

Justyna Danielewicz, Maciej Turała**

TERRITORIAL CAPITAL AS A DETERMINANT OF DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES IN FUNCTIONAL AREAS

Abstract. The sectoral approach to shaping processes of development has recently started to lose ground to a territorial-based approach. The territorial approach has already become the leading paradigm for creating development policies on the EU level as well as on national and/or regional levels. This results from the growing role of territorial capital in the globalizing world – even though globalization is an undisputed fact, the development policies are increasingly emphasizing the need to adapt development plans to the existing, specific conditions characterizing each territory.

Endogenic resources which in their entirety create territorial capital are typically located within the administrative borders of several, functionally inter-dependent territorial units. That is why individual communes (or other territorial units, i.e. districts or even regions) should not become the leading subjects of development policies as this role is best performed by entire functional areas. A functional area may cover the territory of anywhere from several to over a dozen communes and/or districts located in not just one administrative region and as such requires that an integrative approach to steering development processes is applied.

The article aims at analyzing the changes in perception of the ‘territorial capital’ concept as well as at highlighting its growing importance with regards to development processes. The authors will also indicate the possible dimensions in which integration of the approach to steering development processes is possible.

Keywords: territorialisation; territorial capital; functional areas; integration

JEL: R58, H000

1. INTRODUCTION

If we assume that development planning needs to relate to the paradigm of sustainable development defined as a set of balanced interrelations between the economic sub-system, the social sub-system and the natural environment, a question of strategic nature arises: how should the contemporary system of development planning be set up so that it **can** be described as an ‘integrated system’.

Contemporary regional policy, which concentrates on stimulating development in territorially-based systems, has experienced both structural and systemic problems with optimising development through sectoral planning and is

* Uniwersytet Łódzki, Wydział Zarządzania, Katedra Zarządzania Miastem i Regionem.

now emphasising, with growing intensity, the need for introducing an integrative approach to the policies of stimulating development. Spatial planning and policy seem predestined for using the integrative approach to development planning (Markowski 2013: 27–41).

The process of integrative approach to development planning is described or reflected by various postulates that nonetheless have a common denominator which can be described as the need to combine strategies, policies and action plans, and to ensure cooperation between various actors. In the most general terms, integration is perceived as the coordination of a strategy-creation process aimed to avoid contradictory policies and to achieve development outcomes guaranteeing a win-win scenario.

The terms ‘development’ and ‘development creation’ are typically raised with reference to a specified territory. The territory is often narrowed down to the administrative borders of a single commune, leading to a discussion of ‘local development’. This approach may be considered overly restrictive and narrow considering the context of creation and dynamic transformation of functional areas that span from several to even several dozens of territorial units.

A broadly defined territory has recently become perceived as a place where technological processes and innovations are created. The locally available resources frequently determine the territory’s potential for competing at regional, national and international levels (Przygodzki 2015: 2).

The article has two main objectives. Firstly, it strives to provide a breakdown of evolving approaches to the concept of territory and territorial capital. Secondly, it aims at highlighting the role of territorial capital in local economic development.

The article is composed of four parts. The first part presents the role of a territory in development processes and the concept of ‘territorialisation’. The second part highlights that any decisions relative to development creation should consider a number of functionally inter-dependent territorial units making up a functional area rather than being restricted to the administrative borders of single communes. The third part of the article explains the concept of ‘territorial capital’ by comparing existing approaches and definitions. The fourth and final part presents the principles of a new, integrative approach to development planning in functional areas, and analyses the forms of integration relative to the creation of development processes. The article ends with brief conclusions and recommendations.

2. TERRITORIAL PERSPECTIVE ON DEVELOPMENT

Many authors considering globalisation processes raise the issue of de-territorialisation (Brenner 2004; Appadurai 2005). Globalisation has become a synonym for a shrinking world where even the most local of events, from unemployment through ethnic conflicts, may affect conditions and decisions in faraway places.

In this sense, globalisation truly embodies the process of de-territorialisation, because all social, political or economic actions are increasingly becoming global and cease to be organised along the lines of a purely territorial logic. The national economic space has even ceased to be considered synonymous with the national territorial space (McGrew 2009: 18–19). Borders have become unnoticeable and no longer need to be crossed, relations tend to become more and more supra-territorial – distance, borders and geographical space are losing their economic and political importance (see: Scholte 1997). M. Castells (2008) emphasises that contemporary development occurs in the space of flows rather than in the space of places as in the past. Markets no longer need to be defined geographically and, in some cases at least, determining the geographical location of transactions and organisations has become impossible.

This does not mean that territories and borders have become completely insignificant, however globalisation erodes their role as factors restricting social activities and the division of power. In the day and age of instantaneous communication, when organisations are set up in real-time, differentiating between the national and the international, between what lies within a country and what lies without it, is no longer plausible. This diminishes the role of borders decreases, but not of territories.

Authors promoting the concept of de-territorialisation fall into the trap of simplification and fail to separate the importance of functional areas from that of administrative borders. The importance of space insofar as economic activities are concerned has not decreased at all. Economic processes continue to be concentrated in specified space and despite all the talk of de-territorialisation meant as the separation of economic activities from space taking place, this is not the case. Concentrated production systems are venues where both real as well as potential synergies of regional scope occur.

The territory does not lose its importance in the globalised world. On the contrary – globalisation increases the possibility of territorial differences and local specificities becoming more visible (Scott 2001). In the economy of flows, some part of it (i.e. goods, capital and information) is constantly on the move, driven by the nodes of the economic system. The role of the nodes is played by some specific places, predominantly by metropolitan areas. The economy is becoming a “flowing warehouse” that provides the required resources in specific space and time. The *just in time* philosophy has been extended to a global level – information and services are available online round the clock.

Life is organised in space in a certain peculiar way – the features of space and the relations between them have a certain range. Apart from that, there are also administrative divisions. The economy does not recognise them, even though every activity is located in some territory. It is plain to see when we look at territory’s features that are important for the performance of certain activities and determine its competitiveness that they cannot be either transferred or copied elsewhere.

Competing comes down to rivalry for resources concentrated in a specific territory that also has specific functional relations.

The last decades have witnessed a growing propensity to concentrate various types of business activity (i.e. manufacture or services) to come together and to create regional centres or clusters. Spatial proximity as well as proximity in terms of time of access are particularly significant as a source of greater competitive advantages for many companies. As a result of concentration trends, large regional groups and clusters of producers increasingly function as territorial platforms for competing global markets.

Porter (1998: 78) emphasises that what goes on in enterprises is indeed important, but the emergence of clusters shows quite vividly that the business environment plays an equally important role. The importance of location was for a long time undervalued or even neglected, despite evidence that innovativeness and competitive success in many business fields depend on the geographical location.

Localised learning is based not only on formal knowledge. It is mainly determined by the type of knowledge that is difficult to define and highly immobile in geographical terms, and by inter-dependencies that are not subject to market exchange. One relevant example of such relations is technological externalities which are an asset shared by a group of enterprises or even industries concentrated in a given region and which may create important, regionally specific conditions affecting innovativeness and competitiveness of regional clusters (Asheim, Cooke 1998).

The contemporary, globalised economy is thus characterised by a growing importance of high quality spatial development perceived by many enterprises as a key location factor. The market leaders seek competitive advantages through high quality competences, including knowledge and skills (human capital) and high levels of social trust (social capital) that are inexorably bound to high quality space. These intangible factors develop from out-of-market cooperation and intensive contacts and lead to the creation of mutual trust (Markowski 2015).

Storper (1997: 170) defines 'territorialisation' as an outstanding sub-system of territorial agglomerations, where economic vitality (capacity for survival) comes from assets (encompassing practices as well as mutual relations) that are unattainable in many other places and that cannot be easily and quickly created. It needs to be emphasised that the physical, geographical features (such as the availability of mineral resources) are becoming less and less significant in that respect, while the importance of environment-specific factors that determine future development processes and constitute permanent sources of competitive advantage continues to grow. Regions with sufficient resources of knowledge that apply appropriate organisational solutions and are more efficient in transforming information into products that are subsequently commercialised perform far better than regions that have fewer competitive technologies and weaker human and social capital (Domański 2001: 47).

In economic terms, territorialisation may be manifested through certain permanent regional features that arise from the emergence of non-transferable competitive advantages with regards to the business environment, the quality of the anthropogenic and spatial environments, and the system of relations. The notion of ‘the territorialisation of the economy’ initiated a discussion on how “the place” affects the foundations of competitiveness. It can be assumed that in order to make an area more competitive and to lay the foundations for its sustained development it must be provided with good environment (spatial development). It needs to be emphasised yet again that the foundations are determined by functional relationships and so they are related to territories extending beyond the administrative borders of individual territorial units (be it communes, districts or regions) or even national borders. For this reason, development planning should take place at the level of functional areas.

3. FUNCTIONAL AREA

The National Spatial Development Concept 2030 defines a functional area as a compact spatial system comprising functionally interrelated areas sharing conditions and determinants of development and development objectives (Ministry of Regional Development 2012: 178).

Taking a functional area as an object of development planning and management means thinking beyond administrative boundaries – functional areas are a **dynamic system that changes in space and time**. The volatility of relationships between economic entities and people is crucial to understanding a functional area.

The scope of a functional area – which is equivalent to the scope of public intervention being planned – may change depending on the set of criteria (indicators) that has been adopted to delimit it.

In considering the problem of delimitation of functional areas from the perspective of economic functions one must be aware that their scope will change following changes in product life cycles, markets, the number of companies, the spatial extent of externalities resulting from business activities, etc.

However, the scope of functional areas may also be affected by other, non-economic factors, such as the physical features of the geographical environment; the need to sustain life and bio-diversity or the need to keep the air clean; the human need of maintaining contact with nature; other relations arising between people as they perform various educational, recreational, cultural, health-related or other functions.

Finally, determining the scope and boundaries of a functional area is, to a certain extent, a political decision made by political subjects (agents) to achieve the strategic objectives of development. Political bodies in charge of implementing

a development strategy observe spatial relationships to determine what territorial scope of intervention will be the most appropriate operationalise (implement) the strategy.

Because of the dynamic nature of a functional area some interventions may even be performed outside the formal boundaries of a functional (planning) area. This particularly probable when some strategically important functions require a cooperative approach for objectives set for a larger territory to be achieved.

A functional area typically consists of many administratively separate territorial units, all of which have specific resources at their disposal. The resources constitute their territorial capital that underpins their development.

4. TERRITORIAL CAPITAL

Territorial capital is a means of building competitiveness and improving the quality of life which may be considered synonymous with achieving development goals. One of the features of territorial capital is that it is created through civilizational processes that may extend beyond the boundaries of administrative units, so reducing development, development planning and management to the administrative borders of individual territorial units is a mistake that limits the long-term development prospects.

Territorial capital was first mentioned in the context of regional policy in OECD' *Territorial Outlook* of 2001 (2001: 15–16). The OECD's approach was subsequently adopted by the DG Regio of the Commission of the European Union (EU). It emphasises that each region has a specific 'territorial capital' that is distinct from that of other areas and generates a higher return for specific kinds of investments than for others, since these are better suited to the area and use its assets and potential more effectively (European Commission 2005: 1). This definition concentrates on a measurable economic category – a return on investment – and assumes relatively high returns on specific kinds of investments. No reference is, however, made as to what amounts of these returns can be.

Another approach to territorial capital has been proposed by Camagni (2009: 120–128). Camagni defines territorial capital as a "set of localized assets – natural, artificial, human, organizational, relational and cognitive – that comprise the potential of a certain territory". Van der Ploeg (2008: 13) and other authors have defined territorial capital as "the amount and intertwining of different forms of capital (or different resources) entailed in, mobilized and actively used in (and reproduced by) the regional economy and society". For Ventura (2008: 160), territorial capital is "a stock of resources specific to the place and available to those who live and work in the territory. These resources (material and immaterial) are common goods for a local community". Berti (2011: 9) has added that territorial

capital is “the whole of the local assets which if adequately mobilized provide comparative advantages to those who live and work there”.

Each of these definitions emphasizes the importance of specific local resources and territorial assets that need to be actively employed for the overriding objective of territorial development to be achieved.

It needs to be stressed, though, that the success of a given territory does not solely depend on its material resources – it is rather a combination of material and immaterial factors that is of significance (Perman et al. 1996; OECD 2001).

Camagni (2009: 123) has identified a number of resources comprising territorial capital. They have been grouped into a matrix reflecting various levels of rivalry and materiality with regard to these resources. The theoretical taxonomy of the components of territorial capital is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Theoretical taxonomy of territorial capital components

Rivalry	High rivalry	Private fixed-capital stock	Relational private services operating on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ external linkages for firms ▪ transfer of R&D results 	Human capital: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ entrepreneurship ▪ creativity ▪ private know-how
	private goods	Pecuniary externalities (hard)		Pecuniary externalities (soft)
	Club goods	Toll goods (excludability)	University spin-offs	
	Impure public goods	Proprietary networks	Cooperation networks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ strategic alliances in R&D and knowledge ▪ public/private partnerships in services and schemes 	Relational capital (associationism): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ cooperation capability ▪ collective action capability ▪ collective competencies
	Public goods	Collective goods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ landscape ▪ cultural heritage (private ‘ensembles’) 	Governance on land and cultural resources	
	Low rivalry	Resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ natural ▪ cultural (punctual) 	Agglomeration and district economies	Social capital (civiness): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ institutions ▪ behavioural models, values ▪ trust, reputation
	Social overhead capital: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ infrastructure 	Receptivity – enhancing tools		
		Connectivity agencies for R&D transcoding		
	Tangible goods	Mixed goods	Intangible goods	
	Materiality			

Source: Camagni (2009: 123).

Territorial capital is most frequently understood as the degree of availability of material and immaterial factors (endogenic assets) in a given area, as a result of which specific resources or limitations affecting the performance of the functional area may emerge. In other words, endogenic assets represent the intrinsic potential of a given territory – they are created inside it and their character is unique to it. For the sake of simplicity, four large categories of territorial potentials can be created, which require attention insofar as the policy context is concerned (Table 2.).

Table 2

Territorial capital as a sum of potentials

Territorial capital	Economic potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • economic base and structure of an area; • entrepreneurship and innovativeness; • scale and structure of local and regional markets; • financial capital;
	Social potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demographics; • human capital; • social capital; • ecological awareness of the inhabitants;
	Spatial and environmental potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • spatial accessibility; • settlement structure; • spatial order; • cultural heritage; • social and technical infrastructure; • landscape and natural resources; • quality of the natural environment;
	Institutional potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • institutional capacity of local government administration; • networks of co-operating economic and social institutions; • public authorities' attitude;

Source: developed by the author.

A modern, and appropriate, approach to territorial capital emphasises its relational and synergistic formula. Markowski (2013: 6–7) has proposed a definition that corresponds to this formula: “territorial capital is a set of peculiar externalities which are created and made available as a result of multi-functional interaction between the users of a given territory; territorial capital is in fact a dynamic (in both space and time), complex club good that is available to the users (i.e. the club) operating within a functional area”.

Building territorial capital in a specified functional area requires the public policy makers to adopt an integrative and interactive approach. Actions leading to the creation of territorial capital need to include those aimed at shaping a coherent

spatial development, as well as those of softer kind, concentrated more on building relations in the social and economic spheres.

Acting on territorial capital in policy making means acknowledging the integrated nature of any policy strategy. Interventions add value if they relate to different but linked assets, promote network relations and cooperative agreements, and support innovative projects emerging through these agreements rather than single partners (ESPON 2013: 12).

5. INTEGRATIVE APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT PLANNING IN FUNCTIONAL AREAS

Development processes take place in different territories – there can be talk of local, regional or territorial (i.e. occurring in functional areas) development. However, irrespective of their scope and scale, the term “development” is universally applicable. Below, there is an overview of the approaches to defining development :

- Szlachta (1996) points to a specified territorial unit and defines development as “the systematic improvement of economic entities’ competitiveness and of inhabitants’ quality of life, as well as the growth of the economic potential of a given territory that contributes to the country’s socio-economic development”;
- Kudłacz (1999: 15) refers to the “permanent growth of the inhabitants’ living standards and economic potential within a specified territorial unit”;
- Klasik (1997) highlights the “permanent growth of three elements: the region’s economic potential, its competitive strength, and as the inhabitants’ standard and quality of life”;
- lastly, Blair (1995: 14–15) emphasises that the concept of development relates to the local society and implies increasing competitiveness (mainly growth of wealth, income levels and employment rates) as well as improving quality of life.

Summing up, development may be referred to as a process of moving onto a higher level of need satisfaction. This definitional approach implies that development has three major dimensions:

- an economic dimension (increasing employment rates and incomes);
- a social dimension (improving quality of life);
- a spatial and environmental dimension (preservation of the natural environment).

Development is therefore both quantitative (economic dimension) and qualitative (social dimension) in nature. It needs to be emphasised that the integrative approach to development planning and management should also take into account the long-term perspective, especially their impacts on the environment (the spatial and environmental dimension). This approach to defining development is equivalent to the concept of sustainable development.

The integrative approach to development planning takes account of several types of integration, three of which are thought to be crucial: spatial integration, functional integration and integration in time. The other types of integration, such as financial or subject-based integration, are secondary and consequential of the three core ones.

Spatial integration means that pro-development activities are carried out in many territorial units characterised by functional relations. Each territorial unit (a commune, a district or even a region) has a similar, complex and inhomogeneous structure of objectives that requires that the limited resources available to local authorities be allocated to the priority activities.

Looking from a broader perspective, though, it becomes clear that each territorial unit is surrounded by a number of other units facing the same inhomogeneity and complexity of objectives and scarcity of resources at their disposal. In this context, spatial integration results in many territorial units pooling their resources to perform activities that can increase territorial capital across the functional area.

This aspect of integration emphasises that the decisions on spatial development, particularly on the division of functions within the functional area, need to be made jointly in such a way as to ensure a complementary distribution of the functions.

Functional (sectoral) integration means that particular activities of local authorities lead to the achievement of objectives arising from economic and social functions, as well as from functions underlying spatial development and/or the preservation of the natural environment, even if the objectives are conflicting or contradictory. This type of integration is sometimes referred to as ‘substantive integration’.

Functional integration underlies the integrative approach to development planning that requires public authorities to consider all circumstances, limitations and consequences (impacts) of each and all functions.

Integration in time means that projects must be carried out in line with the approved schedule. When this type of integration is not present, development impulses may become weaker or fade away, even if all activities are completed. This dimension of integration implies that all actions need to be synchronised and that an appropriate sequence thereof and a degree of coordination must be ensured (e.g. the construction of new waterworks and a sewage system should be combined with the repair of a road linking several communes that make up a functional area).

Subject-based integration is the most visible when projects are designed and implemented. It consists in various stakeholders (different territorial units and local governments, economic entities, social organisations or even individuals) contributing to development planning and management. A reflection of this type of integration is multi-level governance in territorial units and functional areas.

Financial integration derives from subject-based integration and means that pooling of financial and other resources by various entities. Financial integration may result from the combination of funds contributed by different sectors (public and private), public-private partnership instruments, and EU funds.

The growing spatial polarisation and increasing divergence between regions give more importance to the features of territorial potential. This means that development policies should concentrate on the strengthening of entire territories rather than on giving direct support to individual businesses, because it is the business environment as a whole that needs support and assistance. Therefore, policies capable of influencing an entire territorial system or a set of inter-linked territorial systems (functional areas) rather than particular territorial units should be designed and implemented. Such policies require co-operation between different actors (horizontal co-operation) and levels of public authorities (vertical co-operation). Only then will synergies for the entire functional area be available.

The above explains why contemporary development concepts make a point of shifting attention from individual territorial units to functional areas that allow strong territorial capital to be built. Without such a shift, permanent competitive advantages leading to higher incomes and employment rates that epitomize development will not be attainable.

6. CONCLUSIONS

An integrative approach to development planning in the public sector is gaining in popularity. However, the implementation of an integrative and holistic approach to development faces numerous barriers in public administration, mainly because of its hierarchical and sectoral organisation. In practice, the launching of sectoral, specialised plans is strongly linked to a bureaucratic system of interests and values, rather than to the results of *ex ante* evaluations based on a holistic and integrative approach (Markowski 2015).

The currently dominating planning system separately deals with socio-economic development and spatial development issues. Socio-economic planning has been evolving along its own course and it treats spatial issues as having marginal importance, frequently viewing them as inconveniences or even barriers to development. However, an integrative approach to development processes requires that the social, economic and spatial sub-systems are integrated, meaning that all socio-economic objectives should automatically be reflected in spatial development plans. This reasoning brings us closer to the optimal allocation of resources as a concept of sustainable development.

The territorial capital concept proposes integrating elements which have been fully independent so far. Territorial capital and development are characterised by a mutual interdependence, a feedback. All definitions of development presented

above share the view that development is founded on territorial capital existing in a functional area. On the other hand – development is known to increase territorial capital...

Therefore, the territorial development policies (i.e. allowing for a territorial approach to development) should first and foremost help areas to develop their territorial capital (European Commission 2005: 1).

An integrative approach to development planning and management brings a number of benefits. These are:

- a clear-cut framework for carrying out public investments and coordinating them within a functional area;
- co-operation allowing various entities to reach a consensus on the scope of tasks and the manner of delivering them and ultimately improving efficiency of action;
- a possibility of accomplishing tasks that the territorial units would never undertake on their own
 - lower costs of service delivery (at least in some cases);
 - augmentation of social capital in the functional area.

Putting the integrative approach to work is a difficult task, though, as it requires partnership, commitment, a sense of community of interests and an ability to look outside the administrative borders of territorial units.

REFERENCES

- Appadurai A. (2005), *Nowoczesność bez granic. Kulturowe wymiary globalizacji*, Wydawnictwo Universitas, Kraków.
- Asheim B., Cooke P. (1998), *Localised innovation networks in a global economy: a comparative analysis of endogenous and exogenous regional development approaches*, „Comparative Social Research”, JAI Press, Stamford, vol. 17.
- Berti, G. (2011), *Weaving the rural web: The dynamics of rural development in Lunigiana*, „Quaderni Sismondi”, no. 12(4).
- Blair J. P. (1995), *Local Economic Development: Analysis and Practice*, Sage, London.
- Brenner N. (2004), *New State Spaces. Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford University Press, Oxford–New York.
- Camagni R. (2009), *Territorial capital and regional development*, [in:] R. Capello: Nijkamp (Eds) *Handbook of Regional Growth and Development Theories*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Castells M. (2008), *Spółczesność sieci*, PWN, Warszawa.
- Domański R. (2001), *The innovative city*, House of Poznań University of Economics, Poznań.
- ESPON (2013), *SPAN-3. Spatial Perspectives at Nuts-3 Level*.
- European Commission (2005), *The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union. Towards a Stronger European Territorial Cohesion in the Light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Ambitions*. A Background Document for the Territorial Agenda of the European Union, EC, Luxembourg.
- Klasik A. (1997), *Koncepcje rozwoju regionalnego Polski na tle zróżnicowań regionalnych*, stenogram z seminarium na temat: Rozwój regionalny Polski jako element integracji europejskiej, Sejm RP, 22 kwietnia 1997.

- Kudłacz T. (1999), *Programowanie rozwoju regionalnego*, PWN, Warszawa.
- Markowski T. (2013), *Flexible and integrative planning in functional urban areas – towards a new approach to spatial planning*, [in:] Gaczek W.M. (ed.): *Dynamika, cele i polityka zintegrowanego rozwoju regionów – aspekty teoretyczne i zarządzanie w przestrzeni*, Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Poznań.
- Markowski T. (2015), *Zintegrowane planowanie rozwoju – dylematy i wyzwania*, „Studia KPZK”, Polska Akademia Nauk, Warszawa, no 161.
- McGrew A. (2009), *Globalization and Global Politics*, [in:] Baylis J., Smith S., Owens P. (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Ministry of Regional Development (2012), *Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030*, Warszawa.
- OECD (2001), *Territorial Outlook*, OECD, Paris.
- Perman R., Ma Y., McGilvray, J. (1996), *Natural and Environmental Resource Economics*, Longan, London.
- Porter M. (1998), *Clusters and the new economics of competition*, „Harvard Business Review”, November-December.
- Przygodzki Z. (2015), *Integracja procesu planowania rozwoju. Uwagi metodyczne i sposoby wdrażania planowania zintegrowanego*, tekst niepublikowany.
- Scholte J. A. (1997), *Global Capitalism and the State*, „International Affairs”, no. 73 (3).
- Scott A. J. (2001), *Globalization and the Rise of City-regions*, „European Planning Studies”, vol. 9, no 7.
- Storper M. (1997), *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global Economy*, Guilford Press, New York.
- Szlachta J. (1996), *Główne problemy polityki rozwoju regionalnego Polski na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*, [in:] *Strategiczne wyzwania dla polityki rozwoju regionalnego Polski*, Wyd. Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung, Warszawa.
- van der Ploeg, J. D., van Broekhuizen, R., Brunori, G., Sonnino, R., Knickel, K., Tisenkopfs, T., Oostindie, H. (2008), *Towards a framework for understanding regional rural development*, [in:] J. D. van der Ploeg, T.Marsden (eds), *Unfolding Webs: The Dynamics of Regional Rural Development*, Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Ventura, F., Brunori, G., Milone: & Berti, G. (2008), *The rural web: A synthesis*, in: J. D. van der Ploeg, T. Marsden (eds), *Unfolding Webs: The Dynamics of Regional Rural Development*, Van Gorcum, Assen.

Justyna Danielewicz, Maciej Turała

KONCEPCJA KAPITAŁU TERYTORIALNEGO W KSZTAŁTOWANIU PROCESÓW ROZWOJU OBSZARÓW FUNKCJONALNYCH

Streszczenie. W podejściu do kształtowania procesów rozwojowych zaczęto odchodzić od podejścia sektorowego na rzecz podejścia terytorialnego. Jest ono głównym paradygmatem w tworzeniu polityki rozwoju zarówno na szczeblu Unii Europejskiej, jak też na szczeblu krajowym czy regionalnym. Przyczynił się do tego obserwowany wzrost roli kapitału terytorialnego w globalizującym się świecie, który wymaga takiego ukierunkowania polityki rozwoju, które pozwoli

na wykorzystanie specyficznych uwarunkowań występujących na poszczególnych obszarach. Ze względu na fakt, iż walory endogeniczne składające się na całość kapitału terytorialnego zazwyczaj zlokalizowane są w obrębie kilku jednostek samorządu terytorialnego, które wykazują ze sobą silne powiązania funkcjonalne, przedmiotem polityk rozwojowych nie powinny być pojedyncze gminy lecz obszary funkcjonalne.

Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie różnych podejść do koncepcji kapitału terytorialnego oraz wskazanie roli, jaką odgrywa ten kapitał w procesach rozwojowych. Autorzy pragną też podkreślić potrzebę integracji planowania i interwencji realizowanych w obszarach funkcjonalnych.

Słowa kluczowe: terytorializacja; kapitał terytorialny; obszary funkcjonalne; integracja