

Andrzej Łuczyszyn

Agnieszka Chołodecka

Wyższa Szkoła Bankowa we Wrocławiu Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny we Wrocławiu

Functioning of peripheries under conditions of space metropolisation and knowledge-based economy – a discussion on selected aspects

Summary. Contemporary background of economic life is conditioned by globalisation processes of both quantitative and qualitative nature. One may often speak of facing the economy of the turn of the 20th and 21st c., also referred to as the “new economy.” Its most crucial resource is knowledge and, to be more specific, knowledge management. A notion of growing popularity is knowledge-based economy (KBE), claimed to rely on more extensive utilisation of knowledge resources and skills as well as on development of technologies providing fast and cheap access to information. It is indeed a type of economy whose development and growth are directly dependent on concepts, information and various kinds of knowledge. Therefore, one may claim that the idea of KBE manifests itself in educational dimensions (knowledge-based society), the innovation system as well as the institutional and legal framework. Under such economic circumstances, international fluxes of technology and investment are heavily concentrated on developed countries, ensuring them advantage in terms of technological advancement level, attractiveness of products, efficiency of systemic and organisational features. Consequently, managing local businesses in such conditions is not an easy process, as it seems that a completely different set of tools is required to manage local economic development under a centrally-administered system, and yet a different set may become useful when one faces new social and economic circumstances where horizontal relationships within collectives of economic entities (networks) have already started playing a dominant role. Hence the two unprecedented economic phenomena, whose scale has already grown to dimensions formerly unobserved in the economic history, namely globalisation and metropolisation of the social and economic sphere, causing the relationships between entities operating in the global economic space and their local environment to become specific. The said local dimension of globalisation is on one hand a measure of growth rate, and on the other hand, it makes one realise the power of ongoing phenomena taking an extremely abrupt course.

Key words: peripheries, peripheral space, metropolisation, globalisation

Introduction

The functioning of peripheral territorial units under new social and economic conditions of the present is very specific, both in practical and the theoretical terms. The related problems are becoming more and more complicated, mainly due to the complexity and multifaceted nature of this extremely difficult process. Having observed economic events taking place in the local dimension, numerous authors have reached diverse conclusions which – based on complex analyses, procedures and often specific guidelines – lead to a diversity of approaches and standpoints, and hence to the multifaceted attitude when considering the notion of development in peripheral socioeconomic spheres. There is a particular bone of contention in this respect, namely the divisions in studying the influence of a new paradigm of transfer from the industrial economy to the post-industrial one, mainly focusing on the impact of endogenous and exogenous factors on the efficiency of structures and entities functioning in social and economic spheres.

In the local socioeconomic space, there are fairly complicated economic processes taking place, predominantly resulting from the system of mutual correlations between individual entities, including the public and the private ones, only to mention the major elements. It means that, when operating in such a space, one must face the local economy, local growth, local economic policy, local labour market or certain elements of knowledge-based economy, as it is a part of creative economy, between which there are mutual correlations heavily dependent on both endogenous and exogenous factors. These correlation factors may exert positive influence on the capacity to drive the local growth, however, when they are applied in inappropriate combinations, they may well, and often do, lead to economic and social peripherality.

1. Peripherality in regional economy

The literature of the subject provides no explicit and unambiguous definition of a peripheral territory. In general, one may only speak of certain groups defining peripherality. One of them claims that peripheries are areas distant from economic centres and hardly accessible in terms of communication and transport. They are characterised by a low population density and poor urbanisation. The second of the aforementioned groups refers to economic notions¹, emphasising the level

¹ According to the European Union's cohesion policy, the fundamental criterion decisive of peripherality is the local level of economic growth the measure of which is low GDP (below 75% of the EU average per capita, according to the purchasing power parity).

of social and economic development. There are also other definitions which speak of properties of poor economic development, such as being specialised in agricultural and forest products or raw material processing, manufacturing based on cheap and labour-consuming workforce, low level of the infrastructural and managerial (including public) development, low level of innovativeness and entrepreneurship.

Some definitions are based on a reference to the economic dependence of peripheral areas on economic and political centres. It may be manifested in various ways, for instance through exploitation of the given peripheral region's resources (such as labour, natural resources, outlet market), only to mention attracting the most valuable part of the human capital from peripheries to centres. At the same time, peripheral areas depend on the transfer of public aid and investment funds supplied from central regions.

It should be stressed that peripherality may be a property of countries, regions, microregions, but that one may also observe internal peripherality within those structures. Peripherality thus understood is obviously identified from a perspective of distance (point of reference), nevertheless, the location itself does not necessarily need to be decisive of the economic peripherality. In this respect, it is worth stressing that a peripheral region (microregion) is predominantly associated with a peripheral municipality which directly influences the entire peripheral area. The foregoing may imply that both communes and administrative districts in Poland can be peripheral, if only from the perspective of significance and standing of their leading administrative units (municipalities, villages), which may further imply that peripherality can also depend on the status of the leading unit (rural commune, urban commune, urban-rural commune). And it has already been observed as typical for such peripheral units that their inhabitants are stagnant and their population is declining².

Under the new paradigm of development observed in the global economy, which consists in a transfer from the industrial to the post-industrial phase (transformation of the industrial economy into information-based or knowledge-based economy), peripherality acquires special meaning, since the disproportions emerging in a region due to the leading role of a large centre (agglomeration, metropolis, conurbation) lead to changes in quantitative and qualitative terms. The foregoing means that the settlement system of the given local socioeconomic space may determine the peripherality. What is additionally worth stressing is that a specific selection of historical factors has been responsible for the development of some socioeconomic spaces under more advantageous conditions compared

² A. Kwiatek-Sołtys, *Dynamika zaludnienia a zmiany w użytkowaniu przestrzeni małych miast w Polsce*, in: *Przemiany przestrzeni miast i stref podmiejskich*, ed. J. Słodczyk, R. Klimek, Opole University, Opole 2006, p. 223.

to others. For many years, large centres imposed the growth rate upon themselves assuming invariability of parameters in the peripheries (population index, average population density, share of forests in the overall area, share of farmland in the overall area of the unit).

Under the contemporary social and economic circumstances, a distinct and profound regression can be observed in peripheries. It extends the group of peripherality definitions by stressing negative elements and hazards, only to mention the expansion of the grey market (illegal employment, building the model of economy based on standard growth factors), which does not correlate with the processes taking place in large centres. The lack of cohesion in the process of building a regional model of creative economy leads to divisions, disappearance or marginalisation of peripheries. Hence the existing civilisational backwardness petrifies, and the outflow of capital, human and innovative resources from peripheries becomes excessive. Consequently, one may speak of the economy of peripheries based on its own tightly closed and complete model featuring very weak bonds with the centre (capital of the region).

Peripheral economy does not currently provide enough impulses capable of contributing to intensification of the socioeconomic growth rate of local communities, since the most fundamental growth factor is the increase of production intensity which may only be achieved when modern technologies are applied. A factor limiting the development of peripheries to a considerable extent, besides the lack of state-of-the-art technologies, is also a narrow and little absorptive outlet market. Fragmented peripheral markets cause reduced internal and external demand for products supplied by peripheries.

What has recently been considered as particularly important is a process of metropolisation of space which, besides positive effects such as innovativeness, development of modern technologies, scientific research or increase of budget revenues of large cities, also induces negatives, such as the following: space appropriation, economic and social polarisation, social exclusion, crime growth etc. Also isolation between peripheries, semi-peripheries and metropolises is becoming evident, with most benefits being drawn by the latter. At the proverbial "bottom", a specific model is emerging and it cannot keep up with the effects of large centres. One can observe more and more clearly the elements of negative public management, manifesting themselves in such spheres as conflicts of authorities or preferential treatment of particular personal benefits valued higher than the public good. It should also be added that one may observe fading out of the exogenous functions which could permeate the endogenous functions in order to accumulate the effect of synergy between individual centres, and hence also spaces in the region. Under such circumstances, various types of barriers emerge, including natural barriers resulting from the distance between the core centre and the peripheries, but also, if not primarily from historical conditions. In peripheries,

such a process mainly induces financial barriers which determine the economic growth and development in a very special manner. The clearly noticeable process of decentralisation and deconcentration of tasks does nothing but force one to seek additional sources of revenue, and this task must be performed by a basic public entity managing the local economy and development, namely the local self-government. There are specific processes taking place in peripheries of a region, as one may observe more and more evident stratification of the capacity to generate internal grass-roots forces, which consists in the metropolis's ability to take over such peripheral spaces from another region.

2. Metropolisation of social and economic space as an outcome of globalisation

Metropolisation is basically an element of globalisation. It consists in emergence of a new spatial structure that not only accumulates the global potential but also changes former relations between the centre and the surrounding, the ultimate outcome of which is the development of urbanised space. It is also a phenomenon occurring in time. Without a doubt, an important element of this process is the decline in the state's role in the economy and the simultaneous increase of the economic role played by regions and municipalities. It is also directly associated with a new specific phenomenon referred to as regionalisation.

Contemporary economy is based on the creation of spatial economic networks, as they are referred to, through which all sorts of activities and socio-economic phenomena tend to naturally accumulate in selected cities. This is also related to concentration of the latest types of operations as well as scientific and economic institutions. It is often referred to as flexible production agglomeration. It is for this phenomenon that not only do large urban entities become areas of economic process concentration, but also transform into real centres strongly affecting the development of other areas. This is how one can observe the emergence of metropolises the characteristics of which were defined by B. Jałowiecki and M.S. Szczepański claiming that³:

- they absorb foreign production factors, investments, workforce as well as goods and services,
- there are foreign companies, headquarters, regional branches of international corporations, banks, non-governmental organisations, educational institutions

³ B. Jałowiecki, M.S. Szczepański, *Miasto i przestrzeń w perspektywie socjologicznej*, Scholar, Warszawa 2002, p. 225.

(schools) and universities with a considerable share of foreign students as well as diplomatic posts operating on their territories,

- they export production factors, and there are enterprises, banks and other social and economic, cultural and scientific institutions,
- they are directly linked with the abroad by means of various transport systems, including motorways, fast railways, international airports,
- they are characterised by intensive communication with foreign countries via post, telecommunications and tourism,
- they feature a well-developed service sector targeting foreign customers (conference and exhibition centres, luxury hotels, international schools, high-quality office premises, international law firms, international scientific institutions),
- there are mass media of international range,
- there are international events (congresses, festivals etc.) being organised,
- they host national and regional institutions involved in foreign relations (associations, sports clubs).

The foregoing substantiates the claim that large cities (agglomerations, metropolises) being the final outcome of the space metropolisation process are potential target locations for migration and capital accumulation. Malisz believes that metropolitan centres are only subject to internal deconcentration, this being an outcome of the fact that people, while changing places of residence or business, still tend to remain within a sphere of influence of the metropolitan system, thus usually increasing its spatial range⁴ (concentrated dispersion).

With regard to the foregoing, in times of new metropolitan centres emerging, one may observe yet another phenomenon being induced, namely the centres competing with one another. Hence in order to win competitive advantage over other similar centres, one should distance itself from its own surrounding, focusing on individual criteria of this advantage, as well as from small peripheral territorial units to be found in the region. “When perceived in such a context, the metropolis represents the functions of its own and of its surrounding. In the process of a large city’s development, structural units operating in the region are becoming elements of the former’s internal organisational structure and perform dedicated functions, both in an internal and an external arrangement”⁵. Under such conditions, i.e. in times of such a dynamic competition, metropolitan systems are dominated by exogenous, urbanising functions which should indeed play the most significant role in strengthening regional structures, thus influencing the cohesion of settlement

⁴ B. Malisz, *Podstawy gospodarki przestrzennej*, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1984, p. 75.

⁵ K. Heffner, *Konkurencyjność małych regionów i znaczenie aglomeracji miejskich w ich rozwoju*, in: *Agglomeracja miejska i jej znaczenie dla konkurencyjności miast i regionów*, ed. K. Szolęk, Publishing House of the Department of Economic Policy and European Regional Studies of the Wrocław University of Economics, Biblioteka Regionalisty No. 2, Wrocław 2002, p. 52.

systems. Consequently, it may turn out that the growing increment in the size of an urban centre actually limits its functions.

Based on such considerations, one may reach a conclusion that large centres emerging as a result of the space metropolisation process, by participating in production, export, import, investment, scientific collaboration, cultural exchange etc., become more independent of smaller municipalities. It also means that the space metropolisation process can be perceived in a twofold manner: on one hand, from the perspective of a certain population inhabiting the given socioeconomic space, and on the other hand, from the perspective of concentration of specific functions and institutions.

3. Knowledge as a development driver

It should be stressed in the first instance that, in the age of globalisation, liberalisation, internationalisation and metropolisation of socioeconomic space, standard growth factors become less and less important to the benefit of knowledge. "However, unlike with material resources, knowledge is scattered, variable and does not constitute any company's property"⁶. It also requires emphasising the fact that the contemporary market organises economic activity around knowledge, which means that it is a factor that keeps developing and that it is generally possible under the conditions of full collaboration. "From an economic point of view, knowledge is an important component of the economic infrastructure and market processes, however, it constitutes public good which becomes materialised in artefacts and realised in education of individual persons. It has been qualified among new production factors, but it is not merely a simple sum. As a new factor, it has been responsible for redefinition of the old ones, and all these changes take place in the process of their dematerialisation"⁷.

More and more is currently being said about knowledge management or knowledge-based economy (KBE). The content of this notion may be assigned at least four interpretations⁸:

- knowledge-based economy constitutes a sphere of an economy type where development is achieved under predominant influence of science or scientific knowledge prevailing over other factors,

⁶ M. Leszczyński, *Wiedza czynnikiem rozwoju regionu*, in: *Gospodarka lokalna i regionalna – wybrane aspekty*, Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Kielce 2011, p. 133.

⁷ S. Korenik, *Region ekonomiczny*, CeDeWu, Warszawa 2011, p. 33.

⁸ Z. Chojnicki, T. Czyż, *Aspekty regionalne w gospodarce opartej na wiedzy w Polsce*, Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Poznań 2006, pp. 18-19.

– knowledge-based economy is a part of economy driven by technological knowledge or innovations based upon it, which may be applied in production of goods and services. In this respect, special importance is attached to ICT innovations,

– knowledge-based economy is not only created by innovative correlations, but also by processes of learning and educating of economic entities, both in the preparatory stage and in the course of the economic activity. From the perspective of education, knowledge-based economy is envisaged to constitute economy of “learning people” (the notion of human capital is based on the same assumptions),

– besides innovativeness and education, knowledge-based economy is also characterised by specific organisational and institutional conditions of economic activity which influence the absorption of knowledge and innovation as well as the competitiveness of economy. The foregoing also applies to the social sphere, including the creation of social capital and implementation of an appropriate state educational policy.

In the contemporary world, one of the most important phenomena driving success has become innovativeness, currently also a key factor of competitiveness. Therefore, a significant element of knowledge management is innovation. According to Castells, innovation is the single main source of productiveness, whereas knowledge and information provide grounds for the management process. Then there is also education, which is becoming a key property of work. It threatens people who are not able to raise their professional qualifications on an ongoing basis with marginalisation. All elements of life are becoming more and more networked. New economic rules manifest themselves in the transfer towards flexible production, targeting a certain individualised recipient (market), where quality play a key role. Economies of scale have replaced economies of scope.

The very notions of knowledge-based economy, knowledge management, intellectual capital, and many other derivative terms, have recently become specific buzzwords used, without much reflection, in various statements. Determining the specificity of knowledge as a resource should enable assessment of its economic significance, since the crisis has evidenced that we are well past the times of proven solutions understood as repeatable, standard activities based on commonly recognised patterns. What seems to be growing in importance in a local scale is the element of collaboration between various entities and persons, since creative, innovative solutions emerge in the process of multifaceted interaction. And hence the best space appears to be a region (microregion), since the physical proximity, cultural bonds, similar values and trust are the best grounds for development of different forms of flexible horizontal (non-hierarchical) connections, where the interactions taking place are origins of innovation.

4. Selected problems of peripheries under the new development paradigm

Both the contemporary globalisation of the international economy and its consequences, which manifest themselves in the metropolisation of socioeconomic space, including the grounds for emergence of knowledge-based economy, just to mention one of its faces, does not favour small, peripheral entities. Growing barriers of demand for goods and workforce are to be associated with technological development to a great extent. Automation and robotisation stand for development, but also for a phenomenon which constrains employment and wages, thus disturbing the principles of revenue division in the society. Under such circumstances, it is very difficult to meet such conditions as to make the production level generate demand and market. Hence the workforce absorption capacity of economic growth is declining. Competition as well as the pursuit of cost cutting and performance increase create pressure upon employment and salary reduction, which then disturbs the creation of demand that market economy depends on. And hence we have been facing a classical demand phenomenon, namely a sheep herd instinct to acquire shares of the new economy. This situation is directly translated into a local level.

As regards symptoms of globalisation, one may claim that the development of such elements as local scale intellectual capital, to name but one, will be heavily diversified across individual industries (networks) in the future. For instance, shortage of higher education schools or workplaces where state-of-the-art (R&D) technologies are applied will not strengthen the local intellectual capital, and neither will it become a factor stimulating the development of ICT technologies in the processes of keeping up with the development typical for such industries. Such a situation will trigger even greater disproportions penetrating the local environment, thus intensifying its marginalisation.

As far as the growing liberalisation is concerned, one should certainly mention the fact that it leads to dangerous competition not only between privately-owned businesses, but primarily between public entities. Spatial administration units, such as communes, which apply benchmarking, basically implement and practice rankings enabling them to become eligible to acquire funds from outside when the standing of their own budgets keeps deteriorating. What follows is a process of obligatory networking of communes which not entirely stems from the objective and commonly recognised social and economic criteria. The proverbial leader's role in the process of blending is often assumed by an administrative district (poviat), referring to the coordinative activity of communes, but what actually lies beneath such an initiative is a phenomenon of the budget deficit among administrative districts which must apply for financial

engineering instruments along with communes, and often even for the most fundamental undertakings.

Not only did the decentralisation processes, which started spreading across the proverbial “bottom” to a degree far larger than expected, weaken local sectors such as industry, agriculture, trade, fishery, tourism, safety etc., as well as spatial policy in the scope of development of new management forms, but primarily evidence the “erosion” of resources towards larger centres, thus strengthening them both in social and economic terms, additionally contributing to further weakening of smaller territorial entities. And therefore one is not mistaken claiming that, in certain cases, what we actually face is pathologisation of smaller units, not only from the angle of revenues, but also entailing technical, social or communicational infrastructure. As regards the second group mentioned, they are rather associated with threats (barriers) for local growth which manifest themselves in specific conflicts between local authorities with reference to strategic trends of development, the source of which is yearning for power without comprehension of the nature of public interest. Consequently, making a reference to local growth, one should definitely not object to a statement that, in fact, it does occur and is positively perceived in large urban centres (agglomerations, metropolitan areas), whereas its negative perception is mainly a domain of smaller territorial units, peripheral to the agglomeration. Specific “remoteness” between polarised local development areas within the same region is often not compensated through such instruments as, for instance, intraregional policy which, in turn, determines inter-regional policy, thus weakening it to a certain extent. The evident disproportions on the local development level most certainly confirm such a perspective, whereas the time factor, in this particular case, intensifies these disproportions even further. One may even claim that perception of spatial socioeconomic aspects, innovative aspects and broadly understood social processes is gradually changing.

The foregoing only confirms that we have faced a phenomenon of anisotropisation⁹ which consists in accumulation (compaction) of economic activity around active economic centres (usually large, modern metropolitan centres) and fading (dilution) of economic activity proportionally to a distance from them. It triggers a number of effects, including marginalisation of peripheries becoming poorer and poorer. It has a direct impact on the development of functions of the given socioeconomic system where, for instance, the rural style vanishes in favour of the urban style, but also affects the division of material, financial as well as human resources.

By strengthening the position of large cities, spatial economic networks emerge, and a network-type system of connections develops between them. Such specific network conglomerates perform what is referred to as network collectivism

⁹ S. Korenik, *Region ekonomiczny...*, p. 89.

which determines the behaviour of the governmental and self-governmental sector, identifying and, at the same time, highlighting positions of these sectors in the economy as well as problems involved in collaboration. It primarily applies to possibilities of creating common platforms of financial engineering and acquiring funds for shared tasks, at the same time. This, in turn, causes a “tunnel effect”, as it is referred to, the nature of which is that areas located outside of a system of large cities make use of its positive effects to a negligible extent, and often by no means whatsoever. Among the rare cases showing that it is not the case, one may only speak of the European Union structural funds being accessed. The only example worth being mentioned in this respect is a platform of collaboration between the chosen local self-governmental unit and the Marshal’s Office of a large municipality (Human Capital Regional Operational Programme and the projects implemented within the framework of these schemes). It is also an example showing the element of hierarchisation of priorities, but also of the networks themselves (national, regional, local ones).

Under such conditions, the role of smaller territorial units, and primarily the peripheral ones (often of rural or rural-urban nature), should be strengthened through grass-roots initiatives. Without assistance of local authorities, such initiatives will never penetrate the metropolis in order to hamper the phenomenon of space discontinuity (breaking), and hence marginalisation of the role played by smaller municipalities in regional development. One may refer to the practice showing that what is needed is the common values for building (filling) of the gap between centres and peripheries. The role of local self-governments as a bridging link is indispensable in such conditions. This arrangement needs mutual influence (permeation) in a bottom-top configuration, i.e. from the commune to the province, according to the principle of subsidiarity. What is at play in this case is also some reverse actions, i.e. particular subsidiarity assuming to form of subsidies, grants etc., or in other words, specific consolidation of economic functions of large and small municipalities through a shared regional and local financial scheme. The necessity of the said consolidation under the new socioeconomic conditions raises considerable difficulties, yet it is by no means unattainable, at least to a degree enabling efforts to be made to counteract unemployment at a local labour market.

Conclusions

The new paradigm of growth leads to spatial reorganisation of the economy, including the relationship changes it induces between the metropolis and its regional surrounding. What we basically observe in practice is a process

of the metropolis networking under an international network of large cities, which actually leads to an equally high rate of decline in the significance of their relationships with the surrounding as the willingness to participate in the network. Under such conditions of economic activity, global corporations tend to allocate their businesses in places where no one actually controls them and, at the same time, where there are expensive recipients. Unfortunately, territorial units referred to as peripheries (communes, administrative districts) are no such places, since – like other units of territorial administration performing similar functions – they do not have the means required to become involved in more serious projects, mainly investments. The explicitly emphasised discontinuity of space between such territorial units, just to mention metropolises, may pose threats of increased isolation of such spaces, at the same time leading to a decay of endogenous factors capable of fitting into the networked system of mutual dependencies in the region. It may also mean that peripheries will keep growing in their peripherality, whereas large centres will strengthen their position due to a lack of interest in the situation of other municipalities. It may even be called “double peripherality” (both social and economic), which can deepen the disproportions on the given region’s map even further. Hence the force of impact of exogenous factors (impulses flowing from the metropolis) will be too small to create synergy with endogenous factors.

Symptoms of knowledge-based economy entering peripheries are currently incidental which further contributes to the asymmetry between the units in question. The need for ongoing adjustment to turbulent changes of the environment induces more and more serious threats to the local dimension, and hence to local self-governmental institutions as well. On the other hand, the division of a region’s socioeconomic space into peripheries, semi-peripheries and metropolises triggers a kind of isolation and tight closure of smaller units. They are simply incapable of absorbing the solutions applied by metropolises, and by themselves, they cannot permeate the network of horizontal regional correlations leading to various mutual transactions. It means that the contemporary local development is becoming a new category, and one facing more and more serious barriers.

References

- Chojnicki Z., Czyż T., *Aspekty regionalne w gospodarce opartej na wiedzy w Polsce*, Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Poznań 2006.
- Heffner K., *Konkurencyjność małych regionów i znaczenie aglomeracji miejskich w ich rozwoju*, in: *Aglomeracja miejska i jej znaczenie dla konkurencyjności miast i regionów*, ed. K. Szolek, Publishing House of the Department of Economic Policy and European Regional Studies of the Wrocław University of Economics, Biblioteka Regionalisty No. 2, Wrocław 2002.

- Jałowiecki B., Szczepański M.S., *Miasto i przestrzeń w perspektywie socjologicznej*, Scholar, Warszawa 2002.
- Korenik S., *Region ekonomiczny*, CeDeWu, Warszawa 2011.
- Kwiatek-Sołtys A., *Dynamika zaludnienia a zmiany w użytkowaniu przestrzeni małych miast w Polsce*, in: *Przemiany przestrzeni miast i stref podmiejskich*, ed. J. Słodczyk, R. Klimek, Opole University, Opole 2006.
- Leszczyński M., *Wiedza czynnikiem rozwoju regionu*, in: *Gospodarka lokalna i regionalna – wybrane aspekty*, Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Kielce 2011.
- Malisz B., *Podstawy gospodarki przestrzennej*, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1984.

Funkcjonowanie obszarów peryferyjnych w warunkach metropolizacji przestrzeni i gospodarki opartej na wiedzy – wybrane aspekty

Streszczenie. Współczesne gospodarowanie w przekrojach lokalnych nie należy do procesów łatwych, zupełnie inny bowiem wydaje się zbiór narzędzi niezbędnych do zarządzania rozwojem lokalnym w gospodarce w układzie centralnym, a jeszcze inny w sytuacji występowania nowych uwarunkowań społeczno-gospodarczych, w których zaczęły dominować relacje poziome w ramach kolektywizmu działalności podmiotów gospodarczych (sieci). Takie cechy, jak m.in. odmienny sens wielkości, żywiołowa zdolność do tworzenia skupisk, równość uczestników, reitermediacja sprzyjająca budowaniu gospodarki opartej na wiedzy, stają się siłą napędową rozwoju integracji regionalnej, mającej źródło w procesach pogłębiania współzależności gospodarczych i politycznej państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Swego rodzaju sukcesy gospodarcze krajów UE doprowadziły do popularyzowania wielu koncepcji kształtowania współczesnej gospodarki, gdzie jedną z nich jest kreacja gospodarki opartej na wiedzy (GOW). Oznacza to, że w różnych przekrojach gospodarowania, głównym motorem powinna być innowacja, która stanowić ma czynnik stwarzający przewagę konkurencyjną, opierający się na potencjale endogenicznym. Nie wydaje się jednak, że kształtowanie tych procesów jest dla wszystkich możliwe szczególnie w przekrojach regionalnych i lokalnych. Występująca polaryzacja przestrzeni społeczno-ekonomicznej nie tylko na arenie krajowej, ale i regionalnej (wewnątrz regionu) jest tego potwierdzeniem. Pojawiające się peryferie mocno polaryzują społeczność, a coraz większe bariery natury finansowej nie sprzyjają rozwojowi takich obszarów. Zanik funkcji egzogenicznych przy jednoczesnym braku możliwości indukowania funkcji endogenicznych tworzy swego rodzaju lukę w przestrzeni.

Słowa kluczowe: peryferie, metropolizacja, przestrzeń peryferyjna, globalizacja