Measurement of Rurality Degree Using TOPSIS-FUZZY Technique based on Order Preference by Similarity to a FUZZY Ideal Solution
(Case Study: Khodabandeh County Rural Region)
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Extended Abstract
Introduction
Spatial planning concepts have become prominent in discussions and strategies that focus on regional and rural development. At the heart of this policy framework is an understanding that competition between regions is one of the primary driving forces influencing social and economic development and hence cohesion. It is also understood that some regions have greater advantages in terms of their location and resources than others. Recognition of the fact that resources and conditions for social and economic development vary spatially, gave rise to the concept of territorial cohesion. Rural point is domain in Iran. Although the term rural is frequently used, it is rarely defined. This issue is compounded by the choice of spatial units that form the basis for analysis. The literature on the topic of rural development is populated by uncritical use of terms such as rural regions, rural areas and rurality. The failure to accurately define what rural and its geographic
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distribution is, hinders evaluation of social, demographic and economic changes and obfuscates the results of any analysis. The concept of Rurality draws attention to rural–urban linkages and interactions of this human settlement in Geographical space of territory. Styles, livelihoods and urban life dominance in rural area and rural adaptation, transform the face and economic, social and ecological structures of this area and give a new form to it that redound to a diversity of economic and social pattern and ecological bed of rurality and for this reason, there comes variable and broad development needs and also planning and management needs of rural people. Therefore, spatial analysis of rurality gradation, could prevent from similar planning for all rural areas and conduct the authority of development and rural planning to plan Co-ordinate with current conditions and potentials of each area, for equality and geographical unity in rural areas. On the other hand, measurement of rurality redounds to deliberation in fence of rural community’s way with livelihood structure and native actions as a cultural heritage. With this viewpoint, many studies were accomplished in the world literature in these phases and micro and macro rural development dominion, and the results of those studies are the basis for rural development planning and the necessity of such studies are observed in Iran too.

Methodology
Hence using synthetic approach and with descriptive-analyzing methodology for this study, contour and data were gathered from questionnaires designed with standards and criterion using the world experience, in 21 rurals point in central village of Khodabande county, by means of FUZZY-TOPSIS technique for rurality.

Results & Discussion
Measurement results show that Zavajer, Lachovan and Dotape sofia villages have a low degree of rurality compared to the other rural areas and this model could well express the rurality gradation among the rural points of this region. So the results of the study and observation are adopted with the current objectivity in rural settlement.

Conclusion
We believe that the proposed research will add information and therefore improve the quality of the discussion about how to define “rural Iran” and the impact different definitions can potentially have on the policies and decisions that affect the lives of all Iranian rural people. We also believe that the proposed research can contribute to community planning and rural policy development at a provincial and national level. Currently, even the most basic decisions, such as what constitutes rural points, are made in a relative vacuum of information concerning which citizens see them as rural and in understanding the utility of rural research using large data sets. These two issues mean that policy makers are now making decisions without the knowledge of whether they are relevant to the population they are making the decision for or how much confidence they should have in research evidence that is presented to them. The proposed research will at least raise awareness of these issues and begin the process of providing answers to these important questions using empirically based evidence. Therefore, on the basis of all analyses performed, it can be concluded that division of rural areas into types in our rurality degree is reasonable. The differences between defined types of rural areas are significant from different point of views and have to be considered in rural development planning and preparation of a long-term rural development state policy. For rural areas of significant characteristics with particular problems and situations, suitable and accordant rural development measures have to be prepared and implemented.
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