

Transformations in the Process of Local Development with Particular Emphasis on Urbanisation and Social Capital in the First Quarter of the 21st Century

Alicja Kozak

Wroclaw University of Economics and Business

e-mail: alicja.kozak@ue.wroc.pl

ORCID: [0000-0002-6025-5529](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6025-5529)

© 2026 Alicja Kozak

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Quote as: Kozak, A. (2026). Transformations in the Process of Local Development with Particular Emphasis on Urbanisation and Social Capital in the First Quarter of the 21st Century. *Biblioteka Regionalisty. Regional Journal*, 26, 9-18.

DOI: [10.15611/br.2026.1.02](https://doi.org/10.15611/br.2026.1.02)

JEL: F63, R11

Abstract

Aim: The author aimed to identify and outline the direction of transformation in local development processes, with particular attention to urbanisation and social capital in the first quarter of the 21st century.

Methodology: The study employed a structured critical literature review, an assessment of secondary data sources, and expert-based interpretative analysis. The literature review draws on peer-reviewed publications and institutional reports (e.g. OECD, World Bank, European Commission) related to local development, urbanisation, and social capital, selected based on relevance and scientific credibility. The analysis followed a thematic and comparative approach to identify key conceptual developments and emerging trends. Secondary data and policy documents were used to contextualise theoretical findings, while expert evaluation provided an interpretative role, integrating theoretical insights with contemporary territorial development practice. The study adopted a conceptual and explanatory research strategy rather than quantitative hypothesis testing.

Results: Local development is undergoing significant transformations, reflected not only in the growing importance of socio-economic space in location decisions but also in new urban challenges and the increasing role of social capital, which can foster innovation and cooperation, yet in some forms may also restrict openness to change.

Implications and recommendations: The findings indicate that current processes of local development must increasingly consider local resources, including social capital, as well as the dynamics of urbanisation.

Originality/value: The article's value is the systematisation of knowledge on local development concerning urbanisation and social capital processes, as well as the indication of their synergistic and conflictual relationships.

Keywords: human capital, creative capital, territorial development, knowledge-based economy

1. Introduction

In the first quarter of the 21st century, local development processes underwent significant transformation driven by global changes and the growing importance of the endogenous resources of territorial units. Globalisation, energy transitions, economic crises, and unpredictable events revealed that the resilience and competitiveness of local socio-economic systems increasingly depend on their adaptive capacities and the quality of governance at the level of local communities. In this context, urbanisation and social capital were particularly decisive in shaping contemporary development paradigms.

Urbanisation has become one of the most significant processes influencing socio-economic structures. Its contemporary manifestation is closely linked to the network economy, information and communication technology development, and new spatial organisational forms. Phenomena such as urban sprawl, hyper-urbanisation, and the creation of 'cities within cities' present new challenges for local development, requiring an integrated consideration of economic, social, and environmental dimensions.

The second factor, social capital, under conditions of decentralisation and the growing importance of local communities, provides the foundation for building adaptive and innovative capacity. However, not all forms of social capital are conducive to development, as overly strong intra-group ties may lead to exclusion and stagnation. Analysing these conditions allows for a better understanding of how social capital either facilitates or constrains the dynamics of local development under contemporary turbulence.

This paper aimed to identify and outline the directions of transformation in local development processes, with particular attention to urbanisation and social capital in the first quarter of the 21st century. The author employed a critical review of the literature, an assessment of secondary data, and expert opinions. The originality of the paper stems from systematising knowledge on contemporary approaches to local development and highlighting the interrelations between global and local processes, as well as the role of intangible resources and new urbanisation challenges in shaping the development strategies of local communities.

2. The Concept, Origins, and Essence of Local Development

The contemporary economic system is the result of multiple, multidirectional changes and processes that have unfolded over a long period of its formation. When analysing local development it is necessary to account for historical, structural, and institutional factors that have shaped the evolution of modern socio-economic systems. Research emphasises (Domański, 2004; Hausner, 1994; Jewtuchowicz, 2005), long-term processes of structural transformation laid the foundations for contemporary concepts of local development. Phenomena occurring at the end of the 20th century and in the first quarter of the 21st century proved particularly significant for their transformation. In the literature on local development, these processes are consistently linked to an endogenous perspective in which the utilisation of local resources, knowledge, and of institutional networks becomes crucial. This orientation is also embedded in the broader current of the new economic geography, which highlights the importance of location, clusters, and knowledge flows. It can be stated that civilisational development during this period underwent profound transformations, resulting in new concepts and phenomena across various dimensions of socio-economic life.

The events exerting significant influence on the dynamics of socio-economic processes in the 21st century include the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine, alongside a range of other phenomena of varying scope and intensity (e.g. the 2008 financial crisis, migration flows, and energy transitions). These events assumed an increasingly dynamic character, with the intervals between their occurrence becoming progressively shorter. At the same time, new phenomena emerged in socio-economic life. Local development is one of the most essential elements of the economy, and its relevance undoubtedly increased during this period. The genesis of this phenomenon can be traced back to the formation of modern principles of territorial self-government in the second half of the 19th century, which initiated the crystallisation of the foundations of local development into more comprehensive conceptual frameworks. In this sense, local development should be examined from a historical and an institutional perspective. At present, it is emphasised that the term local development does not possess a single unequivocal interpretation (Table 1). Instead, it is an imprecise, polysemous, and ideologically charged concept, although it functions as a standard, colloquial term in everyday practice.

Table 1. Selected definitions and conceptualisations of local development in literature and institutional documents

Source	Definition / Conceptualisation	Main emphases
OECD, n.d.	The process of building stronger, more vibrant communities in which economic opportunities emerge, and all members can benefit from a high quality of life	Quality of life, community strength, and inclusiveness
Swinburn et al., 2006	Building the economic capacity of a local area in order to improve its economic prospects and its residents' quality of life	Economic capacity, development perspectives, residents' well-being
Pertoldi et al., 2022	Local development is embedded in cohesion policy and territorial strategies and is oriented toward using local potential within the framework of regional integration	Territorial cohesion, regional policy, integration
Tonon, 2021	Local development is a "human, territorial, multidimensional, [and] integrated process"	Holistic approach, integration of social and territorial dimensions
Milan-García et al., 2019	The concept of <i>sustainable local development</i> links territorial resilience with social, economic, and environmental dimensions	Sustainability, resilience, sectoral integration
Sekula, 2002	Local development is defined in two strands: (1) subject-oriented—emphasis on communities and local actors; (2) process-oriented—emphasis on territorial transformation	Actor vs. process, hybrid definitions

Source: author's own elaboration.

The concept of local development became firmly embedded in economic practice only in the 1980s. Scholars can trace its origins to two main intellectual currents. The first, Anglo-Saxon, was associated with the crisis of large cities and the growing problems of the so-called inner city, which required specific development strategies and public interventions (Fainstein & Gray, 1996; Porter, 1995). The second, more closely related to the European context, emerged on the continent as an alternative to development models previously promoted but rejected in the 1970s—namely, mass consumption, unification, and the welfare state—signifying at the same time the decline of the Fordist paradigm¹. Instead, emphasis began on small scale, diversity, and local distinctiveness, aptly captured by the well-known maxim "small is beautiful" (Hausner, 1994; Schumacher, 1973).

In the emerging models of local development, alongside purely economic aspects, social, cultural, and even ideological dimensions are simultaneously considered. At present the literature contains a wide range of definitions of local development. This definitional divergence is not solely an academic problem—it has significant practical consequences, as different conceptualisations determine distinct strategies of local governments in the areas of investment, social policy, and spatial management. Even

¹ Fordism – a model of production and labour organization based on the principles introduced by Henry Ford in the early 20th century, characterised by the standardisation of products, assembly-line production, high productivity, and mass consumption (made possible by rising workers' wages). Its collapse in the 1970s was linked to the crisis of the industrial economy and the advent of the post-Fordist era (see Jessop, 2005).

the institutions of the European Union have attempted to define it, pointing out that the goal of this process is a fairer distribution of wealth as well as the sustainable development and revitalisation of individual territories. In simplified terms, local development may be understood as the creation of new values within the local space (Klasik, 1996). These values include:

- new forms of activity (economic, social, administrative, service-oriented, etc.),
- new enterprises and institutions, and new jobs,
- new products, goods, and services meeting both internal and external demand,
- attractive location offers,
- high quality of the living environment,
- accessibility of diverse services.

To capture the essence of local development, it may be stated that it is essentially the supplementation of purely economic concepts with elements such as diversity, the valorisation of human potential, and non-market relations. However, the diversity of definitions suggests that local development is a multidimensional category combining economic, social, and spatial components—thus making its unequivocal theoretical conceptualisation difficult.

The importance of local development grew particularly at the beginning of the 21st century, alongside the processes of globalisation and the emergence of new systems of economic activity characterised by greater flexibility and the dominance of horizontal relations—the so-called networks. As already noted, a special role in shaping local development is attributed to territorial self-government. The growing importance of territorial self-government in recent decades reflects the progressive empowerment of local and regional communities and, consequently, the decentralisation of the state. The principle of subsidiarity has become the foundation of contemporary territorial self-government, according to which those levels of public administration should carry out tasks they are best suited to perform. From a practical perspective, the principle of subsidiarity fosters efficiency and brings decision-making closer to citizens, however it also generates disparities in the quality of public services between units with different financial and institutional capacities.

Territorial self-government operates in various forms across countries, enjoying different degrees of autonomy. Central authority retains a superior position in unitary states (including Poland). In contrast, in federal states (e.g. Switzerland, the United States, Germany), particular levels of self-government possess considerable autonomy and independence in shaping socio-economic life. Thus, local development is based on the gradual transfer of responsibility and initiative to the level of local communities, reinforcing the mechanisms of endogenous growth and creating a sense of shared responsibility for development. Regardless of the adopted institutional arrangement, the primary task of local self-government is to undertake actions aimed at activating endogenous social potential, above all to channel it towards the creation of a local climate of entrepreneurship. This becomes even more important given the simultaneous decline in the influence of central authority, with all its consequences, including the erosion of the elites' authority. As a result, local self-government units gradually assume part of the competencies previously reserved for the centre through a gradual decentralisation process.

Naturally, this process does not unfold linearly, and it encounters numerous barriers—often formal (sometimes even utilitarian) as well as structural—yet it seems inevitable in light of the transformations taking place in the contemporary economy. Its inevitability stems from the greater flexibility of such units and their considerable potential for adaptability in response to the intensification of multidirectional environmental changes and mounting competitive pressures. In this regard, the local government unit becomes, alongside economic actors, a new participant in the market game, where it must independently confront increasing competition across various dimensions of socio-economic systems. For these reasons, competitiveness has become not only a fact but also a standard of operation for self-government spatial units. At the same time, at the level of these units, it becomes necessary—given the weakening role of the state—to restore social ties and a sense of community, which serves as a response not only to the erosion of state structures but also to the growing

turbulence of the environment and the consequent escalation of uncertainty. On this basis it is reasonable to state that the ability of local communities to foster their own development is linked to the adaptation of innovations, the assimilation of information technologies, and the utilisation of specific endogenous resources. Conversely, the negatively connoted phenomenon that can also be observed in the reality of our country is regressive localism, manifested in a conservative attitude that seeks to preserve dysfunctional local structures. Ultimately, this leads to the peripheralisation of such units and, in the long run, to the loss of their ability to shape local development processes at a satisfactory level.

As a result it may be stated that whilst local development is becoming an increasingly resource-dependent process, relying on both material and immaterial assets, yet it is ever more closely linked to and influenced by processes occurring on a global scale. According to Jewtuchowicz (2005), this leads to the phenomenon of *glocalisation*, which highlights the complementarity between the advancing process of globalisation and the growing importance of local development. This complementarity is expressed through multidimensional relations between what is local and what is global. This phenomenon is particularly evident in large metropolitan areas, which simultaneously function as global nodes of the network economy and centres of concentration of local resources. In Poland, for instance, glocalisation processes can be observed in cities such as Kraków and Wrocław, which have become hubs of foreign capital and business service centres, while also develop local strategies to support small and medium-sized enterprises as well as the creative sector. This is consistent with the assertion that only areas with a high concentration of economic activity generate the specific conditions necessary for accumulating and exchanging knowledge among the actors operating within them (Gaczek, 2005). Similarly, Robertson (1995) emphasised that glocalisation simultaneously reinforces global and local processes, thereby making local development an integral part of contemporary economic transformations.

The effect of the above is a situation in which even the most peripheral economic systems, located far from the world's leading centres, remain dependent on changes occurring there. Thus, pure autarky and complete self-sufficiency cannot exist. On the contrary, dependence and various forms of interconnected phenomena—constantly interacting, often seemingly insignificant and geographically distant—play a crucial role in other local systems. Such interdependencies are increasingly described by the *butterfly effect* hypothesis, which points to teleconnections (long-distance interactions) between phenomena that appear unrelated. It is argued that small local economic or social events may serve as impulses (sources) for large-scale economic processes at considerable distances from their origin.

From these considerations, local development is becoming an increasingly important component of processes across multiple dimensions and areas of the contemporary economy. Equally important is that local development is not only conditioned by macro-processes unfolding on a global scale, but also, to an ever-greater extent, initiates these global trends. Therefore, it is justified to state that local development is finding new foundations within the emerging digital economy and, consequently, the nascent information society. The advancement of information and communication technologies, digitalisation, and the spread of the network economy open new perspectives for local development—both in terms of innovation and access to knowledge, as well as in fostering more inclusive forms of social participation.

3. New Perspectives and Dimensions of Local Development with Consideration of Urbanisation and Social Capital

Since the beginning of the 21st century, local development has been pursued across increasingly complex economic, social, cultural, and ideological dimensions. These multifaceted processes stem from phenomena rooted in the past (albeit taking on new forms today) and new, previously unknown events and developments. Urbanisation is undoubtedly a specific phenomenon that accompanies and largely compels local development.

Urbanisation, as a process reflecting complex socio-economic transformations in space, manifests itself in expanding urban areas and the diffusion of the urban lifestyle. Its origins date back to the late 18th century in England, where it was a direct outcome of the Industrial Revolution. However, the 20th and 21st centuries brought significant changes to this phenomenon, driven by industrialisation, modernisation, and the rise of the digital economy. As suggested by Parysek (2008, p. 13), by the end of the 20th century, urbanisation worldwide had assumed a new quality, shaped by diverse, often contradictory tendencies rooted in global transformations and the post-Fordist economy. The outcome of these shifts was that, officially, since 2006, more than half of the world's population has lived in cities. Emerging phenomena in socio-economic processes have undoubtedly reshaped urbanisation, giving it a new face and simultaneously creating new foundations for local development. With the formation of the new economy, this process—manifested in disseminating the urban model of life—has reached such a scale and scope that most socio-economic spaces in highly developed countries now exhibit urbanised forms of functioning.

The origins of this transformation are primarily found in the information revolution, and above all in the emergence and dynamic growth of the Internet. According to Castells (2000, pp. 252-253), the network economy—whose fundamental tool is the Internet—concentrates in modern metropolises, which serve as centres of high value-added activity. As a manifestation of the new information era, metropolitan concentration contributes to the blurring of boundaries between the city and its surrounding areas. Due to the flow of information, the rapid advancement of multifaceted communication, and the ease of mobility, access (and openness) to civilisational centres is increasing from ever more distant areas. This leads to the expansion of cities beyond their traditional boundaries, often taking the form of urban sprawl or the emergence of less compact settlement islands functionally connected to the metropolis. This phenomenon generates significant economic costs associated with maintaining technical infrastructure and public services over increasingly larger areas while contributing to landscape fragmentation and heightened environmental pressures.

As Szymańska (2008, p. 46) observed, in some highly developed countries a phenomenon has emerged referred to as hyper-urbanisation, understood as the replication of the newest urban forms nationwide. Consequently, it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish between urban and rural life, as both dimensions intermingle and lose their traditional boundaries.

The changes described above were characterised primarily by (Parysek, 2008, p. 13):

- urbanisation of the suburbs,
- peripheralisation of the urban core,
- development of the outer parts of cities,
- deconcentration and reconcentration of buildings and functions,
- emergence of inner-city enclaves,
- deindustrialisation and reindustrialisation,
- blurring of city boundaries,
- growing social inequalities,
- increasing tensions and confrontations.

With the formation of the knowledge-based economy, one can expect a further deepening of these processes, leading to a redefinition of the foundations of local development. This phenomenon unfolds under increasingly complex functioning conditions, in which modern information and communication technologies play a crucial role. On the one hand, these technologies enhance the efficiency of local government operations, while on the other, they generate new challenges. The Internet and the possibility of establishing real-time connections create the risk of an excess and disintegration of information—often unverifiable and challenging to process—and are also associated with intensified surveillance, the phenomenon of disinformation, and the erosion of privacy within the context of the digital transformation of cities. As Kozak (2022) emphasised, ICT (Information and Communication Technologies), while opening new possibilities for communication and contributing to the intensification of development processes, have simultaneously generated new problems,

deepened existing threats, and led to a peculiar 'shrinking' of time and space in the virtual dimension. An additional dimension is the growth of the platform economy, which, while facilitating entrepreneurship and remote work, also exacerbates the problem of digital exclusion, particularly in smaller towns and among groups with lower levels of educational capital. These phenomena require adequate institutional responses and consistent digital education, which constitutes a key factor in mitigating the risks associated with the functioning of the information society (Kozak, 2022, pp. 17, 39-41). This process fosters the greater openness of socio-economic spaces, yet a negative phenomenon can also be observed in highly developed countries—the self-isolation of urban enclaves characterised by a high degree of self-sufficiency. To counteract such tendencies it is necessary, among other measures, to strive to create attractive public spaces that allow for "fluid locations"² functioning. At the same time, according to Castells (2003), this new spatiality will be subject to segregation through the destruction of networks. This is linked to forming so-called "glocal nodes" in the urban areas of large, lagging agglomerations. These places are connected via fibre-optic links and modern telecommunications systems with the dominant business centres of highly developed countries, while being simultaneously isolated from their immediate surroundings (Castells, 2003). Another negative trend is the spatial segregation of cities, manifested in the emergence of isolated residential estates and the pauperisation of other urban areas.

To sum up, it can be stated that the knowledge-based economy has triggered a reevaluation of urbanisation processes, which directly translates into the shaping of local development. The directions taken by contemporary urbanisation often diverge from earlier forecasts. A good example is the once widespread belief that the significance of place in the functioning of the economy would diminish. When analysing both global phenomena and the functioning of large cities, including those in Poland, one can observe the growing importance of selected, clearly defined, and enclosed spaces for meetings and decision-making. As a consequence, modern development centres are emerging, sometimes referred to as 'cities within cities' and 'delay-free spaces'. Undoubtedly, urbanisation will continue to pose new challenges for local development, compelling decisions of a new socio-economic dimension.

Closely related to urbanisation processes in specific localities is the concept of social capital, which—as noted by Jewtuchowicz (2005, p. 119) noted—is increasingly referred to as relational capital, emphasising its nature rooted in networks of social connections and its growing spatial distinctiveness. This approach extends well beyond economics, encompassing numerous sociological, ethnic, and cultural phenomena. Without question, social capital constitutes a form of intangible capital, and its creation and utilisation follow patterns similar to those observed with other forms of capital (financial, physical, or human). According to Matysiak (1999, p. 62), social capital can be perceived as a mechanism that substitutes for individual inputs, reducing uncertainty in economic action and cooperation. This applies in particular to:

1. expenditures on the protection of private (individual) resources and assets,
2. outlays for collecting information about the economic environment,
3. expenditures related to conveying information about one's characteristics that inspire trust in the environment.

Social capital manifests itself, among other ways, in that individuals, when pursuing their own undertakings, rely not only on the resources they possess but also on the attitudes and behaviours of other members of the community. As a result, a feedback loop emerges that mobilises community members to greater participation in social life by strengthening informal ties. This phenomenon is closely linked to the principle of proximity, or even neighbourhood, which reinforces social capital through the principle of reciprocity arising from durable and recurrent relations among community members. Social capital should therefore be regarded as a key category of local development, constituting one of its fundamental pillars.

² According to Horan (2000, p. 13), this is an ultra-modern hybrid space, combining the traditional urban environment with the Internet, thereby creating new urban forms.

It is widely accepted that social capital derives its sources from traditions of civic engagement, positive experiences of cooperation within local communities, the activities of public organisations and associations, the attitudes of local leaders, and the education system. These elements represent a crucial component of local development, making social capital an indispensable, dominant factor in this process. A frequently cited definition in the literature came from Putnam, who argued that the concept of social capital refers to such features of social organisation as trust, norms, and networks, which can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated action (Putnam, 1995, p. 256).

As pointed out by Grosse (2004, p. 53), not all forms of social capital are conducive to economic development, including local development. This means that social capital can also be perceived as a potential threat to the development of a given territorial unit. For example, rigid social ties and relations, combined with a high level of distrust toward public institutions, may hinder entrepreneurial activity and limit the emergence of new socio-economic initiatives. By contrast, flexible forms of social cooperation, which facilitate access to knowledge and learning, foster the creation of innovations and their diffusion within a community, thereby contributing to economic development. For this reason, in research practice a commonly used method of measuring social capital is the analysis of individual participation in various forms of civic engagement within the local community, such as activity in associations, volunteering, foundations, or public benefit organisations (Jewtuchowicz, 2005, p. 120). The literature also points to the “dark side of social capital” (Portes, 1998), stressing that strong intra-group ties may promote nepotism, clientelism, or social exclusion. Putnam (1995), in his book *Making Democracy Work*, when analysing the regional development of Italy, pointed to such features of community functioning as trust, social norms, and networks of associations, which are manifestations of social capital. Beyond characteristics such as knowledge, experience, qualifications, or skills, human resources are also shaped by qualities that emerge between individual human assets as well as among them collectively.

In conclusion it should be emphasised that the literature reflects diverse approaches to explaining and describing social capital. Social capital, however, cannot a priori be equated with socio-economic development, including local development, nor can it be assumed that it always exerts a positive influence on this process. Even when such a relationship exists, it must be remembered that social capital today tends to erode, resulting from civilisational change and the rise of individualistic attitudes. At the same time, powerful intra-group bonds may acquire an isolating character, leading to stagnation or even regression.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

In the first quarter of the 21st century, local development is shaped by new processes and transformations occurring both in the global economy and within individual states and regions. These changes are leading to the emergence of new dimensions of development that increasingly combine global phenomena with the activation of endogenous resources, often of unique and unrepeatable character. It can be expected that the importance of local development will continue to grow in parallel with globalisation and its accompanying negative effects.

Urbanisation exerts a significant influence on the trajectory of local development, functioning both as a supportive factor and a potential threat. Whilst cities, serving as centres of innovation and investment, stimulate the development of surrounding areas and expand access to education, healthcare, and labour markets, the excessive concentration of growth in metropolitan areas results in the marginalisation of rural regions, while uncontrolled urbanisation contributes to deepening social and spatial inequalities. Hence, the implementation of sustainable local development in the context of urbanisation is of key importance. The concept of *sustainable urbanisation* refers primarily to spatial planning that takes into account the needs of local communities, supports the development of medium-sized and small towns as a counterbalance to metropolitan dominance, and fosters the integration of urban and rural areas.

The significance of social capital as an intangible factor of local development is undoubtedly increasing. More and more frequently, it is emphasised that, alongside material and financial resources, social ties, networks of cooperation, trust, and the capacity for self-organisation form the foundation of effective local action. Social capital is acquiring new dimensions as it encompasses traditional forms of cooperation within local communities and associations, and modern relations based on digital communication and virtual networks. A high level of social trust reduces transaction costs, facilitates knowledge exchange, and increases the propensity to undertake joint economic and social initiatives. Conversely, when social capital takes the form of closed, exclusive ties (*bonding social capital*), it may act as a barrier—reinforcing group isolation, perpetuating distrust toward public institutions, or limiting openness to innovation. Therefore, it is crucial to strengthen forms of *bridging social capital*, which foster open cooperation and the diffusion of innovation locally and beyond the local scale. It appears that one of the most important directions for future research will be the analysis of the synergies between social capital and new digital technologies, which shape innovative forms of cooperation at both the local and supra-local levels.

References

- Castells, M. (2000). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* (vol. I: *The Rise of the Network Society*; vol. II: *The Power of Identity*). Blackwell Publishers.
- Castells, M. (2003). *Galaktyka Internetu. Refleksje nad Internetem, biznesem i społeczeństwem*. Dom Wydawniczy REBIS.
- Domański, R. (2004). *Geografia ekonomiczna. Ujęcie dynamiczne*. PWN.
- Domański, R. (2006). *Gospodarka przestrzenna. Podstawy teoretyczne*. PWN.
- Fainstein, S. S., & Gray, M. (1996). Economic Development Strategies for the Inner City: The Need for Governmental Intervention. *The Review of Black Political Economy*, 24(2), 29-43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02690019>
- Gaczek, W. M. (2005). Innowacyjność jako czynnik podnoszenia konkurencyjności gospodarki regionu. *Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej w Poznaniu*, (57), 9-29.
- Grosse, T. G. (2004). *Polityka regionalna Unii Europejskiej. Przykład Grecji, Włoch, Irlandii i Polski*. Instytut Spraw Publicznych.
- Hausner, J. (1994). Postfordowski paradygmat przemysłowy. *Gospodarka Narodowa*, (4), 8-13.
- Horan, T. A. (2000). *Digital Places: Building Our City of Bits*. Urban Land Institute.
- Jessop, B. (2005). Fordism and Post-Fordism: A Critical Reformulation. In A. J. Scott, & M. Storper (Eds.), *Pathways to Industrialization and Regional Development* (pp. 42-62). Taylor and Francis.
- Jewtuchowicz, A. (2005). *Terytorium i współczesne dylematy jego rozwoju*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Klasik, A. (1996). Zarządzanie rozwojem lokalnym. In F. Kuźnik (Ed.), *Zarządzanie rozwojem gmin w zespołach miejsko-przemysłowych* (pp. 15-34). Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Katowicach.
- Klimczak, B. (2006). *Wybrane problemy i zastosowania ekonomii instytucjonalnej*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Oskara Langego we Wrocławiu.
- Kozak, A. (2022). *Wybrane obszary funkcjonowania miast w nowych realiach społeczno-gospodarczych*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
- Kukliński, A. (2003). O nowym modelu polityki regionalnej – artykuł dyskusyjny. *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, 4(14), 5-14.
- Matysiak, A. (1999). *Źródła kapitału społecznego*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Oskara Langego we Wrocławiu.
- Milan-García, J., Uribe-Toril, J., Ruiz-Real, J. L., & de Pablo Valenciano, J. (2019). Sustainable Local Development: An Overview of the State of Knowledge. *Resources*, 8(1), 31. <https://doi.org/10.3390/resources8010031>
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD]. (n.d.). *Local Development*.
- Parysek, J. J. (2008). Urbanizacja i niektóre współczesne idee, koncepcje i modele planowania miast. In J. Słodczyk, & M. Śmigielka (Eds.), *Współczesne kierunki i wymiary procesów urbanizacji* (pp. 9-28). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Pertoldi, M., Fioretti, C., Guzzo, F., Testori, G., De Bruijn, M., Ferry, M., Kah, S., Servillo, L. A., & Windisch, S. (2022). *Handbook of Territorial and Local Development Strategies*. European Commission. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/57919>
- Porter, M. E. (1995). The Competitive Advantage of the Inner City. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(3), 55-71.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.1>
- Przygodzki, Z. (2004). Znaczenie kapitału społecznego w rozwoju. In A. Jewtuchowicz (Ed.), *Wiedza, innowacyjność, przedsiębiorczość a rozwój regionów*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

- Putnam, R. (1995). *Demokracja w działaniu*. Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time–Space and Homogeneity–Heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global Modernities* (pp. 25–44). Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250563.n2>
- Różga Luter, R. (2004). Gospodarka oparta na wiedzy a rozwój regionalny na przykładzie regionu środkowego Meksyku. *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, (1).
- Schumacher, E. F. (1973). *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. Blond & Briggs.
- Sekuła, A. (2002). Local Development – the Definition Aspect in the 21st Century. In *Company at the Turn of the 21st Century* (pp. 59–64). Politechnika Rzeszowska. <https://open.icm.edu.pl/handle/123456789/4447>
- Swinburn, G., Goga, S., & Murphy, F. (2006). *Local Economic Development: A Primer – Developing and Implementing Local Economic Development Strategies and Action Plans*. The World Bank. Retrieved April 22, 2026, from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/211891468140975725>
- Szymańska, D. (2008). *Urbanizacja na świecie*. PWN.
- Toffler, A., & Toffler, H. (1996). *Budowa nowej cywilizacji*. Zysk i S-ka.
- Tonon, G. (2021). Introduction to the Special Issue “Local Development for Peace and Social Sustainability”. *Local Development & Society*, 2(2), 181–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26883597.2021.2023440>

Przekształcenia w procesie rozwoju lokalnego ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem urbanizacji i kapitału społecznego w pierwszym ćwierćwieczu XXI w.

Streszczenie

Cel: Celem jest identyfikacja i wskazanie kierunków przekształceń procesu rozwoju lokalnego w kontekście procesu urbanizacji i kapitału społecznego w pierwszym ćwierćwieczu XXI w.

Metodyka: W artykule wykorzystano szeroko krytyczną analizę literatury przedmiotu, ocenę danych (informacji) zastanych oraz opinie ekspertów.

Wyniki: Proces rozwoju lokalnego ulega istotnym przekształceniom, czego przejawem jest nie tylko wzrost znaczenia przestrzeni społeczno-gospodarczej w podejmowaniu decyzji lokalizacyjnych, ale także nowe wyzwania urbanizacyjne oraz rosnąca rola kapitału społecznego, który może wspierać innowacje i kooperację, choć w niektórych formach również ograniczać otwartość na zmiany.

Implikacje i rekomendacje: Poczynione ustalenia wskazują, że obecne procesy rozwoju lokalnego muszą uwzględniać w coraz większym zakresie lokalne zasoby, w tym kapitał społeczny oraz proces urbanizacji.

Oryginalność/wartość: Wartością artykułu jest uporządkowanie wiedzy na temat rozwoju lokalnego w zestawieniu z procesami urbanizacji i kapitału społecznego oraz wskazanie na ich synergiczne i konfliktowe relacje.

Słowa kluczowe: rozwój lokalny, urbanizacja, kapitał społeczny, gospodarka oparta na wiedzy
