



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 8 Sayı: 38 Volume: 8 Issue: 38

Haziran 2015 June 2015

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

IDENTIFICATION, ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF RESULTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS OF THE TUZLA CANTON

Vanes TULUMOVIĆ*

Abstract

The subject of research in paper defines two dimensions: problematic and spatial. Problematic coverage refers to analysis of the economy of the underdeveloped areas of the Tuzla Canton in dynamic and structural view. Second dimension of the research subject is spatial and it involves considering the economic-development positions of the underdeveloped areas of Tuzla Canton (and the changes in that view as well). Temporal dimension of the object of research is a long-term time horizon, until about three decades in retrospect, and a decade in perspective. Considering defined subject of the research, the general goal of the paper is evaluation of the economic development position of underdeveloped areas communities of Tuzla Canton in the cantonal economy and opportunities of improving their development. The research hypothesis of the paper reads: intensification of investments and changes in the economic structure of communities in an undeveloped areas of Tuzla Canton will significantly improve their development, thus the level of development of the Canton. The results showed significant differences in the regional development of the Tuzla Canton. Analysis of the data confirmed that the Tuzla Canton has quality of socio-economic basis for more intensive development and overcoming problems of unequal development, which is reflected in the substantial capacity of natural resources, favorable geo-climatic location, developed infrastructure, etc. Research conducted in accordance with the hypothesis set, determined, that more dynamic development and changing economic structure would significantly enhanced the development of underdeveloped areas of Tuzla Canton, which means that, we could overcome existing state of underdevelopment and large discrepancies in the level of development between the developed and underdeveloped parts of the Tuzla Canton.

Keywords: Regional Development, Underdeveloped Areas, Unequal Development.

INTRODUCTION

Preference for (structural) branch aspects development in relation to the spatial dimension, resulted in a growing regional inequalities endangering stability and development of the overall level of social welfare. Also, disproportions in regional development areas, followed as a result of the influence of various factors: difference in the level of knowledge and talent of the human factor, the unequal application of the technical-technological progress, diversity, abundance of natural resources, the availability of financial capital, inequalities in the level of investment, the character of the existing economic structure, etc.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, in economic region of north-eastern Bosnia, especially in the area of Tuzla Canton, are evident and very pronounced differences between individual municipal areas in terms of their participation in the basic production factors (material and personnel) as well as in the achieved effects, particularly in the level of development. Undeveloped area of Tuzla Canton (which includes the municipalities of Čelić, Doboje East, Kalesija, Kladanj, Sapna, Srebrenik and Teočak) occupies an area of 1,108 km² or 42% of the territory TK or 16% territory of the economic region of north-eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In this paper, the analysis and the evaluation of the possibilities of economic development of municipalities of Tuzla Canton in terms of level of their development is using the methodology of the Federal Institute for Development Programming, Sarajevo. Based on the analysis of the main economic aggregates (investment, employment, unemployment, GDP, GDP p.c., foreign exchange) it was established that in the area of Tuzla Canton is expressed disproportion in the level of development of municipalities.

Investments are financial investments in economic activities for the purpose of earning an income, that means, " investments in the present, which, at an acceptable level of risk, brings increased impacts in the future " (Ibreljić, 2006th P. 11.). Total employment is an extremely important factor for the development of a given area, and the employment rate is one common factor of reached level of development. Gross domestic product is the key

* University of Tuzla, Faculty of Economics.

macroeconomic aggregates which shows the economic activity of a given area in a given period. Foreign exchange reflects the state of production specialization and the conquest of market share in other countries on the one hand, and the value of the participation of foreign products on the domestic market on the other side.

Results of data analysis in this paper showed that in Tuzla canton there is a good socio-economic basis for development, but also it is evident that this approach to development is not available in all parts equally what as a consequence has different levels of development. It is important to point out that the accent is placed on undeveloped areas that need special attention in finding appropriate measures of implementation of the development goals and actions in these areas of Canton.

LITERATURE REVIEW THEME OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

In economic development of any area, branch or structural dimension spatial component is extremely important. Most authors agree on the fact that a number of issues of economic and regional development themes efficiently solved in a narrow regional framework than within the sectoral approach and globally - at the level of the overall economy.

Thus, academician Hadžomerović H., at the conceptual definition of the regional dimension of economic development as a necessary condition, preferred three components: optimization relocation of economic capacity; achievement of the objectives of economic policy and export orientation in manufacturing, (Hadžomerović, 1984th P. 3.). *Kubović B.*, Content of economic and regional aspect boils down to (all) relevant issues of the developmental character in relation to the economic structure, economic system and economic policy. In another words, regional component is treated as a special aspect of the developmental process that takes place on narrower areas of the national area and conditioning the factor for achieving optimal branch and global development at the level of countries and regions. (Kubović, 1974th P. 50-51.).

Regional aspect according to *Bogunović A.* Is a special form of economic and social development which, besides global and branch aspect in development policy, has in mind spatial dimension. Development (in regional dimension) is observed as a dynamic process of transformation and improvement of regional structures in order to create new potential in economic and social areas (Bogunović, 1991st P. 1 i 12.). *Papić K.* and *Kamenica S.* calls attention to the fact that so far the regional aspect of development, mainly was limited to the problem of economically underdeveloped areas. They reasonably point to the importance of a broader understanding of the regional component, whereby the contents of the regional aspect encompassed the development of the system of settlements, development centers, development of axes, etc., (Papić, 1977th P. 24., Kamenica, 1976th P. 178.). According to *Ibreljić I.* regional policy includes "all measures of national, regional or local authorities that affect the economic situation of one or more regions," (Ibreljić, 1994th P. 29.).

The motives regional policy *Osmanković J.* differentiates on economic and political. Economic are identified in the realization of needs of balanced development, resolving unevenness and optimization of profits on the basis of adequate allocation of capital in production. Political are manifested in the elimination of discontent of the population of underdeveloped areas, reducing the migration of the population, etc. (Osmanković, 2001st P. 145.). *Šverko M.* in effective management of regional economic development in particular recognizes: mitigation opportunities of regional disparities (economic, social); the need to accelerate the development of the regions and the national economy; possibilities for optimal use of specific development and other resources at the local and regional levels; the possibility of establishing a rational sectoral and territorial division of labor, (Šverko, 1995th P. 11-13.). The importance of the regional dimension of development *Stojanović R.* is able to see in opportunities of dynamic overall development and in adequate territorial division of labor a.k.a. the rationalization of production (Stojanović, 1981st P. 40.).

The essence of Regional Development, *Kantalić M.* sees in "increasing the efficiency of the national economic development and the achievement of equal development among regions. He points out that regional policy should create optimal conditions for the development of the region in order to increase the economic power of the whole regional area " (Kantalić, 2005th P. 40.). If we look at the results of the research activities of EU policy and analyzes the obtained effects leads to the following cognition. Regional policy is other financial policies of the EU, despite the weaknesses of the policies that were an integral part. The success of the EU's regional policy is reflected primarily in assisting the underdeveloped areas that thanks to the help of this residual category in the region reached the developmental status of developed and improved in the region as is the case in some parts of Ireland and Portugal. However, on the other hand, the effects of regional policy were not of the same intensity in the other area, where these effects were significantly lower. This conclusion is confirmed by research (House of Lords, the 2008th P. 26.) that showed that "in the period 1995th-2005th, The growth rate in Ireland was 4 pp above the EU average, while Greece with 1.5 pp, and Spain with 0.7 pp, had much lower effects of regional development policy ". This appearance is present in other EU countries that have achieved various levels of regional development under the same or similar scope of assistance.

Famous authors of the regional economic thought from the area of former Yugoslavia Kubović B. and A. Bogunovic for achieving the intra-regional optimum, suggests alignment of following intra-regional issues: (1) between regional production resources on one side and capital for their use on the other side, (2) between the productive factors and economic infrastructure, (3) between productive and non-productive activities and infrastructure, (4) between the productive factors of certain activities (compliance), (5) between productive factors and other factors of production, (6) between the demands (requirements) for location (space) of industrial capacity, on the one hand and the available physical space and other location factors, on the other hand, (7) between the levels of concentration of the contents and population (urban concentration) on the one hand and material and other living and working conditions of the population, on the other hand, (Kubović, 1974th P. 19., Bogunović, 1991st P. 13.). As of this review may be concluded, in addition to branch, it is extremely important regional aspect, a.k.a. the territorial dimension of development. The fact is that the achievement of rational economic development and the effects of development at the country level and at the narrow territorial ie, the regional level, it is possible only with respect to the regional component.

IDENTIFICATION ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF RESULTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNDERDEVELOPET AREAS OF TUZLA CANTON (research methodology)

The criteria and territorial identification of undeveloped part of the Tuzla Canton territory

According to the methodology of the Federal Institute for Development Planning, municipalities of Tuzla Canton, (hereinafter referred to as TK), were classified into the following groups:

A – developed municipalities with above average level of development of the Federation, which include: Tuzla (index 137,5), Banovići (121,6), Gračanica (117,0), Gradačac (112,0), Živinice (104,7) and Lukavac⁴ (92,2).

▪ **B – underdeveloped**⁵ municipalities:

B₁ - insufficiently developed -whose level of development is in the range of 80 to 100% of the federal average level. In group of underdeveloped municipalities are: Srebrenik (index 96,8), Doboj-east (94,2), Čelić (90,0), Kladanj (87,6) and Kalesija (83,1).

B₂ - extremely underdeveloped – whose level of development is below the range of 80 % of the federal average level. This group consists of two municipalities: Sapna (index 68,0) and Teočak (51,6).

The analyzed data are obtained by filling out the field of local governments (municipalities) where further application of statistical methods of processing of the collected data there have been significant findings that are presented in the sequel.

Investments as a development factor in Tuzla Canton

During the monitoring period (2005-2010) the total was invested in the economy of TK 2.36 billion KM, which is 13% of the investments realized in the FBiH. Thereof in the economy of underdeveloped municipalities (seven municipalities) was invested only KM 254.4 million or 10.7%, and in the developed economy 2.10 billion. KM or 89.3%.

Unfavorable ratio is also in the group of underdeveloped municipalities considering that underdeveloped municipalities (five municipalities: Čelić, Doboj-East, Kalesija, Kladanj and Srebrenik) participate with 9.5% of the total investments of the Tuzla Canton and extremely undeveloped (Sapna and Teočak) with only 1.2%. By comparing the participation in population and realized investments, undeveloped municipalities achieve the participation in the population of 27.4% and 10.7% of investments, while developed in the population participate with 72.6% and 89.3% higher investments.

In the group of underdeveloped municipalities, extremely undeveloped municipalities by the above indicator is also lagging during 2005-2010, where he invested 1,420 KM and in the group of underdeveloped 1,935 KM or 36% more. According to estimates by the authors based on the research of investment activities in the areas (municipalities) TK, clearly the statement crystallizes the very pronounced unevenness of investment flows in these areas, (Tulumović 2013th P. 90-91.)

Chart 1. Realized investments of Tuzla Canton (2005th-2010th) in 000 KM

Municipality	YEAR					Cumulative 2005.-2011.	Partici- pation in %	Growth rate 2005.2011.
	2005th	%	2008th	2010th	%			
A) Developed								
Banovići	10.049	3,3	14.975	23.649	7,2	84.152	3,6	18,6
Gračanica	33.340	10,8	67.925	30.974	9,4	234.208	9,9	-1,4
Gradačac	18.046	5,8	35.898	23.345	7,1	171.022	7,2	5,2
Lukavac	54.735	17,7	142.018	54.053	16,4	419.751	17,8	-0,4
Tuzla	133.834	43,3	251.355	140.859	42,7	1.073.435	45,4	0,9
Živinice	25.629	8,3	28.810	21.385	6,5	126.616	5,4	-3,6

Total (A)	275.633	89,1	540.981	294.265	89,2	2.109.184	89,3	1,1
B) Undeveloped								
B₁) Insufficiently developed								
Čelić	1.921	0,6	3.436	4.067	1,2	14.930	0,6	16,1
Doboj-East	5.125	1,7	5.792	3.929	1,2	26.342	1,1	-5,3
Kalesija	3.331	1,1	10.688	5.954	1,8	45.994	1,9	12,2
Kladanj	5.421	1,8	10.394	5.931	1,8	39.033	1,7	1,7
Srebrenik	15.770	5,1	20.435	11.179	3,4	99.410	4,2	-6,6
Total (B₁)	31.568	10,2	50.745	31.060	9,4	225.709	9,5	-1,2
B₂) Extremely undeveloped								
Sapna	1.509	0,5	6.026	3.138	1,0	21.632	0,9	15,7
Teočak	346	0,1	2.728	1.225	0,4	7.087	0,3	28,7
Total(B₂)	1.855	0,6	8.754	4.363	1,3	28.719	1,2	18,6
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	33.421	10,8	59.499	35.423	10,7	254.428	10,7	0,9
TOTAL TK (A+B)	309.055	100	600.480	329.688	100	2.363.609	100	1,1
FBiH	2.440.045		4.229.995		2.715.051		18.090.095	2,1

Sources: (1) Statistical yearbook of FBiH, various years, (2) Federation in numbers, various years, (3) Tuzla Canton in numbers, various years, FZS Sarajevo,(2) Development strategy in Tuzla Canton 2008th-2013th, Economic Institute Sarajevo/Tuzla, 2008th P. 42

On the problem of high disproportionality in terms of the level of investing in Tuzla Canton illustrative data indicates the size of realized investments in Tuzla as the most developed (8150 KM) and municipalities Teočak, as least developed (954 KM) as evidenced by the ratio of 8:5:1. According to prof. Hodzic K., Tuzla municipality "shows a much higher intensity of investment relation to the Tuzla Canton (increased by 96.3%), and compared to Federation higher by 22.3%," (Hodzic, 2012th P. 14).

Employment in Tuzla Canton

In the economy of the Tuzla Canton, the total number of employees in 2012th, in the level is about 81,000 persons, which compared to the previous year (2011th) is recorded as a decrease in employment for about 2,000 persons. When it comes to unemployment Canton, it is at the level of 16.1% in relation to the population, or 45.1% compared to the workforce. In the area of undeveloped municipalities of Tuzla Canton in all sectors were employed 12,691 workers, which makes 15.7% of total employment of the Canton.

Chart 2. The dynamics of the employment in Tuzla Canton during 2001st-2012th

Municipality	YEAR						Participation in %	Growth rate 2001-2012.
	2001st	%	2005th	%	2008th	%		
A) Developed								
Banovići	5.929	8,1	5.221	7,4	5.579	6,7	5.056	-1,4
Gračanica	6.261	8,6	7.030	10,0	8.276	10,0	8.346	2,6
Gradačac	3.786	5,2	4.376	6,2	5.950	7,2	6.420	4,8
Lukavac	8.552	11,7	8.098	11,5	8.570	10,3	8.039	-0,5
Tuzla	31.508	43,2	28.250	40,0	32.143	38,7	32.079	0,0
Živinice	7.113	9,8	7.415	10,5	8.994	10,8	8.136	1,2
Total (A)	63.149	86,6	60.390	85,6	69.512	83,8	68.076	0,6
B) Undeveloped								
B₁) Insufficiently developed								
Čelić	767	1,1	992	1,4	937	1,1	784	0,1
Doboj-East	866	1,2	1.223	1,7	1.408	1,7	1.244	3,3
Kalesija	1.586	2,2	1.821	2,6	2.857	3,4	3.130	6,3
Kladanj	1.914	2,6	1.524	2,2	2.263	2,7	1.826	-0,4
Srebrenik	3.833	5,3	3.720	5,3	4.839	5,8	4.674	1,7
Total (B₁)	8.966	12,3	9.280	13,1	12.304	14,8	11.658	2,4
B₂) Extremely undeveloped								
Sapna	372	0,5	496	0,7	734	0,9	567	3,8
Teočak	369	0,5	389	0,6	443	0,5	466	2,1
Total(B₂)	741	1,0	885	1,3	1.177	1,4	1.033	3,0
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	9.707	13,3	10.165	14,4	13.481	16,2	12.691	2,4
TOTAL TK (A+B)	72.856	100	70.555	100	82.993	100	80.767	0,8
FBiH	407.199		388.418		430.745		437.331	0,6

Sources: (1) Statistical yearbook of FBiH, various years, (2) Federation in numbers, various years, (3)

Tuzla Canton in numbers, various years, FZS Sarajevo,(2)Development strategy in Tuzla Canton 2008th-2013th Economic Institute Sarajevo/Tuzla, 2008th str. 70, (3) Employment strategy in Tuzla Canton 2009th-2013th, Faculty of Economy Tuzla, 2009th P. 2

Comparison with the participation of the population (27.4%) indicates a large discrepancy in the undeveloped area of Tuzla Canton in terms of the level of the above parameters, or significant lag in this area in total employment of the workforce. The main cause of low participation of underdeveloped municipalities in total employment is related to insufficient investment (10.7%). Comparison of undeveloped areas in TK to developed, points to significant lag of the underdeveloped both in terms of the amount of participation in the total number of employees (15.7% vs. 84.3%), and in terms of the employment rate of the population. On undeveloped area with 15.7% employment rate is extremely low as compared to the total population (10.2%) and in relation to the total workforce (29.3%), which confirms the enormous delay in this area compared to developed part, (Tulumović 2013. p. 95).

Unemployment as a major problem of the areas in Tuzla Canton

The total number of unemployed in Tuzla Canton, according to data for 2012, in the level of 98,289 persons and thereby on undeveloped area is registered unemployment of 30 637 persons which presents 31.2 % of total unemployment of the Canton. If a group of insufficiently developed municipalities is observed, you would get data that shows that this area in total number of unemployed in Canton participates with 26.5% and extremely undeveloped with 4.7 %. If the problem of unemployment is observed from dynamic aspect you could notice that in last decade (2002-2012) unemployment is growing on undeveloped areas in rate of 4.1 %, while on insufficiently developed areas it is in rate of 4.2 %, and on extremely undeveloped areas 3.7 % (Tulumović, 2013th P. 97.).

Chart 3. The dynamics of unemployment in the area of TK (2002th-2012th)

Municipality	YEAR						Participation in %	Growth rate 2002.2012.	
	2002nd	%	2005th	%	2008th	%			2012th
A) Developed									
Banovići	4.210	5,8	4.925	5,9	4.605	5,4	5.400	5,5	2,5
Gračanica	8.612	11,9	8.768	10,4	7.802	9,1	9.350	9,5	0,7
Gradačac	6.090	8,4	6.690	8,0	6.793	7,9	7.834	8,0	2,5
Lukavac	8.376	11,6	9.356	11,1	9.202	10,7	10.877	11,1	2,5
Tuzla	14.673	20,2	17.756	21,1	17.740	20,7	20.210	20,6	3,2
Živinice	9.586	13,2	11.808	14,0	11.939	13,9	13.981	14,2	3,7
Total(A)	51.547	71,1	59.303	70,5	58.081	67,8	67.652	68,8	2,7
B) Undeveloped									
B₁) Insufficiently developed									
Čelić	1.335	1,8	1.737	2,1	2.355	2,7	2.729	2,8	7,3
Doboj-East	2.180	3,0	2.831	3,4	2.607	3,0	2.781	2,8	2,4
Kalesija	6.580	9,1	7.902	9,4	8.765	10,2	9.473	9,6	3,7
Kladanj	2.242	3,1	2.706	3,2	2.724	3,2	2.785	2,8	2,1
Srebrenik	4.862	6,7	6.070	7,2	6.884	8,0	8.298	8,4	5,4
Total(B₁)	17.199	23,7	21.246	25,3	23.335	27,2	26.066	26,5	4,2
B₂) Extremely undeveloped									
Sapna	1.734	2,4	1.989	2,4	2.552	3,0	2.624	2,7	4,2
Teočak	1.399	1,9	1.547	1,8	1.743	2,0	1.947	2,0	3,3
Total (B₂)	3.133	4,3	3.536	4,2	4.295	5,0	4.571	4,7	3,7
Total(B = B₁+B₂)	20.332	28,0	24.782	29,5	27.630	32,2	30.637	31,2	4,1
TOTAL TK (A+B)	72.519	100	84.085	100	85.711	100	98.289	100	3,0
FBiH	287.180		347.478		345.381		384.852		2,9

Sources: (1) Statistical yearbook FBiH, various years, (2) Federation in numbers, various years, (3) Tuzla Canton in numbers, various years, FZS Sarajevo, (2) Employment strategy in Tuzla Canton 2009-2013., Faculty of Economy Tuzla, 2009., str. 26

Gross Domestic Product as key macroeconomic aggregates

When it comes to dynamic of gross domestic product on Tuzla Canton area it needs to be pointed out that in last decade (2002-2012) on this area was registered *relatively high growth rate* of gross domestic product (8,9 %).

The evaluation is performed based on the fact that on the FBiH level in the same period realized growth rate of GDP in the amount of 7.4 %. If we look at the participation of developed and undeveloped in gross domestic product for the previous period (2002-2012) it can be observed that on the area of developed municipalities contributes most portion of GDP TK, which is 86.5%.

The data for the same period show that the participation of developed municipalities in total GDP in TK moved to a level of approximately 85% to 88%. The second part of the area, ie, underdeveloped in total GDP participates in the level of 13.5%, and at the same municipalities of insufficiently developed areas (five municipalities) participate with about 12%.

Chart 4. GDP in the municipalities of Tuzla Canton (1990th-2012th) in 000 KM

MUNICIPALITY	YEAR							Participation in %	Growth rate 2002.2012.
	1990th	%	2002nd	%	2008th	%	2012th		
A) Developed									
Banovići	180.224	10,6	82.171	7,6	204.904	8,6	229.173	9,0	10,8
Gračanica	146.350	8,6	66.193	6,1	166.782	7,0	180.065	7,1	10,5
Gradačac	154.601	9,1	75.323	7,0	119.131	5,0	130.956	5,1	5,6
Lukavac	201.113	11,8	90.160	8,3	252.557	10,6	278.282	10,9	11,8
Tuzla	842.656	49,4	563.784	52,2	1.129.355	47,4	1.178.604	46,2	7,6
Živinice	151.457	8,9	76.468	7,1	200.139	8,4	212.803	8,3	10,7
Total (A)	1.676.401	98,4	954.099	88,3	2.072.868	87,0	2.209.883	86,5	8,7
B) Undeveloped									
B₁) Insufficiently developed									
Čelić	22.006	1,3	5.706	0,5	23.826	1,0	32.739	1,3	19,0
Doboj-East	21.100	1,2	5.900	0,5	28.591	1,2	32.739	1,3	18,6
Kalesija	30.084	1,8	25.108	2,3	54.800	2,3	65.478	2,6	10,0
Kladanj	40.379	2,4	21.684	2,0	52.418	2,2	49.108	1,9	8,5
Srebrenik	64.049	3,8	43.368	4,0	123.895	5,2	130.956	5,1	11,6
Total (B₁)	177.618	10,5	101.766	9,3	283.530	11,9	311.020	12,2	11,8
B₂) Extremely undeveloped									
Sapna	34.917	0,2	12.554	1,2	14.296	0,6	16.369	0,6	2,6
Teočak	16.357	1,0	3.434	0,3	11.913	0,5	16.369	0,6	16,8
Total (B₂)	51.274	1,1	15.988	1,5	26.209	1,1	32.738	1,2	7,3
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	228.892	11,6	117.754	10,8	309.739	13,0	343.758	13,5	11,2
TOTAL TK (A+B)	1.705.269	100	1.080.931	100	2.382.606	100	2.553.642	100	8,9
FBiH	11.137.500		7.942.665		15.079.790		16.369.510		7,4

Sources: (1) Development Strategy of Tuzla Canton 2008-2013., Economic institute Sarajevo/Tuzla, 2008., P. 35-40, (2) Macro-economic and socio-economic indicators in FBiH, various years, The Federal Institute for Development Programing, Sarajevo

Very interesting are the comparisons of GDP participation of underdeveloped area with its participation in population, employment and investment. Derived data and indicators point to the following facts: there is a great disproportion in terms of participation of the underdeveloped areas in the TK population (27.4%) and participation in the realized GDP ratio (13.5%), which means that this area lacks the capacity of economic activity that should effect new products and services, ie, significantly increased effects of gross domestic product. Another disproportion is indeed much milder between participation in the total number of employees (15.7%) and the participation of GDP (13.5%), which confirms the lack of efficiency of the workforce in this area compared to the developed areas. The third indicator is related to the comparison of participation of the underdeveloped areas of Tuzla Canton in gross fixed capital formation (10.7%) and the participation of GDP (13.5%). These data suggest a more effective investment in this area of TK in relation to the other areas, (Tulumović 2013. P. 100).

Gross Domestic Product – per capita

When it comes to per capita GDP, derived data show that this ratio ranges between 2.120 KM in 2002, and 5177 KM in 2012.. In the last mid-term GDP per capita is above 4,179 KM. It should be emphasized that in this period (2002-2012) it is achieved a relatively high rate of growth of per capita GDP TK (9.3%), and the growth rate of GDP per capita Federation is slightly lower (7.3%).

Chart 5. GDP p.c. in municipalities of Tuzla Canton (1990.-2012.) in 000 KM

MUNICIPALITY	YEAR						Growth rate 2002.-2012.
	1990.	2002.	2006.	2008.	2010.	2012.	
A) Developed							
Banovići	6.778	2.851	5.327	7.963	8.353	8.872	12,0
Gračanica	3.088	1.244	2.323	3.211	3.241	3.435	10,6
Gradačac	3.701	1.440	3.006	2.578	2.667	2.846	7,0
Lukavac	3.565	1.740	3.253	4.943	5.129	5.485	12,1
Tuzla	6.407	4.152	7.241	8.591	8.410	8.944	7,9
Živinice	2.765	1.453	2.479	3.657	3.616	3.820	10,1
Total(A)	4.659	2.595	-	5.730	5.735	6.101	8,9
B) Undeveloped							
B₁) Insufficiently developed							
Čelić	1.972	371	977	1.692	2.207	2.372	20,3
Doboj-East	1.750	890	2.488	2.804	3.004	3.208	13,6
Kalesija	851	719	1.390	1.156	1.721	1.821	9,7
Kladanj	2.577	1.377	2.854	3.457	3.081	3.317	9,1
Srebrenik	1.566	1.032	1.958	2.998	2.952	3.139	11,7
Total(B₁)	1.380	862	-	2.440	2.507	2.667	11,9
B₂) Extremely undeveloped							
Sapna	2.566	878	1.833	1.101	1.196	1.284	3,8
Teočak	2.074	746	1.066	1.600	2.079	2.223	11,5
Total(B₂)	576	753	-	1.283	1.518	1.615	16,6
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	1.052	846	-	2.267	2.360	2.511	11,4
TOTAL TK (A+B)	3.683	2.120	3.970	4.786	4.809	5.177	9,3
FBiH	4.117	3.425	4.860	6.479	6.582	7.001	7,3

Sources: (1) Development Strategy of Tuzla Canton 2008-2013., Economic institute Sarajevo/Tuzla, 2008., P. 35-40, (2) Macro-economic and socio-economic indicators in FBiH, various years, Federal Institute for Development Programing, Sarajevo

As with actual GDP, as well with GDP per capita developed municipalities achieve the highest level (6,101 KM), which is the situation before the war (1990) of around 28%, as evidenced by the growth rate of 9.3%. Achieved per capita of these municipalities is higher for 17.8% of the cantonal. This data says that in this group of municipalities largest economic power is concentrated in Tuzla Canton (Tulumović 2013.P.102).

Foreign trade as an indicator of economic status Capacity of the Tuzla Canton

In recent years, the value of the foreign goods traffic in the Tuzla canton level is between 1.84 billion., KM (in 2009) and 2.24 billion., KM (in 2012). The volume of foreign trade in 2011 (2.52 billion., KM) exceeded the level achieved in-recession period (2008) of 2.45 billion., KM, which has by entering the recessionary period became lower so that in last year (2012). it reached decline to around 2.24 billion., KM.

Review at realized commodity exchange shows that undeveloped municipalities *have realized participation in total foreign trade* of Tuzla Canton in 2012 in level of 8,9 % which is almost symbolic in relation to developed municipalities (91,2 %). *Insufficiently developed municipalities achieve participation of 8,8 %* while extremely developed participate with significant 0,1 %, (Tulumović, 2013. P. 104.).

Chart 6. Value of foreign trade of municipalities of TK (2008.-2012.) in 000 KM

MUNICIPALITY	Ukupna vanjskotrgovinska razmjena							
	2008.	TK=100	2009.	TK=100	2010.	TK=100	2012.	TK=100
A) Developed								
Banovići	33.232	1,4	37.440	2,0	35.647	1,6	37.711	1,7
Gračanica	282.150	11,5	369.010	20,1	291.243	12,8	330.915	14,8
Gradačac	477.640	19,5	277.680	15,1	433.843	19,1	528.818	23,6
Lukavac	773.404	31,5	477.980	26,0	808.463	35,6	569.232	25,4
Tuzla	484.022	19,7	387.540	21,1	402.405	17,7	424.044	18,9
Živinice	187.677	7,6	131.240	7,1	135.644	6,0	149.702	6,7
Total(A)	4.476.250	91,2	1.680.890	91,4	2.107.245	92,8	2.040.422	91,2
B) Undeveloped								
B₁) Insufficiently developed								
Čelić	5.098	0,2	2.990	0,2	4.177	0,2	4.855	0,2
Doboj-East	47.355	1,9	40.430	2,2	40.811	1,8	36.361	1,6
Kalesija	41.167	1,7	20.690	1,1	28.299	1,2	57.997	2,6
Kladanj	20.052	0,8	16.290	0,9	16.327	0,7	23.241	1,0
Srebrenik	91.678	3,7	66.840	3,6	63.244	2,8	74.231	3,3
Total (B₁)	205.350	8,4	147.240	8,0	152.858	6,7	196.685	8,8
B₂) Extremely developed								
Sapna	2.613	0,1	2.050	0,1	2.957	0,1	611	0,1
Teočak	8.069	0,3	8.130	0,4	8.286	0,4	109	0,0
Total (B₂)	10.682	0,4	10.180	0,6	11.243	0,5	720	0,1
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	216.032	8,8	157.420	8,6	164.101	7,2	197.405	8,9
TOTAL TK (A+B)	2.454.156	100	1.838.310	100	2.271.101	100	2.237.824	100
FBiH	15.718.468		11.689.935		13.469.738		15.221.014	

Sources: Socio-economic indicators in FBiH, various years, Federal Institute for Development Programing, Sarajevo

The level of exports in Tuzla Canton

Tuzla Canton has in the period (2008-2012), cumulative, achieved total exports amounting to 4.8 billion., KM. In period of 2008-2011. there has been registered a growing trend of export at a rate of 5,9 %, and is recorded more dynamic growth than in FBiH (5,3 %). In 2012. godini achieved rate of export growth is only 0,2 %, which characterizes current state of the economy in Canton. On the other hand participation of TK in federal export is about 20 %.

Chart 7. Exports by the municipalities of Tuzla Canton (2008.-2012.) in 000 KM

MUNICIPALITY	2008.	%	2009.	2010.	2012.	%	Cumulative 2008.-2012.	%	Growth rate 2008.-2012.
A) Developed									
Banovići	23.984	2,5	25.410	25.318	30.404	3,1	140.433	2,9	5,9
Gračanica	116.955	12,1	166.860	137.384	150.256	15,3	726.678	14,9	6,3
Gradačac	213.485	22,1	138.310	209.468	251.271	25,6	1.075.855	22,0	4,0
Lukavac	375.940	39,0	240.030	440.676	309.669	31,6	1.825.181	37,3	-4,8
Tuzla	107.911	11,2	101.100	109.267	114.160	11,7	549.684	11,2	1,2
Živinice	55.120	5,7	35.390	34.894	37.399	3,8	200.410	4,1	-9,5
Total (A)	893.395	92,6	707.100	957.007	893.159	91,2	4.518.241	92,4	0,0
B) Undeveloped									
B₁) Insufficiently developed									
Čelić	278	0,0	220	95	741	0,1	2.342	0,1	27,7
Doboj-East	16.638	1,7	16.110	16.965	13.249	1,4	78.612	1,6	-5,7
Kalesija	10.974	1,1	8.380	10.529	24.485	2,5	67.191	1,4	22,2
Kladanj	13.437	1,4	11.630	12.148	16.847	1,7	70.712	1,4	5,7
Srebrenik	26.960	2,8	21.660	22.454	31.164	3,2	131.122	2,7	3,5

<i>Total(B₁)</i>	68.287	7,1	58.000	62.191	86.486	8,8	349.979	7,2	5,9
B₂) Extremely undeveloped									
Sapna	160	0,0	110	86	82	0	667	0,1	-15,4
Teočak	2.898	0,3	4.330	5.277	50	0	20.347	0,4	-62,3
<i>Total(B₂)</i>	3.058	0,3	4.440	5.363	132	0,1	21.014	0,5	-55,2
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	71.345	7,4	62.440	67.554	86.618	8,8	370.993	7,7	4,8
TOTAL TK (A+B)	964.739	100	769.540	1.024.561	979.775	100	4.889.232	100	0,2
<i>FBiH</i>	4.726.756		3.786.298	4.871.245	5.248.547		24.197.000		2,4

Sources: Macro-economic and socio-economic indicators in FBiH, various years, Federal institute for Development Programing, Sarajevo

Developed part of TK has realized an export of 4,5 billion KM or 92,4 % of total Cantonal export. Based on the above can be said that developed municipalities (Lukavac, Gradačac, Gračanica i Tuzla) are the main carriers of the foreign trade of the Canton. *Insufficiently developed municipalities are participating* in export of the Canton with 7,7 %, where is recorded guhe disproportion in regard to developed municipalities (92,4 %) or *twelve times less export from the territory of insufficiently developed municipalities*. That tells us that most of the da je većina export-oriented manufacturing capacity (goods and services) is located in areas of developed municipalities.

Evident is a growing trend of exports in the analyzed period (2008-2012) at a rate of 4.8%, but with a less favorable rate than at developed municipalities. Sapna i Teočak as an extremely undeveloped municipalities participate with significant 0,5 % of export in Canton. These municipalities achieve participation in export of developed municipalities of only 1,0 %, (Tulumović, 2013. str. 105.).

Conditions of imports in Tuzla Canton

Total cantonal imports for the period 2008-2012., (Cumulative) amounts to 6.4 billion., KM, which is amounting to 13.6% of the Federal imports (47.2 billion., KM). When it comes to the dynamics of imports, the data are showing a decreasing trend of total imports, namely: in the level of FBiH during the period 2008-2012., At a rate of -2.6% and at the level of TK at a rate of -4.2%.

Undeveloped municipalities of TK in period of 2008-2012. have achieved an import of 533,7 million KM or 8,3 % of total import of the Canton. On the other hand, developed municipalities have achieved an import of 5,8 billion KM or 91,3 % of import in TK, which presents about *eleven times more import* achieved in developed municipalities. This is expected since it is concentrated in these areas over 90% of production capacity.

Chart 8. Import of Tuzla Canton municipalities (2008.-2012.) in 000 KM

MUNICIPALITY	2008.	%	2009.	2010.	2012.	%	Cumulative 2008.-2012.	%	Growth rate 2008.2012.
A) Developed									
Banovići	9.248	0,6	12.030	10.329	7.307	0,6	46.118	0,7	-5,7
Gračanica	165.195	11,1	202.150	153.859	180.659	14,4	878.337	13,6	2,1
Gradačac	264.155	17,7	139.370	224.375	277.547	22,1	1.171.456	18,2	1,2
Lukavac	397.464	26,7	237.950	367.787	259.563	20,6	1.662.039	25,8	-10,2
Tuzla	376.111	25,3	286.440	293.138	309.884	24,6	1.572.070	24,4	-4,8
Živinice	132.557	8,9	95.850	100.750	112.303	8,9	545.055	8,5	-4,2
<i>Total (A)</i>	1.344.730	90,3	973.790	1.150.238	1.147.263	91,2	5.875.075	91,3	-3,9
B) Undeveloped									
B₁) Insufficiently developed									
Čelić	4.820	0,3	2.770	4.082	4.114	0,3	19.492	0,3	-3,9
Doboj-East	30.717	2,1	24.320	23.846	23.112	1,8	131.261	2,0	-6,9
Kalesija	30.193	2,0	12.310	17.770	33.512	2,7	117.406	1,8	2,6
Kladanj	6.615	0,4	4.660	4.179	6.394	0,5	28.398	0,4	-1,2
Srebrenik	64.718	4,3	45.180	40.790	43.067	3,4	237.151	3,7	-9,8
<i>Total (B₁)</i>	137.063	9,2	89.240	90.667	110.199	8,8	533.708	8,3	-5,4
B₂) Extremely undeveloped									
Sapna	2.453	0,2	1.940	2.871	529	0,1	8.918	0,1	-31,5
Teočak	5.171	0,3	3.800	3.009	59	0,0	18.229	0,3	-68,3

<i>Total (B₂)</i>	7.624	0,5	5.740	5.880	588	0,0	27.147	0,4	-46,8
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	144.687	9,7	94.980	96.547	110.787	0,1	560.855	8,7	-6,6
TOTAL TK (A+B)	1.489.417	100	1.068.770	1.246.785	1.258.049	100	6.435.929	100	-4,2
<i>FBiH</i>	10.991.712		7.903.637	8.598.493	9.972.467		47.228.163		-2,6

Sources: Macro-economic and socio-economic indicators in FBiH, various years, Federal Institute for Development Programing, Sarajevo

By examining the actual growth rate, underdeveloped municipalities have recorded relatively higher negative rate (-6.6%) than developed (-3.9%). Sapna and Teočak participate with 0.4% of imports in TK, and negative growth rate (-46.8%) encourages and gives an indication of positive developments. Current state of the import shows that the biggest volume of import is achieved by developed municipalities: Lukavac (25,8 %) and Tuzla (24,4 %) which presents over 50 % of import of the Canton.

The imbalance in trade in 2008 is in the level of -524,6 million KM (or 64,7 % coverage) and in 2012 -278,2 million KM (or 77,8 % coverage). It is interesting to notice that developed municipalities participate with about 90 % value of foreign goods traffic of the Canton.

The balance of trade of developed municipalities was reduced from -451.3 million, KM in 2008, to -254.1 million, KM, which is about 1.7 times the value of the deficit reduction. Municipalities of Lukavac and Banovići in this category achieve positive foreign trade, while municipality o Tuzla achieves the biggest deficit of -195,7 million, KM. When it comes to undeveloped municipalities of Tuzla Canton, it needs to be pointed out that on this area are present increased coverage of import by export (Tulumović, 2013. P. 107-108.).

Chart 9. Overview of coverage of imports by exports in municipalities of Tuzla Canton during 2008.-2011. (in 000 KM).

MUNICIPALITY	2008.		2009.		2010.		2012.	
	Cover-age	Balance	Cover-age	Balance	Cover-age	Balance	Cover-age	Balance
A) Developed								
Banovići	259,34	14.736	211,22	13.380	245,12	14.989	416,12	23.097
Gračanica	70,80	-48240	82,54	-35.290	89,29	-16.475	83,17	-30.406
Gradačac	80,82	-50.670	99,24	-1.060	93,36	-14.907	90,53	-26.277
Lukavac	94,58	-21.524	100,87	2.080	119,82	72.889	119,30	50.105
Tuzla	28,69	-268.200	35,30	-185.340	37,27	-183.871	36,84	-195.724
Živinice	41,58	-77.437	36,92	-60.460	34,63	-65.856	33,30	-74.904
Total (A)	66,44	-451.335	72,61	-266.690	83,20	-193.231	77,85	-254.104
B) Undeveloped								
B₁) Insufficiently developed								
Čelić	5,77	-4.542	7,94	-2.550	2,33	-3.987	18,02	-3.373
Doboj-East	54,17	-14.079	66,24	-8.210	71,14	-6.881	57,33	-9.863
Kalesija	36,35	-19.219	68,07	-3.930	59,25	-7.241	73,06	-9.027
Kladanj	203,13	6.822	249,57	6.970	290,69	7.969	263,51	10.454
Srebrenik	41,66	-37.758	47,94	-23.520	55,05	-18.336	72,36	-11.903
Total (B₁)	49,82	-68.776	64,99	-31.240	68,59	-28.476	78,48	-23.713
B₂) Extremely undeveloped								
Sapna	6,52	-2.293	5,67	-1.830	3,00	-2.785	15,46	-448
Teočak	56,04	-2.273	113,95	530	173,37	2.268	85,95	-8
Total (B₂)	40,1	-4.566	77,35	-1.300	91,20	-517	22,44	-456
Total (B = B₁+B₂)	49,31	-73.342	65,74	-32.540	69,97	-28.993	78,18	-24.169
TOTAL TK (A+B)	64,77	-524.678	72,00	-299.230	82,18	-222.224	77,88	-278.274
<i>FBiH</i>	43,00	-6.264.956	47,91	-4.117.339	56,65	-3.727.248	52,63	-4.723.920

Sources: Macro-economic and socio-economic indicators in FBiH, various years, Federal Institute for Development Programing, Sarajevo

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS OF RESEARCH

Considering the key economic aggregates such as: gross fixed capital formation, employment, unemployment, GDP and the effects of foreign exchange, there have been established highly expressed imbalances between developed and underdeveloped municipalities of Tuzla Canton.

Here is specially accentuated low level of participation in achieved investments as the main development factor, which is confirmed by report about achieved investments per capita and the data shows that is, in undeveloped municipalities, invested only 1.859 KM for medium-term (2005-2010) and in developed 5.823 KM, ie., three times more, then low level of GDP, which is confirmed by researching where comparing the participation of GDP of undeveloped area with its participation in population has resulted a big disproportion in aspect of participation of undeveloped area in population of TK (27,4 %) and of participation of achieved GDP (13,5 %), which means that this area misses capacity of economic activity which should effect new products and services ie, significantly increased effects in GDP.

When it comes to effects in GDP research has confirmed very decreased participation of the undeveloped area of Tuzla Canton in total economy of TK. According to cumulative of GDP participation of undeveloped area of Tuzla Canton during 2002-2012. Is in the level of 13,5 %, (and developed 86,5 %) whereby the insufficiently developed municipalities participate with about 12 % and extremely undeveloped only with 1,5 %.

Particular emphasis is on state of unemployment as a major problem that Canton has been facing for the last decade. How much the problem of unemployment is expressed in an undeveloped area of Tuzla Canton (rate 4.1%) compared to other areas confirms the fact that the growth rate of unemployed in FBiH almost halved (2.9% rate) for the period 2002-2012.. Negative trends in the production capacity of the economy primarily industrial and agricultural production are the reason for redundancies that the economy can not absorb such a capacity, which are the result of structural and cyclical nature.

Results of the research had confirmed continuous deficit in foreign trade which is for undeveloped areas in period (2008-2012) at the level of about 189 million KM or of about 37 million KM on the average annual basis. Undeveloped municipalities of TK in total deficit of goods trade in Tuzla Canton participate with about 11 %. The fact that encourages is that in observed period deficit in goods trade shows decreasing trend.

Analysis of the natural resources confirms that they are various: arable land (40 %), area under forests (47 %), wood mass is about 8,8 million m³ or 53 % of TK. Human resources (active population is in level of 94.066 persons or 27,1 % and total workforce is in the level of 42.993 persons or 24,1 %). Also significant are, various potentials in non-metals and minerals (clay, limestone, quartz sand).

Very influential factor of dynamise of development and changes in the economic structure of the underdeveloped part of the Tuzla Canton, is developed infrastructure. Among the most important objectives and measures of infrastructure development are identified by the following: (1) construction and modernization of infrastructure in all its segments (road, railway, telecommunication, electricity, water supply, etc.), in order to improve the local economy and sustainable development, and strengthen the competitive power (2) networking and coordination of activities within the infrastructure; (3) balanced development of infrastructure in all areas for effective overall development; (4) establishment of institutional capacity for routing and spatial regulation of infrastructure development; (5) providing funding for the rehabilitation of existing and construction of new infrastructure facilities; and (6) greater positioning services spatial planning in accordance with the legislation.

Bearing in mind the available resources and manufacturing tradition in certain sectors, favorable relief and geoclimatic conditions in the future development of the underdeveloped areas of Tuzla Canton preferred orientation of agro-industrial complex, ie, the improvement in the overall agri-food sectors (agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry, beekeeping), and on this basis the development of industrial-processing capacities.

It is especially important training and strengthening of agricultural holdings as carriers of production in agriculture. It takes are reimbursed certain structural changes in order to improve the effect of economic activity, providing a more effective chance activities that have greater development opportunities in these various spheres.

CONCLUSION

The general conclusion from this section can be reduced to a synthesis that in Tuzla Canton there is a good socio-economic basis for development, but also it is evident that this approach to development is not available in all areas evenly with the result are distinct levels of development. It should be noted that the emphasis is on undeveloped areas

that should especially focus on finding the adequate measures of implementation of development goals and measures in these zones in the Canton, which will be discussed in further work. Here it emphasizes the low level of participation in the gross fixed capital formation as a major developmental factor, then the resulting low level of GDP and GDP pc as a result of the negative trend of economic growth as a result of micro and macro factors, which are reflected in the expansion of the gap between developed and underdeveloped municipalities. The reduction in capital inflows is considered one of the key factors for developmental delay in these municipalities, without which we can not implement important development projects to improve the situation in this area. Particular emphasis is state of unemployment as a major problem Canton faced in the last decade. Negative trends in the production capacity of the economy especially industry and agriculture are the reason for redundancies which the economy with such a capacity can not absorb, and which are the result of structural and cyclical nature. It should be reimbursed later some structural changes to preunaprijedio effect of economic activities, providing a chance for effective activities that have greater development opportunities in these zones in. Tuzla Municipality as the most developed municipalities of Canton has a great contribution to the development of a wider catchment area. It is necessary to achieve greater connectivity underdeveloped municipalities with Tuzla to allow greater and faster level of development of these municipalities and the Canton as a whole. The harmonization of measures for the development of underdeveloped municipalities through the adoption of larger allocations of the Budget of the Canton as a stimulus, one of the priorities of the Tuzla Canton.

Note: Given the high level of GDP P.C. Lukavac (5,129 KM in 2010) compared to most municipalities TK, this indicator ranks municipality of Lukavac the third place in the Canton- after Tuzla (8410 KM) and Banovići (8353 KM), along with the fact that GDP pc preferred over all other indicators, this municipalities has been listed in the developed municipalities

Note: The paper puts special emphasis on disadvantaged areas (municipalities) of Tuzla Canton with the aim of better insight into the economic-economic status of these areas, as well as recognition of causes and measures and modalities improve and overcome the situation lag, and achieving greater effects of development.

REFERENCES

- BOGUNOVIĆ, A. (1991) Regional economic, Zagreb.
- Federation in numbers, various years, Federal Institute for Statistics, Sarajevo, [Online]. Available from: <http://www.fzs.ba/>
- HADŽIOMEROVIĆ, H. (1984) Regional component as factor of optimal development of the country, Proceedings, Faculty of Economics, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, p. 3.
- HODŽIĆ, K. (2011) Unemployment and performance improvement of the labor market of BiH, Proceedings No. 3, University "Vitez" Travnik, Travnik, p. 11-30.
- IBRELJIĆ, I. (2006) Investments – theory, projects, evaluation, Harfograf, Tuzla.
- IBRELJIĆ, I. (1994) Regionalization and regional development, Faculty of Economics, Tuzla.
- KAMENIĆA, S. (1976) The development of the theory of equality of growth and its application in practice, Economic institute Sarajevo.
- KANTALIĆ, M. (2005) Regional policy in the process of restructuring and development-thesis, Zagreb.
- KLAPIĆ, M. (2002) Tuzla as the development center of northeast Bosnia, the Institute of Economics in Tuzla, Tuzla.
- KUBOVIĆ, B. (1974) Regional economic, Informer, Zagreb.
- Macro-economic and socio-economic indicators in FBiH, various years Federal Institute for Development Programing Sarajevo, [Online]. Available from: <http://www.fzzpr.gov.ba/>
- OSMANKOVIĆ, J. (2001) Regionalization-Theory and practise, Beta, Sarajevo.
- PAPIĆ, K. (1977) Economic regionalization of BiH, Pegled No.11-12, Sarajevo, p.. 24.
- PROKOPIJEVIĆ, M. (2009) European Union, Regional policy.
- Socio-economic indicators by municipalities of FBiH, various years, Federal Insitute for Development Programing, Sarajevo, [Online]. Available from: <http://www.fzzpr.gov.ba/>
- Statistical yearbook FBiH, various years, Federal institute for statistics, Sarajevo, [Online]. Available from: <http://www.fzs.ba/>
- STOJANOVIĆ, R. (1981) Regional aspect of development, Proceedings, Beograd, p. 40.
- Development strategy of Tuzla Canton 2008-2013., (2008) Economic institute Sarajevo/Tuzla, p. 35-40.
- Employment strategy of Tuzla Canton 2009-2013., (2009) Faculty of Economics Tuzla, p. 26.
- ŠVERKO, M. (1995) Management of regional development, Faculty of Economics Rijeka.
- TULUMOVIĆ, V. (2013) An acceleration of the development and changes in the economic structure in order to improve the development of underdeveloped areas of Tuzla Canton, MA thesis, Faculty of Economics, University of Tuzla, Tuzla.
- Tuzla Canton in numbers, various years, Federal Institute for Statistics, Sarajevo, [Online]. Available from: <http://www.fzs.ba/>