



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2022.5.19>

UDC 930.1:069.1
LBC 63.012

Submitted: 14.08.2022
Accepted: 05.09.2022

**ON THE ISSUE OF METHODOLOGY
FOR EVALUATING RESOURCE POTENTIAL OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES
IN THE SYSTEM OF MEANS AIMED AT TO POPULARIZE
HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF RUSSIA'S REGIONS¹**

Vladimir A. Zolotovskiy

Volgograd State University, Volgograd, Russian Federation

Pavel I. Lysikov

Volgograd State University, Volgograd, Russian Federation

Abstract. *Introduction.* The task of the study is to identify and characterize the means of popularization of the regional historical and cultural heritage on the example of archaeological monuments of Volgograd Oblast. Taking into account the need to diversify regional cultural and educational tourism, to actualize new practices in heritage tourism we consider it necessary to focus on the archaeological heritage unique for most regions. Due to its interactivity and the possibility of combining several forms of recreational and cultural and cognitive activities, archaeological tourism can also become one of the most promising forms of promotion of cultural and historical heritage. Developing a methodology for assessing the archaeological potential of the region in the field of tourism will allow us to understand the principle of formation of a unique geo-cultural image of the region as the basis of cultural and historical framework. *Methods.* Assessment of the archaeotourism potential of Volgograd Oblast is possible with a combination of the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Weighted Linear Combination (WLC), and applied methods, such as the questionnaire and Geographic Information System (GIS). *Analysis.* We identified the criteria for assessing the archaeotourism potential of the region the number of which can be limited to 1 quantitative and 7 qualitative indicators ranked on an assessment scale with 4 rating points – 0, 2, 4 and 5. Since the selected evaluation criteria play an unequal role in the formation of the tourist potential of the territory, it was necessary to determine the weighted coefficients for each of them. *Results.* The development of archaeological tourism acting as the most accessible and most popular forms of popularization of cultural heritage will be provided by the development of the territory's historical and cultural framework based on a comprehensive assessment of the tourist potential of the region. The methodology was proposed in the framework of this study. *Authors' contribution.* V.A. Zolotovskiy prepared the part devoted to the actualization and identification of the research topic. P.I. Lysikov developed an adequate methodology for assessing the archaeotourism potential of the Volgograd Oblast.

Key words: popularization of historical and cultural heritage, museumification, historical and cultural framework, archaeological monuments, archaeological tourism, assessment of archaeotourism potential, Volgograd Oblast.

Citation. Zolotovskiy V.A., Lysikov P.I. On the Issue of Methodology for Evaluating Resource Potential of Archaeological Sites in the System of Means Aimed at to Popularize Historical and Cultural Heritage of Russia's Regions. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 4. Istoriya. Regionovedenie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations], 2022, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 254-264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2022.5.19>

К ВОПРОСУ О МЕТОДИКЕ ОЦЕНКИ РЕСУРСНОГО ПОТЕНЦИАЛА АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ОБЪЕКТОВ В СИСТЕМЕ СРЕДСТВ ПОПУЛЯРИЗАЦИИ ИСТОРИКО-КУЛЬТУРНОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ РЕГИОНОВ РФ¹

Владимир Алексеевич Золотовский

Волгоградский государственный университет, г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация

Павел Иванович Лысиков

Волгоградский государственный университет, г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация

Аннотация. *Введение.* Задачей изыскания является выявление средств популяризации регионального историко-культурного наследия на примере памятников археологии Волгоградской области. С учетом необходимости диверсификации предложений в сфере регионального культурно-познавательного туризма, актуализации новой практики в туризме наследия, мы считаем необходимым остановиться на уникальном для большинства регионов археологическом наследии. В силу своей интерактивности и возможности комбинирования нескольких форм рекреационной и культурно-познавательной деятельности одной из наиболее перспективных форм популяризации культурно-исторического наследия может стать археологический туризм. Выработка методологии оценки археологического потенциала региона в сфере туризма позволит понять принцип формирования уникального геокультурного образа региона как основы культурно-исторического каркаса. Оценка археотуристского потенциала территории представляется возможной на основе сочетания следующих *методов*: анализа иерархий, взвешенной линейной комбинации, а также таких прикладных методов, как анкетирование и ГИС. *Анализ.* Мы выделили критерии оценки археотуристского потенциала региона, которые можно ограничить 1 количественным и 7 качественными показателями, ранжируемыми по шкале оценки с 4 рейтинговыми баллами – 0, 2, 4 и 5. Поскольку выбранные критерии оценки играют неодинаковую роль в формировании туристского потенциала территории, были определены весовые коэффициенты для каждого из них. *Результаты.* Развитие археотуризма, выступающего в качестве наиболее доступных и максимально востребованных форм популяризации культурного наследия, будет обеспечено разработкой историко-культурного каркаса территории, основанной на проведении комплексной оценки туристского потенциала региона, методика которой была предложена в рамках настоящего изыскания. *Вклад авторов.* В.А. Золотовский подготовил часть, посвященную актуализации и выявлению проблематики темы исследования. П.И. Лысиков разработал адекватную методику оценки археотуристского потенциала Волгоградской области.

Ключевые слова: популяризация историко-культурного наследия, музеефикация, историко-культурный каркас, памятники археологии, археологический туризм, оценка археотуристского потенциала, Волгоградская область.

Цитирование. Золотовский В. А., Лысиков П. И. К вопросу о методике оценки ресурсного потенциала археологических объектов в системе средств популяризации историко-культурного наследия регионов РФ // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 4, История. Регионоведение. Международные отношения. – 2022. – Т. 27, № 5. – С. 254–264. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2022.5.19>

Introduction. *Relevance of the research topic.* The destructive impact of globalism in the form of the comprehensive spread of mass culture and the “abolition” of national and regional cultural values, has led to disastrous consequences in the form of oblivion of cultural heritage. Given the specifics of the openness of modern information society, the specifics of political systems and directions of constitutional law development, one

of the most effective forms of preservation of national and cultural identity is the actualization and use of cultural monuments in the enlightenment and educational spheres of tourism. At the same time, being a product of globalism, which is undergoing the deepest essential and institutional crisis in the post-pandemic period, it is mass tourism that preserves its fundamental cultural and cognitive function.

“Travelling man” as a reflection of a certain social environment is influenced by specific ideological and value orientations and life attitudes. Highlighting the special status of cultural heritage in the system of social relations, as well as assigning it a priority place in public policy of different levels and directions can be clearly defined as a sign of sustainability of socio-cultural development. Tangible and intangible cultural monuments, first of all, should be considered as a particularly valuable and not subject to essential deformations ideological foundation of the process of formation of a spiritually healthy society. Satisfaction of people’s cultural needs, realization of humanistic constitutional rights, including through acquaintance with the heritage sites, is part of the modern socio-cultural environment. At the same time, cultural monuments as objects of cultural and cognitive practice act as a resource for expanding historical knowledge.

The purpose of the study is to identify and characterize means aimed at to popularize regional historical and cultural heritage. The study includes the following tasks: to determine forms of popularizing historical and cultural heritage; to identify factors that affect the development of promising directions in popularization practice at the regional level, as well as to identify methodological foundations that determine its effectiveness.

Problem statement. In the conditions of globalization the monuments of culture and history are given a special role of value factors determining the specificity of the development of socio-cultural processes. Globalized transnational culture is a direct threat to the preservation of national identity, distinctive cultural tradition, and cultural heritage [19, pp. 85-86; 11, p. 73].

The problem of cultural heritage preservation, including through its actualization in the implementation of museumification tasks, has a direct connection with the environmental understanding of culture, with the concept of cultural landscape, historical memory and other components of culture as an integral system [1, p. 96]. Cultural and historical environment is the most effective mechanism of formation and preservation of historical memory. Historical memory as a result of the successive social accumulation of socio-cultural experience provides not only preservation of cultural values

and traditions transmission, but also spiritual health of society. The very process of formation of historical memory is most effectively provided through widely available relevant forms and types of cultural practices of popularization of cultural and historical heritage, in which objects of cultural heritage act as basic sources of activities to preserve the diversity of national, ethnic and religious culture [18, pp. 14-16; 8, pp. 221-223].

The protection of cultural and historical heritage sites is ensured by an appropriate political and legal culture, moral guidelines and the will to pass it on to future generations. The preservation of cultural heritage is aimed not only at the formation and development of appropriate current forms of culture-bearers’ self-identification, but also at the development of intercultural and inter-civilizational relations. Destruction and oblivion of cultural heritage sites threaten a spiritual crisis, destruction of social and historical memory. Modern practices for the protection of cultural heritage are aimed not only at its preservation in its primary form, but also at achieving its maximum accessibility and popularization.

Since museumification remains the main form of cultural heritage preservation, museums are the main subjects of its popularization [5] (for details on the content, types, and methods of museumification, see: [9]). Museums as the main socio-cultural institution specializing in the study, identification and preservation of regional heritage should become a link between heritage and tourism, ensuring the preservation of historically and culturally significant monuments. The implementation of preservation and popularization functions of museums has led to their special place in the system of teaching and educational practices, including enlightenment, education and tourism. Using a combination of means and forms of popularization, museums not only ensure the cultural heritage preservation of the regions, but also develop relevant approaches to its actualization by expanding the directions of participation in society, organizing innovative interactive and project activities [7, pp. 151-153; 16].

As part of the subject of the study, we should note that the most common forms of popularization of archaeological heritage are the creation of specialized exhibitions and archaeological

museums, archaeological museum-preserves, including open-air museums.

Filling with objects and types of presentation / representation in such sites has no typical solution and depends on many factors: the specificity of the archaeological sites themselves (in terms of form and type); infrastructure; the level of technological support; the existence of traditions in the field of museumification and archaeological practice. The following sites can be recognized as examples of an effective approach to the choice of the form of presentation of archaeological heritage. On the one hand, it is the reconstructed museum-preserve “Kostenki” (Voronezh Oblast), representing the Paleolithic dwelling made of mammoth bones. On the other hand, it is the archaeological museum-preserve “Tanais”, acting as an interactive living museum, containing the traditional exhibition museum halls, a collection room, a scientific department and restoration studios.

Transmission of cultural values, their perception within the framework of intercultural dialogue and preservation in the process of spiritual development of society in the form of cultural and historical memory is provided by tourism as the most accessible socio-cultural practice. The main condition for the preservation of cultural and historical heritage is continuity, achieved through repeatable social practices. One of the most effective and most accessible forms of popularization and preservation of cultural and historical heritage is tourism. Actualization of cultural heritage sites, including memorialization sites, in the framework of their use in the excursion practice of heritage tourism allows solving multiple tasks in the field of spiritual and patriotic education [2, pp. 99-101].

Cultural and historical heritage determines the content of the cultural potential of a particular territory, and also affects the choice of forms of cultural heritage sites actualization in the framework of ensuring effective promotion through their use in tourism. One of the main humanistic goals of heritage tourism is to preserve monuments, encourage the construction of museums and preserve the cultural landscape of territories. Currently, one of the main obstacles to the development and organization of heritage tourism is the problem of preservation of cultural heritage sites. Despite the special role of tourism

as a form of promotion, it is necessary to recognize the problem of maintaining the integrity and pristine nature of cultural heritage, since cultural and historical monuments are the ultimate resource.

Tourism is an interdisciplinary knowledge, combining almost all branches of scientific knowledge, including those concerning the preservation of cultural heritage through various forms of its presentation. Tourism itself is represented by an extremely heterogeneous activity, formalized by the purposes of tourist travel in various forms.

In the context of cultural heritage preservation policy, heritage tourism as a subspecies of cultural and cognitive tourism acquires particular importance among the types of tourism. Heritage tourism has no formal definition in the domestic law and doctrine. However, in the foreign literature, it has not only received an established understanding, but also took an independent place in the understanding of the problem of museumification of cultural heritage sites in modern society. When it comes to understanding heritage tourism, it is generally accepted that its fundamental quality is the orientation of the tourist to get acquainted with objects of cultural heritage [37, pp. 239-243; 33; 36; 25; 41, pp. 3-4].

The critical feature of heritage tourism as a special type of socio-cultural practice is manifested in the highest degree of public involvement in cultural and cognitive activities. Heritage tourism and its subtypes significantly expand the range of subjects of knowledge, as well as cognitive tools, together with the channels of dissemination of knowledge, making it accessible.

Due to its interactivity and the possibility of combining several forms of recreational, cultural and cognitive activities, one of the most promising forms of promotion of cultural and historical heritage is archaeological tourism. Archaeological tourism (sometimes archaeotourism) is a special kind of tourism which is a subspecies of heritage tourism. In general, most experts agree that archaeological tourism is a journey to visit historical sites, museums and sites that constitute the archaeological heritage of an area (i.e. archaeological monuments) [39, p. 32; 32, p. 162]. In addition, archaeological tourism may also

include visits to archaeological laboratories, ongoing field research and even travelers' direct participation [30, p. 66; 34, p. 165]. The latter form of the organization of archaeotourism in the western literature was called "volunteer archaeological tourism" (see, for example: [31; 35]). Thus, archaeological tourism carries out many functions: cognitive, educational, communicative, promotes preservation and popularization of cultural and historical heritage sites. It is closely connected with scientific, rural, ecological and other types of tourism. Its main goal is to reveal the specificity of certain periods of development of human society in the process of acquaintance with archaeological monuments as objects of display. Archaeological monuments include archaeological finds, tangible assets of the past which are very diverse and, accordingly, their classification can be different. In the general totality of cultural heritage sites, it is archaeological objects that constitute their essential part.

The attractiveness and high socio-cultural significance of archaeological tourism are determined not only by the uniqueness of the archaeological sites themselves, but also by the possibility of involving citizens in rescue archaeological work, as well as various forms of their interactive representation (from reconstruction of the organization of ancient people's household to modelling ancient and medieval rituals, as well as acquaintance with archaeology as a science). Archaeological tourism is widespread abroad and is systematically fixed in the Russian tourist practice. Underdevelopment of the domestic archaeological tourism is primarily based on the lack of understanding of its resource base.

The preservation of cultural heritage in some form of presentation / representation is aimed not only at the transmission of historical memory, but also at the transfer of a complex of knowledge to the next generations. By determining cultural heritage as a subject of scientific research, we expand the opportunities of historical knowledge in the field of religious, ethnocultural, social and political history. The specificity of the content of cultural policy should be focused on achieving the most effective and preserving results of cultural and historical heritage actualization through various socio-cultural practices of popularization [20, p. 198; 10, p. 66].

Determination of actual forms of popularization of cultural heritage through its representation and presentation in the framework of tourist projects implementation is limited by the condition of cultural heritage sites and possibilities of their use/updating. In the latter case, the factor of territorial distribution of the cultural heritage sites and their existing spatial organization should be highlighted as a determining one.

In such circumstances, the most effective mechanism for the inclusion of cultural heritage in tourism as the most accessible popularization of socio-cultural practice is the cultural framework of the territory. As a form of spatial organization of cultural heritage sites, it is a system of micro-territories with historical and cultural content, providing infrastructural accessibility of cultural monuments, various types of museum objects and aimed at creating conditions of maximum accessibility of cultural and historical display objects. Effectively formed cultural framework unites all the territorial tangible and intangible cultural heritage sites into a systemic totality, allowing for the widest development of research, scientific-cognitive and cultural-educational activities [13, pp. 131–132; 20, pp. 199–200].

Volograd Oblast has a large number of archaeological monuments belonging to various cultures. The revealed archaeological material is museumified and placed in local history museums of the region. The use of the region's archaeological potential in local history activities of cultural, cognitive and educational orientation within the framework of heritage and archaeological tourism is a priority goal in the sphere of popularization of the region's cultural heritage. Its achievement is limited by the weak study of archaeological heritage sites as a factor in the popularization of the cultural heritage of the region in the form of tourism. The reasons for this are: insufficient attention to the organization of profile cultural and educational activities within the framework of educational work of historical and local history orientation, undeveloped promising forms of actualization of cultural heritage sites on the basis of museumification means. The primary task on the way to overcoming the existing limitations is the assessment of the cultural potential and the formation of the cultural framework of the region on its basis.

Given the specificity of tourism heritage and the quality of cultural and historical heritage of Volgograd Oblast, reflecting the millennial cultural, political and religious history of the Great Steppe that unites several civilizations at once, it seems appropriate to develop an archaeological historical and cultural framework of Volgograd Oblast. Developing a methodology for assessing the archaeological potential of Volgograd Oblast in the field of tourism will allow us to understand the principle of formation of a unique geo-cultural image of the region as the basis of cultural and historical framework.

Methods and materials. The choice of appropriate methods for assessing the tourist potential of a territory depends on a number of pre-established indicators, among which are the object, subject, purpose, as well as the assessment criteria. Since the purpose of evaluation is the development of archaeotourism in Volgograd Oblast, the object of evaluation is, respectively, the archaeological tourism potential of the region which we will consider as a set of archaeotourism potential of municipalities within it, while the subject of the evaluation is the representatives of governments interested in tourism development within their assigned territory. An adequate approach to achievement of this goal could be offered by a combination of the following methods widely used to assess the tourist industry:

Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) [26, p. 427sq.; 29, p. 8sq.] (it is also worth noting the so called Fuzzy-AHP Approach developed by a group of Chinese researchers which is a combination of classic AHP and Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation Method (FCEM) [28]) is a mathematical method which is used to make informed decisions by decomposing the problem under study and presenting the latter as a hierarchical structure consisting of three levels, including the final goal (the upper level), criteria (sub-criteria) and alternatives (the lower level). As part of the assessment of the archaeotourism potential of the territory, this method can be used to determine the weights of the selected evaluation criteria by their pairwise comparison by the decision maker (expert) on a scale of 1 to 9.

Weighted Linear Combination (WLC) [22, p. 1; 29, p. 8] is another mathematical method

that is used for expert ranking of selected criteria according to a set rating scale.

Furthermore, to assess the archaeotourism potential of municipalities in the region, it is necessary to involve applied methods of assessment: the questionnaire and Geographic Information System (GIS). The questionnaire should be carried out with the help of purposive (non-probability) sampling method [27, p. 26sq.; 40, p. 17sq.; 23, p. 101] which will determine the expert group of representatives of public authorities, scientific-pedagogical workers and employees of cultural and leisure institutions. Relative archaeotourism potential of municipal formations of Volgograd Oblast should be reflected by means of the corresponding cartogram with application of the elementary spatial analysis method [21; 24; 38; 29, pp. 3-7].

In general, we can summarize that the relevant methodology for assessing the archaeotourism potential of the territory should meet, above all, the requirement of comprehensiveness, i.e. to take into account quantitative and qualitative parameters, to provide a component-by-part, multi-criteria analysis, to calculate particular and integral indicators.

Analysis. There are 1,227 monuments of archaeology in Volgograd Oblast [14]. According to our calculations using the data of the National Cultural Heritage Register of Russia, 1,192 archaeological monuments have the status of objects of federal significance [17]. Another 306 objects of archaeological heritage are on the list of identified objects of cultural heritage of Volgograd Oblast [15]. Nevertheless, the region's potential for the development of archaeological tourism, as far as we know, has not yet become the subject of a special study. There are several articles devoted to the assessment of the tourism potential of the region as a whole [3; 6; 4]. They have mostly theoretical and descriptive character. As for archaeological tourism in Volgograd Oblast, we could not find any serious research on this topic.

So, first of all, we should identify the criteria for assessing the archaeotourism potential of the region, the number of which, we believe, can be limited to 1 quantitative and 7 qualitative indicators. Each qualitative criterion is ranked according to the evaluation scale with 4 rating points – 0, 2, 4 and 5 (Table 1) (see: [12, pp. 491-493]).

Table 1. Qualitative criteria for assessing the archaeotourism potential of municipalities of Volgograd Oblast

Criterion	Definition	Rating scale	Rating points
Uniqueness (U_i)	Typicality or uniqueness of the archaeological heritage sites in the territory of the municipality, average score ¹	>1.05 >1.025–1.05 1–1.025 1	5 points 4 points 2 points 0 points
Attractiveness (V_i)	Visual attractiveness, informativeness, accessibility of perception of the archaeological heritage sites in the territory of the municipality, average score ²	>1.2 >1.1–1.2 1–1.1 1	5 points 4 points 2 points 0 points
Transportation accessibility (A_i)	Distance from each site to the administrative center of the municipality, average score ³	>3 >1–3 0.5–1 <0.5	5 points 4 points 2 points 0 points
Distance to the regional center (D_i)	Distance of the administrative center of the municipality from the point of entry into the region	<50 km >50–150 km >150–300 km >300 km	5 points 4 points 2 points 0 points
Density (P_i)	Density of archaeological heritage sites on the territory of the municipality ⁴	>0.012 site/km ² >0.005–0.012 site/km ² 0.002–0.005 site/km ² <0.002 site/km ²	5 points 4 points 2 points 0 points
Capacity of collective accommodation facilities (C_i)	Number of beds in collective accommodation facilities on the territory of the municipality	>250 pcs. >150–250 pcs. 50–150 pcs. <50 pcs.	5 points 4 points 2 points 0 points
Seating capacity (F_i)	The number of seats in public catering establishments in the territory of the municipality	>300 u. >200–300 u. 100–200 u. <100 u.	5 points 4 points 2 points 0 points

Note. ¹ – the average index of uniqueness U of the objects of archaeological heritage in the territory of municipality i is derived as follows. Each archaeological monument is ranked on an assessment scale from 1 to 3 points where 3 points mean a site which is unique for the country, 2 points are given to a site unique for the region, but typical for the country, and 1 point – to a site which is typical for the region. Then the arithmetic mean is calculated by the formula $U_{icp} = \frac{\sum U_i}{n_i}$, where n_i is the total number of archaeological heritage sites on the territory of the municipality. ² – the average index of attractiveness V of archaeological heritage sites of municipality i is calculated as follows. All archaeological monuments in the territory of the municipality are ranked on a scale of assessment from 1 to 5 points, based on their belonging to a particular type, among which in the territory of Volgograd Oblast, according to the data from the National Cultural Heritage Register of Russia, there are burial monuments (solitary mounds, mound groups / burial grounds), settlement monuments (dwelling site, site of ancient town), ramparts (regardless of purpose). Points are distributed by type of archaeological monuments in the course of expert evaluation. Then the arithmetic mean is calculated using the formula $V_{icp} = \frac{\sum V_i}{n_i}$. ³ – the average indicator of distance A from each archaeological heritage site on the territory of municipality i to its administrative center is calculated by the formula $A_{icp} = d_{icp}c$, where d_{icp} is the average distance (km) from archaeological monuments located on the territory of the municipality to its administrative center by road, and c is correction factor of transport accessibility. The distance from each archaeological monument to the administrative center of the region is ranked on a scoring scale from 0 to 3 points where 3 points are assigned to an object located less than 10 km from Volgograd, 2 points to those more than 10 to 50 km, 1 point to those more than 50 to 100 km, 0 points to those more than 100 km. Then the arithmetic mean is calculated using the formula $A_{icp} = \frac{\sum A_i}{n_i}$. To obtain the correction factor c , the transport accessibility of archaeological heritage sites on the territory of the municipality should be evaluated by roads from the administrative center of the municipality using an assessment scale from 1 to 3 points where 3 points are assigned to roads of federal importance, 2 points to those of regional importance, 1 point to those of local importance. Then the arithmetic mean is calculated using the formula $C_{icp} = \frac{\sum c_i}{n_i}$ which is divided by the maximum score ($c_{max} = 3$). If transport accessibility to the archaeological site is provided by roads of different importance, the category of roads should be selected that covers most of the way to the site from the administrative center of the municipality. ⁴ – density P of archaeological heritage sites on the territory of municipality i is calculated by the formula $P_i = \frac{n_i}{S_i}$, where n_i is the number of archaeological heritage sites on the territory of the municipality (units), and S_i is the area of the municipality (km²).

Weighting of qualitative evaluation criteria. Since the selected criteria for assessing the archaeotourism potential of municipalities in Volgograd Oblast play an unequal role in the formation of the tourist potential of the territory, it is necessary to determine the weighting coefficients (w) for each of them. This task can be solved by the above-mentioned method of hierarchy analysis. Thus, all the criteria are subject to a pairwise expert evaluation according to the following “superiority scale”, where 1 – equal value, 3 – insignificant superiority, 5 – strong superiority, 7 – very strong superiority, 9 – extreme superiority.

All of our selected criteria are summarized in the following table (Table 2).

Evaluation formula. The final formula for assessing the archaeotourism potential of a municipality (T_i) will look like this:

$$T_i = n_i \times (U_i w_1 + V_i w_2 + A_i w_3 + D_i w_4 + P_i w_5 + C_i w_6 + F_i w_7).$$

The archaeotourism potential of the region as a whole is the sum of the archaeotourism potentials of the municipal formations within it ($T = \Sigma T_i$). The relative archaeotourism potential (T_0) of a municipality in relation to the entire territory of the region is calculated by the formula $T_0 = \frac{T_i}{T_{\max}}$, where T_{\max} is the maximum archaeotourism potential among all municipalities of the region.

Results. The traditionally high role of tourism in cultural and cognitive activities is reflected in international and national standard-setting practice. At the same time, the development of heritage tourism provides protection and maintenance of cultural objects. Popularization aspect of archaeological tourism

as a variety of cultural and cognitive activities is reflected not only in the UNESCO Convention on Cultural Tourism, but also more narrowly / substantively defined in national and international acts governing the protection and preservation of cultural heritage. Ensuring the preservation and protection of cultural monuments as part of popularization activities in the form of heritage tourism and archaeological tourism is directly related to the issue of presentation and representation of cultural heritage, as well as the problem of relevant directions and means of museumification of cultural monuments.

The rich archaeological heritage of Volgograd Oblast is of special tourist interest. The introduction of archaeological sites into tourism practice not only through visits to museums, but also within the framework of visits to archaeological monuments, will expand the channels of popularization of the cultural heritage of the region. We proposed a methodology for a comprehensive, component-by-part evaluation of the resource potential of Volgograd Oblast in the field of archaeological tourism enabling us to bring a huge layer of historical and cultural heritage up to date.

The results of the study lead to the conclusion that the development of archaeological tourism, as well as heritage tourism in general, acting as the most accessible and most popular forms of popularization of cultural heritage, will be provided by the development of the historical and cultural framework of the territory, based on the assessment of the potential of a particular type of objects included in the system set of cultural heritage. Given the specifics of the research format and the special place of archaeological sites in the cultural heritage of Volgograd Oblast, we proposed a methodology for assessing the potential of archaeological sites in the tourist show

Table 2. Matrix of paired comparisons of qualitative evaluation criteria of archaeotourism potential of municipalities of Volgograd Oblast

Criteria	U_i	V_i	A_i	D_i	P_i	C_i	F_i	Total	Weight coefficients
U_i	1.00								
V_i		1.00							
A_i			1.00						
D_i				1.00					
P_i					1.00				
C_i						1.00			
F_i							1.00		
							Total		

industry which is the most accessible and promising form of popularization of the cultural heritage of the region.

NOTE

¹ The study was financially supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation as research project no. 0633-2020-0004 “Development of methods of virtual 3D reconstruction of historical objects”.

REFERENCES

1. Astafyeva O.N. Istoricheskaya pamyat kak resurs kulturnoy politiki i formirovaniye kollektivnoy identichnosti [Historical Memory as a Resource of Cultural Policy and the Formation of Collective Identity]. *Kulturnaya pamyat v kontekste formirovaniya natsionalnoy identichnosti Rossii v XXI veke* [Cultural Memory in the Context of the Formation of the National Identity of Russia in the 21st Century]. Moscow, Sovpadenie Publ., 2015, pp. 95-115.
2. Aphonina I.E. Kulturno-poznavatelnyy turizm v kontekste patrioticheskogo vospitaniya v novykh usloviyakh planirovaniya i ekonomicheskogo stimulirovaniya [Cultural and Educational Tourism in the Context of Patriotic Education in the New Conditions of Planning and Economic Stimulation]. *Aktualnye voprosy razvitiya nauki na sovremennom etape* [Topical Issues of the Development of Science at the Present Stage]. Moscow, MPGI Publ., 2019, pp. 99-104.
3. Belikova E.V., Syrbu A.N. Kompleksnaya otsenka faktorov formirovaniya resursov Volgogradskoy oblasti [Comprehensive Assessment of the Volgograd Region Resources Formation]. *Biznes. Obrazovanie. Pravo* [Business. Education. Law], 2014, no. 2 (27), pp. 131-134.
4. Belikova E.V., Nozdrenkova O.V. Issledovanie turistskogo potentsiala Volgogradskoy oblasti, a takzhe otsenka perspektiv territorii [Investigation of Tourist Potential of Volgograd Region and Assessment of Territory Perspectives]. *Vzaimodeistvie biznesa s sotsialno-ekonomicheskoy sferoy v usloviyakh modernizatsii ekonomiki i obrazovaniya* [Interaction of Business with the Socio-Economic Sphere in the Context of Modernization of the Economy and Education]. Volgograd, s.n., 2018, pp. 90-94.
5. Vetrova N.V., Fedorov O.A. Rol muzeev v sokhraneni i aktualizatsii kulturnogo naslediya [The Role of Museums in the Preservation and Actualization of Cultural Heritage]. *Formirovaniye regionalnoy kulturnoy politiki v kontekste modernizatsii obrazovaniya* [Formation of Regional Cultural Policy in the Context of Modernization of Education]. Orel, OGIK Publ., 2014, pp. 274-278.
6. Volkov S.K. Analiz turisticheskogo potentsiala Volgogradskoy oblasti [Analysis of Tourist Potential of the Volgograd Region]. *Regionalnaya ekonomika. Yug Rossii* [Regional Economy. South of Russia], 2015, no. 3 (9), pp. 25-35.
7. Gan O.N. Proektnaya deyatelnost muzeya kak sposob aktualizatsii istoriko-kulturnogo naslediya [Project Activity of a Museum as a Way of Actualization of Historical and Cultural Heritage]. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta kultury i iskusstv* [Bulletin of Saint Petersburg State University of Culture], 2014, no. 3 (20), pp. 151-154.
8. Dandamaeva Z.E. Ob aktualnykh problemakh sokhraneniya i ispolzovaniya istoriko-kulturnogo naslediya Rossii [About Actual Problems of Preservation and Use of Historical and Cultural Heritage of Russia]. *Dukhovnye osnovy otnosheniy chelovek – priroda* [The Spiritual Foundations of the Human – Nature Relationship]. Cheboksary, ChGSKhA Publ., 2020, pp. 221-225.
9. Zolotovskiy V.A. Digital Museumification as a Promising Mechanism for the Preservation and Presentation (Representation) of Historical and Cultural Heritage: Towards the Formulation of the Question. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 4. Istoriya. Regionovedenie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations], 2021, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 256-271. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2021.5.21>
10. Imankulov D.D., Bektemirova Z.A., Moldaliev I.T. Kulturnoe nasledie – kak faktor ustoychivogo razvitiya [Cultural Heritage as a Factor of Sustainable Development]. *Vestnik Kyrgyzsko-Rossiyskogo Slavyanskogo universiteta* [Vestnik of Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University], 2020, vol. 20, no. 8, pp. 65-69.
11. Kozhokar V.A. Sovremennye formy populyarizatsii istoriko-kulturnogo naslediya Priirtyshya muzeem Ertis v Pavlodarskoy oblasti [Modern Forms of Popularization of the Historical and Cultural Heritage of the Irtysh Region by the Ertis Museum in the Pavlodar Region]. *Fundamentalnye problemy gumanitarnykh nauk: opyt i perspektivy razvitiya issledovatel'skikh projektov RFFI* [Fundamental Problems of the Humanities: Experience and Prospects for the Development of RFFI Research Projects]. Moscow, AltGPU Publ., 2020, pp. 73-75.
12. Lysikov P.I. Otsenka potentsiala regionov RF dlya razvitiya spetsialnykh vidov turizma: k postanovke problemy (na primere arkhologicheskogo turizma v Volgogradskoy oblasti) [Evaluating Potential of Russian Regions for Developing Special Types of Tourism: The

Problem Statement (On the Example of Archaeological Tourism in the Volgograd Region)]. *Ekonomika i predprinimatelstvo* [Journal of Economy and Entrepreneurship], 2021, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 488-494.

13. Muravyeva M.V. Kulturno-istoricheskiy karkas kak osnova territorialnoy organizatsii turistskoy deyatel'nosti na territorii Ryazanskoy oblasti [Cultural and Historical Framework as the Basis of the Territorial Organization of Tourist Activity in the Territory of the Ryazan Region]. *Vestnik Ryazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni S.A. Esenina* [The Bulletin of Ryazan State University named for S.A. Yesenin], 2008, no. 2 (19), pp. 131-138.

14. Ob utverzhdenii gosudarstvennoy programmy Volgogradskoy oblasti «Razvitie kultury v Volgogradskoy oblasti»: postanovlenie Administratsii Volgogradskoy oblasti ot 8 maya 2015 g. № 217-p [On Approval of the State Program of the Volgograd Region "Development of Culture in the Volgograd Region": Decree of the Administration of the Volgograd Region of May 8, 2015 № 217-p]. *Volgogradskaya pravda*, 2015, May, 20 (no. 88).

15. Perechen vyyavlennykh obektov kulturnogo naslediya [List of Identified Cultural Heritage Sites]. *Komitete gosudarstvennoy okhrany obektov kulturnogo naslediya Volgogradskoy oblasti* [The Committee for the State Protection of Cultural Heritage Objects of the Volgograd Region]. URL: <https://nasledie.volgograd.ru/objects/vyyavlennye-obekty-kulturnogo-naslediya/perechen-vyyavlennykh-obektov-kulturnogo-naslediya>

16. Gogunskaya T.A., Karmazina N.V., eds. *Sbornik metodicheskikh materialov po sotsialnomu proektirovaniyu i metodik aktivizatsii professional'nogo samoopredeleniya v sfere sokhraneniya kulturnogo naslediya* [Collection of Methodological Materials on Social Design and Methods of Activating Professional Self-Determination in the Field of Cultural Heritage Preservation]. Simferopol, IT "Arial" Publ., 2020. 152 p.

17. Svedeniya iz Edinogo gosudarstvennogo reestra obektov kulturnogo naslediya (pamyatnikov istorii i kultury) narodov Rossiyskoy Federatsii [Information from the Unified State Register of Cultural Heritage Objects (Historical and Cultural Monuments) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation]. *Ministerstvo kultury Rossiyskoy Federatsii* [Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation]. URL: <https://opendata.mkrf.ru/opendata/7705851331-egrkn>

18. Sivolap T.E. Aktualnye problemy sokhraneniya kulturnogo naslediya Rossii [Actual Problems of Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Russia]. *Obrazovanie i nauka bez granits: fundamentalnye i prikladnye issledovaniya* [Education and Science Without Borders: Fundamental and Applied Research], 2016, no. 1, pp. 14-18.

19. Frolenkova I.Yu. Sokhranenie kulturnogo naslediya sredstvami kulturnogo i dukhovno-poznavatel'nogo turizma [Preservation of Cultural Heritage by Means of Cultural and Spiritual-Educational Tourism]. *Missiya konfessiy* [Mission of Confessions], 2018, vol. 7, no. 1 (28), pp. 84-90.

20. Shulgin P.M., Shtele O.E. Kulturnyy karkas kak forma ispolzovaniya kulturnogo naslediya i osnova territorialnoy organizatsii turizma v rossiyskikh regionakh [Cultural Framework as a Form of Using Cultural Heritage and the Basis of Territorial Organization of Tourism in Russian Regions]. *Turizm: nauka i obrazovanie* [Tourism: Science and Education]. Khimki, Universitetskaya kniga Publ., 2021, vol. 2, pp. 197-206.

21. Aldakhil M.D.A. *Classification of Tourism Potential in Al-Qaseem, Saudi Arabia Using GIS: Doct. Thesis*. Leicester, 2007. XIII, 296 p.

22. Ashouri P., Faryadi Sh. Potential Assessment of Nature-Based Tourism Destinations Using MCA Techniques (Case Study: Lavasan-e Koochak). *Journal of Environmental Studies*, 2010, vol. 36, no. 55, pp. 1-3.

23. Asmelash A. An Assessment of Potential Resources of Tourism Development in Ethiopia: The Case of Dejen Wereda. *African Journal of History and Culture*, 2015, vol. 7 (4), pp. 100-108.

24. Baskerville B.G. *Building a GIS Model to Assess Agritourism Potential: A Master Thesis*. Lincoln, NE, 2013. vii, 98 p.

25. Chapagain N.K., Joshi J. Heritage Tourism and Sustainable Development. *Tourism and Development in the Himalaya*. Oxon, New York, Routledge Publ., 2022, pp. 286-307.

26. Deng J. et al. Evaluating Natural Attractions for Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2002, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 422-438.

27. Edward M., George B.P. Tourism Development in the State of Kerala, India: A Study of Destination Attractiveness. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 2008, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 16-38.

28. Gu X. et al. Evaluating Nature-Based Tourism Destination Attractiveness with a Fuzzy-AHP Approach. *Sustainability*, 2022, vol. 14, pp. 1-23.

29. Hoang H.T.T. et al. Multicriteria Evaluation of Tourism Potential in the Central Highlands of Vietnam: Combining Geographic Information System (GIS), Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA). *Sustainability*, 2018, vol. 10, pp. 1-20.

30. Hughes K. et al. Integrating Education and Entertainment in Archaeological Tourism: Complementary Concepts or Opposite Ends of the Spectrum? Walker C., Carr N., eds. *Tourism and Archaeology: Sustainable Meeting Ground*. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Pr., 2013, pp. 65-90.

31. Kaminski J. et al. Volunteer Archaeological Tourism: An Overview. *Volunteer Tourism: Theoretical*

Frameworks and Practical Applications. London; New York, Routledge Publ., 2011, pp. 157-174.

32. Khan S. Archaeological Tourism and Heritage Management: A Case Study of Taxila Valley. *Journal of Asian Civilizations*, 2020, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 159-173.

33. Light D. Heritage Tourism. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 2014, vol. 11 (4), pp. 472-473.

34. Melgarejo A.M., López I.S. Relationship between Tourism and Archaeology: Archaeological Tourism, an Independent Tourism Typology. *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 2017, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 163-180.

35. Möller K. Archaeologist for a Week: Voluntourism in Archaeology. *Feasible Management of Archaeological Heritage Sites Open to Tourism*. Cham, Springer Publ., 2019, pp. 105-114.

36. Neef A. Cultural Heritage Tourism. *Tourism, Land Grabs and Displacement*. Oxon, New York, Routledge Publ., 2021, pp. 144-164.

37. Poria Y., Butler R., Airey D. The Core of Heritage Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2003, vol. 30 (1), pp. 238-254.

38. Rahayuningsih T., Harini Muntasib E.K.S., Prasetyo L.B. Nature Based Tourism Resources Assessment Using Geographic Information System (GIS): Case Study in Bogor. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 2016, vol. 33, pp. 365-375.

39. Srivastava S. Archaeotourism: An Approach to Heritage Conservation and Area Development. *Global Journal of Engineering, Science & Social Science Studies*, 2015, vol. 1, iss. 2, pp. 31-42.

40. Taylor T.K., Banda-Thole Ch. Tourism Development Potential of the Northern Province of Zambia. *American Journal of Tourism Management*, 2013, vol. 2 (1A), pp. 10-25.

41. Zhu Y. *Heritage Tourism: From Problems to Possibilities*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2021. 79 p.

Information About the Authors

Vladimir A. Zolotovskiy, Candidate of Sciences (History), Head of the Department of Service and Tourism, Volgograd State University, Prosp. Universitetsky, 100, 400062 Volgograd, Russian Federation, zolotovskiy.azi@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4259-8851>

Pavel I. Lysikov, Senior Lecturer, Department of Service and Tourism, Volgograd State University, Prosp. Universitetsky, 100, 400062 Volgograd, Russian Federation, lysikov@volsu.ru, blademaster18@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7484-798X>

Информация об авторах

Владимир Алексеевич Золотовский, кандидат исторических наук, заведующий кафедрой сервиса и туризма, Волгоградский государственный университет, просп. Университетский, 100, 400062 г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация, zolotovskiy.azi@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4259-8851>

Павел Иванович Лысиков, старший преподаватель кафедры сервиса и туризма, Волгоградский государственный университет, просп. Университетский, 100, 400062 г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация, lysikov@volsu.ru, blademaster18@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7484-798X>