ali Čair, Prilep, Kukul, Prilep, Tražica, Prilep, Bezisten Prilepec, Gluva Dolina, Prilepec, Korita, Prilepec, Markov Zid, Prilepec, Sivec, Prasad, Aništa, Rakle, Venci, Rakle, Kutline, Rakle, Markovi Kruši, Rakle, Ramnište, Rakle, Staro Gumno, Rakle, Ulica, Rakle, Čerenjet, Rakle, Suvi Livadi, Selce, Izgoreno Trlo, Smolani, Lozja, Smolani, Selište, Smolani, Surkova Straga, Smolani, Gjupecko Maalo, Staro Logovo, Gjeramidnica Staravina, Gramađe, Toplica, Reka, Čardak, Topolnica, Kriva Vrba, Topolchani, Gramađe, Trojaci, Gjorgovica, Trojaci, Manastirče Trojaci, Alijeva Tumba, Carević, Bunarite, Carević, Glava, Carević, Staro Selo, Carević, Česma, Sv. Nedela, Carević, Tabachica, Čumovo, Branenica, Štavica.</p> <p>Burials, sacred objects, individual finds: Bostaništa, Alinci, Crkvište, Alinci, Gramadina Belovodica, Selište Belovodica, Village Church Berovci, Staro Bonče, Bonče, Monastery Sv Archangel Mihail, Varoš, Padarnica Varoš, Sv. Atanas, Varoš, Sv. Dimitrija, Varoš, Sv. Jovan, Varoš, Sv. Nikola Varoš, Sv. Petar, Varoš, Sv. Haralampija, Varoš, Village Church Veprčani, Solište – Pazalka, Veprčani, Lačnikot, Vitolište, Sv. Haralampija, Vitolište, Sv. Atanas, Vitolište, Petočna Voda, Volkovo, Village Cemeteries, Volkovo, Sv. Atanas, Galičani, Karataš, Dabnica, Baevo Trlo, Dunje, Church Latinska, Zagorani, Sv. Spas, Kalen, Village, Kruševica, Sv. Archangel, Kruševica, Zapološka Reka, Lenište, Bački Dol, Mazučiste, Village Church, Mali Radobil, Drum, Malo Ruvci, Church, Malo Ruvci, Gramađe – Belilo, Monastery, Stone Cross – Prisoje, Monastery, Stone Well, Monastery, Sv. Dimitrija, Melnica, Bresja, Nikodin, Dalov Grop Oreovec, Lekovo, Oreovec, Lozja, Oreovec, Valjeto, Peštani, Pripniš, Peštani, Sv. Gjorgija, Peštani, Pletvar, Pletvar, Selište Pletvar, Kutlište, Podmol, Village Church, Podmol, Hospital – Teacher’s School, Prilep, Karataš, Prilep, Well, Prilep, Chapel, Prilep, Povedenica, Prilep, Silos, Prilep, Želkoec, Rakle, Sv. Dimitrija, Smolani, Gradište, Topolica, Kanda, Toplica, Sv.</p>

Nikola, Toplica, Džaferica, Topolchani, Rock Graves, Treskavec, Gumenje, Treskavec, Sv. Bogorodica, Treskavec, Vasilički Cemeteries, Trojaci, Debel Rid, Trojaci, Sv. Gjorgija, Trojaci, Little Church, Trojaci, Sv. Duh, Trojkrsti, Roman Gaber, Carević, Sv. Dimitrija, Carević, Cuclu, Štavica.
Municipality of Kruševo
Settlements: Gradište, Aldanci Burials, sacred objects, individual finds: In the village, Bučin, Dab, Bučin.
Municipality of Dolneni
Settlements, fortifications, roads, individual finds: In the village, Belo Pole, Gjerekarica, Belo Pole, Čocorica, Belo Pole, Adžina Bara, Vranče, Čuka – Livage, Vranče, Stari Lozja, Vranče, Bačiliste, Debrešte, Gradište, Debrešte, Brčki, Desovo, Ramnište, Desovo, Mezinca – Gramažište Dolgaec, Village Cemeteries, Dolneni, Gradište Drenovci, Lozja, Dupjačani, Pero Livada, Dupjačani, Surun, Dupjačani, Stari Cemeteries, Zrze, Petočna Voda, Kutleševo, Kruši, Nebregovo, Orman – Bukov Dol, Nebregovo, Stari Lozja, Novoselani, Pusta Crkva, Senokos, Dva Daba, Slepče, Monasterište, Slepče, Selište – Crkvište, Slepče, Birište, Crnilšte, Ograda, Crnilšte, Palezi, Crnilšte. Burials, sacred objects, individual finds: Sv. Nikola, Belo Pole, Petočna Voda, Brailovo, Tumba, Brailovo, Sv. Nikola, Vranče, Cemeteries, Golemo Mramorani, Asanica, Gorno Selo, Rizoec, Gorno Selo, Sv. Atanas, Gostiržani, Village Mosque, Debrešte, Village Mosque, Dolneni, Cemeteries, Dupjačani, Village Church, Dupjačani, Šaldašica, Zabračani, Dolna Church, Zrze, Sv. Nikola, Zrze, Sv. Atanas, Malo Mramorani, Cemeteries, Nebregovi, Village Church Nebregovo, Sv. Gjorgija, Novoselani, Village Church, Sekirci, Sv. Atanas, Senokos, Village Church, Slepče, Stara Reka, Slepče, Staro Gumno, Slepče, Krivi Stogovi, Crnilšte.
Municipality of Krivogaštani
Settlements, fortifications, roads, individual finds: Petkov Vir, Borotino, Čuka Livage, Vrbjani, Čukarče Cvetkosko, Vrbjani, Selište – Mogilani, Pašino Ruavci. Burials, sacred objects, individual finds: Village Church, Borotino, Sv. Dimitrija, Vođani, Sv. Atanas, Godivje, Krjni Zid, Krivogaštani, Sv. Dimitrija, Krivogaštani, Sv. Nikola, Krivogaštani, Village Church, Krušecani, Village Church, Obršani, Village Church, Pašino Ruvci.

Source: Archaeological Map of the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2002.

From the tabular overview, it can be seen that the largest number of archaeological sites from this period is found compared to other historical times. This prevalence represents the greatest tourism development potential in the municipalities of Prilep, Dolneni, Krivogaštani, and Kruševo. The distribution varies across this regional area. The highest concentration of sites is observed in the municipality of Prilep, followed by Dolneni, Krivogaštani, and Kruševo. This indicates that the municipality of Prilep has the greatest potential for tourism development based on these attractions.

3.5. Late Antique and Early Christian Sites

The Late Antique period spans from the stagnation of the Roman Empire in the 3rd century and its continuation based in Constantinople. This concerns rare findings with special cultural dimensions on a European level. These sites present opportunities for visitation and inclusion in tourism offerings. Early Christian refers to the period from the emergence of Christianity opposing polytheism in the ancient era. This period signifies civilization achievements from the 1st century until Christianity became the state religion in the Roman Empire under Emperor Constantine I in 313 AD. The sites from this period include settlements,

fortifications, mines, necropolises, sacred objects, and individual finds. Their distribution across municipalities and locations in this area is given in Table 5.

Tab. number 5. Late Antique and Early Christian Sites

Municipality of Prilep
Settlements, fortifications, and mines: Tašačica, Varoš, Staro Selo, Veseličani, Bojkov Dol, Vitolište, Vrtka Livada, Vitolište, Zagradnička Čuka, Vitolište, Zadna Reka, Vitolište, Karavaščina, Vitolište, Kovačevo, Vitolište, Ligorasa, Vitolište, Prteva Livada, Vitolište, Sv. Petka - Golem Dab, Vitolište, Sinjak, Vitolište, Kale, Vrpsko, Gradiška Tumba, Guđakovo, Kozjanik, Guđakovo, Papradiški Rid, Guđakovo, Pisanik, Guđakovo, Soliška Padina, Guđakovo, Sredna Gramada, Guđakovo, Trnka - Anovi, Guđakovo, Crnelica, Guđakovo, Gramađe, Dren, Džidževo, Dren, Torovo Trlo, Dren, Dejčin Grop, Dunje, Prčinoga, Dunje, Markovi Kuli, Kalen, Gradište, Kokre, Gramađe, Kokre, Gradište, Kruševica, Sadevite, Melnica, Anton Gramada, Nikodin, Crkvište – Bačkova Niva, Oreovec, Barički Dol, Pletvar, Jelova Ograda, Polčište, Baba, Prilep, Bončica, Prilep, Suvi Livadi, Selce, Well, Treskavec, Zlatovrv, Treskavec, Baltovi Nivi, Carević, Stara Crkva, Carević, Stračina Livada, Carević, Bogdanova Niva, Čanište, Verovi, Čumovo.
Necropolises, sacred objects, individual finds: Spanica, Bonče, Markovi Kuli Varoš, Gornik, Veličani, Sv. Troica, Golemo Konjari, Village Church, Golem Radobil, In the village, Guđakovo, Sv. Bogorodica, Kadino Selo, Crkvište, Kalen, Monastery Sv. Nedela, Kruševica, Crkvište, Kruševica, Nedelska Voda, Lopatica, Plevenje, Monastery, Nerezinje, Nikodin, Bakalica, Prilep, Topolka – Šilovo, Prilep, Markova Stapalka, Prilepec, Čaršija, Rakle, Cemeteries, Smolani, Zlatovrv, Treskavec, Solišta, Trojaci, Cemeteries, Carević.
Municipality of Kruševo
Settlements, fortifications, and mines: Kale, Bučin, Stari Dol, Vrboec, Petro's Grave, Gorno Divjaci, Gramađa - Zad Zadel, Kočište, Gjermidnica, Kočište, Kale, Kruševo, Kale, Lokveni, Selište, Ostrilci, Staro Selo, Ostrilci, Stripčarnik, Ostrilci, Trska, Presil, Monastery Svetomirani.
Necropolises, sacred objects, individual finds: Hill, Bučin, Monastery, Kočište, Sveto Preobraženje, Kruševo, Sv. Bogorodica – Sv. Gjorgji, Presil, Štrbel Presil, Gumnište, Rastoica, Sinonec, Rastoica, Bavči, Turkish Podvis.
Municipality of Krivogaštani
Necropolis: Tumba, Vrbjani.
Municipality of Dolneni
Settlements, fortifications, mines: Visoj, Belo Pole, Markov Čardak, Belo Pole, Gorna Korija, Vranče, Dlaboka Bara, Vranče, Rusoica, Vranče, Tumba, Vranče, Brevčina, Gorno Selo, Bučalište, Gorno Selo, Gorna Church, Debrešte, Gradište, Debrešte, Kale – Gradište, Debrešte, Selište, Desovo, Čair, Desovo, Bostanište - Tri Bari, Dolneni, Krapaska Bara, Dolneni, Mramor, Drenovci, Lozje, Zabračani, Martinci, Zabračani, Popoica, Zabračani, Šarorica, Zapolžani, Dreniče, Nebregovo, Slatina, Novoselani, Bela Česma, Senokos.
Necropolises, sacred objects, and individual finds: Bojojca, Brailovo, Monastery Sv. Ilija, Brailovo, Tumba, Brailovo, Gorna Church, Debrešte, Gorna Field, Desovo, Kiš, Desovo, Kletovnik, Desovo, Zabrački Ridge, Zabračani, Monastery Zrze, Nedelska Voda, Nebregovo, Monastery Nebregovo, Dol, Rilevo, Selište – Crkvište, Slepče.

Source: Archaeological Map of the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2002.

From the data in Table 5, it should be noted that, although the number of sites from the Late Antique and Early Christian period is smaller than those from the Roman era, it still represents a notable attraction for tourism development. The largest number of sites from this

period is found in the municipality of Prilep. The second-highest concentration is in the municipality of Dolneni. Unlike other periods where the municipality of Kruševo has relatively few sites, this period is more represented in Kruševo, although by this criterion, it ranks third. The number of sites is smallest in the municipality of Krivogaštani, with only one site.

3.6. Medieval Sites

The Middle Ages, or the medieval period, began at the end of the 4th century and the beginning of the 5th century and lasted until the 15th century. This period coincides with the decline of the Roman Empire and the rise of Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire in these areas. The prevalence of medieval sites in this region is particularly impressive. Research has precisely determined the cultural and chronological attributes of the sites and findings (B. Babić, T. Polak, 1982). These sites leave deep archaeological traces in the municipalities, facilitating their inclusion in tourism offerings. The number and distribution of these sites serve as a basis for intensive regional development. The sites include settlements, fortifications, roads, necropolises, sacred objects, and findings. These details are presented in Table 6.

Tab. number 6. Medieval Sites

Municipality of Prilep-Општина Прилеп
<p>Settlements, fortifications, roads: Населби, утврдувања, патишта: Ogradi, Bešište, Markovi Kuli, Varoš, Sv. Atanas, Varoš, Tašačica, Varoš, Viori, Veprčani, Sv. Petka – Golem Dab, Vitolište, Crkvište – Urvič, Vitolište, Trpčeva Church, Dunje, Katun, Kalen, Trpčeva Church, Kalen, Markovi Kuli – Gradok, Monastery, Stojanov Šopur, Melnica, Ubava Glava, Čanište.</p> <p>Necropolises, sacred objects, and findings: Turčija, Bešište, Sv. Varvara, Varoš, Sv. Vrač, Varoš, Sv. Gjorgija, Varoš, Sv. Jovan, Varoš, Sv. Nikola, Varoš, Sv. Haralampije, Varoš, Sv. Dimitrija, Veprčani, Zadna Reka – Gramađe, Vitolište, Crkvište – Cemeteries, Vrpsko, Church Latinska, Zagorani, Korita, Kokre, Monastery Sv. Nikola, Monastery, Ilino, Prilep, Čuka, Topolchani, Sv. Petka, Čanište.</p>
Municipality of Kruševo
<p>Settlements, fortifications, roads: Leki, Gorno Divjaci, Stari Kući, Gorno Divjaci, Kale, Dolno Divjaci, Kale, Kruševo, Monastery – Staro Lipovo, Pusta Reka.</p> <p>Necropolises, sacred objects, and findings: Košari, Gorno Divjaci, Stojkolas – Church Korijče, Gorno Divjaci, Sv. Nedela, Gorno Divjaci, Church, Žitoše, Sv. Preobraženje, Kruševo, Jakova Koliba, Ostrilci, Gjupecko Cemeteries, Presil, Dolna Church, Pusta Reka, Kruška, Pusta Reka, Mlaki Gramađe, Rastoica, Nad Sopotot, Rastoica.</p>
Municipality of Krivogaštani
<p>Settlement: Vrbjanska Čuka, Slavej.</p>
Municipality of Dolneni
<p>Settlements, fortifications, roads: Markov Čardak, Belo Pole, Adžina Bara, Vranče, Gradište, Debrešte, Zagoriče, Debrešte, Kale, Desovo, Dolno Gradište, Belo Pole.</p> <p>Necropolises, sacred objects, and findings: Monastery, Belo Pole, Mlaka, Debrešte, Kletovnik, Desovo, Monastery, Dolgaec, Petočnica, Strovia.</p>

Source: Archaeological Map of the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2002.

The data in Table 6 shows that the number of medieval sites in this region is smaller than those from the Late Antique and Early Christian periods. This is particularly true for the municipality of Krivogaštani, which has only one site. In terms of site concentration, the municipality of Prilep has the largest number of sites, indicating its potential for cultural tourism development. Kruševo ranks second, followed by Dolneni.

4. Results and Recommendations

Analysis of the current state shows a high level of engagement from the archaeological scientific and professional community in identifying this heritage. Research indicates that the municipalities of Prilep, Dolneni, Krivogaštani, and Kruševo have rich archaeological sites from various periods, ranging from the Neolithic to the medieval period. It should be noted that, thanks to the archaeological efforts, a foundation has been established for recognizing one of the most important tourism potentials, which can be activated and included in the tourism offerings, creating recognizable and competitive tourism products in these municipalities. The analysis reveals that these impressive archaeological sites are minimally included in tourism development. The systematization of archaeological sites by municipal and local affiliation documents the long tradition of civilization achievements in these areas, identifies the spatial tourism scope, and serves for tourism valorization and promotion of these municipalities as rare spatial tourism units. The cultural function of tourism involves creating tourism culture as an inductive component. In this way, the cultural function of tourism becomes a factor that will facilitate the mass development of tourism and its qualitative determination (S. Kurunoski, 2008). This should be understood in the context of cultural tourism saturation.

In the future, improvement is expected based on the following foundations:

- Increasing the scope of archaeological studies and discovery of regional and municipal sites and findings.
- Tourism valorization of immovable and movable heritage of this kind.
- Defining locations for tourist visits to archaeological sites.
- Addressing the common issue of inaccessibility to the sites (due to private ownership, poor accessibility, or infrastructure limitations). In such cases, markings should be made on road infrastructure, expanded access to sites, or state land.
- Promotion of these locations as part of the anthropogenic wealth of tourism.
- Organizing events and manifestations showcasing various human achievements with tourism significance.
- Organizing cultural and artistic gatherings based on the type of site.
- Entertainment events with educational and recreational content.
- Organizing competitions of sporting and cultural nature related to the attraction.
- Scientific gatherings and events.
- Economic events such as fairs, exhibitions, tastings, and presentations of various economic activities related to the archaeological heritage of these municipalities.

Bibliography

1. Babić, Boško and Polak, Tadeusz. Medieval Prilep (Early Medieval Slavic Settlements, Origin and Development of the Urban Settlement and the Markovi Kuli Fortress), 1982.
2. Mitkoski, Aleksandar and Temelkoski, Dušan. The Kukul – Baba Site near Prilep, Archaeology, Macedonia, Macedoniae, Acta Archaeologica, 2020.
3. Mikuličić, Ivan. Art in the Stone Age, Artistic Treasures in Macedonia, Macedonian Book, Skopje, 1984.
4. Marinoski, Naume. Tourist Geography of the Republic of Macedonia, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Ohrid, 1997.
5. Marinoski, Naume. Fundamentals of Tourism Theory and Practice, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Ohrid, 2015.
6. Korunoski, Sašo. Cultural Heritage, FTON – Ohrid, 2008.
7. Vasileva, Marija. "Where is our past – Introduction to the prehistory of Pelagonija", Art-Studio, Bitola, 2005.
8. Archaeological map of the Republic of Macedonia, MANU, Skopje, 2002.