



HAL
open science

The population role in territorial dynamics. Elements for a reflexion

José Luis de Sola Bejarano, Dolores Redondo Toronjo

► **To cite this version:**

José Luis de Sola Bejarano, Dolores Redondo Toronjo. The population role in territorial dynamics. Elements for a reflexion. 9th International Conference of Territorial Intelligence, ENTI Strasbourg 2010, Nov 2010, Strasbourg, France. pp.15. halshs-00770591

HAL Id: halshs-00770591

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00770591>

Submitted on 8 Jan 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

THE POPULATION ROLE IN TERRITORIAL DYNAMICS. ELEMENTS FOR A REFLEXION.

José Luis de Sola Bejarano
Universidad de Huelva
josel.sola@juntadeandalucia.es

Dolores Redondo Toronjo
Universidad de Huelva
toronjo@uhu.es

Abstract:

This paper reflects on the role of population in the construction of territorial development processes based on the assessment of the aptitudes of that population. Studies of social capital as well as territorial identity lead today to analyze the non economical factors on the construction of territorial networks of knowledge and therefore they allow advancing from assisted territories to innovation ones.

Keywords: Territory, territorial development, innovative environment, social capital, territorial identity

The population role in territorial dynamics. elements for a reflexion.

« L'approche en termes de milieux innovateurs s'insère parfaitement dans la problématique de la globalisation qui exprime la pluralité des dynamiques qui concourent aujourd'hui à la différenciation spatiale des capacités à innover et des processus d'innovation », (Maillat, 1994).

1. - INTRODUCTION

Since the eighties various approaches and theories of economic development have extended. Terms like *endogenous development*, *industrial districts*, *development zones*, *innovative environments*, *local productive systems* or *social capital* have become nowadays, plot centres of theories of territorial development. These terms, used in different fields of Social Sciences, are also monopolized by many public actors with very different lines of thought. These different meanings are causing considerable confusion not only in the conceptual framework, but also in empirical work, as well as in the implementation of specific actions of territorial development. In this context, perhaps the most attractive of all these new (or not so new) concepts is the reinterpretation of the territorial development process, in an environment of great uncertainty and shifts in the economy and society.

The development of a territory consists of a complex process of transformations and endogenous changes, driven not only by the territory entrepreneurial capacity, but also for his creative ability. Many studies have constantly shown doubts about the impact of spatial concentration of public and private investment, and if they drive and even generate endogenous development processes and self-sustaining.

Addressing the development and production adjustment of local economies with incentive policies to business location has been a fact in Andalusia as well as in almost all regions with growth problems. Heavily criticized, this model seems

exhausted with the crisis, and the model of local development, that in the last ten years seemed marginalized, has been reconsidered, despite the support that it has received the academic field and in the European community policies. Local development is again considered a significant means of solidarity, offering a framework for the reconstruction of a collective project in the areas most affected by the crisis (Jouen, 2010). The local or territorial development is considered again a carrier of innovations to combat the current crisis.

Territorial development can be defined as the expression of social change characterized by the emergence of multiple actors and the search for alternative solutions to traditional economic structures. However, one important aspect is the consideration of social and cultural criteria as well as economic criteria, all of which provide a more human side of development for the entire territory. Jean Bruno states that:

"With the notion of territorial development, the social sciences, in a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary perspective, the means to know the importance of territory were given, not only as a biophysical reality tangible, but as a social construct" (Jean, 2006:467 cited by Gagnon et al, 2008:1).

This explains the need for understanding the complexity and uniqueness of the territorial dynamics where factors and variables involved increasingly question the analysis of these processes and the interdependencies between the major areas of development (Gagnon et al, 2008).

Hence in recent times another expression has emerged in the scientific literature: territorial development viable that puts in the centre of the debate the relationship between social and environmental variables, and their feasibility, i.e. the quality of human development. All of it done through the notion of capital, social capital in particular, and later the territorial capital, term in expansion in the current scientific literature.

The current reality shows examples of innovative areas in countries with different economic development and this multiple and changing reality has led to very different approaches. This reveals that at now days we are witnessing a profound transformation of production in which the Fordist era models give access to other more flexible and decentralized models. Since the eighties different approaches are being discussed: the industrial districts (Becattini, 1981), new industrial spaces (Scott, 1988), industrial clusters (Porter, 1990), the knowledge economy (Cooke, 2002) theory innovative environments (Aydalot, 1986; Maillat, 1995), and the intelligent territories (Caravaca, 2009).

How to analyze the complexity of the processes of regional economic development? Why are there winner territories and not so winner? What variables must be presented to disadvantaged areas in the territories to become intelligent? What factors are involved primarily in the so-called innovative environments? Are the strategies of large enterprises compatible with the strategies of the territories? How to implement the promotion of foreign investment in the new regional development policy?

All these questions were made during the Territorial Employment Policies Official Master, both at the headquarters of Huelva and Cordoba in the 2009-2010 academic years. Discussions focused on the success or failure in innovation policies in specific areas, but, away from success systems such as Manchester or Silicon Valley, and focusing the issue on the analysis of two

areas marked as territories long severely disadvantaged such as the two mining areas of Huelva and Cordoba; two areas affected by the crisis in decades, and objects at a time of intensive government intervention with results far from desirable. What have been and are the impediments to the process of territorial development in these areas in the middle of restructuring? But above all, what role did people play in the development of regional revitalization plans?

The reflections made by students to these issues addressed in the session we were invited to delve into the motivating factors in the success or failure of innovative policies, trying to understand the innovation process, and looking at the impact of cultural and institutional components because they have strategic value in the processes of territorial development (Maillat, 1995), but especially in the particularities related to the territory which indicate that social and cultural aspects unique to a particular grant space and play a role in the development territorial.

The conclusions reached by the students on these problems invited us to study more deeply the factors that intervene in the success or failure of these innovative policies, trying to better understand the innovative process, and searching the impact of the cultural and institutional components, because these have strategic values in the territorial development processes (Maillat 1995).

This works try to understand some of the issues raised. To this end, a first aspect we have discussed is the evolution of the concept of territory and territorial development. A second issue focuses on the importance of social capital and the territorial capital. And finally, we question the territorial identity and its influence on the development of certain areas, analyzing the importance of the role of the population throughout the innovation process.

2. - AN INNOVATIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR THE TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT?

Everyone knows the complexity of development processes and the difficulty in explaining the reasons for success in some areas and, the failure on others. This theme is recurrent in many recently published papers from different disciplines that study the local environments. Attention to local companies has increased, and this not only as support to economic activities but as a development resource and as a competitive factor (Aydelot, 1986, and Pecqueur Colletis, 1995, Vazquez Barquero, 2005).

In recent years the notion of territory has once again become the central point at present called endogenous local development. This notion of development is not confined to one geographical area but that "the territory is defined as "intersection of networks" (physical, human, formal, informal) of strategies and interdependencies between partners linked together, a place of production, of negotiation, of sharing a common future¹ (Miedes, 2008). The system is built upon the geographical proximity of the actors but also by their common dynamic reflects the actions that result from these relationships, rules, norms and principles that occur together "(Pecqueur and others, 2004:7). The territory appears as a permanent social construct in constant appropriation (Miedes, 2008) as a specialized system of actors with

¹ « On prend donc ici le parti de considérer le territoire (qui est le résultat) ou la territorialisation (qui est le processus) comme une forme particulière de coordination par la création de groupe. Cette forme de coordination est à l'origine d'une modalité particulière de création de valeur et d'émergence de ressources nouvelles ou latentes. Ces « ressources territoriales spécifiques » sont plurielles et débordent dans de nombreux cas la seule sphère productive. » (Leloup, Moyart & Pecqueur, 2004: 7).

a variable range of strategic capacity for subsistence. In one of his last works Pecqueur (2010: 171) states that:

« Les territoires sont donc des entités socio-économiques construites. Ils engendrent des processus de création de ressources en vue de résoudre des problèmes productifs inédits. Pour nous, le territoire n'est pas une échelle géographique de coordination entre acteurs (échelle infra-régionale, cantonale...) mais une dimension qui se situe entre l'individu et les systèmes productifs nationaux. Le territoire est alors plus qu'un réseau, c'est la constitution d'un espace abstrait de coopération entre différents acteurs avec un ancrage géographique pour engendrer des ressources particulières et des solutions inédites »

This capability does not results only from politics or economics factors, but also from a systemic behaviour of the organize territory. In this context, economic and social development becomes understood as self-organizing capacity of the entire social organization on the one hand, and the effectiveness of the "engineering intervention in the territory" on the other (BOISIER, 1997: cited by Miedes 43, 2008). From this perspective, we can speak of "development from below" by mobilizing and channelling resources and capacities in the territory, but where local actors interact with each other (Vazquez Barquero, 2007) organizing and carrying out its initiatives in a creative and coordinated way.

Recently a significant change regarding the role of territory in the innovation and diffusion dynamics has been reveal. The territory has grown from a simple medium in which economic activity is developed to become an environment conducive to development, meaning that the environment becomes an active element, thus producing a reappraisal of the role played by the territory (Camagni, 2003). Returning to the definition of territory today, we can say that the country is a conglomeration of social

and economic relationships between actors and between them with space. The result is based not only on the process emerged from the strategies of the actors but also of the phenomena of collective learning and the ways to value the economic, financial, natural and cultural rights available to the territory.

The specific characteristics of development actors and the features of the social system under which these actors interact and invest are therefore essential. In addition, the relationships that characterize a social and economic environment explain what benefit the innovative act or not. But can innovation be reduced as a result of inter-trade environment that cause a new combination of production? We think not, besides the relationships develop in the territory are not only economic interactions but the social structures are in the source of innovative behaviour. All these factors, social, economic and organizational of a specific territory impact the way that innovation is born, grows and spreads.

The first works about innovative processes (1980-1990) believed that innovation and its impact were carried out in a linear fashion, starting from the research to be transformed into technologies that later spread to the productive network. But the works done between 1995 and 2008 showed that business innovation is not just technological, but multidimensional and transverse (Quevit, 2007) because the impact occurs not only in business but also in the external environment. We thus conclude that innovation requires a local environment that is conducive to their development.

This requires to reconsider the relationship between Science-technology and Society, not from a linear logic and in one direction, but circular and systematic. The nature of the innovation process and the relationship between innovation and society, very complex, not only depends on the application of research results but also entrepreneurial skills, strategic and multi-stakeholder organizations in the territory.

Different investigations (Aydelot, 1986; Veltz, 1993) on socio-economic and territorial transformations associated with the current phase of capitalism incorporate new standards such as the processes of innovation and the interaction space made up of flows and networks (Caravaca, 2003). Innovation is therefore understood from this approach as the ability to generate and integrate knowledge, and therefore becomes a key factor for competitiveness. Innovation allows in the current context that territories can be better inserted and adapted to complex changes of advanced capitalism, without being excluded mainly because of the lack of innovative spirit.

Scientific literature has had certain grandeur about the act of innovation and its impact on territorial development (Moulat and Seki, 2003). In this regard, the work on innovative environments developed by the GREMI Group (Groupe de Recherche Européen sur les milieux innovateurs) seemed interesting to us to deepen our reflection on the “winner” territories. This group, multidisciplinary, is developing for about fifteen years ago, scientific papers on regional competitiveness; jobs that have been built from the central and precursor concept of Philippe Aydelot "innovative environments as a framework for territorial competitiveness (Quevit, 2007). In 1980 Aydelot already criticized the paradigm on which regional development was based, and its two most significant theoretical trends on the spacecraft trajectories: on one hand, *the neoclassical theory of spatial convergence*, and on the other hand, *the Marxist theory of divergent*. This author has developed what he called *the theory of spatial hierarchy's investment*.

“Ces retournements recouvrent en fait des transformations plus structurelles dans les processus dynamiques: avant la crise c’était le dynamisme innovateur et organisationnel de la grande entreprise qui formait le moteur de la croissance des régions. Maintenant, si des mécanismes polarisateurs prennent une ampleur certaine dans les secteurs de pointe, associant le rôle moteur des grandes entreprises et le dynamisme de nombreuses

créations industrielles de petite dimension, un dynamisme nouveau, issu non plus des technologies de pointe mais des milieux eux-mêmes fournit aux régions moins industrialisées les moyens d'un renouveau » (Aydelot, 1983 citado por Breteche, 2009 : 5).

The approach proposed by these researchers, although some authors consider hybrid², responds very well to the questions we ask in reference to the factors that focus more on success or failure of the act of innovating in an area as it integrates all aspects that contribute to a territory for its development strategy. However, the territory can only become an innovative country if its strategy and development policy involve three determinants:

- 1.- Economic determinants, i.e. determinants linked to changes of a global economy and new relationships between local and global
- 2.- The organizational determinants, i.e. the variables related to the dynamics of territorial governance and relations between regional actors involved in an integrated regional development approach and open to change
- 3.- The socio-cultural determinants: i.e. the value system of a society that it is mobilized around a vision of the future, thereby stimulating the creativity of the population (Quevit, 2007)

The focus of these researchers centre the analysis on the *innovation environment* as it is equipped with two characteristics: it is both a context of innovation when analyzed from the perspective of an innovator, but also, and above all development actors, i.e. the innovative environment become a real subject³ and not a single space location of

economic activities. For Maillat (1995), the innovative environment is characterized by an economic culture that creates an atmosphere in which economic activities exceed beyond market relations and maintains a special relationship of proximity. Maillat (1995) argues that innovation and technological changes occur in a particular territory and are associated with local know-how, the qualification of human resources, knowledge institutions and organizations that conduct research and development, and ultimately, with the local innovation system (Maskel et al., 1998).

Quevit (2007) argued that the innovative environment is a territorialized set outward that integrates know-how, rules and relational capital. It is not a closed universe, but in constant interaction with the environment. “Maillat and Aydelot consider the value of land as a differential explicative resource. In this sense, Precedo’s works (2007) criticize this approach by stating that the design of innovative environments does not go beyond an abstract concept more in line with the concept of functional space than with territory as real player of development local.

Camagni (2003) brought a new factor to this theory: the cooperation of any given territory agents is an intangible value that provides an increase in social capital to local areas, allowing a greater increase in social cohesion, which allows activate the innovation potential of the territories.

The existence of good productive resources and the presence of a well-trained human capital, as well as a network of groups and institutions are factors described to implement a dynamic development, but as set out in different jobs, all of this is not enough if there is no a good interaction between the various institutions and implicated agents, an interaction that allows for adequate infrastructure in the territories, but especially that allows to generate confidence in the population which will also allow the mobilization of agents to facilitate a good cooperation among them.

³ When we use the term subject, we refer to an individual or collective subject that has the capacity to self define and self built.

3. - SOCIAL CAPITAL AND TERRITORIAL CAPITAL: BASIC FACTORS IN TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT.

In the nineties of the last century a strong debate in international forums emerged that focus primarily in the concept of social capital⁴ in a context of economic and social development. The debate, which began in the United States, appears after finding problems on social cohesion and the secondary role of the state in the management of inequality and social relations, and reconsidering the role of civil society. For American literary, integration into networks of social relations not determined by the State and its intensity, are essential in the analysis of social ties. The basis of the collective interest is focussed on the strength of associative participation since according to the American historical tradition of counter-claim to the state, civil society has full capacity to resolve conflicts created by the existence of multiple conflicting interests.

The concept of social capital is introduced in the discussions as a first step on the basis that this is a production factor, underestimated by the economy. To this day, the production factors identified by the classical economists were basically land, labour and financial capital, but in the fifties, the works of R. Solow introduced the importance of technology (physical capital) in economic development, and in the sixties, the contributions of economists TW Schultz (1961) and G. Becker (1964) added the notion of *human capital*. If *physical capital* is created as a tool that facilitates production, *human capital* will do essentially the skills and qualifications of those who work the tools. Based on this same logic, one can say that the ties between individuals are also part of the capital (Forsé, 2001:1). When the links change so much that productive action is eased, we can say that *social capital* is created and that human capital is based on individuals while social capital is based on relationships. *Human capital* and *social capital* are complementary from this perspective (Schuller, 2001).

⁴ See the excellent web: <http://www.oecd.org/els>, very useful, where they can be found very interesting texts on social capital, civil society, and lastly also texts about the notion of government.

Table 1: Differences between human capital and social capital

	Human Capital	Social Capital
Orientation	Individuo	Relationships
Measures	Years in school	Attitudes / Values Membership / participation of a group Degrees of confidence
Results	Direct: income and productivity	Social cohesion Economic performance More social capital
Model	Linear	Interactive/circular

For many authors, the theory of capital in its three dimensions-physical, human and social -has no reason to be limited to the sphere of action purely economic purposes. As long as the realization of a goal involves interplay between several individuals, you can use this same conceptualization. This "new"⁵ approach called social capital owes its importance mainly to the work of R. Putman (1993, 1996) in Political Science, J. Coleman (1990) in sociology, to F. Fukenyama (1996), in History and Economic Sociology and the World Bank's work. However, a precursor of these was P. Bourdieu (1980) who in the late seventies and used the notion of social capital. The storyline of these studies takes into account the existence of a relationship between decentralization, citizen participation, quality of policies and local economic growth.

There is a variety of approaches to social capital, and yet the most important

⁵ We put quotation marks around the adjective again as Marx had considered the idea of capital as a social relationship "Capital is not a thing but rather a defined set of social relations that belong to a definite historical period of human development (...) To understand the capital must decipher his character and social relationship" Marx (1867), Appendix II-III: Reproduced in Leicht, 1999, quoted by L. Moreno (2000), p. 173. But also classics like A. Smith, E. Durkheim, T. Veblen or M Weber found references to the importance of social and cultural factors in economic development.

fact is the hypothetical consensus on its definition. For most authors, social capital is based on the norms and networks that facilitate collective action (Woolcock, 2001:13). Both Coleman (1990) and Putman (1993) recognize the functional nature of the definition of social capital and its relevance to the analysis framework of the decision theory. When Coleman (1988) raises the social capital variable, explains that this should not be attached to a single social phenomenon; it must always be grasped as a concept in relation to a variety of phenomena that have elements in common. But mostly it describes social capital as those institutions that have in common to be that part of the social structure and to facilitate the actions of the actors, individuals or collective, within a given social structure. However, Putnam (1993) uses more the notion of networks and norms that facilitate, in his view, cooperation and coordination of the community, encouraging (directly or indirectly) to achieve economic benefits. These intangible factors would be the basis for economic development in general.

From this perspective, social capital comprises several interdependent aspects. First, it is emphasized *trust* as an essential component, as it facilitates *cooperation* within society. This *trust* allows spontaneous sociability among citizens, thus consolidating the belief of rational behaviour among the "*standards of generalized reciprocity*" and facilitating the resolution of the dilemmas of collective action, i.e., cooperation, founded on the principle of reciprocity. And finally appears

one last component: "*networks of civic engagement.*" These are manifested in the existence of voluntary associations and relationships characterized by horizontal exchange among participants. The horizontal and egalitarian (as opposed to traditional associations dominated a strong vertical structure) is helping to foster social trust and cooperation in society. This form of civic engagement is an incentive-responsibility of individuals in public life (Donati, 1998, Arias and Costas, 2001). If citizens are more involved in the production of wealth, the cooperation will be fruitful. In this sense, social capital is considered more as a moral action, although its effects are shown both in the levels of social cohesion and legitimacy and in the efficiency of governance and economic productivity. The participation of citizens in shaping policy and control of surfaces policies emerges, thus, as one of the key variables of this new approach. The literature of recent years has been establishing, not only locally but internationally especially in a strong relationship between citizen participation, a level of confidence in the policies and economic growth.

As far as the trust between the different actors in the political field extends, decisions making will rely more on the commitment and agreement, and it will expand the possibilities of designing innovative policies to address new problems or persistent (Arias and Costas, 2001), providing greater social cohesion.

Another definition is the Kesselman formula (1997), who recognizing the differences in the discipline that uses it, stresses that in terms of social capital, the basics of it is based on the *quality* of relations between individuals or households. This way, it analyzes the degree of integration between individuals or households to social networks. This approach is totally influenced by the

definition that R. Putman (1995) gives to the concept of social capital⁶.

For the European Commission (1994), social context is an essential factor for economic growth, in the same way that social progress is for the creation of wealth. Social capital⁷ is not a simple extension of human capital (Forsé, 2001) as shown by different studies. Human capital is framed by individual characteristics; however, social capital is part of the *network of relations* of an individual, and is therefore a social resource. Using this concept, we want to make that individuals or groups can find resources in their connections with other individuals or groups as ways to make these connections. However, to speak of creation of capital is not sufficient with the existence of a relationship, but this has to be mobile and mobilized. To understand this process, it is assumed that each actor proceed to do different relational investment framed in strategies.

⁶ Putnam (1995b:664-665) adopts the following definition of social capital "By social capital, I mean features of social life-networks, Norms and trusts-that enable Participants to act together more Effectively to Pursue Shared Interests.

⁷ The lack of empirical specificity has led to a number of criticisms of various theories of social capital in recent years. The most common were, first, that they do not respond to a new situation but they are only marketing deal with the problems of exclusion and poverty in the world and therefore we can say that there is little content. Second, these theories would be the latest trend in social sciences. The idea is vague, ambiguous and not very rigorous, and yet, we've seen a multitude of empirical studies from different disciplines of Social Sciences under the name of social capital. It seems that the social capital responds to all the sauces, currently there is widespread confusion about the object of study. A third criticism received is that they promote economic imperialism and social relations are seen as capital. And finally, these theories do not address the role of power and more specifically to individuals further away from it.

As we can see, the notion of social capital has gone from being associated with a utility strictly linked to the individual (Bourdieu, 1986, Coleman, 1988). This concept is now more united to collective problems of governance and community development (Putnam, 1999). In this sense Portes (1988) argued that the success of this concept is essentially due to two reasons: first it is the importance of the positive consequences of sociability that understands this concept, and second it is the influence of non-economic factors in the development processes. But for some authors, social capital can be defined as a facilitator of social action, both for individuals and for society (Charbonneau, 2005).

The concept of territorial capital indicates, however, more the wealth of the territory, but in search of unique features that can give value. The territorial capital can only be assessed in terms of the history of the territories. European Programmes on rural territorial development, LEADER, have highlighted the components of the territorial capital. These are: the mobilization of local people and social cohesion; culture and territorial identity; activities and jobs; the image of the area, migration and social and professional integration; environment; management of space and natural resources; the evolution of technology; competitiveness and market access. We can say that territorial capital cannot be considered static but dynamic and it is related to a project of territory and territorial competitiveness.

4.-FROM ATTENDED TERRITORY TO INNOVATION TERRITORY “TOWARDS SELF-ESTEEM OF TERRITORY?”

From long ago, it is known the characteristics of the territories that are winners: a good functioning of institutions, capacity of local public and private actors to coordinate action within the framework of a project (i.e. good governance), a entrepreneur spirit, a quality labour, capacity of innovation, cooperation and adaptation to new markets and new technologies (Pecqueur, 2010). These criteria have changed little, but the question is always the same, and is what we have asked from the start how. How to achieve it?

Some arguments said that the actor is acquiring a central role in territorial development policies. This is the driver of the competitive strategies based on R + D + I. From the European Union it is being promoted the idea that cooperation between the actors of a territory is one of the essential conditions for a type of interaction between them, necessary to develop joint projects by sharing resources, skills and perspectives. This cooperation, of course, would benefit from various forms of proximity provided by the territory (Rallet and Torre, 2002). That is, if previously paid special attention to the structural preconditions of national territory, the centrality of the actor is linked to new forms of governance much more complex. New forms that require, from the agents, active participation of a citizenry capable of the tasks involved with space and with an interest in acting in favour of it.

This was one of the focal points of discussions with pupils, which showed other interesting thesis: In all this, what is the role of the population, and their involvement in the act of innovating in the area? Are there non-economic reasons for the success or failure of development policies in a territory?

Territorial identity as a factor of involvement and participation in territorial

dynamics of innovation thus becomes one of the relevant analysis. What is the role of sense of belonging to a territory? Would this be a major factor? The sense of belonging to a territory, in promoting social cohesion, innovation and competitiveness, provides capital to local areas, but above all it will transform these territories from receivers to active and innovative because when cohesion, cooperation and confidence of individuals increase, territories can increase their competitiveness. Would local initiatives, whether individual, or collective, be the real engine of regional development? Does the local population have potential untapped innovative ideas, and therefore require a collective learning for the implementation of these ideas? The horizontal and vertical participation is essential. But participation is configured in trust relationships among actors of a territory. Do these actors have a story above or otherwise relational trust relationships are built on a mutual learning among stakeholders?

In this sense, the works of the Precado (2004, 2007) provide interesting elements to this issue. This author is not only based on the importance of knowledge as an exchange factor but also in the psychosocial processes that promote participation and involvement of people in the processes of territorial development and earning is the factor for this. This author shares the philosophy of behaviourism to explain territorial identity:

"The starting point puts them on the assumption that all development is learning and that learning is a cognitive process by which relatively permanent behavioural patterns acquired (developing training for formal and informal). According to behaviourism, acquisition functions through stimulus-response mechanism (value, identity, belonging and sense of place), and when responses produce positive effects on the environment (improvement or change) increases the frequency or likelihood of their repeated answers (demonstration effect); on the contrary when they are negative is reduced that frequency or probability "(Precado, 2007:100).

Since this approach it is understood that the involvement of people in the process of change is central to the success of territorial development projects, because if they focus on external or exogenous factors, to stop them also ends the development process. And this is the situation we have discussed in the course, the two mining areas have been subject to restructuring plans for over 20 years, but the population has not been involved in them. And as a result we can say that despite the investments, grants and plans, it has not met a community structural change in the processes of change and innovation. Even today in the two areas is expected to reopen the mine as a factor in generation and job creation for the counties involved in this process. These territories are territories assisted, unable to adapt it to self change.

The jobs of Precado (2004) highlight the value of identity as a factor of social cohesion. Territorial identity converts the territory in a territorial community, and this is equipped with social capital based on personal involvement in collective cooperation and self-esteem not only individual but social, and why not to say territorial. The whole process thus creates a new potential for innovation and competitiveness:

"The sense of belonging and identification of individuals with its territory is active support for the involvement of the people themselves in the process of change and an effective basis for the participation of citizens in its development" (Precado, 2007: 102)

Other authors explain, however, that identity is constantly created and recreated by actors in the territory, incorporating both internal and external factors to the community, away from those approaches that conceive of identity as a static set of cultural attributes.

It is clear that non-economic factors of identity and territory, i.e., the set of social, cultural, institutional, historical,

geographical and environmental issues must be taken into account to build innovative competitive environment, to changing situations and scenarios of uncertainty.

5. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, just post some questions that we want to be open to future insights. A first question concerns the complexity of land development. This is a process of very complex endogenous transformations, and therefore it cannot be explained through mechanisms external to the process. This requires understanding the innovative capacity, and this is a drive for socio-economic transformation processes of a territory. Moreover, this process relies not only on economic factors, but especially in socio-cultural factors, meaning that development is a process in which social issues are integrated with economic aspects. A second issue arises with respect to endogenous resources that presume its own territory as a competitive resource. From this perspective it is very interesting the analysis of innovative environments and their impact on the territorial capital, noting the importance that this issue plays in social cooperation, encouraging innovation and competitiveness. The territory would be like an ACTIVE SUBJECT and determining for the processes of social and economic development. In short, we can say that territorial development is an interactive process where non-economic factors are as important as economic ones. But we must be careful because every success in territorial development is the mix of local culture, a mode of governance and a production system, which makes it impossible to build a generic model, useful in areas that are structurally and culturally very different. A third issue is one of the most important and is the "territory self-esteem", which refers to the territorial

identity and the role of population in this process. Non-economic factors of identity and territory, i.e. that all social economic and cultural forces of a territory should be taken into account to build innovative competitive environments, especially now as we are in a stage of profound changes.

6.- Bibliografía

ARIAS, X.C y COSTAS, A. (2001): "El eslabón perdido de la descentralización. Argumentos a favor de los gobiernos locales", Claves de Razón Práctica, nº 114, pp.38-43

AYDALOT, P. (1986) *Les milieux innovateurs en Europe*, Economica / GREMI, Paris.

BECATTINI G (1981): «Le district industriel : milieu créatif », Espace et Société, nº66-67, pp. 147-164

BECATTINI, G (1992): « Le district marshallien : une notion socioéconomique », en Georges Benko et Alain Lipietz, *Les régions qui gagnent*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, pp. 35-55.

BRETECHE, P (2009) : « Action publique et territoire innovants : analyse contextuelle de l'évolution d'un milieu : le cas du « pays d'Aix-en-Provence » *Deuxième dialogue euro méditerranéen de management public* 7-10 octobre 2009 Portoroz-piran – Slovenia

BOURDIEU, P. (1986): «The form of capital », en John G. Richardson (dir.), *Handbook of theory and Research for sociology of education*, New York, Greenwood Press, pp. 241-258.

CAMAGNI, R. (2003): "Incertidumbre, capital social y desarrollo local: enseñanzas para una gobernabilidad sostenible del territorio", *Investigaciones Regionales*, 2:31-58

CARAVACA, I. (1998): “Los nuevos espacios ganadores y emergentes”, *EURE (Santiago)* [online]. Vol.24, n.73, pp. 5-30. ISSN 0250-716.

CARAVACA, I y al. (2003): “Redes e innovación socio-institucional en sistemas productivos locales”, *Boletín de Asociación de geógrafos españoles* n° 36, pp 103-115

CARAVACA, I. (2009): “El debate sobre los territorios inteligentes: el caso del área metropolitana de Sevilla”, *Revista EURE* Vol. XXXV, n° 105, pp 23-45

COLLETIS, G. Y PECQUEUR, B. (1995): “Dinámica territorial y factores de la competencia espacial”, en A. Vázquez Barquero y G. Garofoli, *Desarrollo Económico Local en Europa*. Colegio de Economistas de Madrid

COLEMAN, J. (1988): « Social capital in the creation of human capital », *The American journal of sociology*, Vol. 94, pp. S95-S120.

COOKE, P. (2002): *Knowledge economies. Clusters, learning and cooperative advantage*. London-New York: Routledge

CHABONNEAU J. (2005) *Associations en réseaux et capital social collectif: bilan d'expériences et d'analyses*, Texte présenté dans le cadre du projet « *Social Capital in Action: Thematic Policy Studies* » Projet de recherche sur les politiques, INRS urbanisation, culture et société, 41 pages.

COPPIN O. (2002) : « Le milieu innovateur : une approche par le système », *INNOVATIONS* 2002/2, n° 16, p. 29-50.

DONATI P (1998): « El desarrollo de las organizaciones del Tercer Sector en el proceso de modernización y más allá », *Revista española de Investigaciones Sociales*, n° 77/79, pp 113-141

FORSÉ, M (2001) : « Rôle spécifique et croissance du capital social », *Revue de l'OFCE*, n° 76, Paris

FUKUYAMA, F. (1997) : *La confiance et la puissance : vertus sociales et prospérité économique*, Paris, Plon, 412 p.

HALLY (1999): “Une injonction: appartenir, participer. Le retour de la cohésion sociale et du bon citoyen”, *Lien Social et politiques*, RIAC, n° 41

GAGNON, CH. et al. (2008) : « Développement territorial viable, capital social et capital environnemental : quels liens ? », *La Revue en Sciences de l'Environnement*, Vol 8, n°2.

GRANOVETTER, M. (1985): “Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness”. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 481-510.

GRANOVETTER, M.(2006) : L'influence de la structure sociale sur les activités économiques, *Sociologies Pratiques*, N° 13, 9-36.

JOUEN M. (2010) : « Rôle et place des facteurs endogènes dans le développement des territoires » en *Créativité et innovation dans les territoires*, Rapport du groupe de travail présidé par Michel Godet en <http://www.cae.gouv.fr>

MAILLAT, D. (1995): “Territorial dynamic, innovative milieus and regional policy”. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 7: 157-165.

MAILLAT, DENIS, MICHEL QUEVIT ET LANFRANCO SENN (éds.)(1995,)*Réseaux d'innovation et milieux innovateurs: un pari pour le développement régional*, Neuchatel, Edes, 376 p.

MASKEL, P., et al. (1998): *Competitiveness, localised learning and regional development*. London: Routledge.

MOULAERT F., SEKIA F. (2003): « Territorial Innovation Models: A Critical Survey », *Regional Studies*, vol. 37-3, pp. 289-302.

QUEVIT, M. (2007) : « Territoires innovants et compétitivité territoriale : de nouveaux enjeux pour le développement territorial en Wallonie » en *Territoire(s) wallon(s), Hors Série*

PECQUEUR, B. (2010) : « Le territoire comme entité d'innovation et de mobilisation des populations face à la mondialisation des échanges » en **Créativité et innovation dans les territoires**, Rapport du groupe de travail présidé par Michel Godet

PORTER M. (1990): « The Competitive Advantage of Nations », London. *Mac Millan*.

PORTES, A. (1998) « Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology », *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, pp. 1-24.

PRECEDO LEDO A. (2004): *Nuevas realidades territoriales para el siglo XXI: Desarrollo local, identidad territorial y ciudad difusa*, Edit. Síntesis

PRECEDO LEDO, A. (2007): “La evolución del desarrollo local y la convergencia territorial” en M. Garcia Docampo (edit.) *Perspectivas teóricas del desarrollo local*

PUTMAN, R. (1999) « Le déclin du capital social aux États-Unis », *Lien social et politiques – RIAC*, vol. 41, pp. 13-22.

PUTMAN, R. (1995): « Bowling Alone. America's declining social Capital », *J. Democracy* n° 6, pp 65-78

PUTMAN, R. (1993) *Making democracy work*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 258 p.

SCHULLER, T. (2001): “Complémentarité du capital humain et du capital social”, *Revue canadienne de recherche sur les politiques, ISUMA*, pp20-27

SCOTT, A.J. (1988). *New industrial spaces: Flexible production organization*

and regional development in North America and Western Europe. London: Pion.

THEYS, Jacques(2002) :*L'approche territoriale du développement durable, condition d'une prise en compte de sa dimension sociale*. Développement Durable and Territoires. Disponible en ligne http://www.revue-ddt.org/dossier001/D001_A05.htm

UZUNIDIS D. et al. (2010) : « Innovation et proximité, entreprises, entrepreneurs et milieux innovateurs » *Documents de travail N°10 / 2010 Réseau de Recherche sur l'Innovation*

VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, A. (1988): *Desarrollo local, una estrategia de creación de empleo*. Madrid, Pirámide.

VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, A. (1993): *Política Económica Local*. Madrid, Pirámide.

VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, A. (2005): *Las nuevas fuerzas del desarrollo*. Barcelona, Antoni Bosch editor.

VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, A. (2006): Surgimiento y transformación de clusters y milieus en los procesos de desarrollo. *Revista Eure XXXII*, 95:75-92.

VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, A. (2007): “Desarrollo endógeno: teorías y políticas de desarrollo territorial”, *Investigaciones regionales n° 11*, pp. 183-210

VELTZ, P. (1993): « Logiques d'entreprise et territoires: les nouvelles règles du jeu » en Savy, M. y Veltz, P. *Les Nouveaux Espaces de l'Entreprise*. Editions de l'Aube, Datar, Paris.

WOOLCOK, M (2001): “Le rôle du capital social dans la compréhension des résultats sociaux et économiques » *Revue canadienne de Recherche sur les politiques, ISUMA*, pp11-18