"Integrated" in Regional Development Discourse, Policy and Practice

Selected Perspectives, Candidate Indicators, Measures, Research Questions and Critical Reflection in the Context of New Regionalism.

" …. regional planning strives to achieve a better integration of spatially organized economies on a basis of *interdependence* (*and reciprocity*) rather than *dependence* (*and exploitation*)."

Friedmann (1975; 803).

Introduction

This resource paper is designed to explore, in a selective manner, various perspectives on the oft-used term or concept of "integrated", especially as it is found in policy, practice and research in regional development and planning. Following a presentation of a number of perspectives that might be embedded in an "integrated" approach to development planning, many of them overlapping, candidate research indicators are suggested. From there a number of measures are presented for each indicator, and then these are translated into a set of concrete questions that might be posed in researching the presence, intensity or absence of these various perspectives in actual policy and practice contexts.

This is followed by a commentary reflecting on some cross-cutting themes and issues evident in this sample of perspectives. Finally, the paper attaches this exploration to the current concept or conceptual framework of *New Regionalism* and the four companion sub-concepts associated with this in the academic and professional discourse.

The word, idea or concept of "integrated" in regional development has a very long and diverse pedigree (e.g. Mumford, 1938; Krueger et al, 1963; Friedmann, 1975, 1987). Its substance, however, stretches from the inspirational and lofty ideal of normative aspirations, the well intentioned requisites of professional practice, a central concept in much of our theorizing, and the pragmatics of operational or technical specifications, on to what is now a jaded prefix in much political rhetoric, and to an unconscious piece of jargon, long devoid of meaning or even intent. In short, we know of it in many guises.

"Integrated" – Selected Perspectives

Here we will sample from across this spectrum, focusing on the more formal and substantive use of the concept, to garner a better informed and critical appreciation of what this term might mean in Canadian regional development contexts.

The Multidisciplinary and Interdisciplinary Perspective

In much of the regional development literature, as well as the local development literature "integrated" has been associated, either implicitly or explicitly with either a *multidisciplinary* or an *interdisciplinary* perspective. We will not get into the extended academic discourse associated with these two concepts here. Suffice to note that, for example, perspectives from Economics would be combined in whatever manner with perspectives from the disciplines of (say) Sociology, or Political Science. This understanding of the concept of "integrated" has attained something of a normative status in development planning and management, as recognition of both the shortcomings of previous perspectives, dominantly those from Economics, and the real world complexity of regional and other development contexts. To be thorough, incisive and effectively analytical we are expected to frame and conduct our analyses in this manner.

Sometimes this is formalized in a particular methodology or technique as in Integrated Assessment or IA (Rotmans and Dowlatabadi, 1998). It is suggested that much of this perspective has been informed by an egalitarian communicative rationality, stemming at least in part from Habermas and associates in critical theory (Tansey, 2005). Related to this, a central concern of IA has been to integrate the often arcane and inaccessible language and concepts in the physical and biophysical sciences with the social sciences, notably through public participatory processes.

Candidate Indicators

These might include social, environmental, political, cultural as well as economic topics on the policy and practice agendas, such as housing, health, political organization, heritage resources, education, culture, elder care, child care, biological diversity, recreation, and the arts.

Candidate Measures

These would be very diverse including, for example, housing units, housing conditions, housing affordability, health centres, school spaces, courses on local history, local arts festivals and investments, spaces in homes for the elderly, child care workers, physical infrastructure, heritage buildings and sites, museums, art galleries, industrial parks, businesses, shopping facilities, parks and recreation facilities, recreation programmes, energy sources, local government functions, resources and facilities, and many others.

Candidate Research Questions

Field and other research questions might include:

- Please indicate under what topics or headings were ten (10) of the region's problems and/or opportunities categorized (prompt - "labour force out-migration", "cultural vitality", "natural areas degradation")?

- What social factors, if any, were explicitly brought into the economic analysis (e.g. of the labour force, of the business profile, of growth)?
- Was the question of culture related to local government services and development in the plan?
- Was the region's history and heritage related to economic growth potentials and targets in the plan? If so, how was this done?
- What are the regional plan's specific objectives for social development?
- What are the regional plan's specific objectives for environmental enhancement and management?

The 'Other than Economic' Perspective

Another overlapping perspective (with the *interdisciplinary* perspective) promotes an "integrated" perspective in regional development and planning as a purposeful tempering of the hegemony associated with the long-established economic perspective (e.g. Friedmann and Alonso, 1976). This *other than economic* meaning of an "integrated" approach sometimes serves to augment or perhaps moderate what is seen as the dominant economistic perspectives at hand, or to preempt their anticipated dominance by assertively bringing in anthropological, ideological and other perspectives. This perspective is not necessarily the preserve of what might be called oppositional sources.

> "We take an integrated view of prosperity, looking beyond economic measures to include the importance of quality of place and the development of people's creative potential."

> Martin Prosperity Institute, University of Toronto, 2012.

Sometimes the insertion of the social dimension of community in regional development is the primary agenda here (e.g. women, poverty, families, human welfare). It is often oppositional in tone and intent. Overlapping this is the so-called "alternative Economics" perspective (e.g. Schumacher, 1973, Ekins, 1986; Max-Neef and Ekins, 1992; Ross & Usher, 1986) which attempts to take a more holistic view of contexts and episodes, by reforming the conventionally applied Economics theory and concepts.

The emergence of sustainable development as an agenda item, and sometimes a focus of attention since the 1970s, might be interpreted as the quintessential rejection of the narrowly defined economic perspective (e.g. Rees, 1989, 1991; Canadian Institute of Planners, 1990). This could also been seen as a vigorous attempt to at once diversify the approach to development to include the evident realities of ecological limits (e.g. Rees, 1989), while at the same time rejecting the circumscribed and inadequate economic logic and its assumptions and ascribing to it an historical role as the source of many of the persistent problems and failures of the development project itself (e.g. Henderson, 1978; Ekins, 1986; Sachs, 2003).

Candidate Indicators

Alternative Economics perspectives in policy and practice will extend the ambit of the conventional calculus to (for example) household management, whole economy metrics which will include activities in the informal, familial, cultural and other areas in the real economy, natural systems accounting, societal 'happiness', self-reliance measures, and degrees of dependency.

Power as an explicit topic of policy design and development planning practice might be included here among the indicators.

Candidate Measures

Among these might be "quality of life" indices, social economy enterprises, measures of voluntarism, satisfaction or 'happiness' scales, sense of place response measures, mutual aid and sharing scales, inventories of so-called green enterprises, profiles of gender diversity in business activity, profiles of family owned and operated enterprises, different social capitals (e.g. associative, communal), attitudinal measures on welfare, equity and social distribution, and others.

Candidate Research Questions

The research questions here might include

- On the scale provided please indicate the degree to which the question of personal security is addressed in policy and/or practice for the regional development agenda.
- Is the distribution of livelihood opportunities among all of the resident population addressed in the regional development agenda? If so, please describe.
- Is cultural development a part of the regional development plan here? If so, please describe.
- What sectors make up the entire regional economy?

- Is the question of "healthy communities" explicitly addressed in the regional development policy? If so, how is this described?

- What was the source(s) for the definition and delineation of the regional "economy"?

The Levels of Government Perspective

Another use of the term "integrated" relates to the expressed need to address development issues in the context of *multiple levels of government*. Even before the formal articulation of the concept of globalization (e.g. Dicken, 2003; Amin and Thrift, 2000; McMichael, 2004), regional development and regional planning have long been aware of the issues associated with layered political jurisdictions (e.g. Perks and Robinson, 1979). Scott has suggested that the difficulties of policy integration across the various levels of government are due to "compartmentalized policy delivery, the

exclusion of many relevant stakeholders and jurisdictional fragmentation" (Scott, 2008, p.3). The attachment or 'joining up' if not the integration of policy fields and their associated programmes and projects has been the subject of a significant body of literature and practice here. It should be noted that the challenging question of scale, which is not synonymous with level, overlaps this perspective.

A diversity of issues ranging from bureaucratic clutter, duplication, contradictions, administrative rivalries, inefficiencies, political "turf", and missed opportunities for synergies, to the need for more "joined up government" drive this perspective. Emergent responses touch on what today is increasingly addressed under the concept of multi-level systems of governance (OECD, 2011). Through this it is postulated that in the current conditions of scarce public resources for regional development and the evident need to re-position development policy away from redistributive subsidies toward asset-based territorial investment " … multi-level governance instruments are among the few remaining tools to implement growth policies effectively." (Ibid., 22),

Candidate Indicators

Relevant indicators here might include explicit reference to Federal government policies, programmes, projects and practices, NAFTA policies, other Provincial policies, programmes and projects, as well as Municipal policies, programmes, projects and practices, in the formulation of regional development policies, plans and programmes, and in development planning practice.

Candidate Measures

These might include the number of explicit references to policies, programmes and projects from various levels of government, substantial treatments of particular policies or other issues emanating from various levels of government, the evidence of research, reports, data, briefs and other materials emanating from different levels of government, the presence of representatives from different levels of government on the regional development planning advisory, steering, management, technical and other committees or task forces, the administrative process for plan design, refinement, draft approval and final adoption, and other measures.

Candidate Research Questions

The field and other research questions could include the following

- What is the governmental make-up of your Steering Committee or equivalent for this project?
- What is the public policy agency process for draft plan review and response, and for final plan approval and adoption?
- What are the major policies and other initiatives from *other* levels of government that have influenced (a) the formulation of the issues and objectives of the development policy and plan, (b) the design of the research, (c) the process for

designing the plan itself, (d) the identification of development alternatives, and (e) the selection of a final alternative for regional development here?

- What has been done, organizationally, through communications, through formal agreements (e.g. MOUs), in monitoring and evaluation, and otherwise, to "join up" public policies and programmes in the development plan?

The Counter-Silo Perspective

For quite some time it has become fashionable to identify so-called endemic 'silo' predilections in bureaucratic behaviour where portfolios, budgets and political capital are protected and a minimum of sharing and collaboration is pursued with other ministries, departments or agencies in the same organization. It is generally associated with large government, though it is well known that such behaviour is far from the preserve of public bureaucracies.

To counter the isolation and insulation that occurs when one part of an organization refuses to work with another part, each referred to as 'silos', there has emerged a policy and practice that purposefully sets out to alleviate if not eradicate this behaviour. Here we refer to this practice to further the integration of policies, programmes, projects and practices as the *'counter-silo'* perspective.

Some of these practices are associated with so-called matrix management, which has been criticized by the management theorist and celebrity Peter Drucker (Drucker, 1998). Some of it is associated with progressive 'total quality control' ideas and multi-functional team processes emanating from Japanese industry after the mid-20th century. Examples in Canada of attempts to integrate complementary portfolios include the large scale *Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs* (TEIGA) in Ontario in the 1970s, where the responsibilities for regional development, local government, long range strategic planning, economic development and other fields were closely bound up with the Province's budgetary functions. More recently the Federal government struck an interdepartmental committee on rural development to link all departments' interests and activities in this eclectic field. This was followed by the formalization of the *Rural Development Network* (RDN) within the government of Canada. The *Rural and Co-operatives Secretariat*, the remnants of which were recently housed within the department called Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, was the permanent organization to service this multi-portfolio network. There are many more examples of continuing attempts to eradicate the isolationism associated with these 'silos' and to foster interdepartmental collaboration and inter-agency initiatives.

Candidate Indicators

In the policy arena typical indicators might include formal official statements fostering the breaking down of interdepartmental boundaries and obstacles for collaboration, critical examinations (often commissioned) of duplication, poor communications and inefficiencies, and incentives for collaboration, liaison and coordination.

In programmes and projects the indicators will identify specific bridge-building groups or processes that cut across guarded portfolios and long established domains of responsibility. They might be newly structured inter-agency boards or similar groups, secretariats that cut across (and perhaps integrate) departments and other organizations, a specialized task group that spans a set of portfolios, and/or the appointment of a senior official with direct reporting responsibilities to the board, governors, Minister, cabinet or similar overarching power centre.

Candidate Measures

Measures identifying the response to the 'silo' syndrome could encompass the (relative) budgetary investment in the new integrating or coordinating agency or person, the term of office provided for in the initiative (e.g. 18 months, 5 years, unspecified), the bureaucratic status of the senior appointment (e.g. Vice-President, Deputy Minister), and the specifics of the remit which might range from monitor and report, to encourage and promote collaboration, on to the authority to enforce coordination and substantive integration.

Measures here can range from those that record what has been put in place to minimize or eradicate the 'silo' syndrome, to those that record what has been achieved to deconstruct the 'silos' and their practices.

Candidate Research Questions

- Is there any evidence of what has been referred to as the bureaucratic 'silo mentality' in any organization (private, public, community) associated with the design and implementation of the regional development plan?

- If there are no concerns regarding this issue, what has contributed to the climate of interdepartmental and inter-agency coordination and collaboration here?

- If there are no concerns, but the practice does exist, why has it continued here?

- What is the nature of the initiatives in policy and practice that have been pursued to address this issue?

- What have been the results of these initiatives to date?

- What factors militated against their success to date?

- What factors contributed to their success to date?

The Participation Perspective

Another perspective on the notion of "integrated" planning and management relates to the question of *participation*. This has been a central concern in planning, whether in urban,

neighbourhood or regional contexts (e.g. Arnstein, 1969; Thompson, 1976; Douglas, 1988; Murray, 2010). Ethical and other issues around inclusion, access, recognizing the plurality of communities, achieving what has been termed "voice", addressing gender and other issues, have all engendered a demand for more integrat*ing* processes in planning, whether it is regulatory planning (Caldwell, 2010) or development planning. In contemporary Canada it may encompass new Canadians, the poor, youth, small business, those in social housing, First Nations, women, those with physical and other challenges which militate against their engagement in the development process, and many others. Interestingly enough "inclusion" has emerged as a specific foundational objective in the *Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020* (Schmitt, 2011).

Candidate Indicators

In the policy arena one might look for explicit commitment to inclusive *intent* and *process*.

In programme(s) and practice indicators might include explicit reference to participatory process, method and techniques, such as the use of social media, town hall meetings, community charrettes, consultative design, focus groups, facilitation processes, and engagement of specialist practitioners. Likewise one might inspect the make-up of technical, advisory, management and other committees, task groups and others to construct indicators of outreach, participation and inclusion.

Candidate Measures

These could include the number of public events held, the location of events, the diversity of media used to communicate (e.g. cable TV, twitter, newspapers, community bulletin boards), explicit measures to address youth, women, First Nations, small businesses, and others, the allocated budget for participatory process, the professional fees for facilitators, the evidence of feedback processes, the presence of the public in the plan finalization and approval stages, weightings allocated to public inputs (e.g. different development priorities), investments in negotiation and mediation processes, time adjustments and other measures of flexibility and responsiveness, investment in a variety of languages for communication, and other measures.

Candidate Research Questions

The research questions might include the following

- What role, if any, did the general public (not only formally organized interest groups) play in the final selection of the development strategy here?
- Have any (and how many) public events been held in each phase of the regional development planning process?
- What was the locational distribution of these?
- What media were used in the process?

- ▪ What provisions were made to ensure access for *all* interested residents (e.g. hearing impaired, youth, new Canadians)?

The Efficiency and Effectiveness Perspective

Another facet to this notion or concept of "integrated" emanates from the drive to secure desired or required *efficiencies*, or degrees of demonstrated *effectiveness*. An "integrated" approach is recognized as demonstrably more scientific, rigorous and systematic than other approaches. Much of this is associated with operations analysis and management science, and what has now become a diverse literature in evaluation. Not surprisingly a significant proportion of this may be sourced in public administration and associated concepts of the New Public Management (NPM) from, amongst others, Osborne and Gaebler (1992). Likewise, it is associated with a desire to determine and measure *ex ante* the efficacy of proposed regional and other development programmes and projects. In the managerial turn which we have witnessed over the last two decades one associates this perspective on "integrated" with the drive to "streamline" and "right size" government and all the trappings of governing (e.g. Douglas, 2005).

Candidate Indicators

In policy one might look to explicit commitment to, and expectation of formal evaluation, and reference to the concepts of effectiveness, efficiency and economy, as well as measurable 'deliverables' for the regional development initiative.

In programme(s) and practice the setting of specific goals and objectives and in some instances targets, would be indicative of the presence of this perspective. In addition, the identification of formalized units of measurement for (a) outputs, and (b) outcomes might be expected. Monitoring as a concrete programmatic commitment, some emphasis on quantitative indicators, as well as net benefits, value for money, multiplier effects of investments, and short term returns to discrete projects would all be expected indicators here.

Candidate Measures

Among the measures which might be appropriate here is the presence of formal assessment procedures (e.g. cost-benefit analysis), the presence of formal monitoring and evaluation procedures (e.g. logical framework analysis), the presence of formalized plan management protocols (e.g. MBO measures, results-based management), evidence of cost management metrics, explicit targets and benchmarks (e.g. employment levels, visitor volumes), perhaps some preference for PPP approaches to project identification and implementation, and other measures.

Candidate Research Questions

Research questions here may focus on

- Does the regional plan have a formal M&E component built into its implementation and management?
- Besides development objectives does the plan have explicit output targets?
- Does the development plan here explicitly link output targets (e.g. river lands protection, visitor volume increases) with the requisite and specific input requirements (e.g. capital budgets, pre-completed projects)?
- What components of the plan implementation agenda have been assigned costs, in terms of capital and operational costs?
- Which development objectives have been selected on the basis of cost minimization?
- What weight was accorded to input costs in the selection of the plan's development priorities and output targets?

The Holistic Human Perspective

Yet another perspective on the concept of "integrated" might be called a *holistic human* perspective. While overlapping with a number of other perspectives this has attempted to cover all the human dimensions of the development enterprise, from basic physiological needs to self-actualization. Some of this perspective has informed the so-called Basic Needs approach to development in the 1970s (e.g. Hettne, 1995), as it has influenced the Sustainable Livelihoods approach to livelihood strategies in developing contexts (e.g. Scoones, 1998; DFID, 2007). Its Maslovian footings are self-evident, while not always explicitly articulated as such. It is associated with concepts of modernity and modernization, with the concomitant notions of a changed human being, equipped with new attitudes (e.g. individualism, market rationality) and capacities, and released from the dominance of basic physiological imperatives, the normative sanctions from folklore, and the priorities of personal security.

Candidate Indicators

In policy we might look for explicit references to a rounded, complete approach to the regional development problem, well beyond the confines of conventional economic or physical perspectives to encompass spiritual, cultural, political, aesthetic, physiological and other dimensions of the human condition and "development'. It is diverse like as a multidisciplinary approach might be, but does not confine itself to the categories of formal disciplines.

In programme(s) and practice one might look to intensive degrees of purposeful connectedness in planning topics, connecting for example the biophysical environment and enterprise development, connecting social attitudes and public housing, linking youth and community culture, making the tiers between tourism and social cohesion, associating community health and transportation planning, and connecting aging with police services and personal security.

Candidate Measures

Typical measures here might include various attitudinal scales addressing a full range of human conditions (e.g. personal safety, fulfillment, self-esteem), interpersonal relations (e.g. friendliness, reciprocity, support), development priorities (e.g. quiet neighbourhoods, maintaining the 'rural' nature of the community), the question of the health and integrity of the community itself, conflict, power, tensions, local democracy, ethno-cultural identity, the availability of 'good jobs', and other measures.

Candidate Research Questions

The research questions addressing this perspective might include the following

- Does the development policy and plan here explicitly deal with (a) questions of personal security, (b) the spiritual dimension of residents' lives, (c) the collective sense of community pride, and/or (d) issues around racial, cultural, socioeconomic and other forms of discrimination?
- How does the plan connect environmental health and community wellbeing?
- How does the plan address the question of the family and household life-cycle in the community?
- What objectives does the plan contain for the alleviation of risk, deprivation, and marginalization among a proportion of the region's residents?

The Community Development Perspective

This perspective has a very long and diverse lineage (e.g. Loomis, 1966; Cary, Jr. 1970; Chekki, 1979; Holdcroft, 1982; Douglas, 1987, 1993, 2010). Sometimes referred to as "community organizing" this perspective from policy and practice, and to a lesser extent from theory and research, brings a very strong normative, applied and activist dimension to rural and regional development policy and planning (e.g. Melnyk, 1985; MacLeod, 1975; Lotz, 1998). Notwithstanding some of its solid foundations in the social sciences, community development tends to be practice rich and theory poor (Douglas, 2010). Addressing the welfare of communities, and their members (e.g. households, youth, the poor), this perspective comfortably incorporates a variety of disciplinary concepts (e.g. power, hierarchy, exclusion). By its very nature it cultivates a synthetic appreciation of issues, opportunities and challenges (e.g. homelessness, family violence), and easily facilitates an action research approach to development planning. While it has been interpreted as teleological in its theoretical foundations (e.g. Battachharaya, 2004), because of its goal-oriented and solutions bearing focus, community development policy and practice is highly informed by practice, and not infrequently by contest and advocacy. So consultation, engagement, public participation, inclusion and proactive outreach are hallmarks of the local democratic process that is characteristic of community development. Attention to social and economic, as well as political equity is embedded in the development process.

Candidate Indicators

While the terms "community" and "community development" are used quite liberally, indeed loosely, an organization pursuing a community development or CD approach will explicitly emphasize the participatory and equity dimensions of development. It might even state that is has chosen a CD approach, over other more conventional approaches (e.g. statutory, bureaucratic, laissez faire) and will demonstrate a grassroots or so-called bottom-up approach to setting development priorities, goals and objectives. Land use planning, recreation facilities and programme management, housing provision and other activities will be informed by a strong participatory process, by the explicit inclusion of social, cultural and other perspectives, and by concrete attention to diversity within the beneficiary population (e.g. gender, age, income). The organization itself might have advisory bodies, board membership, staff and other resources that clearly reflect the broader development agenda, beyond the conventional economic (e.g. enterprise development), infrastructure (e.g. roads, arenas) and other items on the usual development agenda. Attention to access and distribution (e.g. proportion of low income families engaged in youth recreation programmes) will be indicative of the social justice agenda here.

Candidate Research Questions

- Is the question of social justice an explicit or an implicit topic in the development plan?
- Has the development policy and plan information on income distribution and trends?
- Are there explicit objectives, and maybe targets, regarding household income distribution?
- Does the development policy integrate social and cultural factors in the priorities and objectives for employment and business development in the area?
- Are community and social service organizations, such as the Salvation Army, a women's shelter, a youth drop-in centre or equivalent, and others directly involved in the development plan or strategy?
- Does the organization have professional staff with formal qualifications in community development, social work, or social planning?

The Comprehensive Planning Perspective

This is a perspective long grounded in the tradition of urban and regional planning (e.g. Banfield, 1959; Faludi, 1984; Breheny and Hooper, 1985; Friedmann, 1987; Almendinger, 2002). The Weberian rationality underpinning the emergence of what became formal planning procedures demanded that the survey, analysis, plan design, and planning itself secure a *comprehensive* understanding of the development context, and the issues at hand. Anything less would risk missing important dimensions of the situation, and possibly significant interrelationships among the myriad of factors operating in the milieu. It was argued that a set of plan alternatives could not be scientifically formulated without a thoroughgoing understanding of *all* facets of the situation. So the final plan, the recommended course of action logically emerging from the evaluation of the alternatives,

and one that best responded to the 'public interest', could and should emanate from a rational comprehensive process. This perspective has been subject to trenchant critique and challenge, especially since the 1980s (e.g. Forester, 1989, Friedmann, 1987). In the Canadian context Mitchell and others have attempted to distinguish between an integrated approach to watershed and natural resources planning, and what he regarded as the impracticalities of a conventional comprehensive approach (Mitchell, 2008).

Candidate Indicators

In policy the regional problem or set of issues will be couched in a broad-based and diverse set of perspectives.

The comprehensive perspectives will be especially evident in the research design and the science-based methodological framework for the analysis underpinning the plan itself. Disciplinary diversity (e.g. Economics, Political Science, Sociology), the breadth of topics addressed (e.g. transportation, fiscal management, water resources, cultural profiles, economic bases), and the range of problems and challenges (e.g. poverty, soil erosion, out-migration, competitiveness) will be indicative of comprehensiveness. Development objectives (e.g. population targets, industry mix targets) and associated criteria are conventional indicators of a rational comprehensive approach to integrated development planning.

However, the core indicators will emanate from the process, its step-wise rationality, its basis in comprehensive surveys and analyses, the use of forecasts and perhaps scenarios, the drawing up of a short-list of alternatives, the systematic comparative evaluation of these development alternatives, and the identification of a scientifically derived singular recommended design and course of action.

Candidate Measures

These will include metrics on demographics (e.g. age, sex, in/out-migration), employment (e.g. sector, industry, place-or-work/residence, occupation), housing (e.g. type, location, age), physical infrastructure (e.g. roads, rail, sewage systems, electricity), health care (e.g. clinics, practitioners, hospitals), land base (e.g. area, types, soils, ownership, physiography), culture (e.g. ethnicities, languages, religions), local government (e.g. type, fiscal condition, functions), economy (e.g. principal functions, business profile, growth record and potentials, development potentials/constraints), settlement system (e.g. towns and villages, functional differentiation, locational patterns), biophysical environment (e.g. eco-systems, flora and fauna, hazard lands), and many other measures.

Again, measures of the process will be central capturing its linear logic from analyses to development alternatives, to systematic assessment and identification of the "right" course of action.

Candidate Research Questions

This perspective will generate questions such as

- What does the regional development plan address in terms of the nature of the local economy as it relates to principal functions, specialization, diversity, growth record, constraints and potentials?
- Does the regional development policy and plan incorporate the principal policies and priorities in the regional communities Official Plans (or equivalents)?
- Does the regional plan address the housing type profile in the region, housing trends and issues?
- Do the regional development policy and the associated plan incorporate the local government system in the region, its mandate and functions, its priorities, constraints and potentials?
- Does the development policy and plan here explicitly link the recommended development agenda with the "public interest" (or "public good"), however expressed?
- Does the development policy and plan derive a recommended course of action from a multi-topic analysis of the region, encompassing for example the economy, environment, culture, social and other dimensions of the region?
- Does the singular development plan emerge from an explicit short-list of development alternatives and/or alternative strategies?
- Does the regional plan include an evaluation process for assessing the development alternatives?

The Politico-Territorial and Spatial Perspective

It might seem superfluous to specify the territorial or spatial dimension of regional development policy and planning, but it is not. The "region", however defined, can be taken for granted, as a given, with little reference to the implications or relevance of its geographical configuration. This can be the case, for example, when it is taken that the politically defined or administrative geographical categories we refer to as the "region" is assumed to be not only understood, but self-evident (e.g. the Prairies), or when it is taken as implicitly understood that the traditional or historical "region" (e.g. the Fenlands, the Basque region) is objectively fixed. While these perceptions are evident, there is also the purposeful design of regions (e.g. Friedmann and Weaver, 1979; Douglas, 2006) and notably their critical spatial dimensions, such as size, centre and boundaries. The *spatial* characteristics of the region matters, and indeed is increasingly understood to be a central facet of these entities. They are recognized as a pivotal operational dimension, *not* a passive dimension, relating to the integration of the development function itself and its objectives, as well as other considerations (e.g. Faludi, 2007, 2008).

The implicit and explicit association, if not the posited correlation between the distinctive spatial dimension of regional development policy and planning and integration is exemplified by Healy's comment that, "Spatial planning has traditionally provided a key tool for integration of economic, social and environmental considerations in land use and development" (Healy, 1999, p. …). The European Spatial Development Perspective

promotes 'territory' as a new dimension of European policy with the intent of achieving a better integration of sectoral policies and reconciling 'the social and economic claims for spatial development with the area's ecological and cultural functions', thus contributing to sustainable, balanced territorial development (ESDP, 1999, 10) "(Healy, 1999, p.1345).

Since time immemorial political leaders of fiefdoms, tribal lands, nation states and empires have been exercised with the need to minimize the centrifugal forces which dogged their territories and threatened dissension and disintegration. At the same time they were preoccupied with the imperative of maximizing the cohesive or centripetal forces which bound allegiances, and secured some stability. This spatial tension remains a challenge in regional design today, and the planning and implementation of development policies (Douglas, 2006). Here we refer to this dimension of integration as the *politico-territorial* perspective.

Many nation states have created a pan-territorial vision or code of integration, such as Indonesia's *Pansascila*. The European Union (EU) has moved since its genesis in the Treaty of Rome (1957) increasingly toward an integrated territorial entity. Initiatives such as the Schengen Agreement (1985) and several others have sought to facilitate the ease of movement of labour, capital, goods and services across all national borders, while a variety of supplementary treaties (e.g. Maastricht, Nice, Lisbon) have cumulatively fostered the economic, social, administrative and increasingly, the political integration of the 27 member EU. Schmitt has noted that the ministers responsible for Spatial Planning and Territorial Development in the EU have "sought to emphasize the need and potential for an integrated spatial, or as it has come to be termed in recent years, territorial perspective on strategic transnational policy making" (Schmitt, 2011, p.1). Indeed, one explanation for the current protracted crisis in the Euro Zone within the EU is the lagging and stalled integration of political structures, organizations and processes in contrast to those of their monetary, fiscal and financial equivalents. Since 2001 the latter have moved significantly further ahead than the former. This disjuncture continues, therefore, to precipitate and aggravate numerous and systems threatening malfunctions.

While often embedded in the literature on *New Regionalism* much of the discourse around this particular perspective is to be found in the Political Economy, International Relations and related fields, and the larger part of the research and writing appears to favour transnational contexts and concepts over intra-national contexts (e.g. Hettne, 2005; Söderbaum and Shaw, 2003). So the territorial dimension more often than not focuses on macro-regions (e.g. South-East Asia), economic blocs, military alliances, free trade regions (e.g. NAFTA, MERCOSUR) and so on. The role of politics, security and global positioning in shifting international power relations are central considerations. Not surprisingly the European Union (EU) has not only been the centre of much attention and writing, providing a very lively and accessible case study (e.g. Wiener and Dietz, 2004; Rosamond, 2000), but it has also been the genesis of considerable theorizing and conceptual development. European integration is inextricably bound up with a number of other foundational and highly influential geo-political concepts, such as *cohesion* and the

spatial or *territorial* perspectives that increasingly underpin the EU project (e.g. Schmitt, 2011).

Candidate Indicators

Policy - the region as a spatial entity will be accorded some legitimacy in policy. For example it might be referred to as an "official" government administrative region (e.g. Central Tourism Region), as a special region with some priority designation (e.g. the Greater Toronto Greenbelt), or a geographic area where a cluster of public policy priorities converge to reinforce the regional reality (e.g. the BMW Region in Ireland, the Mezzogiorno in Italy, Northern BC in Canada). Increasingly *place-based development* in the EU serves as code for a territorial focus for integrating public policy initiatives, focusing multi-level governance, and leveraging localized assets for regional development.

In programmes and practice the indicators will include attention to the region's comparative positioning in the larger (e.g. national) economy, relating to for example income disparities, health and longevity indices, formal education levels, housing provision, standards in public services, demographic dynamics (e.g. net migration), unemployment, and other dimensions of development. In some instances this comparative assessment will include neighbouring regions in other countries (e.g. INTERREG), and may also address political issues, such as relationships with the central government, and minority political movements. Other indicators will include the central government's (or equivalent) rationale for designating this region (e.g. the economic development priority, the unique tourism potentials, the particular cultural characteristics), and associated programmatic priorities and commitments (e.g. youth employment, language conservation, infrastructure investments).

Candidate Measures

These might include specific comparative indices, usually interregional, regional/national, or regional/international, such as unemployment rates, household income, or schooling completion rates. Other measures might include regional-specific policies reflecting the national or central governments priorities for this region (e.g. potable water targets, broadband access objectives, unemployment reduction goals). In some contexts the designated region will have political development objectives (e.g. devolution, local government development). As noted above, the association of this perspective with a strong spatial emphasis and a direct tie to place-based development will bring with it measures of local assets (e.g. social capital, cultural resources, mineral assets, labour force skills) and key institutional resources (e.g. legislation, R&D organizations, proven governance systems).

Candidate Research Questions

This perspective would be expected generate research questions such as

- What is the central policy link between the development plan here and national (provincial, state) goals?
- What is the rationale for the geographical or spatial identification of this particular 'region'?
- What comparative criteria are in use here to (a) determine the nature of the problem or opportunity, and (b) identify desirable targets for development?
- Are there region specific programmes and/or projects available for the regional development agenda here?
- Who was responsible for the final determination of the 'region' - size, boundaries, spatial configuration?
- Is there an inventory and systematic assessment of key assets in the region?
- Has the process identified and built upon a combined set of development resources and opportunities unique to this region?

The Trans-Border Territorial Perspective

Another spatial perspective is evident within the globalization of economic systems and increased interest in barrier-free regional markets which straddle both sides of two or more national political borders. Not unlike historical arrangements between trading cities such as the Hanseatic League (13th-17th centuries) in Northern Europe, there is increased interest in minimizing the disruptive effects of borders. Research, policies and projects have addressed the need to maximize the integration of labour markets, the regional markets for goods and services, the connecting infrastructures (e.g. rail, roads), the regulatory and administrative systems (e.g. licenses, professional accreditation, taxation), and other elements in what are increasingly seen as functional regions. We refer to this perspective on the concept of integration as the *trans-border territorial* perspective.

Some arrangements are narrowly focused such as those between Canadian and American cross-border jurisdictions (e.g. Windsor-Detroit). Others, such as those now under the active promotion of successive INTERREG policies of the EU are much more multidimensional (OECD, 2010a). These cover everything from rapid transit systems, common external investment recruitment policies, industrial clustering initiatives, maximizing the potentials of learning regions and many other facets of the integrating region. Examples include the Öresund (Denmark and Sweden), the Vienna-Bratislava region (Austria and Slovakia) and Frankfurt-Slubice (Germany and Poland). Under the powerful umbrella Cohesion Policy of the EU these initiatives are strongly advocated and usually involve complex trans-border partnership organizations. Larger trade-based initiatives with limited degrees of integrative objectives include the Emerald Triangle (Laos, Cambodia and Thailand).

Candidate Indicators

In policy the trans-border reality and priority is likely to be explicitly stated as such. This will be indicative of the presence of this perspective.

In programmes and practice, not unlike some other perspectives, there will be a significant presence of comparative analysis (e.g. population dynamics, economic profiles, incomes), notably those addressing patterns of differential growth and potentials. Cross-border or boundary flows will be highlighted. Mapping of current or potential interaction (e.g. journey-to-work, shopping) will be in evidence. And notably indicative of this perspective will be attention to complementarities, such as supply chain linkages, labour force exchange opportunities, under-used infrastructure, and common market opportunities.

Candidate Measures

Measures that we might anticipate from this perspective might include a variety of comparative statistics on the adjoining regions or districts (e.g. population, labour force, trade patterns), some emphasis on cross-border flows (e.g. commuting, retail trade, shipments, visitors), coverage of the connecting infrastructure (e.g. bridges, ferry services, rail links), records of intergovernmental and other formalized arrangements (e.g. trade accords, regular exchanges, taxation, licensing and other protocols), and indicators of shared facilities (e.g. entrepot centres, customs buildings, convention centres). Other measures will include economic series on the increased integration, market profiles, and the complementarities of the adjoining regional economies.

Candidate Research Questions

The sorts of research questions likely here would be

- What does the regional development agenda envisage as the planned linkages, if any, between these two economies?
- Does the research and analysis underpinning the development plan devote considerable attention to the interrelationships between the adjoining economies?
- What if any institutional and organizational linkages are planned for in the development strategy for this region, and a neighbouring region(s)?
- Was the economic, social and other analysis conducted as background to the development plan undertaken through collaborative mechanisms between the adjoining regions (e.g. common steering committee, common surveys, joint data base management)?
- What proportion of the total capital investment that the development plan commits is accounted for by formalized partnership arrangements?

The Operational Perspective

In policies addressing regional planning and in the practice itself "integrated" often refers to the *operational dimension* of this field. It is a project management perspective. It refers to individual development tasks (e.g. surveys, GIS applications, forecasting) and associated activities and their functional connections to specific projects (e.g. roads, labour force training centres), and the instrumental connections between these projects (e.g. bridges, early childhood education training) with over-arching programmes (e.g.

rural transportation, child care provision). This perspective often addresses the means-ends architecture of workflow schemas set out as task/activity input-output relationships, expressing these as critical path networks, programme evaluation and review techniques (PERT), Gantt charts, precedence diagramming and other management frameworks. The technically rational planning process for the regional development strategy is operationally integrated through these interrelationships and management techniques (e.g. Douglas, 1994).

Candidate Indicators

There will be few if any indicators of this in policy, though there may be a formal commitment to "integrated" planning that endorses this rational planning approach and commitment to formalized management. Indicators in programmes and planning, as well as constituent projects, will include formalized strategic planning (and occasionally, management), the use of critical path and similar techniques for plan management, a detailed methodology often articulated in flow diagrams and similar conventions, reference to "results-based management", and attention to benchmarks (expressed as start-up/end dates, specific outputs, accomplishments) both in the plan analysis phases, and in plan approval and implementation. The professional make-up of the regional planning team, both full-time employees and consultants (e.g. management consultants, operations analysis specialists) will reflect the presence or absence of this perspective in the process.

Candidate Measures

These will include detailed task and output specification (e.g. survey design, pilot test, instrument/process refinement, survey execution, analysis and report), timelines, logical input-output connections, float times, key decision points, graphic presentation of the research (and sometimes, administrative and approvals) process, and other metrics integrating the regional development planning process.

Candidate Research Questions

Key questions for the research under this perspective will include

- Was there a formalized (e.g. graphically detailed) design of the regional plan preparation *process*, from the derivation of its purpose, the identification of basic objectives, the specification of the required analyses, the mode of plan design, the process of plan selection and approval, and the key steps in implementation?
- Were the results of specific research tasks and activities specified as inputs for each subsequent research task?
- How was the plan preparation time schedule depicted and used in the actual process?
- Were key decision points formally identified in the plan preparation process?

- What techniques or project management technologies were used in designing and then managing the plan preparation process, from the opening phase and tasks to the concluding phase and tasks, including budgeting and resources allocation?

The Growth/Equity Perspective

Again, overlapping with some other perspectives there is a broader perspective within which the entire regional development and planning initiative is traditionally couched. It is said to be "integrated" as it responds to the now classic (but ever contested) dichotomy involving on the one hand national economic efficiency and growth objectives, and on the other regional or spatial objectives addressing outcomes relating to equity, welfare and (re)distribution. We might refer to this perspective on the need for some integration as the *growth/equity* challenge. It is alive and well in current political and other debates across Canada, most OECD countries and elsewhere, even if it is not always articulated as a challenging compromise, or a public cost of entertaining a regional or spatial dimension to societal development (e.g. Savoie, 1986; Courchene, 1986). Recently the importance of regional economic vitality, beyond the core metropolitan engines of growth, and the national benefits of investing in the growth potentials of all regions in a country, have been re-emphasized (OECD, 2001 b).

Candidate Indicators

Indicators to be found in policy will either address the purported dichotomy (i.e. the equity versus economy dilemma) explicitly, or make reference to the requisite trade-off or balancing between national economic growth priorities and the unevenness across regions, either in terms of actual historical or potential performance.

Indicators to be found in development programmes and planning practice will include some comparative analysis (e.g. population, employment growth, sectoral profiles), usually using conventional economic metrics, addressing concepts such as lagging and leading indicators, and making reference to redistributive flows (e.g. welfare payments, subsidies, incentive investments). In the Canadian context so-called equalization policies and their foci (e.g. access to public services) have been central to this perspective for more than half a century. Long established indices of convergence (e.g. in GDP/capita, household income) or divergence relating regions to the national economy are typical here. Gini coefficients or similar indices might be used to illustrate contrasting degrees of distribution across regions, or a region in question and the national context, for household income, employment, educational access or other topics.

Candidate Measures

This perspective might suggest measures such as employment, unemployment, household income, GDP per capita, educational achievement, measures of communications facilities on a per capita or household basis (e.g. television, broadband access), access to health services or various kinds, health conditions (e.g. weight, diseases), housing conditions, availability of sanitation services (e.g. sewage treatment), crime rates, economic

productivity trends, and many others. Transfers of various sorts (e.g. pensions, social support transfers, investment income) are often used as measures illustrating counter-flows in the growth/welfare system. Longitudinal data sets are common, illustrating the nature of the problem (e.g. structural unemployment) as a structural or chronic condition, and to present the nature of re-distributive options for so-called 'balanced development'.

Candidate Research Questions

The research here might be addressed by questions such as

- In the identification of the condition of the region, and its problems and potentials, was this done in a comparative setting, comparing it with (for example) the province or Canada as a whole (e.g. as a lagging region, as a leading region, one requiring special measures)?
- Are public policy interventions relating to compensating for the region's relatively poor performance covered in the plan analysis and design?
- Are concepts and terms such as 'core/periphery', heartland/hinterland', 'marginal areas', and similar expressions used in formulating the problem or issues at hand, and the direction of the plan itself?
- Is a postulated "balance" between maximizing national/provincial growth potentials and the costs of investing in lagging regions, addressed implicitly or explicitly in the problem/issue formulation, and/or the plan design?

The Complexity Perspective

Not unrelated to the concept of participation is the felt need to secure "integrated" perspectives, but not so much because of moral, ethical and social justice concerns, but to secure a better technical or methodologically sound appreciation of the real word *complexity* of the context in question. So the desire has been to garner and sometimes measure the admixture of local or regional perspectives in terms of their operating worldviews, the culturally sourced meanings in the place, the ideological lenses through which various actors see the situation, and other facets of the context or episode.

Complexity might also be approached through the ecological perspective addressing uncertain processes of irreversibilities, random amplification of impacts, uncertain degrees of and the timing associated with systems resilience, and other factors. Perspectives incorporating chaos, non-linear dynamics, and random events are commonly found in this perspective. Research and analysis here reflects the limits of information and especially understanding, the associated constraints on projections, forecasting and the consequences for design, plans and development management.

Candidate Indicators

In policy we would expect explicit recognition of contextual complexity. This might be evident in modest or restrained expectations in terms of desired outcomes (e.g. attitudinal

change), or conservative approaches to the organization's (e.g. Province's) ability to (a) understand the complexity in place, and (b) effect desirable change.

In programme(s) and practice we might look for recognition of the presence of recent arrivals and concomitant cultural differences (e.g. new Canadians), attention to First Nations, identification of gender-based constituencies, alternative lifestyles groups, and others. A conflicted history in the region might be acknowledged. Indeed plural histories might be acknowledged. Probabilities rather than more definitive indicators might be more in evidence here. The same uncertainty might be explicit as it relates to ecological processes, including livelihood/environment interactions and feedback processes. Scenarios or simulations might be more in evidence rather than conventional quantitative forecasts or projections. Public health, income and food security, as one example, might be linked in integrated causal and programmatic designs.

Candidate Measures

The complexity perspective would suggest measures such as ecological systems mapping (e.g. for wetlands, forest regeneration, inshore fisheries), power mapping for a community or the region as a whole, incidence of visible minorities, language diversity, faith-based diversity, social deviance measures, household/market interrelationships, the informal economy (e.g. bartering networks, volunteer sub-systems), different types of social capital (e.g. associative, bureaucratic), and measures of the pace and diversity of change (e.g. demographically, in formal education). Risk measures, with associated probabilities, might be attached to various biophysical elements in the region (e.g. floodplains, slopes, coastal areas) addressing potentials for forest fires, flooding, erosion and other issues. Measures of child obesity, the incidence of diabetes, school-based nutrition, household income profiles, and cultural characteristics might be examined as interrelated sub-systems in the regional society. Correlates from this perspective might be related to the available of foodlands, agricultural practices, the incidence of garden allotments, statutory land use practices and other facets of the region.

Candidate Research Questions

Field and other research questions here might include the following

- Were such things as social, cultural, economic and similar networks or sub-systems explicitly identified and analyzed in the development planning process?
- If so, what is the nature of the social networks identified in the research for the regional plan?
- Does the development strategy explicitly address the question of uncertainty?
- Does the plan address population health and environmental issues?
- Does the development plan address the interrelationships between cultural and political dynamics?
- Does the plan use the term "systems"? If so, are they mapped or otherwise dimensioned?
- Is the question of the sustainability of the regional economy addressed?

- ▪ If so, from what perspectives (e.g. culture, ecology, politics)?

The Systems Theoretic Perspective

The emergence of systems theoretic approaches to development planning, the critique of our post-Enlightenment scientism and attendant reductionism, and the chequered record of policy and practice have all combined to re-focus our attention on the realities of complexity, multi-functionality, diversity, randomness and uncertainty that characterize the world we live in, and attempt to plan (e.g. von Bertalanffy, 1968). "Integrated" approaches have variously attempted to address these systems realities and acknowledge that we do not and cannot fully "know" what is there and how it functions, yet alone predict its trajectory and attempt to "manage" it! (e.g. Gunderson and Hollings, 2002). Chaos theory has achieved some currency here. "Integrated" as taking a *systems theoretic* perspective, even if not always formally articulated as such, is another view on the various meanings of this term in regional planning.

Candidate Indicators

Indicators of this being evident in policy will be rare. The signal indicator will be acknowledgement or assumption of the region as a 'system', albeit an open system. This will likely include acknowledgement of the complexity of the regional society, economy and biophysical environment, and notably acceptance of uncertainty as to the interrelationships across these and their directions, and more so the impacts of public policy interventions.

In a systems theoretic perspective on integrated development one would expect indicators to address such core concepts as latent and kinetic energy, order and organization, causal interrelationships, cross-boundary energy flows, resistance, dynamic equilibria, and entropy.

Complex interconnectedness of the region's society, economy, physical environment, political structures, and other aspects of the regional reality will be explicit. Sub-systems will be identified, such as the eco-tourism sub-system within the tourism sector, or informal training within the labour force training system, and will be linked to their larger systems. A functionally organized and spatially differentiated settlement system from hamlets to cities might be acknowledged in policy and development designs. Interactive flows will be identified and traced between components of the region's systems (e.g. retail trade patterns, wildlife seasonal migration patterns). The region will be analyzed and planned as an open system (e.g. two-way cross-boundary flows). Macro-indicators might attempt to depict the 'energy' or 'information' in the system. More advanced attempts might even try to gauge the ability of the regional system to achieve outputs through 'work'.

Candidate Measures

Social energy might be measured through public meetings, media traffic, leadership contests, and other measures. The rate of enterprise formation and expansion might be used to gauge entrepreneurial energy. Patent registration, licensing, product mandates and other measures might be used to gauge the level (and rate of change) of innovation in the region, and map innovation networks and sub-systems (e.g. colleges and new enterprises). Regional gross domestic product might be used as to gauge potential. Imports and exports as well as population migration patterns might be used to illustrate inter-system energy transfers. Retail trade areas might be used to depict economic trade sub-systems (i.e. trade). Spatially defined congregational areas might be used to measure the dynamics of faith-based sub-systems. Productivity dynamics might be used to represent 'work' performed in the economic sub-system within the region. E-mail and telephone traffic might be used to delineate other sub-systems and their interrelationships. Watersheds and spatially identified recreation patterns might be used to investigate human-environmental interdependencies. Garbage recycling and other conservation measures might be used as indicators of political persuasion and transformation (i.e. energy-to-work dynamics).

Candidate Research Questions

Research from this perspective would pose questions such as

- Is the region conceived of as a "system", in the language of the analysis behind the policy and/or plan?
- Are sub-systems identified in the research design and analysis?
- Are relationships between the region and other regions, or the larger world addressed and depicted?
- Is the question of potential (e.g. ecological potential, cultural potential) addressed in the regional planning process?
- Is the region's ability to get things done (e.g. create jobs, maintain eco-systems health, nurture cultural integrity), to transform explicitly addressed in the analytical process?

Commentary

As will be evident from this breadth of fifteen (15) perspectives, all under the rubric of the concept "integrated", it involves a significant variety of meanings when applied to regional development and planning. And there will be other perspectives on the illusive notion or concept of "integrated". There is considerable overlap between some perspectives, but there are evident distinctions between all fifteen perspectives. It is acknowledged that some perspectives have been more dominant than others (e.g. the 'comprehensive' versus the 'systems theoretic'). And they have waxed and waned over the years (e.g. Douglas, 1997, Healey, et al, 1999). But all are in play in one way or another, some more in evidence in academe and in professional discourse, others more evident in policy and practice. What is important here is to acknowledge both the ontological and epistemological differences and similarities which inform each perspective. From this one must be cognizant of the substantial and substantive

differences and similarities that then emanate in policy, plan design, development organization, development process and outcomes, from the adoption of one or more perspectives, and the concomitant exclusion or minimization of others.

The lengthy record of political, popular, professional and academic discourse on the much abused term "sustainable development" (e.g. IUCN, 1980; Brundtland, 1987; Kates, et al, 2005) provides a useful example of convergence where, from time to time and with different perspectives in the mix, a blending of some of the perspectives presented here has occurred. With the ever popular Venn diagrams (e.g. Sadler and Jacobs, 1990) the 'multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary' perspective, and what has been described here as the 'other than Economic perspective' are very common in depicting the requisite integration for sustainable development. This is often implicitly supplemented with the 'Growth/Equity' perspective where the theme of redistribution, social justice and reducing glaring gaps in income and access to resources is part of the problematique, and part of the prescribed solution. The 'Systems Theoretic' and selected other related perspectives are occasionally to be found as ingredients in the integrated perspective that purports to speak to the sustainable development thesis, again explicitly or implicitly in academic discourse and the attendant political rhetoric.

It is something of an irony that the term 'integrated' can be almost entirely absent in other synthetic constructs such as 'sustainable livelihoods', where socio-ecological adaptive and self-organizing systems are at the heart of the concept (e.g. Singh, 1996). With core defining attributes of non-linearity, uncertainty, diversity, resilience, categories, tagging, co-evolutionary dynamics and learning, the sustainable livelihoods thesis, either as a statement of real world practice in adaptive behaviours or as a normative guide for poverty alleviation and development, would be expected to pivot on notions of integration. But it does not. Notwithstanding this it is clear that perspectives such as the 'Systems Theoretic', the 'Complexity', the 'Holistic Human', the 'Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary', the 'Growth/Equity', the 'Participation' and other perspectives have contributed to the formulation of the SL concept in rural and regional development, and its operational presence in policies and programmes.

On first impressions the practice of, and the available theory in community development (CD) would seem to proffer a first rate example of a thoroughly integrated set of perspectives (e.g. Chekki, 1979; Roberts, 1979; Nozick, 1992; Gittell and Vidal, 1998; Douglas, 2010). However, notwithstanding some of the dominant practice roots of this eclectic field, such as public health and social work, and the more general theoretical frameworks provided by Sociology, Social Psychology and other disciplines, the practice/theory links are weak and the theoretical foundations remain underdeveloped, at best (Douglas, 2010). A variety of disciplines (e.g. Geography, Political Science, Sociology) have facilitated some degree of synthesis and an increased appreciation of the multidimensionality of community development, either as outcome or as process. Some professional practices (e.g. Planning, Architecture) have been less than impressive in integrating the physical, social, political, cultural economic and other dimensions of the community reality. So, even in a field which by its very nature is interdisciplinary and eclectic in its analyses of issues, its perspectives and its formulations of explanatory

concepts, and its derivation of plans and prescriptions, one is struck by the modest degree of integration that has in fact been achieved.

It might be assumed that in environmental planning (and management) integrated perspectives have perforce been achieved and applied. As with any eclectic field attempting to draw together the biophysical sciences, the social sciences and the fields of policy and practice, the record will be very mixed. Are the lofty aspirations or claims of Cicin-Sain and Knecht (1998) justified and borne out both by research methodologies and practice? They define what they call Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management (ICOM) as,

> " … a continuous and dynamic process by which decisions are made for the sustainable use, development and protection of coastal and marine areas and resources. First and foremost, the process is designed to overcome the fragmentation inherent in both the sectoral management approach and the splits in jurisdiction among levels of government at the land-water interface."
>
> (Ibid. p. 39).

This call for harmonization suggests that the perspectives relating to 'Levels of Government', the 'Comprehensive Planning' approach, the 'Counter-Silo' and others should all be operable here in driving toward increased integration. It is generally accepted that in many jurisdictions environmental protection and assessment legislation (e.g. EIA) and associated regulations and practices have become increasingly multidisciplinary, and perhaps interdisciplinary. So these perspectives may be said to be actively evident. In Mitchell's view (1998) to reach the ultimate goal in managing and developing resources 'integration' will involve 'relating resources management to management of other societal concerns ranging from job opportunities to housing and regional transportation" (Mitchell, 1986, p.4). This brings up the articulations raised in the 'Counter-Silo' and 'Levels of Government' perspectives raised here. But depending on what is inferred in the term 'relating', which sounds a trifle passive, one might assume that a 'Comprehensive Planning' perspective is implicitly present here, and far less confidently, a 'Systems Theoretic' perspective.

As previously noted public policy in the regional development sector continues to use this term with some license and considerable variability. Suffice to note here a recent example from the Province of Ontario in Canada where in relation to the development of Northern Ontario under the Province's *Places to Grow* legislation (2005) there is an explicit commitment to "an integrated approach to these economic development strategies through the creation of regular five-year economic action plans for Northern Ontario." (Ontario, 2011. p. 10). The term is not defined. The scope of the Plan is said to be 'comprehensive' (Ibid. p.6). Attracting investment for the purpose of growth and economic diversification includes an "integrated and timely one-window response to investment opportunities." (Ibid. p. 10). Likewise, "Provincial policies, programmes, and regulations will integrate approaches to natural resources management to support environmental, social and economic health." (Ibid. p. 37). There is much in the Plan that touches on several of the perspectives identified in this resource paper, including concerns to streamline and make more efficient the entire multi-level public sector in the

development of Northern Ontario, the need to connect environmental, resources exploitation, social development, conservation, tourism development, job creation, quality of life, and other concerns and priorities. Collaboration and coordination and participation are terms used frequently throughout the Plan. A territorial dimension is evident in the defining of Northern Ontario itself, and in the commitment to "identify regional economic planning areas as an inclusive collaborative mechanism for long term economic development, labour market, and infrastructure planning that crosses municipal boundaries." (Ibid. p. 29). So, several of the perspectives one might associate with this sub-concept in *New Regionalism* are in evidence in this particular regional development initiative, albeit without a clear definition of the scope and depth of what an integrated policy or development planning process might entail. Therefore, one cannot ascertain with any certainty whether the Plan seeks to attain the lofty heights suggested by Scott in defining *New Regionalism* as a development process that "integrates notions of economic dynamism, administrative efficiency, community empowerment, civil society, responsive governance within a spatial framework, the region" (Scott, 2008, p.4).

Finally, many of the indicators of an integrated approach to development planning suggested in this paper are to be found in some definitions of planning itself. One example here is the one associated with the Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP, 2012). "Planning is an interdisciplinary activity" (Ibid, p.2). It deals with closely "interrelated" fields of knowledge and practice. It is designed to achieve "efficient" solutions through "coordinated" activities. It takes a "holistic approach". As has been the case in the evolution of the profession and discipline of planning (i.e. physical planning for urban and regional contexts), the pursuit has increasingly been understood to be intrinsically integrated.

"Integrated", *New Regionalism* and its other Subsidiary Concepts: Some Cross-Connections

"Integrated" is widely regarded as one of the central sub-concepts underpinning the much contested concept or conceptual framework of *New Regionalism* (e.g. Markey, 2011). This over-arching framework radically re-locates the entire regional development policy and planning process, moving it away from the former nostrums of centralized policy making, incentives-based development, the centrality of re-distributive perspectives, especially relating to interregional disparities, and the dominance of economics perspectives. Now the complex of unique attributes and assets we associate with place (territory), human and community capacity, information, knowledge and innovation, decentralization and devolution, the realities of rural and urban functional interdependencies, and the emergence of governance as new shared power modes of development, challenge and may even supplant the received wisdom of conventional theorizing and practice of regional development (e.g. Markey, 2011). We summarize these four other sub-concepts as place-based development, multi-level governance, reconstituted urban-rural interrelationships, and innovation and knowledge transfer.

Cross-Connections

This resource paper set out to initiate a critical exploration of the concept of *integrated*, especially as it might apply to regional development planning. It was acknowledged that its use, and perhaps abuse, stretches across a very considerable spectrum. A quick scan of texts on development, planning, community development, regional analysis and related fields produces significant contrasts. In many substantial texts the term is not to be found in the index. In many it receives cursory attention. In others it is apparently assumed to be understood; everyone knows what is meant by "integrated area development", or an "integrated" approach to the problem. So with this diversity its meaning cannot be taken to be universally understood, or accepted. Not surprisingly its application in practice is not likely to be any less diverse, and perhaps as a consequence it will be highly unpredictable.

What it does suggest is that the problems, opportunities and challenges in the regional context can be seen through a variety of lenses, or types of 'integratedness'. These allow us to understand them as more complex, more interrelated and more multidimensional than we might have perceived them, at first glance. As a result of this it suggests that we proactively interrogate regional development policy and the practice of regional planning in a somewhat more demanding manner so as to critically determine its sensitivity and responsiveness to the varying dimensions of complexity which this sub-concept in *New Regionalism* suggests.

The brief review here also intimates that there is considerable overlap in several of the ways this concept might be interpreted, though any one dimension (e.g. the levels of government perspective) might be argued as pivotal, depending upon the regional development context in question, and the perspectives of the person posing the issue. It begs the questions as to whether there is a useful meso-level categorization available that might, for instance, re-group the perspectives into a *spatial* or territorial sub-set, another sub-set with a primarily *functional* perspective, and other sub-sets. Another tripartite categorization might have a territorial or *spatial* axis, an operational or *management* axis, and finally an axis under which all those perspectives that might be associated with *sustainable development* may be subsumed.

As noted above, the current extensive discourse around the topic of N*ew Regionalism* includes other subsidiary concepts, i.e. place-based development, multi-level governance, rural-urban interdependencies, innovation, knowledge mobilization, learning and transfer, as well as integrated approaches to development. The last mentioned has been the focus of this resource paper. The cross-connections between these sub-concepts are not necessarily self-evident, and the degree to which they must be operative to constitute conditions of this *New Regionalism* in policy and/or practice, is part of the lively debate which characterizes the discourse around this organizing concept.

The cross-connections between some of the five sub-concepts associated with *New Regionalism* are explicitly stated in the so-called Barca Report (2009). Schmitt summarizes these as follows:

" .. .. .. this place-based approach to policy making and delivery is considered to be particularly aligned with principles of Territorial Cohesion, resting as it does on horizontal coordination, evidence-based policy making, and integrated functional area development. Finally, it is argued that a place-based approach should assist in implementation of the subsidiarity principle through a multi-level governance approach."

(Schmitt, 2011, p.4)

It is somewhat easier to appreciate the overlap between the component perspectives of the subsidiary concept of "integrated" as summarized in this paper, and the other subsidiary concepts constituting *New Regionalism* such as place-based development, multi-level governance, rural-urban interdependencies, and innovation and knowledge mobilization. Thus, one can quite easily relate a *holistic* approach or a *comprehensive* approach to regional development planning with a place-based approach to development. Likewise, one can easily relate an integrated approach to development that explicitly acknowledges the *multiple levels of government* dimension with the concept of multi-level governance. And one can appreciate the linkage between a *holistic* perspective and the place-based concept, one of the pillars of *New Regionalism*.

So we might speak of several levels of, albeit uneven and incomplete, interconnection here. The first is between each of the five subsidiary concepts (e.g. place-based development, integrated) that go into the organizing concept of *New Regionalism*. The second level is between the constituent perspectives that are available in each sub-concept and those of all of the other sub-concepts. Then there is the relationship between the perspectives in each sub-concept and each of the other four sub-concepts themselves. And, as noted, there are cross-connecting relationships between the perspectives within each of the sub-concepts, as illustrated in the fifteen (15) perspectives addressed in this paper. A further set of connections would relate these intra-national regional perspectives to the supranational "new" regionalism being investigated by an extensive body of related research in the fields of international relations, political studies and other (Hettne, et al, 2000. See also *End Note*). All of this makes for a very complex milieu of interrelationships characterized by causal paths, associative incidences, negating or off-setting factors, cumulative processes, symbiotic effects, and intricate feedback patterns.

The Region

An important part of the discourse here relates to the region as a spatial construct which in itself facilitates the development enterprise. Designing and negotiating the spatial entity which we refer to as a region is an explicit component of the development enterprise itself, even though this aspect is often neglected (e.g. Douglas, 2006). It might be seen to parallel the design of the development organization itself, or the design of the regional planning process. It is a distinct and complementary initiative in the overall development undertaking.

Seeing the region not just as an extensive spatial entity (i.e. more geography beyond the local), but a consciously designed territorial platform to facilitate and operationalize

development initiatives, is a very important dimension of this approach to development planning itself. Designing the spatial frame which we call the "region" is a purposeful investment to facilitate development initiatives that are more expeditiously undertaken at a particular *scale*, and at a particular *level*. Not unlike the systems concept of 'requisite variety', the regional design is a purposeful investment in efficacy. A region may be well designed for the purposes at hand, or it may be inappropriately designed. The intent is to expedite the most appropriate inter-community, inter-organizational, multi-level, inter-sectoral, and other interrelationships that positively augment those at the more local, sectoral and other more restricted scales and levels (e.g. Douglas, 1999). Expressed another way, the region can be envisaged as a practical spatial configuration to expedite an integrated approach to development design and implementation.

It would be ironic, if not tragic, if the region as an active spatial construct were to be forgotten in the contested discourse around *New Regionalism*, or in the examination of its constituent sub-concepts and their internal perspectives.

Summary

This resource paper has attempted to unpack some of the perspectives which might be operable within the notion or concept of "integrated" in the context of regional development policy and planning. We acknowledge the longevity of this challenging concept (e.g. Balassa, 1961) and its contemporary currency (e.g. Ayuk and Kaboré, 2013). It has suggested a number of indicators, measures and questions which might be used in researching the presence of integrated approaches to regional development. From there some cross-connections between this set of perspectives were explored. Situating this exploration in the context of *New Regionalism*, "integrated" development was presented as one of five sub-concepts underpinning this conceptual framework. The possible interrelationships between the sub-concept of "integrated" and the other four sub-concepts (e.g. place-based development, multi-level governance) were then briefly explored.

What is evident is that this one underpinning sub-concept, which we have referred to as "integrated", is a highly complex and variable dimension of both regional development policy and planning practice. While it may be well worn in its long academic and professional lineage, we cannot assume a universal understanding of what this approach to development policy, plan design or planning practice actually means. There may be some comfort in the degree of overlap between selected perspectives, but there also are significant differences. This brings to mind the concern raised by Friedmann that the practitioner come to grips in a pro-active manner with his or her theory of self and situation, and self in situation (Friedmann, 1987). The array of perspectives suggested here that might inform the policy maker's or the regional planning practitioner's understanding of how the world works and what the regional situation actually means, are sufficiently diverse to bring about substantively different policies and practices. They are, therefore, of material import, and not simply the discretionary niceties for academic and other musings. No less important, the meanings which this sub-concept of "integrated"

might contribute to our attempts to define and activate a *New Regionalism*, are diverse and will most certainly generate a diversity of outcomes.

"Like its classical cognate, the English word *integrity* has a range of connotations, from wholeness and completeness to soundness and freedom from defect."

(Miller, 2013. p. 33)

If that which is integrated or more integrated can be said to approximate integrity in terms of how a phenomenon is perceived and understood, and therefore acted upon, the idea of an "integrated" approach to regional development policy and practice cannot but be of the utmost importance.

The exploration of the internal interrelationships between the variety of perspectives identified here, and the interrelationships between this sub-concept and the other four sub-concepts underpinning the putative conceptual framework we refer to as *New Regionalism*, presents a challenging research agenda. No less challenging are the interrelationships between these and the "new" regionalism explored in the shifting context of supranational regional formations.

End Note:

The extensive discourse that has accompanied the conceptual framework of *New Regionalism* has not in any way been confined to intra-national contexts, as has been the intent here. Through extensive research and practice in political science (studies), international relations, political economy and several related fields there has been a substantial array of initiatives relating to the new supranational regional patterns emerging around the globe (e.g. Hettne et al, 2000; Weiner and Diez, 2004). The "new" regionalism here is situated in the so-called "new world order" and is contrasted with the "old" regionalism of an essentially bi-polar world operating through the power blocs of the former Cold War. The "new" is posited as multi-polar and is being fueled by (a) globalization, (b) the reconstituted role (and relevance) of the post-Westphalian nation state, (c) the post-Cold War milieu, (d) a variety of bilateral free trade and other accords (e.g. NAFTA), (e) new global governance institutions and organizations (e.g. WTO), and (f) new political security issues. The emergence of the EU, moving from free trade and a customs union toward political integration, and the practice of multilateralism have been a dominant factors in the conceptualizing of the "new" regionalism here. The "new" regionalism moves further from the dominantly economic and security perspectives of the "old" regionalism (e.g. EFTA, COMECON), into a more "integrated" regionalism addressing ecological, physical infrastructure, social and many other perspectives that cut across groups of nation states (e.g. Visegrád in Central Europe). Regional "integration" is a pivotal facet of this conceptualization of a "new" regionalism (Hettne, 2000, p. xxi; Weiner and Diez, 2004; Chapters 1 and 12; Keating, 2004). It involves adapting to the emergent globalism, a convergence of values and policies among partnering nation states, and a purposeful construction of supranational regions and concomitant institutions.

The *New Regionalism* addressed in this paper cannot be abstracted from the political and other dynamics of the "new" regionalism being addressed in this other extensive body of research and discourse. Indeed their functional interrelationships would be fertile ground for further research.

Bibliography

Allmendinger, Philip. 2002. **Planning Theory**. Basingstoke; Palgrave.

Amin, A. and N. Thrift. 2000. **Globalization, Institutions, and Regional Development in Europe**. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Arnstein, S. 1969. "The Ladder of Public Participation." **Journal of the American Institute of Planners**. Vol.35, No.4. pp. 211-224.

Association of European School of Planning (AESOP). 2012. "What is Planning?" http://aesop-planning.eu/en_GB/what-is-planning. Accessed November 21, 2012.

Ayuk, Elias T. and Samuel T. Kaboré. (Eds.) 2013. **Wealth Through Integration**

Regional Integration and Poverty-Reduction Strategies in West Africa. Ottawa andNew York; IDRC and Springer.

Balassa, Bela. 1961. **The Theory of Economic Integration**, Homewood, Illinois; Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Banfield, Edward C. 1959. "Ends and Means in Planning." **International Social Science Journal**. Vol. XI, No.3. pp. 361-368

Bhattacharyya, J. 2004. "Theorizing Community Development". **Journal of the Community Development Society.** Vol. 34, No.2. pp. 5-34.

Breheny, M. and A. Hooper, (eds.) .1985. **Rationality in Planning**. London; Pion

Brundtland, Gro Harlem. 1987. **Our Common Future**. New York; Oxford University Press.

Caldwell, Wayne. 2010. "Planning and Management for rural Development: The Role of Local Government." In, Douglas, David J.A. (ed.). **Rural Planning and Development in Canada. Toronto**; Nelson. Chapter 4.

Canadian Institute of Planners. 1990. **Reflections on Sustainable Planning**. Ottawa; CIP

Cary, Lee. (ed.). 1970. **Community Development as a Process**. Columbia, MO; University of Missouri Press.

Chekki, Dan A. (ed.). 1979. **Community Development: Theory and Method of Planned Change**. New Delhi; Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.

Cicin-Sain, Biliana and Knecht, Robert W. 1998 *Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management Concepts and Practices* (Washington D.C.: Island Press).

Courchene, Thomas J. 1986. "Avenues of Adjustment: The Transfer System and Regional Disparities." In Savoie, Donald J. (ed.). **The Canadian Economy: A Regional Perspective**. Toronto; Methuen. Chapter 3.

DFID. 2007. **The DFID Approach to Sustainable Livelihoods in a Nutshell.** London; Access via - http://www.poverty-wellbeing.net/media/sla/docs/2-1.htm

Dicken, Peter. 2003. **Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21st Century.** New York; The Guilford Press.

Douglas, David J.A. 1987. Douglas, David J.A. "Community Development: Scope, Issues, Potentials". **Journal of Community Development**. (March/April 1987). pp. 16-23.

Douglas, David J.A. 1988. "Public Participation in Rural Development: Critical Comments on Definition, Scope and Perspectives." In Cummings, F.H. (ed.). **The Sulawesi Regional Development Project: Mid-Term Review Conference**. Guelph; Sulawesi Regional Development Project, University of Guelph. pp. 119-137.

Douglas, David J.A. 1993. **Community Development: Observations and Lessons from Experience**. Guelph; Rural Reportings, University School of Rural Planning and Development, University of Guelph.

Douglas, David J.A. (ed.). 1994. **Community Economic Development in Canada**. Toronto; McGraw-Hill Ryerson. See especially Volume 1, Chapter 7.

Douglas, David J.A. 1997. **The Return of "Regional Planning": New Directions?** St.John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, July 1997. A Presentation to the Canadian Institute of Planners National Conference.

Douglas, David J.A. 1999. "The New Rural Region: Consciousness, Collaboration and New Challenges and Opportunities for Innovative Practice." In, Ramp, William, Kulig, Judith, Townshend and Ivan and Virginia McGowan (eds.). **Health in Rural Settings: Contexts for Action.** Lethbridge; University of Lethbridge. Chapter 2.

Douglas, David J.A. 2005. "The Restructuring of Local Government in Rural Regions: A Rural Development Perspective." **Journal of Rural Studies**. Vol.21. pp.231-246

Douglas, David J.A. 2006. "Rural Regional Development Planning: Governance and Other Challenges in the New EU." **Studia Regionalia**. Vol. 18. pp. 112-132.

Douglas, David J.A. with Bob Annis. 2010. "Community Development: A Cornerstone of Rural Planning and Development." In, Douglas, David J.A. (ed.). **Rural Planning and Development in Canada**. Toronto; Nelson. Chapter 10.

Drucker, Peter. F. 1998. **Peter Drucker on the Profession of Management.** Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press

Faludi, Andreas. 1984. **Planning Theory**. Oxford; Pergamon Press.

Faludi, Andreas (ed.). 2002. **European Spatial Planning**. Cambridge, Mass.; Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Faludi, Andreas (ed.). 2008. **European Spatial Research and Planning**. Cambridge, Mass.; Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Forester, John. 1989. **Planning in the Face of Power**. Berkeley; University of California Press.

Friedmann, John and Clyde Weaver. 1979. **Territory and Function: The Evolution of Regional Planning**. London. Arnold.

Friedmann, John. 1987. **Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action**. Princeton; Princeton University Press.

Gittell, Ross and Avis Vidal. 1998. **Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy**. Thousand Oaks; Sage.

Gunderson, L.H. and C. S. Hollings (eds.). 2002. **Panarchy: Understanding Transformation in Human and Natural Systems**. Washington, D.C.; Island Press.

Healey, Patsy, Khakee, Abdul, Motte, Alain and Barrie Needham. 1999. "European Developments in Strategic Spatial Planning." **European Planning Studies**. Vol. 7, No. 3. pp. 339-355.

Henderson, Hazel. 1978. **Creating Alternatives Futures: The End of Economics**. New York; Berkeley Publishing.

Hettne, Björn. 1996. **Development Theory and the Three Worlds**. Harlow; Addison Wesley Longman.

Hettne, Björn, Inotai, András and Osvaldo Sunkel. (eds.) 2000. **National Perspectives on the New Regionalism in the North.** Basingstoke; Macmillan Press Ltd.

Hettne, Björn. 2005. "Beyond the 'New Regionalism'. **New Political Economy**. Vol. 10, No.4. pp. 543-571.

Holdcroft, Lane E. 1982. "The Rise and Fall of Community Development in Developing Countries, 1950-1965; A Critical Analysis and Implications." In, Jones, Gwyne E. and Maurice J. Rolls (eds.). **Progress in Rural Extension and Community Development**. Vol. 1. Chichester; John Wiley & Sons.

Kates, Robert W., Parris, Thomas M., and Anthony A. Leiserowitz. 2005. "What is Sustainable Development: Goals, Indicators, Values, and Practice." **Environment.** Vol. 47, No. 3. pp. 8-21.

Keating, M. 2004. "European Integration and the Nationalities Question." **Politics and Society**. Vol. 32, No. 3. pp. 367-388.

Krueger, Ralph R., Sargetn, Frederic, O., de Vos, Anthony and Norman Pearson. 1963. **Regional and Resource Planning in Canada**. Toronto; Holt, Reinhart and Winston of Canada.

Loomis, Charles P. 1966. **Social Systems – Essays on Their Persistence and Change**. Toronto; D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.

Lotz, J. 1998. **The Lichen Factor; The Quest for Community Development in Canada**. Sydney, NS; University College of Cape Breton Press.

Markey, Sean. 2011. **Primer on New Regionalism**. Vancouver; CRD 4, Canadian Regional Development Project.

Martin Prosperity Institute, University of Toronto, http://martinprosperity.org – sourced November 22, 2012.

Max-Neef, M. A. and P. Ekins. 1992. **Real-Life Economics: Understanding Wealth Creation**. London; Routledge.

McMichael, Philip. 2004. **Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective**. Thousand Oaks; Pine Forge Press.

Melnyk, G. 1085. **The Search for Community: From Utopia to a Co-operative Society**. Montreal; Black Rose Books.

Miller, James. 2013. **The Philosophical Life**. London; Oneworld Publications.

Mitchell, Bruce. 1986. In Lang, R. (ed.). "The evolution of integrated resource management", in **Integrated Approaches to Resource Planning and Management.** Calgary; University of Calgary Press. pp 13 -26.

Mumford, Lewis. 1938. **The Culture of Cities**. New York; Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Murray, Michael. 2010. **Participatory Rural Planning: Exploring Evidence from Ireland.** Farnham; Ashgate.

Nozick, Marcia. 1992. **No Place Like Home: Building Sustainable Communities**. Ottawa; Canadian Council on Social Development.

OECD. 2010. **Regional Development Policies in OECD Countries**. Paris; OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2011a. **OECD Regional Outlook 2011: Building Resilient Regions for Stronger Economies**. Paris; OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2011b. **OECD Regions at a Glance**. Paris; OECD Publishing.

Perks, William T. and Ira Miles Robinson. 1979. **Urban and Regional Planning in a Federal State**. New York; McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Province of Ontario.

Rees, William. 1989. **The Ecological Meaning of Environment-Economy Integration**. Vancouver; University of British Columbia.

Rees, William E. 1991. "Economics, Ecology, and the Limits of Conventional Analysis." **Journal of the Air and Waste Management Association**. Vol. 41, No. 10. pp. 1323-1327.

Roberts, Hayden. 1979. **Community Development: Learning and Action**. Toronto; University of Toronto Press.

Ross, David P. and Peter M. Usher. 1986. **From the Roots Up: Economics as if Community Mattered**. New York; The Bootstrap Press.

Rotmans, J. and H. Dowlatabadi. 1998. "Integrated Assessment Modeling." In Rayner, S. and E. Malone. (eds.). **Human Choice and Climate Change**. Columbus; Battelle. pp. 292-377.

Sachs, Wolfgang. (ed.). 2003. **The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power.** Johannesburg; Witwatersrand Press, and ZED Books.

Sadler, Barry and Peter Jacobs. 1990. "Conclusions and Recommendations on Further Directions for Research and Development." In, Peter Jacobs and Barry Sadler. (eds.). **Sustainable Development and Environmental Assessment: Perspectives on Planning for a Common Future**. Ottawa; Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council.

Savoie, Donald J. (ed.). 1986. **The Canadian Economy: Regional Perspective**. Toronto; Methuen.

Schmitt, Peter. 2011. **The Territorial Agenda of the European Uniona 20202: A Turning Point in Striving for Territorial Cohesion?**
http://www.nordregio.se/en/Metameny/Nordregio-News/Europes-str. Accessed 19/01/2012.

Schumacher, E. F. 1973. **Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered**. New York; Harper & Row.

Scoones, Ian. 1998. **Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis**. Brighton; IDS Working Paper 72, University of Sussex.

Söderbaum, Fredrik and Timothy M. Shaw. (eds.). 2003. **Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader**. Palgrave MacMillan; Basingstoke, U.K.

Tansey, James. 2005. "Exciting the Collective Imagination." In Dale, Ann and Jenny Onyx. (eds.). **Social Capital & Sustainable Community Development: A Dynamic Balance**. Vancouver; UBC Press. Chapter 14.

Thompson, Rollie. 1976. **People Do It All the Time**. Ottawa; The Ministry of State for Urban Affairs.

Weiner, Antje and Thomas Dietz. (eds.). 2004. **European Integration Theory**. Oxford; Oxford University Press.