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The concept of urban-rural collaboration, which is designed to serve cohesion policy goals in the European Union, is relatively new and assumes the need to link large metropolitan areas with surrounding rural areas in a number of ways. This concept has found expression in a project called “Urban-Rural Partnerships in Metropolitan Areas (URMA)”. The project was financed by the European Regional Development Fund via the INTERREG IVC program in the period 2012–2014.

An analysis of urban-rural partnerships may be conducted on two different levels: (1) within the framework of the European Union’s cohesion policy and its underlying ideas, (2) in terms of actual partnerships between different entities collaborating on different thematic and spatial levels.

The Institute of Urban Development in Kraków was a partner in the “URMA” project and organized a seminar in December of 2012 dedicated to the issue of urban–rural partnerships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area. The seminar included the project’s partners as well as representatives from the Marshal’s Office of Małopolskie Voivodeship, City Hall of Kraków, and townships located within Kraków’s functional urban area. The seminar had three main goals: (1) to present the concept of urban–rural partnerships, which is virtually unknown in Poland, (2) to present the assumptions behind the project, which was at its early stages at the time, (3) to initiate a direct conversation on the issue of collaboration.
within the metropolitan area of Kraków and especially that between the urban core and surrounding areas, which are mostly rural.

While the seminar participants did not question the need for collaboration, especially in the context of challenges associated with existing functional linkages, questions did arise in the area of problems, barriers, and limitations that reduce the effectiveness of urban-rural collaboration – in some cases inhibit it altogether. Seminar attendees pointed out the lack of legal and organizational instruments that would make it possible to formalize collaboration, frequent conflicts of interest, and fears of losing sovereignty, especially in the case of smaller townships. Other problem areas included cultural determinants, the slow emergence of a culture of collaboration, and low levels of mutual trust that limit opportunities for less formalized collaboration between cities and surrounding rural areas.

The main challenges to urban-rural collaboration are issues associated with spatial planning, development of infrastructure, and public services. These are areas of the greatest conflict of interest and call for coordinated efforts that exceed administrative procedures and proceed with a sense of urgency.

The concept of urban-rural collaboration is already found in a number of current and future-oriented regional development documents in the European Union. Yet, this concept is still little known in Poland. The discourse on regional collaboration occurs in Poland within the framework of the discussion on the development of large metropolitan areas, usually in terms of the needs of large cities. However, the urban-rural collaboration concept hereafter called the “URMA-Approach”, presents a different philosophy. It does not lessen the importance of cities in economic development, but it does underscore the significance of rural areas in the realm of sustainable development. It also identifies other functions that rural areas perform or could perform for urban area residents. Given the asymmetric relationship between large cities and rural areas, partnerships between the two appear to be important in order for any type of collaboration to produce real solutions to real problems and to take advantage of the potential associated with such collaboration. The assumptions behind the URMA approach are explained in detail in the first chapter by M. Jacuniak-Suda, J. Knieling, and A. Obersteg.

Responses provided by the representatives of rural areas – including those provided by township managers who had participated in the seminar – unequivocally pointed to the need for cities to take a more partnership-oriented approach. The city of Amsterdam was cited as an example where the Mayor negotiates with the representatives of small rural townships as equal partners. (Amsterdam is often cited as a flagship example of urban-rural collaboration, but also happens to be a special case in many ways.) On the other hand, such negotiations in Poland are held via regional authorities, if at all. Rural areas and small towns located in the same region are often perceived by large cities in Poland mostly as competitors vying for all types of regional development subsidies rather than as partners who can help accomplish mutually beneficial goals.
The lively discussion at this seminar inspired the editorial team to continue this theme by learning more about urban-rural partnerships in Poland in terms of their pertinent determinants, opportunities, and potential benefits. The operative word here is potential, as none yet exist in a fully functional sense. Some aspects of urban-rural collaboration can be observed in Poland today and this true especially in the less formalized realm of action. Yet, even these informal linkages may serve as a good starting point for more complex systemic solutions.

As in the case of other regional projects, urban-rural partnerships require adaptation to local needs and conditions. It is important to recognize barriers to collaboration as well as potential benefits of collaboration that could affect various entities in cities and rural areas. A number of basic questions are also in order here including who should initiate collaborative efforts, which thematic areas are most likely to produce significant benefits, and at which levels should such collaboration occur. The experience of the “URMA” project partners indicate that the value added of collaboration is not always recognized by local actors.

On the other hand, it would not be sensible to treat urban-rural collaboration as a cornerstone of regional development that brings only positive results, especially given the lack of unequivocal research on this issue. It is important to note that the concept of urban-rural partnerships is often treated as a tool designed to help achieve cohesion policy goals in the European Union, but it should not be viewed as an alternative to existing solutions. It is proper to view it as a supplemental approach. Another issue that needs consideration in the context of the potential and purpose of urban-rural collaboration is the issue of social and institutional development – and not merely economic development. Hence, “URMA” is not designed to simply redistribute resources across a region, but to make optimal use of existing potential and to produce new linkages that will help yield sustainable spatial development.

Partnerships in Poland were sought in order to provide a case-by-case basis for the identification of the nature of urban-rural partnerships and whether it makes sense to pursue such partnerships and the benefits produced by them. One barrier to an analysis of this issue is the generic nature of the term “urban-rural partnership”. Other issues emerged as well. What exactly is a partnership? What types of partners ought to be considered? At what levels can such a partnership exist? The issue of urban-rural partnerships began to escape our grasp. A number of these questions found answers in experiences associated with the “URMA” project in other countries. However, it quickly became apparent that “URMA” solutions may vary by region in light of the great diversity of social and economic conditions across the European continent.

Hence, the editors-in-chief of this publication decided to extend the discussion initiated at the seminar by inviting renowned geographers, sociologists, and urban planners to identify not so much urban-rural partnerships in Poland as the conditions and potential
associated with their formation at various levels including the social, educational, and cultural level as well as the economic, administrative, and spatial planning levels. These contributors were asked to evaluate the scale of existing collaborative interactions between cities and rural areas in Poland and to identify examples of partnerships, desired outcomes, available opportunities, and associated needs.

Abstract

The authors have made an attempt to define the role of urban-rural partnerships as a tool designed to achieve regional cohesion (M. Jacuniak-Suda, J. Knieling, A. Obersteg), to determine success factors in the realm of social and economic achievement in large metropolitan areas and estimate the role of urban-rural partnerships in the achievement of success (J. Bański) as well as to determine the current state of – and perspectives for – local government collaboration in large metropolitan areas in Poland (T. Kaczmarek). They also present the issue of partnerships in the broader context of suburbanization (K. Kajdanek), changes in agriculture (U. Kaczmarek) and discuss the issue in relation to the role of education (K. Szafraniec).

The publication also includes two case studies based on empirical data on regional “collaboration” in two large metropolitan areas in Poland: (1) Kraków (M. Huculak, M. Dej, W. Jarczewski), (2) Łódź (M. Wójcik).

This book serves as a first attempt to analyze selected social and economic aspects and the potential of the idea of urban-rural partnerships in Poland. The Editorial Board believes that this book may help spark further debate between participants from academic, political, and business environments as well as the general public.

At the same time, the editors are aware of the “incomplete” nature of this publication and that more research is needed in this new-in-Poland field of urban-rural partnerships as well as in the established realm of “URMA” across Europe.

Conclusions

Experience accumulated in the course of the “URMA” project and the analysis of other issues associated with this theme by the co-authors of this book yield a number of basic conclusions concerning the very idea of an “URMA” partnership and the practical aspects of it.

First, it appears that the very definition of urban-rural partnerships created for the purpose of the “URMA” project is too broad. While a broad definition is not problematic

1 Urban-rural partnerships are defined as a mutual project-based initiative by entities present in large metropolitan areas and rural areas whose purpose it is to create both stable and flexible community structures (URMA 2011, 2013; BMVI Hamburg 2011, 7–8, 12–14; Kawka 2008, 63; BMVBS 2012, 11 from the References section in the chapter 1).
at the theoretical stage, it can create difficulties at the stage of the identification and evaluation of linkages or the potential for their emergence. The “URMA” definition does not pinpoint what a partnership really is and how it is different from collaboration or other types of interaction between selected entities. It also does not identify thematic areas of collaboration and does not identify entities capable of establishing partnerships. In effect, the operational stage of this concept in an environment not characterized by substantial collaboration (e.g. Poland) comes with multiple limitations despite the existence of instruments (T. Kaczmarek) needed to yield collaborative efforts between local governments in Poland, or between the most important potential actors on the urban-rural partnership scene.

The definition of “urban” and “rural” varies from one country to another and this further complicates the analysis of urban-rural partnerships. Each country in Europe is characterized by a different level of urbanization as well as variable housing types, natural landscapes, and degrees of metropolitan area growth. The latter determines the spatial extent of collaboration and the theoretical analysis of it. The end result is that the very definition of partnerships may be understood differently even if it is made more specific than is the case today.

The real area of interaction in Poland is the metropolitan area with its several rings of townships. Interaction beyond this area is weak and examples of collaboration are few and far between. Metropolitan areas in Western countries often include entire regions and the spatial extent of both actual and theoretical collaboration is often much larger than in Poland. The urban-rural continuum appears to be the best means of representing towns and villages in large metropolitan areas. This concept makes it possible to assign a stage in urban or rural evolution along the urban-rural axis. Yet, the elements of this continuum are transitional in nature and possess both urban and rural characteristics. What makes them different is their degree of urban and rural character. This issue provides yet another barrier to the accurate identification and analysis of urban-rural partnerships.

Another key issue is the centricity of partnerships. It does appear that an “urban-rural partnership” may not be the same as a “rural-urban partnership”. This is especially true at the theoretical stage and both terms imply a certain direction of change as part of a partnership. It may even be inferred that one side needs to be the bigger beneficiary of this endeavor. It may also be inferred that either an urban or rural perspective will be adopted as early as the planning stage of such an endeavor. While “URMA” does point to mutual benefits, the very fact that this needs to be mentioned (M. Wójcik) suggests that not only is equality difficult to attain in a partnership, it can be difficult to imagine. Unfortunately, the “URMA” project did not consider the urban or rural focus of potential partnerships, which makes the idea quite utopian and perhaps impossible to implement.

The difficulties associated with translating the well-designed, but general, concept of European urban-rural partnerships became vividly apparent in the course of publishing this book. This problem was accurately identified by the co-authors who prompted the
editors to reflect on the very idea of urban-rural partnerships. As noted by J. Bański, this concept is new in Poland and it has not been studied thus far. The experience of compiling this book has shown that an attempt to capture this new concept in Poland – one which is rooted in other cultures and economic spaces – requires continuous discussion and systematic revision of questions previously posed.

Aside from terminological issues, research visits in the course of the “URMA” project and the exchange of experiences with key project partners indicate that the key ingredient of successful partnerships is economic development. The larger the disproportion in economic development, the less likely it is that a partnership will be established. The more polarized a relationship, the fewer mutual interactions will come into play. The notion of urban-rural partnerships described in this book has been developed for areas characterized by strong economic cohesion. When this notion is applied to countries such as Poland and Bulgaria, it can seem impractical at times due to strong intra-regional differences in economic growth. (The other partner countries in the “URMA” project were Germany, Holland, and Italy.)

An effective and long-lasting urban-rural partnership requires the existence of mutual needs. Sustainable development, which is favored by the “URMA” approach, can be attained via a similar degree of potential. At the same time, K. Szafraniec argues that the attractive power of rural areas should not be a byproduct of the negative image of cities. This is difficult to attain in the context of significant differences in social and economic development between urban and rural areas – a key characteristic of modern Poland.

The main ideas behind the “URMA” project included the conceptualization of urban-rural partnerships, inspiration and procedure building for their establishment, and a basic platform for the exchange of experiences. In practice, urban-rural partnerships function or do not function regardless of whether they are based on assumptions included in the “URMA” concept. Experience has shown that urban-rural partnerships emerge whenever there is some pragmatic purpose and not some ideological purpose. The more concrete a need, the more beneficial a partnership. The utilitarian nature of partnerships has been shown by the work of M. Huculak, M. Dej, W. Jarczewski, and M. Wójcik in the form of case studies. Only real benefits for all the parties involved constitute a valid reason to maintain a partnership.

This yields several questions: (1) Just how is the building of political/theoretical ideology needed in the establishment of urban-rural partnerships? (2) Just how useful are financial instruments designed to help establish such partnerships and how permanent are partnerships produced thanks to such instruments? (3) Just how do urban-rural partnerships actually generate social and economic development?

At this time, it appears that the idea of partnership, understood as a “higher form of urban-rural collaboration”, based on “URMA” norms is largely a theoretical expression of the European Union’s cohesion policy in Poland in an area that does not need such con-
cepts, but demands the creation and/or enhancement of existing practical instruments. For the time being, according to J. Bański, the role of urban-rural partnerships cannot be evaluated in Poland due to a lack of measurable results of such collaboration in Poland and a lack of studies on this issue. Such evaluations may be possible in the long term when such partnerships become part of Polish reality and not merely a theoretical issue.

Despite the various adaptation difficulties associated with the “URMA” project, new knowledge has been generated on the subject of linkages between urban and rural areas in Poland. The exchange of information among project partners was a key benefit in this case.
1. Introduction – why do we need urban-rural partnerships?

As a result of globalization, metropolitan areas are forced to constantly strengthen their functions and their position in the international competition for investments, qualified workers, facilities and or services improving the quality of life. Since the 1990s many of Western European cities have made attempts to intensify cooperation with their surrounding peri-urban and rural hinterlands in order to combat inner-metropolitan disparities, and at the same time, strengthen endogenous potentials for a more balanced regional development. This trend has been intensified by the European Spatial Development Perspective (EDSP), which places a focus on polycentricity and new partnerships between the city and the countryside. In this context, the ESDP (CEC 1999, 21) states: “Cities have increasingly diverse functional inter-dependencies with their surrounding countryside. These interdependencies require voluntary cooperation across administrative boundaries between local authorities, to strengthen the region as a whole in competitive terms”. Furthermore, the European Union’s Territorial Agenda 2020 acknowledges the leading role of metropolitan areas as drivers of the development of their wider surroundings. Here, the metropolitan areas can act as assets for the development of all of European territory, but under the condition that other regions benefit from their dynamism and are mutually interconnected (CEC 2011, 4–7). However, the role of metropolitan areas as engines of growth (BBSR 2006, 708) is also limited, due to their structural problems, increasing socio-spatial segregation, social polarization and inner-metropolitan peripheralization.
Therefore, development perspectives can emerge from economically vibrant rural and urban areas.

Another aspect is that many contemporary challenges such as suburbanisation, impact of climate change, changes in energy policy and environmental pollution are very complex and do not stop at administrative, regional and national boundaries. They can only be tackled when the actors concerned overcome existing barriers by thinking and acting holistically. Therefore, the above mentioned challenges can also be potentials providing new opportunities for urban and rural actors to work together, allowing for urban-rural partnerships to be developed. In addition, urban-rural partnerships contribute to the reduction of regional disparities by the identification and more efficient use of potentials which urban and rural areas equally exhibit, as well as competences and skills various of regional and local stakeholders. All regions – economically strong as well as weaker ones – can contribute to growth and benefit from it. By working together a new dimension of spatial solidarity can be initiated.

Whereas relationships (Bengs, Zonneveld 2003; Zonneveld, Stead 2007; Copus 2013), interdependencies (Caffyn, Dahlström 2005) and interrelations (Repp et al. 2012) between urban and rural areas are common due to commuter flows, food production or leisure activities, there is a need to define, develop and test additional fields of urban-rural partnerships (CEC 1999; Kawka 2008, 2013; Artmann et al. 2012) in order to widen the territorial dimension of cooperation.

Due to the fact that rural-urban partnerships are rather “a spongy idea” (Kawka 2013, 1) and a generally agreed upon definition is not yet in sight, the aim of this chapter is to explore the concept of urban-rural partnerships and provide a set of guidelines developed within the INTERREG IV C project “URMA” in order to encourage the creation of urban-rural partnerships in a wider European context, but also to initiate the scientific discussion on the purpose and character of urban-rural partnerships in Poland. The following chapter is divided into five sections. Following the introduction, the approach of urban-rural partnerships is described, after which selected European policy documents will be presented in the second section. The third section deals with the background and objectives of the “URMA” project, accompanied by a set of possible guiding principles behind urban-rural partnerships. In the fourth section, lessons learned on how the “URMA-Approach” can be implemented in practice. The conclusion will be provided in the final section.

2. Urban-rural partnerships as a tool of the EU-cohesion policy framework

At the EU-level the first document to address the need for urban-rural partnerships was the European Spatial Development Perspective, ESDP (1999). It stressed the importance of polycentric spatial development and a new partnership between urban and rural areas. The emergence of a relatively decentralized urban structure would enable the potential of rural areas to be developed and so also reduce regional disparities. Moreover, it would involve overcoming the
outdated dualism between city and countryside. According to the ESDP, city and countryside should be treated as a functional, spatial entity with diverse relationships and interdependencies, since they form a region and are mutually responsible for its further development.

The Territorial Agenda (CEC 2007) and the Territorial Agenda 2020 (CEC 2011) build upon the aim of the ESDP and stress the importance of the development of a balanced and polycentric urban system and new urban-rural partnerships. Referring to the 5th Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion, TA 2020 identifies Cohesion Policy as a “key framework through which the EU can address territorial development challenges and help unleash territorial potential at local, regional, national and transnational levels” (para. 6). The TA 2020 draws a framework for urban-rural cooperation by recognizing that regional interdependencies are increasingly important; therefore continued networking, cooperation and integration between various regions of the EU at all relevant territorial levels are needed (para. 9). Further, TA 2020 stresses the point that “territories with common potentials or challenges can collaborate in finding common solutions and utilize their potential by sharing experience” (para. 12). In the concrete context of urban-rural cooperation, TA 2020 acknowledges diverse links existing between urban and rural territories; this includes peri-urban and peripheral rural regions. Therefore, integrated governance and planning should be based on a broad partnership in order to recognize urban-rural interdependence. This can be achieved by locally developed place-based strategies. Following the polycentric and balanced territorial development, small and medium-sized towns should play a crucial role in rural areas. At the same time, metropolitan regions should recognize their role as the entities responsible for the development of their wider surroundings. Finally, TA 2020 highlights the importance of improving the accessibility of urban centers from rural territories (para. 29), ensuring access to services and job opportunities.

The 6th Cohesion Report does not mention the concept of urban-rural partnerships. Only with regard to Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) it refers to the rural development pillar, as “the policy which includes economic, social and environmental dimensions based on a territorial approach and can help to maintain a sustainable balance between urban and rural areas” (CEC 2014, 189). It remains vague how this should lead to the establishment of urban-rural partnerships. Still, the document refers to new instruments such as Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI), Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and multi-fund programs combining finance from the European Social Fund, European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund in order to tackle particular territorial development challenges (CEC 2014, 236).

What can be learned about urban-rural partnerships from reading the policy documents described above? First, EDS P, TA 2007 and TA 2020 recognise the city and countryside as one functional spatial entity due to mutual interdependence reflecting diverse relations. Second, the documents stress the importance of polycentric spatial/urban development and the need for new urban-rural partnerships. Third, partnerships should be
set up in order to develop place-based strategies with the aim to collaborate, find common solutions and share experience. Making use of endogenous potential plays an important role here. Whereas the early documents had introduced the concept of urban-rural partnerships and had justified it, the 6th Report refers directly to implementation tools such as ITI or CLLD. In summary, questions on the definition, principles and guidelines needed to establish urban-rural partnerships in practice remain open and remain to be addressed.

3. “URMA” project – towards a new understanding of urban-rural partnerships

3.1 Background and objectives

The need to gain more knowledge about urban-rural partnerships and to provide a platform for knowledge exchange on urban-rural partnerships within “URMA” has emerged from various directions. First, the “URMA” project concept was inspired from the demonstration project “Supra-Regional Partnership Northern Germany/Hamburg Metropolitan Region” developed within the framework of the German Federal Government’s program “Demonstration Projects of Spatial Planning” (2008-2010). In this project innovative means of addressing regional disparities and new governance structures were developed for large scale urban-rural partnerships. Second, based on a Dutch example, “Amsterdam – A Responsible Capital”, and the Hamburg project, METREX (“Network of Metropolitan Regions and Areas”) set up an expert group called “URMA – Urban-rural relationships in metropolitan areas of influence” with the aim to explore an integrated approach to cooperation between different actors in developing and implementing joint urban-rural initiatives. At different METREX-meetings in 2011 the project objectives, potential fields of urban-rural cooperation as well as funding options were discussed (METREX 2014). Finally, in March 2012, the “URMA” project kick-off conference took place in Hamburg. Furthermore, the “URMA” project benefited from the expertise provided within the framework of the Advisory Council for Spatial Development at the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development on recommendations “Large-Scale Partnerships: Opportunities for Innovation and Cohesion at a New Spatial Level”.

The overall aim of the “URMA” project was to support the exchange of experience with regard to the emergence and implementation of urban-rural partnerships in selected European metropolitan areas and their wider hinterlands. In particular, the improvement of effectiveness of regional and local policies towards a cross-sectorial and multi-level urban-rural governance approach lay at the core of the project. In this context, urban-rural partnerships could serve as a tool to strengthen the potential for the generation and transfer of innovative solutions in various thematic fields of spatial development. Within three years of duration, nine participating partners from Bulgaria, Germany, Italy, Holland and
Poland (Fig. 1) have developed ideas on how urban-rural partnerships could be established and implemented in the long-term. In particular, the partners followed three objectives:

- what is necessary to establish and stimulate more intensive urban-rural partnerships,
- in which sectors could urban and rural actors benefit from closer cooperation,
- how could urban-rural cooperation contribute to new forms of shared spatial responsibility, solidarity and territorial cohesion.

As an interregional cooperation project, “URMA” supported the exchange of experience between representatives of regional administrations, research institutions, business and NGOs. Therefore, in the course of the project, a number of conferences, study visits and thematic workshops took place. In addition, a number of outputs were produced: concise glossary, inventory of planning approaches to urban-rural cooperation, pilot implementation reports, field monitoring reports, good practices, as well as recommendations for...
policy makers. However, one of the crucial documents produced in the course of the project was the URMA-approach, a document providing a common understanding on urban-rural cooperation and the rationale behind it, which will be presented in the next section.

3.2. “URMA-Approach” – definition and principles of urban-rural cooperation

Due to different levels of understanding and interpretation of urban-rural partnerships among the partners in the initial phase of the project, the need for a joint definition of the term has emerged. Therefore, a conceptual document, “URMA-Approach”, was developed in which the definition of urban-rural partnerships was laid down. According to this document, urban-rural cooperation is understood as project-oriented cooperation initiatives of various actors in metropolitan areas and their more distant rural hinterlands with the aim to establish stable but flexible cooperation structures (URMA 2011, 2013a, 2013c; BMVI Hamburg 2011, 7–8, 12–14; Kawka 2008, 63; BMVBS 2012, 11). The precondition for the emergence of urban-rural cooperation is a mutually perceived need for more efficient cooperation among the involved stakeholders.

Further, urban-rural partnerships can be characterized by a number of aspects which need to be considered by policymakers when working on respective strategies or instruments supporting the establishment of urban-rural partnerships.

First, there is a need to look at the spatial dimension of urban-rural partnerships. Urban-rural partnerships can be created within the formal boundaries of a territorial entity (administrative regions, association of municipalities, designated metropolitan areas), but can also extend further than the urban core area of influence, beyond classic city-suburban cooperation. In other words, they can stretch over a larger geographic distance than the neighboring or surrounding areas. Therefore, a number of spatial systems can emerge. For example, in URMA’s partner regions at least three spatial scales can be distinguished:

1) Large scale partnerships: supra-regional cooperation of a metropolitan region with its wider hinterland.
2) Metropolitan regional partnerships: cooperation within a metropolitan region between a large city and its surrounding peri-urban and rural areas. This also includes polycentric structures.
3) Partnerships between small and medium-sized towns: in networks with their rural hinterland.

Depending on the topic and need for cooperation such as waste management, public regional transportation networks or flood protection, urban-rural partnerships can be applied at various spatial scales. In addition, with regard to urban-rural cooperation in the field of entrepreneurship, translocal urban-rural cooperation can develop irrespective of
physical proximity and based on virtual interactions. In practice this means that, for example, a rural enterprise specializing in food production may have business links to customers (restaurants, hotels, catering) located at a larger distance or abroad and not necessarily in the immediate vicinity (Copus 2013, 12–13).

The second principle is establishing partnerships on a level playing field. This means that urban-rural cooperation should be based on equal footing, respect and recognition of mutual interdependence between urban and rural actors. The cooperation will fail in the long term if it is dominated by hierarchical structures, stereotypes and demand attitudes. This can be seen in the case of cities which press for uncontrolled urbanization in neighboring rural areas irrespective of restrictions given in spatial plans/land-use plans (Zimnicka, Czernik 2007, 20 ff.).

Further, urban-rural partnerships are reliant on a culture of dialogue. The formation of urban-rural partnerships is based on a voluntary basis and requires an ongoing process of respectful negotiations, capacity building (know-how) and trust building. Urban and rural actors need to gradually establish a culture of dialogue, searching for long-term solutions for (wider) regional benefit, rather than only for short-term and small-scale benefits. This is often problematic in relations between core-city and adjacent countryside, where often hostile competition prevails (Fürst 2003, 447) regarding the location of industrial areas or dealing with traffic congestion, for example. On the one hand, rural areas profit from urbanization, but on the other hand, cities must take part in solving problems which arise from it.

Another aspect is the issue of the sharing of benefits, resources and costs. Urban-rural partnerships should be formed on the basis of mutual benefits as well as mutual resources and cost sharing. Thus, cooperation should bring both, urban and rural actors, win-win solutions. Balanced negotiations of interests and the ability to share resources, responsibilities and commitments will enhance cohesion between the core urban area and rural regions but will also ensure the effective allocation of funding. This also reflects the concept of spatial solidarity which can be applied when thinking of the work/functional division between rural and urban actors. As an example, one territorial entity cannot host a university, technology park and cultural center all by itself; they need to be spread out all over different locations to ensure equal job opportunities, etc. (URMA 2013b, 2). By recognizing the core competences and specific endogenous potentials of an area concerned, local stakeholders can contribute to a reduction in competition.

As for all governance structures, urban-rural partnerships should be developed through the involvement of a wide range of actors representing various sectors and levels of governance: public administration and representatives of local/regional governments, NGOs, business and research. As all the actors have specific know-how, social networks and funds available, they can be viewed as part of an endogenous potential of a region (Blatter, Knieling 2009, 253). As a result, the triple or quadruple helix approach enhances the effectiveness and innovation of projects. The latter in the context of “URMA” is understood as
knowledge transfer based on the creation and dissemination of “novelty”, new knowledge, or the introduction of existing knowledge in a new way (Cooke 2001, 33; Lamboy 2005, 1142). Innovative solutions can be found more rapidly if actors from different fields and sectors work together.

Finally, urban-rural cooperation reflects variable geometry. This principle implies that the array of actors/regions and geographic area involved in urban-rural partnerships may vary according to the thematic orientation of cooperation. Therefore, urban-rural partnerships are most of all driven by concrete actions and tangible projects stretching across administrative units and less by regional planning. Originally, the concept was introduced in the context of European integration, specifically around debates on differentiated integration, which attempt to reconcile heterogeneity within the EU (Stubb 1996, 283). In this context, variable geometry is defined as “the mode of differentiated integration which admits to unattainable differences within the integrative structure by allowing permanent or irreversible separation between a hard core and less developed integrative units”. Further, variable geometry recognizes permanent differences among both the core and the periphery, thus creating various conglomerations of integrative units (Stubb 1996, 285-287).

4. “URMA-Approach” in practice – lessons learned from partner activities

As previously mentioned, an important outcome of the “URMA” project is providing a platform for the exchange of ideas and experiences between all involved partner regions, their respective stakeholders and external experts and institutions. The emphasis on collaborative processes and the exchange of ideas not only lead to more robust and thorough contributions to the topic of urban rural partnerships but also to concrete lessons learned. The learning processes facilitated by “URMA” took place on four different levels: learning within the project among all partners, bilateral learning between two partners facing similar challenges, learning within partner regions, and learning outside the project with external experts and institutions.

The transfer of best practices was particularly relevant to the project as the numerous study trips supported direct exchange and discussion of experiences between the partner regions. For example, while participating in a study visit to the Twente region, urban and rural stakeholders in the voivodeship of Małopolska (the Lesser Poland region) were inspired by the Green Knowledge Portal in the Twente region and the regional food initiatives in Lombardy and Tuscany. This resulted in the development of a new cooperative that will connect consumers in the metropolitan area of Kraków with producers in the rural Gorlice district. Learning between partners also yielded general exchange of knowledge; an example is the sharing of experiences on the analysis and development of tools to combat urban sprawl that was established between the voivodeship of Zachodniopomorskie (the West Pomerania region) and Lombardy.
Learning among the partner regions constitutes the core of URMA’s general contribution to the understanding of and requirement for building better urban-rural partnerships and their role in territorial cohesion. Starting with the basics, urban-rural partnerships can only be successfully initiated when there is a real need and benefit for all parties involved. Experiences cannot be simply transferred from one region to another. It is necessary to understand the various planning and political cultures as well as the different socio-demographic and economic situations and dynamics on regional and national levels to adequately create and support urban-rural partnerships. Regional circumstances must also be considered due to differences in the types of urbanization and spatial development between European countries. The partners also expressed a shared view on multi-level governance. Many urban-rural partnerships not only exist on one government level, but across several government levels (municipal, regional, national, international). In such cases, it is crucial to support the creation of an organizational framework for multi-level governance. This organizational tool can facilitate better information exchange between regional and local planning levels (especially between public officials, civil servants, village mayors, etc.) in order to improve information flow.

**Multi-level governance**

Local bodies of government and administration are responsible for the implementation of regional planning and development. In this respect, they represent an adequate level for facilitating and coordinating the implementation of urban-rural partnerships. Especially in urban-rural partnerships that involve several government levels, they can act as a junction between stakeholders by enabling an information exchange, circulation of regional know-how and monitoring of projects. Further, there are a number of institutions at the (supra-)regional level that have experience in regional cooperation and can act as a driving force to enable urban-rural partnerships: metropolitan associations, city networks, public transportation associations, regional agencies for economic development, research institutes/universities, etc.

**Multi-sector cooperation**

Many urban-rural partnerships face problems that cross sector boundaries, most prominently between the departments responsible for agriculture and spatial development, but also between other thematic fields. In order to find solutions to urban-rural challenges and to make use of the common potentials of urban-rural partnerships, it is necessary to create cross-links between the entities that are responsible for different thematic areas. Urban-rural partnerships can be helpful in overcoming the traditional boundaries between authorities which are responsible for sector policies.
**Functional areas**

As the “URMA” regions and other examples demonstrate, functional interrelations between urban and rural areas cross administrative, regional and national boundaries. Therefore, national governments should recognize that spatial planning and thus urban–rural cooperation needs to reflect functional relations. If an institutionalization of the urban–rural cooperation is called for, new spatial entities can be developed according to the different types of partnerships, ranging from small-scaled functional areas, to metropolitan regions to large-scale meta-regions.

**Stakeholder involvement**

Depending on the type and topic of urban–rural partnerships, a balanced participation of different stakeholders (e.g. public government, knowledge institutes, enterprises and civil society) needs to be achieved. The triple/quadruple helix model can be used to identify new and relevant topics and to create innovation through urban–rural partnerships; as shown in the example of the Green Knowledge Portal in the Twente region.

The examples examined during “URMA” have shown that a key success factor for the implementation of urban–rural cooperation is to convince local political leaders (mayors, councillors), entrepreneurs and NGOs to become actively involved in urban–rural partnerships, so they can subsequently take over projects and act as their driving force. For this reason, it is necessary to identify local leaders who can take charge of the management of urban–rural projects. The Jutland cooperation project shows how mayors of small and medium-sized towns in Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark became involved from an early stage on.

Furthermore, the examples indicated the necessity of involving partners from the private sector to stimulate a better integrated economic development between urban and rural areas. One example of how is by the implementation of partnerships in the development of clusters, including urban as well as rural enterprises and further stakeholders.

**Citizen participation**

Many citizens experience urban–rural interactions in their daily lives. They physically cross administrative borders while commuting and consuming goods and services that span urban and rural areas. Therefore, it is the citizens of urban and rural areas who should be regarded as experts at identifying the opportunities and challenges of urban–rural partnerships. Public participation should be enabled by new methods, like the Charrette method in Tuscany, and involve different groups, such as the young people and students in the Twente region, in order to develop, implement and locally embed urban–rural partnerships.
Events as platform

Large events that used to be locally restricted to one city are now often conducted on a regional level, spanning several towns or areas. Furthermore, they tend to cover a broader range of topics, addressing the general development of a city or region, such as the topic “sustainable regions”. Events such as EXPO 2015 in Milan and the International Garden Exhibition Hamburg 2013 provide an excellent opportunity for exchanges of information and ideas between the various stakeholders. They also enable urban and rural actors to come together and initiate cooperation projects.

EU and national programs and instruments

Experience from previous and current EU and national programs are useful as a source of knowledge to establish urban-rural partnerships (e.g. INTERREG A for the establishment of cross-border relations, LEADER as a model for inter-municipal cooperation and the “German Spatial Demonstration Project MORO” for large-scale partnerships). The concepts of urban-rural partnerships should find support in future programmes.

New funding instruments such as CLLD or ITI are being introduced in some member states. Initial examples from Poland and Bulgaria suggest these may help to improve urban-rural cooperation. However, it is still necessary to better communicate the potential advantages of ITI and CLLD as well as monitor and critically assess the implementation of these new instruments.

A further objective of the “URMA” project was to identify sectors in which urban and rural actors could benefit from closer cooperation. The following listing gives an overview on topics of urban-rural cooperation that have been identified during conferences and study visits as well as through a survey conducted among the “URMA” partners.

Infrastructure – the rural areas of metropolitan regions often suffer from poor accessibility to the metropolitan core, and good infrastructure is a precondition for many urban-rural projects. Therefore, introducing better modes of community transportation, park and ride sites, synchronized bus and rail connections, better timing of metropolitan/regional railways and wider broadband internet coverage can make a big difference.

Regional food and product cycles – the creation or recreation of regional food cycles is a topic that concerns all “URMA” regions. It became evident that regional food connects urban and rural areas and that the demand for this is growing. Partnerships are necessary to develop universal tools that promote regional production chains and to match supply and demand (examples of tools are regional funds for micro-credits, consulting services, cooperatives, markets for local food producers).
Spatial planning and territorial development – all URMA partners emphasize the necessity of spatial planning instruments and policies that better integrate urban and rural planning and development. West Pomerania and Lombardy are, for example, developing guidelines for the future reduction of urban sprawl that will be integrated into spatial development plans.

Economic development – Cluster cooperation that includes urban and rural areas can achieve a better use of resources and support spill-over effects from urban to rural areas and vice versa. Cluster cooperation significantly improves the involvement of small and medium-sized enterprises in regional clusters.

Renewable energies – Regional renewable energy cycles and networks are regarded as an important topic for urban-rural cooperation by most URMA partners. Rural areas can contribute to the energy supply of urban areas. Regional energy production by community wind parks or biomass production advances the local economy.

Local and regional public services facing demographic and societal changes – A shrinking and aging population, especially in many rural regions, demands a better integration of public services, particularly in the fields of health care and education. This applies especially to rural areas in Pleven and the Lesser Poland Region.

Tourism – The combination of tourism assets in both urban and rural areas is regarded as an opportunity to become more attractive as a destination for vacation and for local recreation. All URMA partners are working on better integration of tourist attractions, for example by linking cultural offers with agro-tourism

5. Outlook – how to achieve mutual benefit?

Among all the features characterizing urban-rural partnership in the context of “URMA”, the principle of mutual benefit plays a critical role as a conditional principle and prerequisite for establishing urban-rural partnerships. In the course of the “URMA” project partner regions have provided examples showing that urban-rural partnerships create mutual benefit for both urban and rural regions. Still, the question of mutual benefit remains contested. For example Copus (2013, 20) sees a danger that urban-rural cooperation may become an “end” in itself, rather than a means of achieving cohesion policy objectives. Further, he calls for “real and appropriate benefits for rural Europe” (Copus 2013, 27). Also the German approach of supra-regional partnerships of responsibility, promoting urban-rural partnerships on a large geographic scale, is not free of criticism (Megerle 2008, 7-8; Scheck 2012, 28-29; BMVBS 2012, 14). For example, the involved actors report a high conflict potential due to various motivations and expectations as well as vague durability of governance structures. Therefore, a better understanding and networking between actors on a personal level is a good starting point for urban-rural partnerships to be established
(Köller 2011, 15). Another example consists of collaborative agreements signed in January 2014 between Amsterdam and the fastest shrinking parts of Holland, namely the cities of Delfzijl, Sluis, and Heerlen, within the scope of the “Amsterdam – A Responsible Capital” initiative which are regarded by some researchers as a “forced and far-fetched attempt to care about an imagined larger hinterland” in order to strengthen its city-regional economy by claiming national policy support (Bontje 2014).

In view of this, the mutual benefit in urban-rural partnerships needs to be balanced as a result of negotiations of interests and the ability to share resources, responsibilities and commitments. In particular, four thematic fields turned up in the course of the “URMA” project as top priorities which could be addressed by urban-rural partnerships to achieve a better use of resources and support spill-over effects from urban to rural areas and vice versa and therefore a mutual benefit (URMA 2014):

- improvement of accessibility and infrastructural links (including broadband Internet connection, public transport) between the metropolitan core and its (wider) rural areas (Pleven, West Pomerania, Kraków),
- development and restoration of regional food production and delivery chains in metropolitan areas and beyond (Twente, Lombardy, Tuscany, Kraków),
- stimulation of economic activities in both urban and rural areas through cluster cooperation in manifold themes (Hamburg-Jutland Corridor),
- development of scientific cooperation (Pleven-Sofia, northern Germany-Denmark).

It is also necessary to understand the various planning and political cultures in URMA regions as well as the different socio-demographic and economic situations and dynamics on the regional and national level to adequately create and support urban-rural partnerships in metropolitan areas and beyond them.

Summing up, there is no one universal and “right” model of urban-rural partnerships. The EU provides various information exchange platforms (METREX, EUROCITIES) and financial instruments supporting the creation of urban-rural partnerships such as ITI or CLLD, but the responsibility to establish urban-rural partnerships lies in the hands of regional and local stakeholders which need to find appropriate thematic fields, cooperation rules, organizational and decision-making structures to make urban-rural partnerships happen. Therefore, the “URMA-Approach” can only guide these activities and act as a source of inspiration. Clearly, the approach of urban-rural partnerships cannot replace national regulations related to wider spatial planning, but it can complement and coordinate various sectoral policies. Under real life conditions such as changing national or regional policy frameworks, financial and organizational constraints, staff rotation, to name only a few, it is unlikely for all features of the “URMA-Approach” to be implemented at the same time. However, they
should be understood as guiding principles for all those stakeholders who believe that urban-rural partnerships can add value to the existing initiatives.

References


9. CEC, Commission of the European Communities, 1999, ESDP European Spatial Development Perspective. Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of


1. Introduction

Social and economic success tends to be a public relations concept as opposed to a scientific concept defined as the successful outcome of some endeavor designed to enhance economic growth or some other type of growth. The lack of a scientific definition of “success” based on specific metrics leads to a broad definition of success that may be interpreted in a variety of ways. Social and economic success may be defined using a number of spatial, categorical, and temporal criteria. For example, economic pursuits and their rate of change over time may be described in terms of continuous success or single-event success. Another definition of success is based on its source, which may be internal, external or mixed.

In spatial research studies, success is usually defined in terms of some specific geographic area, usually some administrative unit. According to A. Sobala-Gwosdz (2004), local success is defined as a high rate of fulfillment of the needs of local residents. In addition, social and economic success may be analyzed on a regional, national, and international level. According to K. Heffner (2007), successful areas are areas (clusters of townships or counties) that have attained a high level of social and economic development and continue to maintain a positive growth rate and continue to create better living conditions. Success may also be defined as having a higher rate of growth than that of neighboring geographic areas (Gorzelak et al. 1999).

In my research work, the “social and economic success” of a geographic area is defined as the productive outcome of social and economic phenomena and processes that stimulate
and strengthen an area’s spatial structure (Bański 2008). Two types of success are relevant in this research study – core success and progressive success. The former is characterized by a high rate of economic development including extensive technical infrastructure, social programs, economic activity, social activism, as well as optimal tax expenditures and multifunctional economic growth patterns. The latter is characterized by stable economic growth driven by the successful outcome of a variety of social and economic programs.

Success areas are a permanent fixture in regional growth theories and regional classification systems. In the Theory of Growth Poles, F. Perroux (1955) argues that cities and metropolitan areas characterized by rapid economic growth, concentrations of social and economic activity, and the ability to spread growth across neighboring areas constitute success areas. In the Center-Periphery Model produced by J.R. Friedmann (1974), economic success is associated with core areas characterized by high growth potential and the ability to generate innovative solutions. On the other hand, the L. Klaassen regional classification system defines success areas as being concentrated in affluent regions as well as those found in poor regions characterized by economic growth (Friedmann, Weaver 1979).

This paper focuses on factors that generate social and economic success in metropolitan areas. The term “metropolitan area” is quite fashionable now – it is used 191 times in the National Spatial Development Concept 2030 (Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030 2012). In this paper this term is defined broadly as an area experiencing the social and economic impact of a large city via a variety of functions and linkages.

The purpose of the paper is to describe the role of urban-rural cooperation in social and economic development. The paper uses examples that exclude issues in social and cultural cooperation. It is important to note that the concept of an urban-rural partnership is new and it is related to the existing concept of polycentric spatial development (ESDP 1999; Kunzmann, Wegener 1992). It is rather difficult to speak of the practical outcomes of such cooperation in Poland at this time in the context of social and economic success. This is why urban-rural partnerships will be analyzed only as a potential source of stimulus in economic success.

2. Economic success and its determinants in metropolitan areas

Social and economic success is usually observed in cities whose development rate is greater than that of rural areas. This is especially true of large cities that have enjoyed the benefits of the economic transformation in Poland that began in 1989. Geographic areas close to large cities are also likely to experience economic success. Suburban areas are likely to enjoy economic success due to their parent cities’ ability to accumulate taxpayers and socially-active citizens as well as the ability to better educate their residents. Other key factors include typical economic triggers such as the influx of various types of investment, high rates of residential and commercial construction, modern urban infrastructure, as well as
the presence of a large retail and labor market. Research has clearly shown that successful rural areas tend to cluster around the largest cities in Poland. This is equally true of both geographic areas of core success and progressive success (Fig. 1).

Similar conclusions may be drawn based on the research of K. Heffner, A. Rosner, and M. Stanny on the level of social and economic development in rural areas (Rosner 2007). The basic conclusion is that the farther away from an urban center, the more difficult it is to attain economic success. Geographic areas found at larger distances from regional and national economic centers are markedly less attractive to investors and provide fewer opportunities for the development of new economic functions.

Theoretically, central parts of metropolitan areas are more likely to succeed in the area of social and economic development than outlying parts. External areas linked with the central core via functional and economic ties possess significant potential for growth, which can be triggered via different mechanisms including urban-rural cooperation.

Fig. 1. Sample progressive areas based on positive changes in five indicators for the period 1995 – 2005. The indicators are township population living space per apartment, length of water distribution lines, number of private businesses, township tax revenue
Source: J. Bański, 2008
Economic success requires the occurrence of multiple favorable and mutually linked determinants, which can be divided into three fundamental groups: (1) location factors, (2) social and economic factors, (3) technological and organizational factors. The first group includes close proximity to large metropolitan areas, availability of valuable natural resources, function as a key transportation center, and the availability of valuable and attractive to tourists elements of the natural environment or culture. In the case of metropolitan areas, close proximity to a major urban center is the key to economic success.

The success of areas adjacent to major cities is closely associated with new residential construction – usually in the form of single-family housing – as well as the emergence of business parks and other types of business clusters. New suburban areas are experiencing an influx of urban residents who are well-educated, affluent, and demanding. This, in turn, creates demand for services, commerce, and infrastructure, and strengthens social determinants of success. Relatively inexpensive land allows for new manufacturing investment and service sector growth. This new growth also creates certain threats to the natural environment including urban sprawl and reduces the effectiveness of public transportation, all of which may be perceived as unwanted costs of success.

Social and economic factors are associated with the engagement of residents and investors in social and economic development in a given geographic area. Investor activity is as important a factor as an attractive geographic location. The two factors tend to occur at the same time, as investors find it important to establish their business in an area with a strong labor market as well as strong demand for goods and services. Social and economic activity of local residents includes – first and foremost – the ability to generate new initiatives. Local leaders play a special role in this aspect and serve as role models for other local residents thinking about starting a business or program designed to enhance the standard of living in the area.

Technological and organizational issues include infrastructure and community programs, updating of spatial planning documents, competence of local governments, and strong engagement of local governments. Technical infrastructure and community programs are essential on the road to economic success, as they serve as the basis for various types of development. Updated spatial planning documents and other local planning documents help manage local space in a rational manner and serve as the basis for each new investment in each given area. In addition, success requires a competent and active manager who will skillfully promote his or her geographic area, pursue marketing activity, seek out funding, and negotiate with potential investors in order to entice them to establish their business in his or her area.

3. Role of urban-rural cooperation in the generation of social and economic success

In regional politics, large metropolitan areas are usually perceived as centers of social, economic, and cultural growth that produce development impulses in their surrounding areas,
which feature a supply of human resources, raw materials, food, and recreational opportunities for urban residents. This type of perception may yield spatial polarization across a metropolitan area where functional linkages tend to be unidirectional.

This pattern is confirmed by the spatial distribution of successful rural areas, which are usually found along the boundary line between urban and rural areas and not at larger distances from major urban centers. Interviews with 225 representatives of local governments in the Mazowsze region of Poland also suggest the same. The view of local governments is that internal differences across the Mazowsze region have increased in the last twenty years. These differences are observed by local government representatives from peripheral townships as well as townships part of the Warsaw Metropolitan Area and suburban townships anchored by subregional urban centers. Only one third of interviewees indicated a decrease in differences in development across the Mazowsze region (Bański, Czapiewski, Mazur 2012).

In order to prevent the emergence of these rather negative side effects, it is recommended that mechanisms be designed to redistribute some benefits produced by major urban centers in surrounding peripheral areas. This is mainly true of rural areas. The notion of an urban-rural partnership is designed to achieve this goal. This idea is based on the equality of urban and rural areas and the abandonment of the idea that rural areas are second class citizens to dynamically growing urban centers. The entire definition of the “city” and the “country” needs to transition away from the purely statistical definition where rural areas are simply areas found outside of city limits. In large metropolitan areas, the boundary between city and country is blurred and certain characteristics of both may coexist. This may occur in the form of diffusing urban and rural lifestyles as well as more concrete elements of each settlement type. Commuting to work in the city and residential construction in the form of single-family housing are additional ways in which this diffusion may take place (Bański 2009).

Urban-rural cooperation remains an untested idea in Poland and it is rather difficult to evaluate its role in social and economic success in metropolitan areas in Poland. While there exist some examples of urban-rural cooperation in Poland, these are few and their effects thus far have been less than meaningful.

The basis for this concept suggests the occurrence of positive social and economic outcomes in metropolitan areas including reduced spatial polarization, redistribution of benefits, greater territorial integrity, and enhanced local government. One certain outcome of this would be accelerated development of the given region, which could serve as a model for national success in the area of social programs and economics. Differences in development across each given metropolitan region will continue to exist, but the magnitude of these differences will likely be smaller than today. Geographic areas in each metropolitan area that will make best use of urban-rural cooperation will be able to produce greater social and economic success. It may be assumed that cities and rural areas found close to cities will be the first to succeed via urban-rural cooperation efforts.
A survey was conducted in 2008, which focused on rural townships defined as successful. The surveyed townships are located in several large metropolitan areas of: Warsaw (Nieporęt Township), Szczecin (Dobra Szczecińska), Poznań (Tarnowo Podgórne, Czerwonak), Wrocław (Długołęka), Bydgoszcz and Toruń (Osielsko). The study made it possible to assess key success factors (Bański 2008) that could be later used to determine the right course of action in the area of urban-rural cooperation, with the desired outcome being effective metropolitan area development.

Tab. 1. Significance of economic success factors in rural townships identified as areas of social and economic success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Location factors</th>
<th>Social and economic factors</th>
<th>Technological and organizational factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manufacturing conditions and supply of raw materials</td>
<td>close proximity to a large city</td>
<td>tourist value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnowo Podgórne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieporęt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Długołęka</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czerwonak</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobra Szczecińska</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osielsko</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- irrelevant factor, + auxiliary factor, ++ leading factor

Success in these townships is determined largely by close proximity to large cities, external investor activity, strong community programs, and advanced technical infrastructure. Economic development is stimulated by population influx from large cities and the housing development that normally accompanies it. In this context, urban-rural cooperation should be focused mostly on improving transportation options between the urban core and outlying areas in order to improve access to work, school, and services.

Social and economic success is also the product of investment in the service, retail, and manufacturing sectors. For example, the number of businesses in Tarnowo Podgórne doubled between 1990 and 2005 and now includes large companies such as MAN, Herlitz, Elite Caffè, Kraft Foods Polska, and Stihl. Several large companies also began operating in Długołęka including Renault, Toyota, Selgros Cash & Carry, Bosch, Volvo,
Scania, and Amoco Oil. New investment areas needed infrastructure such as electricity, water, and sewer systems. Local spatial planning documents were also needed. Hence, urban-rural cooperation should address the optimization of new and existing infrastructure including water treatment plants, water collection sites, and power transmission stations. Transportation is equally important in order for workers and goods to reach each new company. Many workers at suburban plants continue to commute from central urban locations and need an effective way of reaching their new workplace. Cities and rural areas should also work together to create investment strategies and updated spatial planning documents.

Social and economic success factors in Czerwonak and Nieporęt townships included the areas’ recreational and tourist value. Large numbers of residents from the urban core visit the two townships on weekends for recreational purposes, which helps local hotels, restaurants, and other tourist services flourish. The newly elected local government in Czerwonak Township decided to help the area switch from an agricultural and industrial focus to a residential and recreational focus. Urban-rural cooperation in townships of this type should involve tourist infrastructure such as bike paths, foot trails, and other attractions. In addition, parking areas and roads designed to serve tourist traffic are also important. Finally, cultural events, promotional events, and security at tourist facilities should also be a priority.

The examples of urban-rural cooperation described in this paper may help communities achieve or strengthen social and economic success. This is why urban-rural partnerships may be considered a key success factor in metropolitan areas.

4. Conclusions

The paper is focused on factors that aid social and economic success in major metropolitan areas. Particular attention is given to the role of urban-rural cooperation and its effect on social and economic success. Economic success requires a number of factors to occur at the same time and these factors need to reinforce one another. These include geographic considerations, social issues, economic issues, as well as technological and organizational issues. Urban-rural cooperation is part of the last category of factors.

It is difficult to unequivocally evaluate the role of urban-rural cooperation in social and economic success in metropolitan areas due to a lack of tangible results in Poland as well as a lack of research studies on this matter. The assumptions behind the idea suggest that positive outcomes may be expected. These include reductions in spatial polarization, redistribution of benefits, territorial integrity, and improved local governance. The presumed outcome of this will be more sustainable development of each given metropolitan area, which can then be treated as a social and economic success area on a national scale. Internal disproportions will most likely continue to exist, but on a lesser scale.

Any analysis of urban-rural cooperation in metropolitan areas really needs to focus on the unique nature of this type of relationship. This includes issues such as commuting
to work in the urban core and vice versa, complementarity of technical infrastructure, and joint strategic planning. Other forms of cooperation should focus on the tourist and recreational aspects of areas surrounding the urban core. These areas are often visited by urban residents on weekends for recreational purposes.
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1. Introduction

Collaboration, cooperation, common action, integration – these are some of the terms used to describe common elements of a system designed to function properly. In the case of local governments, the need to work together is a consequence of a rapidly changing social and economic reality. Administrative reform and other types of change tend to follow, but at a reduced pace. The magnitude and rate of change of urban growth processes, and especially suburbanization, in Poland in the last twenty years have produced the need for new local governance strategies. The same is true of strategic planning and spatial planning in Poland. According to Izdebski (2010), sensible governance of large urban areas as special functional zones is one of the most difficult administrative problems in Poland today.

Collaboration between cities and their surrounding areas is not a new trend. Local and regional agreements have existed for decades in classic areas of collaboration such as water management, waste management, public transportation, and physical infrastructure. However, the contemporary rate of change and overall scale of change in urban areas requires additional collaboration in many areas of social and economic interest.

Regardless of national political system and administrative custom, local governments in most European countries work together in a variety of formalized ways permitted by each nation’s law and in less formal ways that reflect local best practices (Kaczmarek 2005). Today it is considered essential that local governments work together on selected social, economic, and organizational issues. Intergovernmental collaboration has become a key task of public
officials. While this is considered optional in terms of actual laws and regulations in many countries, intergovernmental collaboration has become a necessity and an unofficial norm. The positive experiences of many local governments working together have led to the view that intergovernmental collaboration not only supplements administrative reform, but may also replace it in some cases (Kaczmarek, Mikula 2007). Intergovernmental collaboration is now viewed as a form of flexibility of local government officials and institutions. According to Delcamp (1997, 91), “collaboration is the answer provided by the national government or intermediate governmental organizations or even local communities to the inadequacy of public institutions in the attempt to solve real-world social and economic problems.”

The paper discusses the current level of collaboration between local governments in selected metropolitan areas in Poland as well as barriers and opportunities that are part of the process. Given the recent abandonment of proposals involving new management systems for large metropolitan areas and their functional regions in Poland, progress in the realm of social and economic development will largely depend on the level of collaboration between local governments as well as on associated national urban development policy.

2. The nature and level of collaboration between local governments in metropolitan areas

Metropolitan development defined in functional and spatial terms is one of the most important indicators of development in the modern world (Castells 2002). Research studies have shown that the coordination of development in the urban core and its metropolitan area yields competitive advantages and multiplier effects on a regional, national, and international scale (e.g. Hamilton 2000; Herrschel, Newman 2002; Jouve, Lefevre 2002; Salet, Thornley, Kreuvels 2003; Heinelt, Kübler 2005).

Metropolitan areas consist of complex administrative structures, residential entities, and economic organizations, with their primary characteristics being:

- multiple local centers of administration including rural townships, urban-rural townships, urban townships, urban counties, and rural counties,
- large urban system of residential communities consisting of a large central city or several central cities, suburban areas, and a functional area linked with the core metropolitan area,
- network of infrastructural and transportation linkages directed mostly towards the urban core and evolving radial extensions over time,
- spatial and functional linkages characterized by the flow of individuals, goods, capital, and information.

In such complex and structured systems, the basis for collaboration must include the need to solve problems associated with the functioning of complex urban areas
Local governments and other public authorities are tasked with solving most problems of this type. Collaboration between local governments can be horizontal (e.g. two townships) or vertical (e.g. township and county) and includes tasks that:

- require a joint effort due to the networked nature of the issues of interest (e.g. public transportation in urban areas),
- may lead to more effective provision of services if performed in a coordinated manner (e.g. joint management of school systems or cultural institutions),
- lead to greater effectiveness with increasing geographic coverage (e.g. promotional efforts in the tourism sector or investment sector),
- result from a sense of solidarity or the distribution of costs and responsibilities among the local residents or administrative units that take advantage of specific services, which is especially true of suburban residents in large metropolitan areas who frequently take advantage of services provided by institutions and organizations in the central city,
- exceed the competence of a local government and require an intergovernmental effort (e.g. unemployment reduction efforts, public safety programs),
- exceed the geographic boundaries of a given administrative region (e.g. national parks, landscape parks, tourist regions),
- constitute a consequence of technological progress (e.g. coordination of transportation networks or telecommunications networks),
- serve the local community in the event of a natural disaster or some other major threat (e.g. flood, industrial accident).

The above listed tasks are becoming increasingly important and commonplace from the perspective of integrated management, especially in growing metropolitan areas. The joint pursuit of collaboration along with natural competition may lead to advantages in the realm of leadership best practices, coordinated investment site selection, effective provision of services and the resulting increase in the quality of life as well as better management of metropolitan areas. While integrated regional management has its benefits, it also possesses disadvantages and barriers such as:

- partial loss of local independence in the realm of local governance,
- need to submit to non-local growth strategies and development policies,
- need to bear costs associated with the functioning of the metropolitan area as a whole, especially in the area of public services\(^1\),
- gradual loss of local identity in favor of a metropolitan identity.

\(^1\) In metropolitan areas it is common for suburban townships to use the services of urban core without bearing costs for their maintenance (“free riding”). It includes: transportation, education, culture, and recreation (Kaczmarek, Mikuła 2007).
Intergovernmental collaboration is usually affected by local politics as well as other administrative, economic, social, and spatial issues. It is practiced at various local levels of management and within various organizational and legal frameworks in multiple geographic areas. The most important determinants of intergovernmental collaboration are:

1) Legal rank of each given local government, administrative status, range of assigned tasks, degree of authority, and relationships between different levels of management.
2) Legal basis for collaboration and available forms of intergovernmental collaboration.
3) Economic and social potential, population size, and geographic considerations such as area, natural environment, and location relative to large metropolitan areas.
4) Management style as well as procedures for identifying and addressing non-local problems.
5) Traditions and collaboration experiences of each given local government.
6) European Union policy, national policy, regional policy.
7) External support, availability and sources of co-financing.

Unlike Poland, many European countries (e.g. France, Holland, Switzerland) possess a well-established culture of local government collaboration (Kaczmarek 2005). Poland has a short history of local governance linked with almost two centuries of foreign occupation as well as an array of legal, political, financial, and cultural barriers to such collaboration. Often the need to work together is only appreciated when negative outcomes of non-collaboration come to light and local governments are pressured into working together. Such undesirable outcomes include population shrinkage in the urban core, ecological disasters, transportation issues, and other spatial or economic problems. Township independence is deeply rooted in the Polish mindset and in Polish law as well. This leads to a natural competition for various benefits that accelerate local growth. These include external investors, government subsidies, European Union subsidies, and new residents who are perceived primarily as taxpayers.

High quality financial analyses focused on costs and profits are needed to mobilize local governments to work together by delegating selected tasks and relinquishing certain privileges in favor of a regional governance structure. While there are many factors that favor intergovernmental collaboration, there are also some limitations and barriers that could help accelerate collaboration if eliminated via changes in the law and via the creation of additional financial support mechanisms. Given the current level of flexibility of local governments and their ability to adopt innovative collaborative solutions, such changes would further enhance collaborative efforts, which are very important in dynamically changing metropolitan areas.
3. Legal and administrative issues in metropolitan area collaboration

Collaboration between local governments across a metropolitan area requires certain criteria that help determine the exact nature of the collaboration agreement. These include a legislative basis, various legal regulations, degree of institutionalization, nature of assigned tasks, method for selecting governmental powers and their range, and the degree of financial independence (Norris 2001). In light of the above, integrated management in metropolitan areas can take on four basic forms:

1) Establishment of a new level of local government by designating metropolitan areas special local government units.
2) Establishment of a formal urban and suburban union designed to complete common tasks.
3) Grassroots work in the metropolitan collaboration area via elective community unions and agreements among townships in a given metropolitan area.
4) Establishment of informal or moderately structured collaborative bodies such as councils, forums, conferences, and meetings designed to inform and coordinate community work.

Fig. 1. Forms of collaboration between local governments
Source: based on Kaczmarek, Mikula 2007
Metropolitan governments such as the “metropolitan borough” in Great Britain or the “citta metropolitane” in Italy do not exist in Poland. Hence, the metropolitan area does not constitute a level of local government in terms of Polish law and does not constitute a region with special status in Poland’s government. Polish law does provide for several forms of local township collaboration. The choice of form of collaboration and its extent are determined by existing needs as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of intergovernmental collaboration in metropolitan areas.

Two types of administrative unions may be introduced in metropolitan areas:

1) Regional organizations operating as part of public or private unions such as community unions and associations as well as commercial businesses.
2) Unincorporated organizations that function on an informal basis or some type of agreement (e.g. council or partnership).

The first group includes public and private entities independent of the administrative units involved in their formation. The laws and responsibilities associated with specific tasks are delegated to the regional union whose authority is identical to that of its constituent parts. Incorporated entities can be classified as those in the form of public entities (e.g. township unions) and those operating as private entities (associations).

Community unions are the most natural form of collaboration in metropolitan areas, but still are subject to a number of limitations:

1) Lack of proper authority to establish “township and county” unions, which is particularly problematic in cases where tasks are to be completed by these two levels of local government and in the same area of specialization.
2) Less influence on the way tasks are performed (by the union) versus how things would be done independently by township governments.
3) Loss of township authority to perform any tasks delegated to the union including the setting of rules by the township council – rules that facilitate tasks delegated to the union.
4) Lack of direct authority on the part of the township to regulate the work of the union.
5) Long and formal process of establishing a community union.

The legal status of an association linked with local governments is much less formal than that of a community union, which explains why associations are often established in the first stage of metropolitan area collaboration. Associations do not limit township and county collaboration efforts and may be used to foster collaboration between two or three levels of local government – including the voivodeship level. One basic limitation that does apply to associations that are not publicly incorporated is the lack of the capability to pursue public projects...
along with other local associations in a given metropolitan area. On the other hand, public projects may be pursued by community unions as well as via other agreements.

Organizations based on multi-party agreements are another form of intergovernmental collaboration not based on formal incorporation. A collaboration agreement, sometimes called a convention, does not require separate management levels above the township level. This type of agreement frequently does not oblige its parties to act and tends to be based on trust and a desire to work together. It is a first step towards collaboration based on information and may involve a formal program at later stages designed to further integrate work between local government officials. This type of agreement tends to suffer from a lack of formalization, low level of institutionalization, transient nature, nominal level of activity, and a minor chance of actually accomplishing any common goals in the face of nonexistent legal frameworks and financial regulations that would support such informal organizations.

Given that intergovernmental collaboration is optional in nature, it is decided upon by local governments. Theoretically, local governments could be required to create community unions. However, such statutory requirements do not exist in Poland at this time. At the same time, Poland’s Constitution and its amendments do not preclude collaboration between local governments and do not limit the extent of such collaboration.

4. Evolution and current state of metropolitan area collaboration in Poland

Collaboration between local governments requires local governments that possess some actual power. This was not the case during the pre-1989 communist era in Poland, and local government collaboration during this time period was largely a façade. Poland’s post-1945 communist government disbanded local community unions in 1950 on the basis of a new integrated governance law. Cities and townships could now only sign basic agreements in order to execute administrative tasks. In practice, such agreements were limited to adjacent townships, usually urban townships and surrounding rural townships. Municipal governments were obligated to provide public transportation, manage waste, and supply water and heat.

According to Izdebski (2010, 18), Poland’s national government and local leaders have not been able to produce a modern model of “metropolitan area governance” since the country began its transition from communism to capitalism in 1989. Local government reform of 1990 was a key part of Poland’s transition to capitalism, but paradoxically managed to help break many existing functional and administrative bonds between large cities and surrounding townships. While these bonds were not based on the idea of local government, they still did provide some level of functional collaboration in urban regions in terms of waste management and public transportation. The next wave of reform in 1998 did not include the concept of a “metropolitan county” in order to organize local municipal and township governments.
The introduction of a second level of local government led to further fragmentation of governance in metropolitan areas by creating urban counties and rural counties. This became the basis for inter-county agreements in areas such as labor markets, social assistance, and education. The problem was that inter-county agreements could not include local township governments and inter-township agreements could not include local county governments.

Local government reform in Poland created the basis for inter-township collaboration, although with relatively little flexibility. Local governments also gained the right to decide to enter into such arrangements. The level of local government collaboration in Poland is still far lower than that in many parts of Western Europe, although it has already been 25 years since the establishment of local governments in Poland. A review of community union registries has shown that most forms of local government collaboration in Poland focus on a single task. A total of 227 community unions were registered in Poland in 2013, with 44 in large urban areas. Only several of these unions can be legitimately called “metropolitan unions” that do involve an urban core as well as surrounding townships. Examples include the Metropolitan Transportation Union of Gdańsk Bay and the Upper Silesia Metropolitan Union. One rather novel entity in Poland is the Wrocław Metropolitan Area Development Agency, which was established in 2006 and it is a publicly-held company. The goal of this agency is to promote investment in the region and coordinate the work of the city government and that of another 30 surrounding townships in order to foster economic development in the region.

The last decade has seen a rise in grassroots building of local coalitions in large cities and surrounding townships in Poland, which can be described as a local basis for metropolitan integration. Various informal entities such as councils and partnerships are emerging, as are more formal entities such as associations and community unions whose main goal is to solve common problems and help coordinate urban area management (Tab. 1).

Table 1 shows a number of recent attempts to organize metropolitan areas via various unions and associations. This step has been triggered, in part, by hints from Poland’s national government that new legislation on this matter is forthcoming. However, the main driver of this sudden desire to collaborate has been associated with certain problems due to the growth of new areas of suburbanization, general economic crisis, and resulting financial pressure on many local governments, especially those of large cities. It may be expected that more local initiatives will emerge in the coming years due to more integrated national policy in Poland as well as continental planning policy produced by the European Union.
# Collaboration Between Local Governments in Metropolitan Areas – Determinants...

## Tab. 1. Metropolitan Areas in Poland – selected cases of local collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community union</td>
<td>Górnośląski Związek Metropolitalny “Silesia”</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Silesia Metropolitan Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitalny Związek Komunikacyjny Zatoki Gdańskiej</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Union of Gdańsk Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Związek Międzygminny “Gospodarka odpadami aglomeracji poznańskiej”</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poznań Metropolitan Area Township Waste Management Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public company</td>
<td>Agencja Rozwoju Aglomeracji Wrocławskiej</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrocław Metropolitan Area Development Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Stowarzyszenie Metropolia Warszawa</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warsaw Metropolitan Area Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stowarzyszenie Szczecińskiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego</td>
<td>2005/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szczecin Metropolitan Area Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stowarzyszenie Metropolia Poznań</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poznań Metropolitan Area Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stowarzyszenie Metropolia Bydgoska</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bydgoszcz Metropolitan Area Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gdańsk Obszar Metropolitalny</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gdańsk Metropolitan Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Porozumienie Partnerskie Rzeszowskiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rzeszów Metropolitan Area Partnership Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porozumienie Partnerskie w sprawie Bydgosko-Toruńskiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bydgoszcz – Toruń Metropolitan Area Partnership Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porozumienie Partnerskie Białostockiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Białystok Metropolitan Area Partnership Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porozumienie w sprawie Lubelskiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lublin Metropolitan Area Partnership Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Rada Metropolitalna Zatoki Gdańskiej</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gdańsk Bay Metropolitan Area Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rada Aglomeracji Poznańskiej</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poznań Metropolitan Area Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rada Krakowskiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kraków Metropolitan Area Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stała Rada Współpracy Aglomeracji Kalisko-Ostrowskie</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalisz-Ostrów Metropolitan Area Permanent Collaboration Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. National policy on metropolitan areas in Poland

The Western European experience suggests that top-down support for integrated local governance in metropolitan areas is a product of weak grassroots efforts. When local entities fail to collaborate to solve infrastructural, economic, and social problems, national leaders try to initiate top-down solutions in a legal, organizational, and financial context.

A discussion on reform in metropolitan area administration has emerged in Poland in recent years. The Poland 2030 Report – Challenges in Development (Raport Polska 2030 – wyzwania rozwojowe) was produced in 2009. The report calls for support for large city growth basing on the “knowledge economy” as well as better transportation options and improved internal functional linkages. In 2009 Poland’s national government accelerated work on a new law that would introduce new forms of collaboration between local governments in large urban regions. The purpose of this new legislation on urban policy and local government collaboration was to integrate work on social, spatial, and economic issues and to create a basis for effective as well as integrated management of metropolitan areas in Poland. This proposed new law is sometimes called “the Metropolitan Law”. The resulting internal organization of metropolitan areas was to resemble that of inter-township unions in terms of their multitasking ability.

The legislative process came to an end without producing results and the discussion of changes in metropolitan area governance faded away. Some of the key reasons for this type of outcome included differences of opinion among political parties and parliamentary coalitions, few decisive decisions on the part of the national government, and very strong differences of opinion at different levels of local government as to how the reform process should proceed. The most important opponents of metropolitan area administrative reform were regional and local governments afraid of losing influence in metropolitan areas.

Given the lack of political and social consensus on administrative changes in Polish metropolitan areas, the national government began to provide technical and financial support for grassroots integration of urban functional areas. A number of government documents such as Poland’s National Strategy of Regional Development 2010-2020 (Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego 2010–2020 – regiony, miasta i obszary wiejskie 2010) and the National Spatial Development Concept 2030 (Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030 2012) include statements designed to strengthen the metropolitan areas of voivodeship capitals and support solutions designed to integrate functional urban areas in terms of spatial management, public transportation, public services, and the job market. The details on urban development were published in the National Urban Policy (Założenia Krajowej Polityki Miejskiej z 16 lipca 2013 r.). The assumptions behind this policy were compiled in mid-2013 and were then submitted for public consultation in early 2014.
Urban functional areas, especially metropolitan areas, gained new significance in the area of local governance. It is important to note that, in Poland, the term metropolitan area is a type of informal government designation and not merely a geographic description of a functionally coherent urban region. The main source of funding for Poland’s national urban policy, which includes metropolitan area policy, is to include funds provided by domestic entities participating in its creation and structural funds provided by the European Union (White Book of Metropolitan Areas 2013 (Biała Księga Obszarów Metropolitalnych 2013)).

In the period 2012 – 2013, Poland’s Ministry of Regional Development established a special technical program for urban functional areas, including metropolitan areas, designed to help them absorb European Union funds and promote and plan integrated development. This new program covered subsidies granted via a competitive process designed to support local governments in the area of planning and development of urban functional areas. The program was very popular with urban functional areas including all metropolitan areas in Poland and included several dozen participating areas working on new planning documents that require broader collaboration. Such documents included local development strategies (e.g. Łódź and Warsaw metropolitan areas) and spatial development studies (e.g. Poznań Metropolitan Area, Wrocław Functional Area).

One of the principal criteria used by the European Union to grant funding in its 2014 – 2020 budget period is geographic specificity. Urban functional areas are set to become a full beneficiary of the Union’s funding policy under Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI). These new regulations are a departure from the traditional view of geographic areas as defined via administrative boundaries. Instead of looking at city limits, the program emphasizes relationships between cities and their functional areas. Relationships may exist at the institutional level or program level or may exist at the level of specific tasks in the realm of infrastructure, education, and community cohesion. This is a reflection of the “Rules for urban areas in European Union cohesion policy 2013” (Zasady uwzględniania wymiaru miejskiego polityki spójności UE, w tym realizacja Zintegrowanych Inwestycji Terytorialnych 2013).

The following goals are to be accomplished in Poland via this new EU program:

1) Promotion of collaborative partnerships among local governments in urban functional areas.
2) Increasing the effectiveness of government intervention via the completion of integrated projects designed to solve problems and meet the needs of cities and their functional areas.
3) Increasing the influence of cities and their functional areas on the way support programs are implemented within their boundaries as part of the European Union’s cohesion policy.
Voivodeship capitals and their functional areas in Poland are required to implement the Integrated Territorial Investments. The amount of funding available from this program will be 2.385 billion euro, which will cover 16 urban functional areas of voivodeship capitals in Poland. This information was obtained from a document called the “Multi-annual financial framework 2014-2020” (Programowanie perspektywy finansowej na lata 2014-2020 – Umowa partnerstwa). The necessary precondition in this program is the creation of an institutional partnership called an Integrated Territorial Investment Union whose job it is to represent municipal governments and their functional areas in discussions with regional and national government officials. Community unions and associations serve as the statutory equivalents of said unions. Given that such local organizations have been in existence in metropolitan areas for years, it may be expected that it will be easier for them to adapt to new European Union policies by reaching consensus in the course of discussions on new common projects associated with the Integrated Territorial Investments program.

6. Conclusions

One outcome of the social and economic transformation of Poland in the last twenty years has been the emergence of new growth drivers in large cities as well as new problems associated with public services, public transportation, spatial management, as well as various relationships between cities and their functional areas. New phenomena and processes present on the national and local scene require national and local political leaders to act in the realm of pure politics and planning.

The issue of local government collaboration and metropolitan area management has been debated in Poland for about a decade now. While this issue is underscored in a variety of key government documents such as the National Spatial Development Concept 2030 and the National Strategy of Regional Development 2020, it is currently not a priority for Poland’s national government. The outcome of this is the abandonment of reform designed to regulate large city management in Poland. At the same time, grassroots metropolitan collaboration is in its early stages of development in Poland and may or may not always select the right tools to manage metropolitan areas. In some cases, the management tools used are not adapted to the specific nature and scale of problems facing metropolitan areas.

Financial support from the European Union is a key determinant of local policy. The new support policy of the European Union provides instruments designed to help integrate the functional and spatial aspects of metropolitan areas, which now must establish administrative unions between cities and their surrounding functional areas in order to benefit from this new policy. Whether financial support provided by the European Union's 2014 – 2020 Integrated Territorial Investments program will accelerate integration in metropolitan areas remains to be seen. The same may be said of social and economic effects. The following is a list of benefits associated with the early stages of this new program:
1) Early stages of urban policy decentralization in favor of local and regional policy where local governments decide which projects are needed and how these projects are managed.

2) Mobilization of local governments; creation of common strategies and development plans needed to obtain financial support.

3) Rebirth of abandoned local government partnerships or formation of new partnerships.

4) Opportunities for more integrated functional/spatial development in metropolitan areas.

5) Less regional eccentricity, which is particularly problematic in polycentric urban regions in Poland such as the Gdańsk-Gdynia, Upper Silesia, and Bydgoszcz-Toruń urban regions.

6) Evolution of thinking in terms of the common good – “think metropolitan, act local”.

7) Ability to obtain external funding for integrated local projects that would be difficult to complete via other sources of funding including local tax revenue (i.e. shortage of funding).

While organizational and financial instruments are needed to support local government entities in metropolitan areas, it is also necessary to change the law that regulates metropolitan areas by assigning a special status to such areas along with special budgets and local powers. The most important power in this case is the power to regulate non-local spatial planning efforts. However, changes in the law are difficult to realize due to resistance from different interest groups including local governments themselves. Another basic roadblock is a lack of local government experience in modern planning and management in metropolitan areas.

The OECD Urban Policy Reviews: Poland 2011 (Przegląd OECD krajowej polityki miejskiej w Polsce. Ocena i rekomendacje 2011) states that even in cases where grassroots action in metropolitan areas is successful, more work is needed in order to create laws that would regulate inter-township collaboration, which could be used to help cities, townships, and counties work together to solve social, economic, and spatial problems. In this context, it is necessary to consider the extent of metropolitan area legislation in Poland. According to Izdebski (2010), legislation regulating metropolitan area collaboration could be created in stages and should include a lot of flexibility in the realm of political and spatial solutions for the different metropolitan areas present in Poland.
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URBAN-RURAL COOPERATION IN THE CONTEXT OF SUBURBANIZATION PROCESSES IN POLAND

1. Introduction

According to Artmann et al. (2012) in “Partnership for sustainable rural-urban development. Existing evidences”, a variety of relationships between urban and rural areas have been established by various research studies. The authors emphasize that the problems of urban areas may be rooted outside of city limits – in rural areas – which tend to experience problems originating in cities. Moreover, solutions to all of these problems may be found outside the areas directly affected. In effect, the proper identification of urban-rural relationships is essential in order to create effective management systems that would help solve problems. Such mechanisms would also help improve the quality of life at the local level by optimizing waste management, public transportation, and regional planning. One idea designed to help form urban-rural relationships in a market economy is the urban-rural partnership. Both partners are deemed to be equal, which is a precondition for the European Union’s concept of sustainable development.

Any analysis of the potential for the implementation of the urban-rural partnership concept in Poland needs to include a discussion of the degree of equality of cities and rural areas in Poland. Urban-rural equality is a key part of the partnership concept. It is also necessary to assess the social environment in order to understand the conditions for cooperation. In this paper, this analysis is conducted in the context of suburbanization, which is one of the major change processes in cities in Poland today. The other two key processes are globalization and the emergence of large metropolitan areas.
The purpose of this paper is to show that the establishment of urban-rural partnerships is also possible in suburban areas and will encounter multiple barriers that are poorly understood by local governments and/or there exists a lack of effective tools to identify and reduce barriers produced by years of social change associated with suburban growth in Poland and its unique characteristics. The barriers described in this paper are experienced both at the macro-level and the micro-level of social reality, historical context, and modern challenges.

The history of urbanization in Poland is relatively short. About 60% of Poles lived in cities by the end of the 20th century, while sixty years earlier, it was only 37%. This means that living in the countryside is part of the personal experience of most Poles or their close relatives, which ought to make it easier to understand rural problems and pursue appropriate solutions. However, many Poles choose to forget their rural experience in order to seem more modern and sophisticated.

I. Bukraba-Rylska (2011), citing the great rural sociologist J. Chałasiński, argues that the “redneck” stereotype that had always divided Polish society into elites and commoners (lords and boors) remains alive and well. One reason for this lasting effect is that this classification system now includes education and social status – not just place of residence. A. Leder (2014) puts it succinctly: “The division into lords and boors has survived in our understanding of the world. Some men are poor and lack opportunity, while others have it all. Every landowner has a hired hand. Every nobleman has peasants whom no one sees”. A. Leder’s difficult origins of urban areas in Poland are significant in the formation of urban-rural partnerships due to problems with identity and how it relates to one’s place of residence and one’s willingness to foster local development.

The functional area is a key concept in OECD planning documents, EU agendas, and the most important planning document in Poland today – the National Urban Policy. This concept has not been adopted by local governments on a practical level. However, it is practiced by individuals who take advantage of urban space on a daily basis, but live outside of this urban space. According to K. Nawratek (2013), “This creates an obvious political problem. The ‘functional entity’ present in cities is absent from their political scene”. Urban-rural partnerships assume the maintenance of a separate identity along with a strengthening of collaborative efforts between administrative units. Problems associated with this type of linkage are illustrated by the latest list of assumptions attached to the National Urban Policy: “Functional areas of cities consist of a large number of administrative units. […] The government of each township pursues its own projects independently. This also applies to planning and development policy, which are often pursued without any input from neighboring townships. This approach inhibits cohesive spatial planning and social and economic development across an urban functional region”.

2. Urban-rural partnerships versus the social dimension of suburbanization

The circumstances associated with the formation of urban-rural partnerships in suburban areas are determined by the nature and effects of the influx of new residents to villages experiencing urbanization.

Poland’s National Census provides an estimate of the scale of suburbanization in Poland today (Śleszyński 2011, 49; Kajdanek 2012, 19). In the period 2002–2011, cities in Poland lost more than 200,000 residents, while rural areas gained more than 485,000 residents. Central Statistical Office of Poland asserts that a large number of these new rural residents elected to settle in suburban areas.

Cities in Lower Silesia lost close to 40,000 residents, while rural areas gained more than 45,000 residents. The shift from cities to rural areas is not evenly distributed across the region and tends to cluster around the largest cities – Wrocław, Legnica, and Jelenia Góra. Suburbanization in Lower Silesia can be observed in the form of latitude lines that generally follow major roads such as Highway A4 running from Wrocław to Legnica and Zgorzelec on the German border. Suburban communities also flourish in townships with unique and valuable landscapes such as those in the Kotlina Kłodzka Basin in the Sudety Mountains.

The uneven spatial distribution of suburbanization is also observable at Poland’s lowest administrative level – the township. Data obtained from county governments make it possible to analyze the number of single-family homes built per village, which can be used to identify villages with the largest number of new residents. The magnitude of suburbanization depends on the size of the parent urban center – ranging from multiple villages in the case of major cities to one or two villages in the case of small and midsize cities. The physical distance of suburban communities from the parent urban center also varies from one or two kilometers to more than ten kilometers.


The causes of suburban growth in Poland can be divided into causes associated with macro-structural conditions (i.e. systemic and historical determinants) and causes associated with micro-structural conditions (i.e. personal preferences and motivations). The analysis of both types of causes serves as the basis for an analysis of the effects of suburbanization on the potential for urban-rural partnerships (Tab. 1).
Tab. 1. Causes of suburbanization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-structural factors</th>
<th>Micro-structural factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Housing shortage inherited from the socialist era (1945 – 1989).</td>
<td>A. Ability to realize personal housing plans, increased housing mobility between cities and within metropolitan areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Private property and market competition for land to help realize personal housing goals.</td>
<td>B. Choice of house or apartment in suburbia due to a lower price relative to a similar option in the city – often without giving consideration to hidden costs such as fuel and commute time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Higher incomes and better access to credit help many Poles reject the modest housing options available at large housing estates – inhabited by 40% of Poland’s population in 2006.</td>
<td>C. Suburban homes are in fashion today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Creation of local development plans that zone agricultural areas for housing development, while no limits are put in place to control the amount of land made available to developers. In effect, the amount of land zoned for development exceeds potential needs several times over, which helps create suburban sprawl.</td>
<td>D. Pursuit of a higher quality of life at the individual level – role of open spaces not available in the city, desire to possess more living space per person, ecological value of rural areas, especially in the context of raising children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Some cities experience inner city blight and significantly lower quality of life in housing estates built in the socialist era. Many central parts of cities decline physically and socially.</td>
<td>E. The perception that a home is a single-family home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Increasing number of cars and slow growth of road infrastructure.</td>
<td>F. In the case of some families, the desire to restore a sense of security or increase the level of security beyond the current level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Rapid growth of the construction materials market.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list of motivations for suburban living does not cause new suburban residents to reject the city as a social and spatial system with a physical infrastructure and various service offerings that help individuals realize their life goals. New suburban residents do reject their previous habitats – their places of residence in the city that did not meet their expectations. At the same time, these new rural residents usually do not join the local rural cultural circle that would make them part of rural society. A more accurate way of looking at this issue would be to state that new suburban residents commute between the place where they sleep (suburban rural areas) and the place where most of their life is located (the city) in terms of professional work, consumer activity, and social interactions (Kajdanek 2011, 2012). Of course, this is a simplification that needs to be considered in the context of nuanced variations. This new living arrangement leads to an ineffective use of technical infrastructure and social resources both in the city and in rural areas.

The lack of equilibrium between the potential\(^1\) of suburban areas as places of work, education, consumer activity, entertainment, and other forms of activity supplementing what

---

\(^1\) Which is, as a resource, poorly recognized and rarely used by local governments.
the city has to offer and its level of utilization by new residents is a key argument supporting the notion of urban-rural partnerships. The creation of such partnerships would help better address the needs of all residents of each given functional area and would help stabilize urban-rural linkages in the area of transportation, consumer services, and employment.

One unique aspect of Polish suburbs is the fact that most suburban communities consist of individual families building their own homes on a single lot. The role of large private investors is much more pronounced in areas close to large cities. In effect, new suburban residents build their homes very close to native residents of rural areas. However, this close proximity does not translate into a deeper understanding of the new place of residence or personal identification with rural areas. Physical distance is often accompanied by social distance, which is difficult to overcome in light of a mutual understanding largely based on stereotypes that focus on polar opposites – new vs. native, young vs. old, rich vs. poor, educated vs. uneducated.

2.2. Suburbanization “Polish-style” versus the social aspects of selected areas of potential urban-rural cooperation.

There are many dimensions of urban-rural cooperation; however, most produce a negligible effect in Poland at this point in time. Hence, the most important dimensions in Poland are those that help reduce the isolation of cities and rural areas and measurably improve the quality of life on a local level (Borys, Rogala 2008). These include:

– housing preferences and the home-work relationship,
– availability of services and the core-periphery relationship,
– mobility and all its implications (Rusanen, Hooli 2012).

**Housing preferences and the home-work relationship**

As mentioned previously, suburban living is largely the product of economics, which does not preclude the prestige of living in the suburbs. The expectation is that individuals and families will benefit from this type of move. The shift towards the suburbs is not interpreted in terms of the public good due to the relatively weak relationships that bond newcomers and natives. No spatial considerations are relevant either – most new suburban residents view the world in terms of their own home, garden, and other “special places”.

The movement of urban residents to adjacent rural areas occurs in an uncontrolled manner due to the poor functioning of control mechanisms that can be used by local governments to manage population flow. For example, local zoning plans are created under pressure from landowners and in the hope of attracting investors to the area including housing developers. This leads to large swaths of land being rezoned for housing development without regard for local demographic prognoses. This further leads to a shortage of
space for other functions and many townships are not able to create appropriate infrastructure due to high land prices. In effect, roads and sewer lines and other forms of infrastructure are not built to meet demand. This upsets the functional equilibrium between suburban areas (shortage of functions) and urban areas (concentration of functions). A much more sustainable approach to housing development would base on an urban-rural relationship where each planning effort covers the entire region and not each township separately.

The effects of existing suburbanization cannot be reversed. The task for the leaders of urban-rural partnerships is to take action to improve the quality of life for all residents in terms of access to transportation and other services. Yet another task for local leaders is to create an awareness of the common good within their respective urban area. Local governments ought to work out a practical agreement whereby income taxes are not a political tool used in the struggle between urban and suburban townships, as is often the case today.

The central city remains the primary workplace for most new suburbanites as well as native rural residents. In light of the European Union’s support for multifunctional rural development and the slow transition away from traditional agriculture and towards innovative agriculture and non-agricultural jobs, it would be reasonable for local governments to analyze how rural areas could become a workplace both for new and native residents. The fact that the European Union supports urban-rural partnership projects designed to stimulate economic growth may be an opportunity for local governments to utilize the environmental and landscape value of their local regions to attract innovative companies that would, in turn, attract specialists drawn to non-material compensation. Suburban areas may become weekend destinations for urban residents. Suburban production and distribution facilities for regional and ecological products targeting urban area residents are also a potential opportunity to be explored.

**Availability of services and the core–periphery relationship**

In order to capture the sociological characteristics of this relationship in the context of the suburbs, it is necessary to define the city center in two ways. First, the city center is a pre-defined geographic area offering a unique set of services in a given city. There exists today a tendency to note gaps between central and peripheral areas – gaps in access to services in rural areas and small cities. Service providers tend to relocate to larger cities, while those that remain in rural areas are often perceived as inferior in quality. This is especially true of rural schools and shopping centers (Kajdanek 2011). The second definition of the city center is one where this geographic area plays a special role in society. This may include spending time at sites special to a certain community (plazas, buildings, cultural spaces) as well as the ability to create one’s own spatial identity and a connection to a place and its people.

---

2 Business incubators and clusters of innovativeness, information technology and technology transfer.
The poor availability of services in suburban areas in Poland and high demand for services by new suburban residents translate into a strong functional connection with the city center. The complex nature of this connection can be illustrated via examples: (a) attitude of new suburbanites towards rural elementary schools, rural supermarkets, and small businesses offering basic services similar to those available in the city, (b) attitude of new suburbanites towards traditional public spaces in suburban rural areas.

The following observations were made in suburban communities near Wrocław as well as other suburbs in the Lower Silesia region of Poland:

1) Close to 90% of survey participants shopped at local supermarkets in suburban communities near Wrocław. All surveyed suburbs possessed local supermarkets (Kajdanek 2011). However, these were mostly minor purchases. The key suburban arguments for shopping in the city were “ease of shopping,” greater product selection, and lower prices. Many survey participants also indicated that suburban supermarkets carry lower quality products and products that are often not fresh (e.g. fruit, vegetables, meat).

2) In the case of suburbs located near small and midsize cities, even major shopping trips are done at local (suburban) supermarkets. In addition, suburban customers tend to pay special attention to the quality of locally-made bread.

In the context of the significance of cultural heritage and local products in urban–rural partnerships, the local production of some food staples may be an area of economic growth for suburban areas. 25% of rural residents indicated that there is lack of local doctors. The remaining survey participants stated that a local doctor is available, but 50% never visit him or her despite having a need to visit a doctor. The most frequently encountered explanation is that every person has his or her “own” doctor who “has known me for years and knows how to help me.”

3) Almost 80% of survey participants are aware of a beauty salon in their local community. More than half of these individuals have never visited their local beauty salon. The reasons for this are many and include the general atmosphere at local beauty salons – gossip, snap judgments, and other commentary. The quality of local services is also questioned, especially the long wait times. Similar suburbanite criticisms apply to local bars and eating establishments.

It is important to note that new suburban residents are able to meet some of their needs on their own – at home and in their garden. Examples include getting a tan in the garden instead of a solarium, using a home gym instead of visiting a sports club, high quality television at home instead of going to the movies, and hosting large parties at home (or garden) instead of going to restaurants.
A vital element of the local service offering is the local preschool or elementary school. About 70% of survey participants indicated that their children have the option of attending local preschools, while 85% of survey participants also indicated that their children have the option of attending local elementary schools. However, the percentage of new suburban children at suburban schools remains very low.

It is easier for parents to take their children to school or preschool in Wrocław where they will have proper care throughout the day instead of leaving them at suburban schools. Many rural and suburban schools and preschools in Poland close early and children have to walk home, which is considered not safe by many parents who do not want their children home alone. Instead, many parents choose to pick up their children from urban schools and preschools themselves.

Second, it is considered better for a child to stay at the same school before and after a move to a new residence, as this provides psychological stability and the opportunity to continue building relationships with existing peers. This, of course, precludes the building of relationships with new peers at new schools in suburban and rural areas.

In addition, many parents believe that city schools and preschools in Poland offer a higher quality of education than schools in rural areas. The same is true of extracurricular programs, student clubs, foreign language programs, dance workshops, and other educational programs. While this is not mentioned as a leading determinant, it may be expected that ambitious parents want “what is best” for their children.

It is important to note that many suburban schools outside of major metropolitan areas are recognized as excellent by parents whose children actually attend them. Suburban schools are often partly funded by the European Union and possess the latest teaching equipment and offer smaller classes, which allows teachers to better focus on individual children. The good opinions of parents are corroborated by the strong academic performance of sixth graders in the case of the school in Łagów in the suburbs of Zgorzelec, a small city on the Polish-German border. In this case, data from urban and suburban schools show that suburban children score higher. Parents who send their children to suburban schools or rural schools are usually those whose work schedules are flexible enough to allow them to pick up their children from school. In most cases, it is the mother who does this. In other cases, grandparents who live in the area pick up children and supervise them until the parents come home from work. In some cases, women who work at home send their children to suburban schools and then are able to pick them up anytime during the day.

A closer look at the future reveals an obvious fact – suburban residents will age over time. The current state of the services sector in suburban areas is not satisfactory in terms of access to services and quality. This is especially true of social services. At the same time, low usage of local suburban services leads to the utilization of urban services, which creates an implicitly forced link between the suburbs and the city. The practical outcome of this is an increased number of vehicular trips to the urban core. It should be noted that
social service projects and public infrastructure projects can be financed in small cities and rural areas by the European Union as part of urban-rural partnerships. This yields practical outcomes in terms of balancing the rank of central places in metropolitan areas. Projects financed by the European Union produce the greatest impact on areas such as school education, personal and professional development of youth, education for all age groups, and healthcare.

An entirely separate issue is the creation of attractive public spaces in suburban areas and the revitalization of existing public spaces. This idea is larger than just the renovation of cultural sites and the paving of church plazas. The idea is to create a repertoire of cultural activity and civic involvement associated with public spaces that would serve a variety of local stakeholders. What is also important is that townships work together to make good use of environmental and landscape assets by creating public recreational spaces such as regional bike paths and walking trails.

**Mobility and accessibility**

One of the problems affecting suburban areas in Poland today is transportation. There exists a relative shortage of roads that would provide easy, fast, and safe access to key locations in most metropolitan areas. This is the result of the gap between capital assets used to build new homes and shortages of capital in local government budgets, which are usually tasked with the development of infrastructure. The expectations of new suburban residents compound this problem, as most new suburbanites are used to urban infrastructure and demand it in suburban rural areas. It is expected that local governments will quickly create infrastructure, but this usually does not happen. This means that new suburban residents need at least two automobiles in order to go to work and view the automobile as the only convenient form of transportation to and from the city.

In this context, alternatives to the automobile may be considered in small and midsize cities, and this is borne out by research. In addition, it is important to note that the definition of “near” and “far” tends to differ between large cities and smaller cities.

First, suburban residents believe that the suburbs are close to the city. The concept of “close” is defined not in minutes of automobile travel, as would be the case with the suburban residents of large cities, but in units of time needed to reach the city on foot. Sometimes, this distance is also measured in meters. This basic difference suggests that distance is perceived differently and so are the means needed to overcome this distance. It also suggests that dependence on the automobile may be defined in a variety of ways, although this does not automatically imply the pursuit of sustainable development or ecological awareness. The choice of any mode of transportation other than an automobile is the result of practical attitudes and the availability of sidewalks linking the city with the suburbs. In many cases, sidewalks are also used as bike paths.
Second, some residents use public transportation and rate it high or low depending on the location of their home relative to the available route and location of stops, and still others bike or walk to the city. Bicycles are used by adults as well as older children traveling to school. Some car owners have also indicated that they would use bicycles if convenient bike paths were available. An additional and quite frequently used transportation solution is carpooling – friends from work or neighbors frequently carpool. The same is often true of parents with children in the same schools or extracurricular programs.

The observed cases of automobile non-dependence constitute a very positive signal to local governments seeking to manage new suburban development in an environmentally and socially sustainable manner.

Third, suburbs near small and midsize cities are not normally perceived as difficult in terms of transportation, which is a key difference from suburbs found near large cities. New residents in suburban areas near small and midsize cities often emphasize how easy it is to reach the urban core and how many different modes of transportation are available in their area. Many of the fears about transportation in these areas appear to be unfounded.

2.3. Success factors in urban-rural partnerships in the context of suburbanization in Poland

The following is a list of key success factors associated with urban-rural partnerships in the context of the contemporarily relevant process of suburbanization in Poland:

1) Linkage between different territorial units, and clearly defined forms of governance. Polish law lacks this type of organizational system.
2) Awareness of common problems to be solved by different local governments. Examples include transportation, education, and social programs. The difficulty in Poland consists of a lack of rules and regulations (legal and financial) that would govern the realization of projects.
3) Common strategy and identification of common goals – understanding of the idea of metropolitan area management and the pursuit of common projects by local governments that does not result from a desire to burden others (e.g. the new metropolitan county government) with troublesome and/or expensive projects (e.g. public transportation, waste management, public welfare), but a positively argued pursuit of the development of the entire metropolitan area.
4) Experience and tradition of working together. There exists a lack of experience and the lack of a tradition of working together between local governments in Poland today.
5) Strategy of small steps and the completion of many concrete projects. A variety of actors taking part in projects. This strategy is particularly important with individuals or groups that want to work together, but have no practical experience. In my view, it is
sensible to begin with well-known mechanisms such as Local Action Groups and the Village Fund. Ultimately, it is up to local governments to activate various urban, rural, and sector-based groups and entities in each partnership’s geographic area.

6) Appropriate framework of action – regional, national, European. What is even more important is bottom-up activity, which can be triggered by working at the grassroots level to spark social engagement (understanding oneself, trust, desire to work together) that yields social capital in the long term.

7) Motivation of important actors. Provide support to local government representatives (village managers and township managers) in order to help them understand that it is their job to lead the community in the first phase (and beyond) of the urban–rural partnership. The current state of the office of village manager is quite unsatisfactory (Kajdanek 2011).
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Rural areas in Poland are experiencing rapid change and traditional villages are often no longer associated with peasantry, agriculture, and a general lack of social and economic development. Not only is Polish society becoming less agricultural (now at 13% of employed persons), rural areas in Poland are also becoming less agricultural (28%). Even farmers are becoming less focused on farming – only 17% of Polish households are deriving all or most of their income from agriculture (see Wilkin 2012a, 2012b). The social and economic landscape of rural areas is slowly changing. Rural social composition is also changing, as is the overall image of rural society in Poland. These changes are also helping to make rural areas attractive to new residents. In fact, rural areas are experiencing a net influx of new residents.

On the one hand, rural areas still include a large professionally passive (i.e. unemployed) population (over 60%) and most rural residents who are employed represent lower social classes (80%). On the other hand, there is an increasing number of “non-rural” residents including all types of specialists, government workers, office workers, entrepreneurs (20.5%), and other individuals with some high quality skills (Halamska 2011a). In addition, the quality of education in rural areas has improved significantly, especially in the case of the parent generation of current youth. One out of ten rural parents possess a higher education, as do one out of four urban parents.

Development funds provided by the European Union have helped rural areas in Poland overcome a once mighty barrier to social and economic development. The difference between rural and urban areas persists, but that difference is no longer insurmountable. Average rural income is \( \frac{2}{3} \) that of the average urban resident. Today the average rural home
features a set of modern appliances that had only been affordable for urban residents in the 1990s (Szafraniec 2012). Many spatial barriers have disappeared and modern media have pulled rural areas into the national rhythm of life via easy access to information and global cultural trends. This alters the whole context of socialization and the development of youth. The most favorable situation applies to local elites such as college educated white collar workers, local government leaders, affluent farmers, and other wealthier rural residents. The least favorable situation applies to workers and their families as well as persons without a steady job (who are often welfare recipients). Despite a number of key differences, young people from both social groups do possess the same set of points of reference thanks to the global availability of modern media that teach the art of consumerism and the notion that one's lifestyle is an indicator of success. Can this context be helpful in the propagation of change in rural areas and elsewhere?

1. **Description of rural youth and their aspirations**

Rural areas in most developed countries have experienced a metamorphosis in the last few decades. In Poland, this change is even more visible. The peasant farmer used to be the center of rural life in Poland well into the 1980s. Rural areas in Poland were backward and in recession – at least that is how modern economists would describe it. The standard view in Poland at the time consisted of polar opposites – urban progress and rural lack of progress. The perception was that the rural lifestyle should be stigmatized. While agriculture is receding in rural areas in Poland, the rural lifestyle is gaining value in Poland’s postmodern society. The reasons for this increase in value include certain new social characteristics as well as environmental benefits and the aura of rural landscapes. Rural areas are becoming the latest consumer craze as well as a hotspot for this new consumer craze (Chevalier 2009; Halamska 2011b). New ideas on rural areas are emerging, as are new political strategies and new policies governing agriculture in the 21st century.

There is also a tendency to evaluate the behaviors and life choices of rural youth from an urban perspective. In fact, research has shown that rural youth itself believes that the urban lifestyle is something it should aspire to. Current sociological research shows that both urban and rural youth can be described using similar characteristics. The cultural offering of modern Poland (status, career, money, lifestyle) has captured the imagination of youth from all walks of life. High social status is the aspiration of close to 60% of urban youth and 40% of rural youth. High income – starting salary of more than 3,500 PLN per month – is the aspiration of 30% of rural youth and 50% of urban youth. Rural youth is slightly more likely to settle for an average job than urban youth. Modesty is also more prevalent among rural youth – 36% vs. 18% for urban youth. However, the rural concept of a successful life does not differ markedly from that imagined by more demanding urban youth. A sense of belonging along with a good job as well as high social status and a fulfilling (interesting)
life are key requirements. Rural youth is more likely to nurture traditional values such as attachment to one’s family, religion, modesty, frugality, and resourcefulness. Another key characteristic of rural youth is simply being a regular person who accepts his or her surroundings as they are (Szafraniec 2011).

Differences in professional and lifestyle preferences among the older youth diminish among the very young. Regardless of place of residence, the youngest members of society are more likely than their older peers to demand an interesting and convenient lifestyle. This may be a sign that national consumerist trends are effectively reaching ever younger audiences in Poland, but it also points to an increased risk that emerges whenever growing aspirations meet inadequate opportunities – when the distance between what is desired and what is attainable is too large. Rural areas are undoubtedly high risk areas in terms of matching expectations with opportunities. This is not only a case of the still present social and economic gap between rural and urban areas, but also a case of the social and economic specificity of rural areas as well as financial resources, social capital, and cultural values of the average rural family. The fact remains that rural parents, despite being better educated than the previous generation, are still less educated than urban parents and their ability to earn a living is also less substantial.

Many rural parents are simply not equipped to manage childhood development and to make important decisions regarding the future of their children. Less specialized orientation in the modern world also does not help in this regard. Issues such as the functioning of global markets, new forms of employment, new educational requirements, and a host of other new challenges are often not within the reach of rural parents. Few women in rural areas work outside the home or farm, which leads to an inadequate development of the childcare industry in rural areas. The trend is for rural children to grow up under the watchful eye of mom. This may sound very appealing, but it is also a way of excluding new contacts and new types of experiences. In practice, rural youth are always thinking in terms of their family context and stigma associated with this type of lifestyle. Low self-esteem sets in and leads to educational choices based on low risk (Domalewski 2006). Rural children often choose only selected educational paths in line with certain established patterns of thinking.

2. Aspirations and educational choices of rural youth

Starting in the mid-1990s, most young people in Poland (rural and urban) began to view education as the key to a successful life. The previous lifestyle model had been based on the “socialist worker concept” and a socialist worker only needs a small amount of education to perform physical labor. All this changed when Poland made the transition from communism to capitalism starting in 1989. Today 56% of middle school students in rural areas choose to attend college preparatory high schools. Higher education is
also becoming a goal for many rural youth – an average of 60% of high school students (see Domalewski 2010). The stream of rural youth attending college has increased substantially in recent years. However, there is a certain pattern. Rural students choose schools with fewer entrance requirements and lower teaching standards. Lower quality high schools include 23.4% rural students, while higher quality high schools include only 12.1% rural students. The same is true of colleges and universities.

Rural youth are strongly interested in schools and majors that pose fewer requirements and offer less academic rigor. Traditional (public) colleges and universities enroll approximately 21% rural students, while new schools enroll as much as 35% rural students and non-public schools enroll 60% to 80% rural students. In Poland and elsewhere in Central and Eastern Europe, public colleges and universities have a long tradition of academic achievement, while private schools are new and often untested. A key consideration in college is the selection of a “real life” major that will guarantee a job following graduation. Hence, rural students tend to choose traditional college majors that will lead to a “real” job within the spectrum of available jobs. This includes for instance the job of a teacher, government worker, and the uniformed services (Wasielewski 2013).

At the same time, certain changes in educational choices are being observed today, especially among rural youth. One change consists of interest in technical high schools and a decrease in the drive towards higher education. Interest in technical high schools has grown 10 percentage points in the last six years. Two types of students are turning away from higher education: (1) good students from rural areas, (2) average students from urban areas. While the decision of the latter group is understandable and quite logical, the decision of the former group appears baffling and perhaps erroneous. Average students may not need to pursue the goal of higher education in light of fewer qualifications and little motivation to study, but why would good students forgo higher education?

There is an array of reasons for this including basic assumptions and a personal view of one’s own abilities. Rural residents tend to be pragmatic, but sometimes are also affected by a variety of complexes including a lack of faith in oneself, lack of positive encouragement, and a shortage of knowledge of the non-rural world. While some have also observed another pattern in rural areas – the career ladder pattern – this does not change the fact that the vast majority of rural youth pursue pragmatic education designed to provide rapid results in the form of a job in some “safe” sector of the economy and not in an area characterized by risk and prestige at the same time. This is a very sober assessment of the job market where people with college diplomas are not finding a large number of job offers in Poland. Yet, demand for technicians and other lower level specialists is growing. Long term perspectives and current European as well as global trends are often not on the minds of rural youth in Poland in the context of educational choices.
3. Emergence of post-modernity and new challenges

Rural education in contemporary Poland has reached unprecedented levels, which is perceived as a ticket to a better life and a chance to accelerate Poland’s transformation from communism to capitalism, which has been gradually taking place since 1989. However, a closer look at the details of rural education and its dilemmas and strategies shows that reality is less optimistic. This is especially true in the context of challenges associated not with today, but with tomorrow (post-modernity).

Post-modernity, also known as late modernity or second modernity, is a term used to describe developed economies in the second half of the 20th century. A variety of other names have also been used including network society, information society, and society of risk. It is no longer a matter of if such a society will evolve, but how it will evolve in the years to come. The existence of post-modern society has been proven by the nature of the life of the modern individual and that of society in general. One key characteristic of the post-modern society is its saturation with technology and its dependence on it. It is also a society characterized by a complicated lifestyle, rapid rate of change, and internal contradictions that promote refined consumerism and promise unlimited success, while at the same time producing increasingly difficult to define social and economic problems.

Sociologists note the importance of post-modern characteristics such as flexibility (Bauman 2006), reflection (Giddens 2002), and risk (Beck 2002). The basic idea is that our current world is no longer structured and predictable or stable. It is a world “in the making” that demands the creation of new strategies and life goals that respond to new life situations and challenges. In this brave new world, traditional solutions and sources of authority no longer suffice. It is a “do-it-yourself” world where others may not know how to solve emerging problems or are not sure which solutions to choose.

This new context only appears innocent and simple. A variety of specific life skills are needed in order to function in this new context. The basic requirements are openness, ability to reflect, and the ability to become the chief planner of one’s own life via systematic action in everyday life. When analyzing the world from this perspective, the educational choices of rural youth do not seem particularly sensible.

For example, most young people in urban areas and rural areas choose a college major unrelated to their interests, talents, and opportunities with the implicit goal being “this will work somehow”. In effect, many students pursue some default major that is easy to complete, but later does not bring any desired outcomes. This approach to education does not pay off in the post-modern world, which requires reflection on and an understanding of the field we are pursuing as well as a deeper understanding of ourselves. Decisions made without reflection bear a great degree of risk of failure.
Another example of erroneous thinking is the notion that college is designed to be a preparatory step towards a specific career. This belief is especially widespread among rural youth. It is important to note here that the modern job market is increasingly filled with jobs that are not based upon “professions” but different types of “tasks” performed depending on the current needs of society or the economy. Many careers today are based on the flexible use of one’s skills in response to changing needs in the local or global markets. The do-it-yourself approach is here to stay, while colleges and universities will only teach “pragmatic” skills in select cases.

The third problem is the belief that a master’s diploma will lead to a dream job and correspondingly high social status. Graduation day is a day of relief and the belief that all the hard work is over. Unfortunately, none of this is true. Today’s college education is merely a starting point for lifelong education, and college is a place where the educated return multiple times to learn additional skills and theories in the form of graduate programs and workshops that help build contemporary careers. This type of approach to educational choices is much more common in Western countries where cultural change has occurred more rapidly than in Poland and elsewhere in Central and Eastern Europe for reasons mentioned earlier. This new approach to education is just evolving in Poland and elsewhere in its region. The lack of this approach is especially visible in rural areas in Poland where educational choices are still made for a variety of outdated reasons.

One of the greatest challenges in the post-modern world is change in the labor market. The stable job market known to past generations based on a single employer and little need to acquire new qualifications is a thing of the past. The new job market requires new skills and mobility and is based on a system of temporary work contracts invented in the West in the late 1980s in order to combat growing unemployment. This instant solution to a real problem soon began to reveal hidden problems such as lower wages and less professional development due to a lack of motivation on the part of employers to invest in temporary workers. Young people became the primary victims of this new system, especially those with little sought after job skills (ILO 2010; Szafraniec 2011) and inadequate flexibility. Many of these new job market “victims” had pursued easy college majors or just any college diploma at all.

Many young people have made this mistake, but rural youth have been more likely to make this mistake than urban youth. Rural education, rural professional development, as well as expectations of stability and security combined with fewer social skills and emotional skills put rural youth in a difficult position – either choose stable work close to home and frequently thanks to local relationships, but without the benefit of the modern lifestyle advertised by the media, or choose temporary work devoid of security and stability, but associated with the city and all of its attractions. This creates the following dilemma:
4. To return or not to return?

This dilemma applies especially to those rural students who have left their small towns in order to go to college in the “big city”. The move to the city has changed them as people. Now these formerly rural individuals possessed different needs, aspirations, and customs than their still rural families. While today’s city limits no longer limit big city lifestyles and new technologies such as the Internet and mobile phones allow for a similar lifestyle anywhere in the developed world, a return to rural areas still appears to pose a difficult transition. The lack of cultural attractions is the greatest problem for young people. There is a shortage of places to go to spend time with other young people. Public transportation or lack thereof is another problem in rural areas. The quality of available public transportation is also an issue. Yet, the largest problem is the job market, which offers a limited spectrum of careers for the young.

These are some of the reasons why the only people who return to rural areas are those who have to. This includes individuals with less education, fewer job qualifications, and the inability to support themselves in the city. These migrants usually become unemployed (in the years 2007 and 2009 respectively 59,1% and 63,7% of the unemployed in rural areas were people under 34 years old; as a comparison, people under 34 years old constituted respectively 51,3% and 52% of the unemployed in urban areas; see Frenkel 2012) or inherit a family farm. Some return to the countryside to later leave for work abroad (young rural residents form the most numerous group of people who migrate abroad: 43,6% of permanent migrants and 85,6% of temporary ones; see Frenkel 2012). Few of these returning migrants are college educated professionals who then find work in local rural governments, non-governmental organizations, local schools, and local cultural institutions. Many become disenchanted and dream of another life. In their view, rural areas have changed little since their departure. Things such as infrastructure, transportation, and the overall appearance of rural areas, often cited as signs of rural progress by both national and local level politicians, mean little to young people. None of this rural progress makes it possible to lead a fun life or to find an interesting job. This is why 2/3 of college graduates choose not to return to rural areas (Wasielewski 2013). Young college educated women are the least likely to return to rural areas. Their main goal is to maintain their professional achievements, often at the expense of a personal life and increasingly at the expense of motherhood.

The above data along with stated intentions to live in rural areas (50% of rural youth and 13% of urban youth) show that the image of rural areas is changing and the philosophy of Polish youth is changing, but many old problems remain. These include a lack of clarity as to how rural areas will evolve in the years to come and the idea that rural areas remain a Plan B for most young people – and not a first choice.
5. Future of rural areas in the context of the decisions of young people

The main magnet attracting rural youth consists of large cities and other development zones. Permanent migration data for young people illustrate this pattern. The clear winners in this respect are the following provinces (voivodeships) in Poland: Mazowieckie, Małopolskie, Wielkopolskie, Dolnośląskie, Pomorskie (Fig. 1).

Intellectual drainage implicitly begins at the moment of the college selection decision. The best high school students tend to choose colleges and universities in regions they perceive as most dynamic and professionally advantageous (Wasielewski 2013). In many cases, these are not their own geographic regions. The old saying that “the rich get richer and the poor get poorer” applies to students and career professionals alike. Intellectual capital flows to areas characterized by advanced technologies, high levels of creativity, and social tolerance (Florida 2010). The same is true of less qualified workers as well. Large cities and their immediate surroundings serve as magnets for young educated people. The social and economic distance between major urban areas and peripheral rural areas continues to grow. Peripheral areas maintain their disadvantage by lacking the ability to build strong linkages with large urban centers (Stanny 2013).

Fig. 1. Permanent migration data for people 15-29 years old by province
Source: based on the Central Statistical Office of Poland data (2010)
Suburban areas surrounding large urban centers have been attracting better educated and higher income residents for years due to lower real estate prices, lower costs of living, and a more attractive natural landscape. Today’s suburbs are a form of social and intellectual capital that serves as fertile ground for business activity and new social initiatives based on the infrastructure of neighboring large cities. These processes occur largely with the aid of the younger generation, which is seeking out a more economically friendly place for itself. Thus far, the work of the younger generation has produced both economic and social benefits in large cities and their surroundings.

Areas dominated by traditional agriculture are areas affected by a variety of negative phenomena including a relatively inactive local labor market, high rates of official and hidden unemployment, low income, low quality infrastructure, and schools that do little to solve rural problems. Traditional agricultural areas attract few new residents and tend to become problem areas that cannot produce solutions to their own problems. In addition to new administrative divisions such as metropolitan area boundaries and large distance to large urban areas, many traditional agricultural areas suffer from historical divisions that date back to the 19th century when Poland was occupied by its three powerful neighbors – Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The solution of these multiple problems requires outside intervention on a micro-scale as well as long term regional development strategies that connect with a master plan for Poland as a whole (*Polska 2030. Trzecia fala nowoczesności. Strategia Rozwoju Kraju* 2010). Micro-scale solutions include numerous third sector initiatives (Knieć 2013; Wasielewski 2009) that do not always receive positive feedback. The coordination of regional solutions is a problem for the national government, which avoids making key decisions, and historical divisions are often reinforced by local government decisions in the absence of action on the part of the national government.

6. **Towards constructive action**

As late as the late 1990s many researchers wondered out loud if rural areas will find their way in the course of Poland’s post-1989 social and economic transformation, but today no one questions the potential of rural areas or its youngest members. Current rural youth is different than its previous generation and is mentally the rural generation closest to its urban peers. At the same time, the context of life in Poland has changed towards one determined by globalization and post-modern society, which is not fully understood by rural youth. This is shown by its educational decisions, expectations, and problems with employment. The new aspirations of rural youth cannot be realized in rural areas and urban areas as well. Rural areas offer too little and are too poor, while urban areas are too competitive and expensive for rural youth to make it. Life in rural areas remains a Plan B for most and serves as a safety net for individuals who are not ready to compete for social status in the city. However, rural areas are also receiving positive attention in some cases. This is espe-
cially true of rural areas located close to large cities, which have become partner regions in the context of new European Union policies designed to help produce social and economic cohesion in large urban areas (Baranowski 2002).

If rural areas are really to become a magnet for new residents, then this should be more than just a response to the forces pushing residents out of large cities. Some of the current urban push factors include high density housing, strong business competition, high cost of living, as well as other barriers to a comfortable lifestyle and/or profitable business. Rural areas ought to become functional living spaces with a mature society living its own life and characterized by a positive local identity. The strategy for creating such spaces will not work if it does not focus on multiple social groups at the same time. Rural youth and its education seem to be important pillars of such a strategy. Rural youth is vital because without young people rural areas will become empty, which has already happened in the renovated districts of major cities in Poland. Education is also important because it is the key to solving a variety of social and economic problems in rural areas and elsewhere.

Research has shown that a substantial percentage of young Poles do not reject rural areas as a future place to live. This is a marked departure from the situation in the 1990s. The desire to live in rural areas, especially those near large cities, is also expressed by new college graduates. However, it is important to remember that college graduates in modern Poland do represent a new type of generation – one whose life is divided into two basic elements: work and play. Family life remains optional. It becomes an option once an individual finds a job and becomes independent as well as emotionally ready to start a family. The pursuit of all three areas of life requires appropriate infrastructure and social programs. This includes jobs, cultural institutions, daycare, preschools, elementary schools, and public transportation that is safe and convenient. Rural areas, even those found close to large cities, usually do not have such infrastructure. Therefore, infrastructural development should be a fundamental aim of the urban-rural partnership. Without doing so, the idea will remain inanimate and the polarization of development (urban vs. rural) will not cease to be a problem.

Education is a big part of the solution in this case. It ought to address future problems (e.g. curriculum adjustments in each region), but also it should implement novel solutions that would give rural areas a competitive advantage. Thus far, the only area of education strongly pursued by the private sector has been the establishment of private schools in rural areas. The rise of private schools is largely due to the work of business entities and academic staff who wished to profit from the demographic high among the older and younger generations. Today the education market in Poland is saturated and faith in the magical powers of education is mostly gone in the face of global economic crisis.

Current trends in Poland suggest that many potential candidates are turning away from a traditional academic education and are actively considering a vocational education. At the same time, vocational education in Poland is in a sorry state, suffering from outdated methods of dividing specializations and a lack of capital investment. Bold reform is what
vocational education in Poland needs but is not getting from the national governments or anyone else. In effect, young people who are not interested in college are attending vocational schools that are decades behind current requirements. Vocational school students spend four years learning skills that are mostly not needed in the modern labor market and their parents pay for this.

Paradoxically, this is an opportunity for urban-rural partnerships, which could become engaged in the establishment of vocational schools meeting the specific needs of each region in Poland. Former private school operators could be invited to assist in this type of endeavor, as many are now looking for new ways to invest in the era of Poland’s demographic low. It may be the case that some of these companies are still interested in the education market and would like to sign an operating agreement with Poland’s Ministry of Education and local government officials. Such an agreement would regulate administrative issues, curriculum issues, and the financing of such schools via tuition. This innovative type of partnership could solve not only local educational problems, but could also produce the basis for a new model of vocational education in Poland.

The establishment of vocational schools on the urban-rural boundary makes sense in a number of ways. First, it guarantees profits to any potential investor by lowering operating costs and providing more investment freedom and more freedom to design a curriculum. The second benefit of this type of initiative is that it brings education closer to the customer base – in this case, rural youth. This lowers costs by reducing commuting times for students. Third, it elevates the rank of the host community and reduces the social distance between rural areas and urban areas.

The key issue in this type of initiative is the promotion of knowledge and skills that may not be popular with uninformed youth today, but will become the cornerstone of valued jobs in the near future. One area of education with a strong (i.e. profitable) future in Poland is geriatric care and related issues. Polish society is aging quite rapidly and is projected to do so for decades to come. Population aging will affect every part of Poland in the near future. The need for geriatric specialists and nurses will increase. The same is true of retirement homes, which could be built at a lower cost in suburban areas. The combination of such projects with the establishment of vocational schools would prepare future caregivers and the jobs they will need. Both the jobs and the workers would take advantage of local rural resources.

There are other areas of education that have received little attention in Poland thus far. This includes vital areas such as educational coaching and vocational consulting. Both areas of inquiry focus on self reflection, talent recognition, understanding of limitations, as well as the specifics of educational systems, job markets, and career building. Many of the skills that constitute so-called soft capital and rational decision making capabilities are not taught at home or at school. Some erroneously perceive such skills as automatic. Research studies on this issue suggest that both students and parents recognize the need for learn-
ing such skills. In this case, an agreement with Poland’s Ministry of Education, local governments, and firms in the education market could yield a program of monthly workshops and field trips to firms willing to participate in this type of training program. Young people could observe workers in the workplace in order to get a better idea of how various professions really work. The basic outcome of this type of training would be reduced individual and societal costs of incorrect or impulsive educational and career decisions.

The effectiveness of the types of partnerships described above will likely vary to a substantial degree. The hope that the private sector will bear the costs of educational programs is somewhat idealistic and even naive (Szarfenberg 2005/2006). When the private sector is asked to solve problems that are usually solved by the government, it responds with varying degrees of effectiveness. Yet, there are a number of opportunities and sources of financing available to the private sector (Jarzębska, Kazior 2010). A good starting point in the search for both opportunities and financing consists of sociological research on rural youth. This type of research reveals the aspirations, educational strategies, and life strategies of rural youth in the context of social and cultural change, which generates new challenges in today’s education market in Poland.
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1. Introduction

The role of agriculture in Poland’s economy has been declining for years. The same is true of traditionally agricultural regions of Poland and even at the rural municipality level. In most parts of Europe, including Poland, rural areas are organized into small municipalities known as villages. In this paper, the term “village” will be used to describe this type of rural municipality. The decline in agriculture in Poland can also be observed at the household level, where only 32% earn more than half their income from agriculture. The social and economic policies pursued by local governments in modern Poland rely on a strategy of multifunctional development and a departure from a reliance on agriculture as a primary source of income in rural areas. While this new direction does not assure dynamic economic growth, it does tend to provide a safety net in the event of economic crisis and provides a more stable growth base in the long term. A stable rural economy also tends to foster social stability and even growth. Research on life in rural areas in Poland, including rural typologies, has produced numerous papers over the years (Stola 1987; Kaczmarek 1998; Rosner, Stanny, Heffner 2007; Bański 2009; Stanny 2013). Many of these papers cover the functional structure of rural areas with a focus on production data, multifunctional development, and the slow decline of agriculture.

The rate of decline of agriculture in Poland is especially high in large metropolitan areas. The rate of urbanization and suburbanization as factors diversifying rural areas was covered by Czarnecki (2009) for the period 1996–2002. His view is that the rate of urbani-
zation and the resulting functional diversity are determined by the size of the given metropolitan area and the amount of built-up areas constituting a given metropolitan area, while the emergence of non-agricultural forms of income is driven by plant establishment costs determined by local land values. Agricultural areas located relatively close to large cities in Poland may expect change in the years to come and this change will assume one or two different forms. As new residents arrive from the city and bring with them various professional backgrounds, the employment diversity of suburban populations will increase over time. The influx of residents working in the various service industries is especially likely. In a sense, the opposite may also occur. The opportunity to live in suburban areas and commute to work in the city may actually lead to less diversification of the local rural (suburban) economy. The availability of non-agricultural jobs in the nearby large city may stifle local creation of non-agricultural jobs in rural areas.

Agricultural issues in the context of new suburban evolution in selected regions in Poland were covered in the publication by Jezierska-Thole and Kozłowski (2008). Changes in agriculture in suburban areas can be largely explained by the emergence of new suburban residential communities that grow at varying rates, but do continue to push agriculture farther away from city limits.

Given primarily non-agricultural development in large metropolitan areas, few papers are published on the continuous presence of agriculture in these regions. The purpose of this paper is to show differences in the rate of decline of urban and suburban agriculture in Poland and to describe the changing nature of agriculture in such regions. The data used in this paper come from the National Agricultural Census of 2002 and 2010. The paper analyzes city area farm households in and around 18 large cities in Poland. The selected cities are voivodeship capitals and their surrounding counties. The basic assumption here is that the city is the urban core and the surrounding counties constitute the city’s functional suburban area. The urban-rural continuum concept makes it possible to classify villages as rural villages, urban villages or something in-between. In this paper, metropolitan areas are ranked as rural or non-rural or something in-between based on their degree of elimination of agriculture.

The decline of agriculture may be analyzed in terms of social, cultural, economic, and landscape terms. Rosner (2010) measured the rate of the decline of agriculture via a complex analysis of the percentage of households not engaged in agriculture on more than one hectare of land, percentage of households whose main source of income is not agriculture, percentage of farm households engaged in non-agricultural business activity, percentage of employed individuals working somewhere other than their own farm, and the percentage of employed individuals working outside of agriculture and forestry.

In this paper, the presence of agriculture in metropolitan areas in Poland is analyzed primarily in terms of the number of farms per 1,000 persons of working age, changes in the number of farm households, and the amount of land per farm household. An analysis
of the demographic and social characteristics of urban area farmers makes it possible to identify key characteristics of farm households in large metropolitan areas.

2. Agricultural function of metropolitan areas

Urban area agriculture can be analyzed in at least two different ways. The first method concerns the state of farm households within city limits and the types of production they are associated with. Unfortunately, National Agricultural Census data are available based on administrative geography, which does not guarantee that all farm property belonging to a particular owner will be located within the limits of one city or township. This makes unambiguous analysis of agricultural data for urban areas difficult to perform. The term “urban agriculture” also has a second meaning – one linked with a new phase in urban development known as the eco-city. A number of new terms have been invented including “urban agriculture”, “urban gardening”, and “urban farming”. These terms apply to agricultural production in densely populated areas using the roofs of residential towers, balconies, and city squares. Some urban residents also choose to raise animals. Urban farming is sometimes called “concrete field development” or one form of urban renewal. Futuristic models of cities predict that someday homes, office buildings, and supermarkets will all produce food staples themselves.

Rural areas in the suburbs of large cities in Poland are particularly prone to follow multifunctional development paths and experience urban influence in a number of ways. The main role of emerging suburban areas is to provide residential and recreational space for the urban core as well as to provide transportation corridors, service sector companies, and food production capability. This shift driven largely by suburbanization and often lacking proper planning instruments is sometimes also called gentrification. According to Grzelak (2008), the best place to analyze the concept of gentrification in Poland is the urban-rural continuum. This is also the case in research in Great Britain. Gentrification in suburban areas resembles that in central urban locations via its influx of new residents who are more affluent and often better educated. Other key characteristics include new housing and a general improvement of the quality of life in urban area rural areas.

Rural areas surrounding large cities are designated urbanized areas according to the functional area typology developed by Bański (2009). These areas are characterized by the emergence of conflict between functions such as agriculture and forestry as well as housing and industry. The outcome of this conflict usually brings defeat to agriculture – especially that which is specialized and oriented towards the mass market. Agricultural production suffers in suburban areas due to market competition with typically urban functions such as housing and consumer services. Other factors affecting suburban agriculture include ecological, social, and cultural considerations. This has led to social pressure on many local governments to preserve valuable agricultural landscapes in large metropolitan areas as part of local development plans.
designed to control urbanization. Local development plans (i.e. zoning) are also designed to be multifunctional in nature and serve as key elements of sustainable development in large metropolitan areas (Głębocki, Kacprzak, Maćkiewicz 2012).

The role played by agriculture in most suburban areas is usually associated with food production for the local urban core and may be considered a traditional role. The theory of the food supply zone of cities includes specialized commercial farming that helps support local urban development (Wójcik 2011).

While the concept and spatial extent of the food supply zone are associated with the issue of suburban agriculture, these notions are not synonymous. In times past, agriculture in cities and later in suburban areas used to satisfy virtually all the food needs of urban dwellers. As cities grew and metropolitan areas emerged, the area in need of food increased substantially. At the same time, the suburban food supply zone shrunk in size in the face of encroaching urbanization. Today, agricultural areas found in large metropolitan areas tend to be highly specialized and their share of the urban food market continues to shrink (Zgliński 1994). According to Kulikowski (2008), the capital city of Warsaw possess the most highly developed suburban agricultural zone in Poland. The region features specialized high-volume fruit and vegetable production, but even this metropolitan region cannot be described using a theoretical land allocation model for agriculture relative to its markets.

Metropolitan areas are no longer supplied with food primarily from their surrounding food supply zone, as had been the case several decades ago, but by non-local producers in Poland as well as producers from other parts of the world. This is made possible by better food processing technologies and optimized transportation networks as well as thanks to the more refined tastes of the so-called metropolitan social class (Gorzelak 2006).

The “agricultural link” between large cities and their surrounding areas is difficult to identify in today’s economy. Smętkowski (2009) writes about changes in the city – adjacent region relationship in the industrial age and the post-industrial age. In the industrial age, the relationship between the city and its surrounding region was quite strong. Surrounding regions supplied basic resources to cities including unskilled workers, food staples, and raw materials for manufacturing plants and construction companies. In return, the urban core would provide income from work, processed products, and higher order services. In the post-industrial age, the relationship between cities and their surrounding areas has weakened. Areas surrounding cities today serve a somewhat different purpose and tend to supply both skilled and unskilled workers who commute to work as well as non-industrial resources such as drinking water and physical space – both residential and recreational. In addition, these areas serve as migration hubs for permanent and temporary migrants seeking better opportunities of all sorts.

The resources that used to flow to cities from their surrounding areas in the industrial age have begun to flow from more distant sources (e.g. food staples) or lost their signifi-
cance in the course of economic restructuring (e.g. industrial raw materials). The modern core of the urban economy consists of capital and information flows that produce an urban hub. The physical exchange of materials and the concentration of a large workforce, which used to be the key to an industrial economy, no longer play an important role in the development policy of large cities in the post-industrial age.

3. Change in agriculture in large metropolitan areas in Poland

Agriculture in large metropolitan areas in Poland is subject to change due to dynamic urbanization and suburbanization. While urban agriculture plays a negligible role today, many functional areas surrounding large cities continue to include large agricultural areas. However, the rate of the decline of suburban agriculture and current data on suburban agriculture are difficult to measure or obtain otherwise. The amount of arable land in Poland continues to shrink – a loss of 1.3 million hectares between 2002 and 2010. While National Agricultural Census data are available for both 2002 and 2010, it is not possible to accurately calculate changes in the amount of arable land per metropolitan area, as the census data are organized based on the farm owner’s home address or farm address without compilations based on city, township or county. It is difficult to accurately compare land use data with township land survey data as well as national census data on farmland.

In recent years, the amount of land used by farm households, based on farm address data, has decreased nationally and on a regional basis as well. Yet, the pattern is different for selected urban areas in Poland (voivodeship capitals) (Tab. 1).

An increase in the amount of arable land was observed in 12 urban areas in Poland between 2002 and 2010. This increase was particularly substantial in northern Poland. The opposite trend was noted in other urban areas. It was especially significant in southern Poland. The decrease in the amount of tilled land per farm is especially large in areas surrounding all the studied voivodeship capitals, which can be explained by accelerating suburbanization.

The change process in agriculture in large metropolitan areas can also be gauged using rates of change in the number of farm households – the number of which decreased from 2.93 million in 2002 to 2.28 million in 2010 (approx. 25% loss). Any analysis of changes in farm households at the county and township levels must be based on two household types that result from the nature of the agricultural census. Central Statistical Office of Poland collects data on agriculture in two different ways: (1) for farm households identified in each given county or township based on each farm’s address (land located in the metropolitan area), (2) based on each farmer or land lessee’s home address.
**Tab. 1. Amount of arable land in the years 2002 and 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Arable land in ha</th>
<th>Percentage change in arable land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>50,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>6,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>2,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>4,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>5,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>11,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>6,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>28,841</td>
<td>52,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>9,564</td>
<td>17,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>9,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>4,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>9,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>31,672</td>
<td>26,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>8,313</td>
<td>5,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>74,257</td>
<td>23,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>37,572</td>
<td>6,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>16,899,297</td>
<td>15,502,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

A key characteristic of traditional farm households is living on the farm. This is often not the case in large metropolitan areas in Poland. Hence, it is necessary to differentiate two types of analytical targets: (1) metropolitan area farms, (2) metropolitan area farmers. A farm address is used to identify each farm site in each given metropolitan area. The term “urban farmer” is often used to identify farm owners who live in the city and own land in the suburbs (Tab. 2).

Farm address data (work address) and owner or lessee address data (home address) make it possible to determine the number of urban farmers and on-site farmers (Tab. 2). In light of the fact that little arable land is available within city limits, the number of urban farms is smaller than the number of farmers residing in cities. For example, the number of farmers in the city of Warsaw is six times greater than the number of farms in the city. The same is true of cities such as Białystok, Zielona Góra, and Lublin, where the number of urban farmers is large, but their land is located in neighboring townships or some other parts of Poland.
### Tab. 2. Number of farms by farm address and owner or lessee address in 2002 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of farms by farm address</th>
<th>Percentage change in the number of farms</th>
<th>Number of farms by farm owner address</th>
<th>Percentage change in the number of farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>404.3</td>
<td>2,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>396.3</td>
<td>2,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>230.6</td>
<td>8,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wlkp.</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>203.6</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>201.7</td>
<td>8,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td>1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>150.6</td>
<td>1,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>4,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>7,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>3,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>4,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>14,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>21,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>3,223</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>8,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>22,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>9,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLAND</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,933,228</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,277,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,933,228</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

The number of farms, determined via farm address, decreased in the studied cities of southern and central Poland. The decrease was almost fourfold in Warsaw and Łódź and the mean number of farms per city has decreased across Poland as a whole. However, the number of farms in cities in northern and western voivodeships increased between 2002 and 2010 (Tab. 2). Both regions were dominated by large state-owned farms that were privatized and subdivided in the 1990s, which produced a larger number of smaller private farms. Hence, the number of private farms in Olsztyn and Bydgoszcz increased more than fourfold. The number of farms in Białystok, Gorzów, and Zielona Góra doubled in the same time period. However, these increases are observed for cities only – all counties surrounding cities have experienced declines in the number of farms (Fig. 1). These trends are confirmed by National Agricultural Census data from 2010 that describe the length of farm operation. One factor driving the emergence of new farms in Poland has been the country’s entry into the European Union in 2004 and the resulting direct subsidies paid to farmers by the Union (Tab. 3).
11% of new farms were established in Poland in the period 2005 – 2010. Another fifteen percent were established after 2010. The percentage of new farms located in rural areas is similar across Poland, also in suburban areas. The situation is quite different in large cities. Table 3 shows that “young” farms constitute nearly half of all farms in cities, mostly in northern and western Poland. This suggests that urban area residents are becoming increasingly interested in operating farms, which is borne out by increasing farm size and the increasing total number of farms per city or region in Poland.
Tab. 3. Percentage of new farms in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percentage of new farms – est. in the last 10 yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opolé</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

The increase in the role of agriculture in large cities in northern Poland and a decrease in the role of agriculture in cities in southern Poland can be explained in terms of rates of change in farm size and the number of urban farms and farmers in the period 2002 – 2010. The interpretation of available data is limited by the specific types of data available.

Mean farm size in the provincial capitals of Poland varies significantly and is strongly linked with farm size typical of each given geographic region of Poland (Tab. 4).
Tab. 4. Mean farm size in provincial capitals in Poland in 2002 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Mean farm size in ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

There is no single urban area farm size model for Poland. Mean urban area farm size ranges from 23.4 ha in Olsztyn to merely 2 ha in Kielce, and has virtually doubled in Poznań, Warsaw, Kraków, Katowice, and Łódź. This is due to a smaller number of farms in the case of Warsaw, Kraków, and Łódź, and larger farm size in the case of Poznań (same number of farms). Mean farm size decreased in Olsztyn, Zielona Góra, and Bydgoszcz, and remained the same in other cities in line with farm size characteristic of each given geographic region.

4. **Agricultural entrepreneurship**

The state of agriculture in major metropolitan areas in Poland can also be assessed via the economic activity and/or professional status of urban dwellers. According to the 2011 National Population and Housing Census, 4.3% of the Polish population earns a living by farming. In the analyzed provincial capitals of Poland, agricultural income supports less than 1% of residents, with the largest share in Białystok, Lublin, Rzeszów, and Opole (0.5% to 0.9%). The city of Kraków has some of the most agricultural areas in its immediate vicinity at 22.4% of the population in nearby Proszowice County.
The share of agriculture as a source of personal income is also quite high (above national average) in counties surrounding the cities of Białystok, Lublin, Kielce, Kraków, Rzeszów, Łódź, Toruń, and Bydgoszcz (Fig. 2).

The number of farms – estimated using farm owner home address data – was used to determine the extent of agricultural activity in large metropolitan areas by calculating the number of farms per 1,000 persons of working age (Tab. 5).

In general, agriculture is on the decline in Poland. The ratio of commercial farms per 1,000 persons of working age decreased from 124 in 2002 to 79 in 2010. This decrease is also observable in the herein analyzed voivodeship capitals, except for Bydgoszcz, Zielona Góra, and Gorzów, where the number of farms has increased significantly and the corresponding
number of farmers has also increased. The ratio of commercial farms per 1,000 persons of working age varies significantly from city to city in the studied sample. Table 5 shows cities based on their amount of agricultural activity. Voivodeship capitals in eastern Poland are the most agricultural in the study sample – Rzeszów, Lublin, Białystok, and Kielce. Conversely, the least agricultural cities are Poznań (as in 2002), Warsaw, Opole, Łódź, Toruń, and Gdańsk at fewer than 10 commercial farms per 1,000 persons of working age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of farms per 1,000 persons of working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>10.4 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>20.3 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>21.3 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>18.0 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>12.2 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>14.3 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>20.7 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>19.0 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>15.3 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>10.9 14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>42.7 17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>15.4 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>18.0 22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>20.4 23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>51.5 39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>45.4 39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>63.3 46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>82.4 59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>124.1 79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

Figure 3 illustrates agricultural activity in large cities and their metropolitan areas in Poland. Areas surrounding large cities in eastern and southeastern Poland are rather clearly agricultural in nature – Białystok, Lublin, Rzeszów, Kraków, Kielce. The opposite is true of areas surrounding cities in western Poland. Regional differences in the amount of agriculture present are so strong in Poland that rates of decline in agriculture in suburban areas also vary substantially and it is not possible to observe a common pattern for all cities in Poland. The expected pattern would be strong decline in every urban and suburban area. A good example
of this is the contrast between the Poznań and Kraków metropolitan areas. The suburbs of the city of Poznań are relatively free of agriculture, while those of the city of Kraków are not.

The state of agriculture in large metropolitan areas can be described via the percentage of households earning more than 50% of their income from agricultural activity. The share of farms earning more than half their income from agriculture is smaller in large metropolitan areas than in other parts of Poland due to their commonly multifunctional profile. At the same time, higher productivity and commercial success improve the profitability of such farms and reduce the need for non-agricultural sources of income. The leaders in this respect are Opole, Poznań, and Zielona Góra, with more than 20% of farm households earning more than 50% of their income from agricultural production (Tab. 6). However, the opposite is true of cities in eastern Poland – Rzeszów, Kielce, Kraków, Lublin – where only several percent of farms can survive mostly on agricultural income.

Fig. 3. Urban agriculture – number of farms per 1,000 persons of working age 2010

Number of farms per 1,000 persons of working age
- 6–50
- 50–100
- 100–300
Tab. 6. Urban farm households earning more than half their income from agriculture in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percentage of farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

Poland’s 2010 National Agricultural Census was used to study patterns in plant and animal production by farms in large cities and surrounding areas. Research has shown that no typically urban patterns can be discerned based on available data. The structure of plant and animal production is not affected by the close proximity of large urban markets, which suggests the decline of large food supply zones around large cities. Two main reasons for this decline are unsatisfactory profitability of agriculture and production decisions made by farmers based on existing economic needs in a given region or country.

5. Social and demographic profile of farmers in large urban areas

The number of farmers in Poland in 2010 was 1.89 million, with 22% farming on less than one hectare and 42% farming on one to five hectares of land. What is unique about large metropolitan areas is that the percentage of small farms in such areas is higher than average relative to each corresponding region as well as on a national scale (Tab. 7). Most urban area farmers are “small farmers” with one to five hectares of land. Rzeszów is an exception, in a sense, with a majority of farmers who own less than one hectare of land.
The number of women heading farm households is rather low relative to men – 53 women per 100 men (Tab. 7). While most farms in Poland may be considered family farms, the head of the farm is usually male. The percentage of female farmers is higher in areas that are difficult to farm, agriculture is not a key sector of the regional economy, and men are able to easily find jobs in non-agricultural sectors. This explains the high percentage of female farm operators in primarily tourist regions, industrial regions, woodland regions, as well as urban and suburban regions (Kaczmarek 2014). The percentage of female farmers in cities is higher than the national average for Poland, and higher than the average for suburban areas. This is especially true of heads of farms managing less than one hectare of land, with a ratio of women to men at more than one to one. This is the case in the urban areas of Katowice, Kraków, Rzeszów, Białystok, and Bydgoszcz. Women also tend to dominate in the one to five hectare farm category. The percentage of female heads varies quite substantially from city to city and decreases with increasing agricultural production levels. For example, the ratio of female farmers to male farmers is less than 40 in both the Poznań and Opole urban regions.

**Tab. 7. Selected characteristics of the heads of farm households versus urban farm size in 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of heads of farm households</th>
<th>Women to men ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>Total: 6,083, Less than 1 ha (%): 60.2, 1 to 5 ha (%): 35.6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>Total: 6,617, Less than 1 ha (%): 38.7, 1 to 5 ha (%): 54.2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>Total: 1,328, Less than 1 ha (%): 40.4, 1 to 5 ha (%): 48.6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>Total: 2,086, Less than 1 ha (%): 26.3, 1 to 5 ha (%): 61.3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>Total: 7,970, Less than 1 ha (%): 31.9, 1 to 5 ha (%): 52.8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>Total: 3,175, Less than 1 ha (%): 16.4, 1 to 5 ha (%): 61.1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>Total: 1,242, Less than 1 ha (%): 32.3, 1 to 5 ha (%): 44.1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>Total: 1,278, Less than 1 ha (%): 24.3, 1 to 5 ha (%): 49.7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>Total: 3,387, Less than 1 ha (%): 21.4, 1 to 5 ha (%): 52.4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>Total: 2,209, Less than 1 ha (%): 29.8, 1 to 5 ha (%): 43.1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>Total: 818, Less than 1 ha (%): 15.2, 1 to 5 ha (%): 56.8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>Total: 7,106, Less than 1 ha (%): 9.0, 1 to 5 ha (%): 61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>Total: 1,882, Less than 1 ha (%): 15.8, 1 to 5 ha (%): 53.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>Total: 6,189, Less than 1 ha (%): 16.4, 1 to 5 ha (%): 50.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>Total: 473, Less than 1 ha (%): 26.4, 1 to 5 ha (%): 40.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>Total: 1,789, Less than 1 ha (%): 18.9, 1 to 5 ha (%): 42.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>Total: 913, Less than 1 ha (%): 15.8, 1 to 5 ha (%): 44.2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>Total: 488, Less than 1 ha (%): 12.7, 1 to 5 ha (%): 43.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>Total: 1,891,065, Less than 1 ha (%): 21.5, 1 to 5 ha (%): 41.8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010
Table 8 shows that aging is a problem facing many heads of urban farm households. The percentage of farmers under the age of 45 is much lower than that for the country as a whole and even for rural areas in general. The one exception is the city of Toruń. In addition, the percentage of retired urban area farmers is double the national average. This suggests that the demographic potential of urban farmers is low. Suburban areas of large cities are affected by the same type of demographic problem. For example, aging farmers constitute more than 70% of all current farmers in Poznań County. Aging farmers are defined as those who are not yet retired, but are no longer professionally active. Most suburban farms continue to operate until the owner retires and then remain dormant as a form of capital investment. Production is not increased or continued by the owner’s children – most of whom choose not to become farmers (Kaczmarek 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Active 18 to 44</th>
<th>Non-active 45 to 64</th>
<th>Retirement age 65 or older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLSKA</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

In 2010 more than 10% of farmers in Poland had a college or university education. Despite increases in this area, the percentage of farmers with a higher education was much lower than the national average in Poland (17%). Research has shown that the percentage
of farmers with a higher education is highest in cities and in areas surrounding large cities. The higher than average level of education of urban area farmers may be linked with better access to higher education in urban areas as well as with non-agricultural jobs that require higher qualifications (Kaczmarek 2014). Table 9 shows that large metropolitan areas in Poland are characterized by a higher than nationwide percentage of farmers with a higher education in the agricultural sciences. This is especially true in northern and western Poland. The highest percentage of farmers without a higher education in the agricultural sciences can be found in rural areas and in large urban areas in eastern and southern Poland, where work on the farm is largely a lifestyle choice more than an actual business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>University education (%)</th>
<th>University education in agricultural sciences (%)</th>
<th>Lack of education in agricultural sciences (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szczecin</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opole</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toruń</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielona Góra</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdynia</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Białystok</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Agricultural Census of 2010

6. Conclusions

The role of agriculture in large metropolitan areas has changed in the last few years. Urbanization is putting pressure on agriculture and its ability to produce food. Today, it is dif-
difficult to identify food supply zones in and around large cities in Poland. Specialization in agricultural production in Poland is linked with climate conditions and economic factors and is not directly linked with urban markets. Decline in agriculture, as measured via the number of commercial farms per 1,000 persons of working age, has reached its height in the Poznań metropolitan area, where remaining farms are characterized by high productivity in line with agricultural traditions of the Wielkopolska region. Research has shown that regional issues affect the nature of agriculture in cities and their suburban areas in Poland. However, certain typically “metropolitan” characteristics can also be identified in terms of type of agriculture and type of farm household.

Against all odds, farm size has actually increased in urban areas, as has the number of urban area farms. However, this is true in cities in northern Poland only. Urban farms are generally more multifunctional than rural area farms, and few obtain more than 50% of their income from agricultural production. About 0.5% of urban area residents in Poland earn a living by farming. It is difficult to create a profile of the urban farmer given strong regional differences across Poland. However, it has been shown that the percentage of female farmers in urban areas is slightly higher than that in rural areas.

The age structure of urban farmers in Poland suggests population aging or a high share of retired farmers and those who are no longer professionally active. At the same time, urban farmers tend to possess a high school education and many even have a college degree in the agricultural sciences. This does not apply to farmers in cities in southeastern Poland, which possesses the largest number of farmers without an agricultural education.

In summary, the decline of agriculture in large metropolitan areas in Poland is quite rapid, although the nature of the process varies due to strong regional, organizational, and production differences.
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INFRASTRUCTURAL AND FUNCTIONAL LINKAGES BETWEEN METROPOLITAN AREA RURAL TOWNSHIPS. THE KRAKÓW METROPOLITAN AREA CASE STUDY

1. Introduction – rural areas within large metropolitan areas

Metropolitan areas are both urban and rural in nature. This appears quite obvious and yet this is less obvious in practice. Most individuals notice only the urban features of metropolitan areas. This is especially true of large metropolitan areas, which have been informally assigned special “metropolitan area” status in Poland. In this special case, individuals tend to ignore the rural parts of the metropolitan area and often do not even wonder as to how these parts have evolved. The rural parts of metropolitan areas are usually their outermost parts or townships. Suburban townships including those unofficially designated “metropolitan” are characterized by strong functional and spatial linkages with the urban core and with more distant rural areas. According to Bański (2006, 24), suburban townships are characterized by the “coexistence of linked phenomena, processes, and characteristics typical of urban and rural areas and constitute an excellent study area for researchers interested in the urban-rural relationship”. Indeed, many papers have been published on this relationship including works by Ilnicki (1996), Jakóbczyk-Gryszkiewicz (1991, 1998), and Liszewski (1987). Research has shown that the urban-rural link is the strongest in suburban townships. However, the slow rate of community development in Poland’s metropolitan areas has resulted in the continued presence of traditional rural areas in the outer parts of informally-designated metropolitan areas1 (Nowak, Kicka 2009).

1 In this paper, the outer parts of metropolitan areas are defined as “all townships constituting the given metropolitan area except the central city itself”.
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The urban-rural continuum is a useful concept when attempting to describe the towns and villages that constitute a metropolitan area, as each makes the transition from rural entity to urban entity (Gierańczyk, Kluba 2008). Z. Chojnicki and T. Czyż (2008) suggest that the urban-rural continuum may be understood as a transitional set of populated units with varying degrees of urban and rural characteristics. In addition to being a purely spatial issue (urban-rural axis), the urban-rural continuum may also be interpreted in terms of the process of urbanization as well as modernization of existing built-up areas (Falkowski, Brodowski 2008).

An analysis of infrastructural and functional linkages between townships in areas unofficially designated as “metropolitan” should be based on the notion that these areas are urban in nature and function as a cohesive unit with well-defined zones that emerge with each new stage of development. The work of A. Zborowski (2005) includes a very extensive review of the literature on urban regions, defined as being synonymous with metropolitan areas and the urban day system. This publication devotes a great deal of attention to the analysis of spatial structures and the relationship between the central city and surrounding areas as well as the role played by suburban areas relative to the urban core. Existing models concerned with urban regions assign a number of functions to suburban areas including residential, production, service, and commercial functions.

Townships located in large metropolitan areas can be described in terms of their features and function. In addition, the emerging National Urban Policy in Poland is concerned with the characteristics of metropolitan townships. The 2013 version of this Policy (Założenia Krajowej Polityki Miejskiej do roku 2020 przyjęte przez Radę Ministrów na posiedzeniu w dniu 16 lipca 2013r.) states that it is designed to serve as a set of guidelines for voivodeship governments, urban township governments, urban-rural township governments, as well as rural township governments in urbanized areas located in urban functional areas. Goal No. 4 of the Policy is focused on townships in large metropolitan areas and states that action is needed in order to counteract problems associated with suburbanization. The stated goal is to create spatial order and limit new construction in order to stop urban sprawl. Another part of this same goal assumes the need for integrated public transportation systems in urban areas.

Another key government document, known as the National Spatial Development Concept 2030 (Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030 2012), places special emphasis on these so-called urban functional areas including surrounding rural and urban-rural townships. In summary, the Concept calls for integrated spatial planning in urban functional areas in Poland over the next sixteen years.

The evolution of large metropolitan areas in many Western countries is at a more advanced stage than that in Poland, which affects the degree of collaboration between local governments in large metropolitan areas (Lackowska 2009). Collaboration between local governments in Poland is at an early stage and involves some potential areas and occurs to some degree in places where it does occur. One region where this process is at an
advanced stage is the Poznań Metropolitan Area. The region’s largest research center – Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań – established the Metropolitan Research Center in March 2009. Some collaboration between township government entities in the Upper Silesia Metropolitan Union has also been observed. Other key urban areas in Poland are also pursuing initiatives designed to foster local collaboration within informally-designated metropolitan areas including Warsaw, Kraków, Łódź, and the Gdańsk area (Ziobrowski et al. 2012).

Despite the limited amount of collaboration between local governments in Poland in metropolitan areas, a significant amount of attention is devoted in the Polish research literature to the role of technical infrastructure and economic incentives in the modern development of metropolitan areas (Makieła, Marszał 2005). Internal infrastructure systems help integrate metropolitan areas from within and create linkages between the urban core and neighboring townships, thus producing a functional whole (Makieła, Marszał 2005, 6). Local infrastructural links such as vehicular transportation, rail transportation, telecommunications, power lines, water mains, and sewer systems help generate social and economic ties within metropolitan areas (Makieła 2005, 10–11).

The research literature also devotes significant attention to environmental issues relevant to metropolitan area management (Markowski, Drzazga 2009; Sołtys 2009; Baranowski 2001). The argument is that “today’s metropolitan areas feature the largest concentration of manmade landscapes, also known as the built environment, and serve as a nexus of environmental conflict and powerful economic development leading to a significant transformation” (Sołtys 2009, 51, after Baranowski 2001).

2. Purpose of research and sources of data

In light of the complexity of metropolitan area development, the paper focuses on selected regional linkages and forms of collaboration between townships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area (KMA), with a particular emphasis on rural and urban-rural townships. The purpose of the paper is to describe the relationship between suburban townships and the urban core in the Kraków region and to show linkages between townships located in the outer parts of the metropolitan area. The paper discusses the following:

- infrastructural linkages including the provision of heat, water, and transportation options as well as the removal of wastewater and other waste materials,
- functional linkages such as commuting to work.

The paper includes background information on the boundaries and size of the Kraków Metropolitan Area and population changes in its constituent rural townships for the years 1995–2012.
The data analyzed in this paper were obtained from a variety of sources such as structured interviews that focused on existing collaboration efforts in the Kraków Metropolitan Area as well as key barriers to collaboration and perspectives for future collaboration. A total of 21 interviews were conducted including 16 interviews with mayors and township heads or their deputies in townships surrounding the city of Kraków as well as with the deputy mayor of Kraków and representatives of local businesses. In addition, data from the Central Statistical Office of Poland were used, as were data obtained from the Marshal’s Office of Małopolskie Voivodeship. Additional data were collected from businesses that are part of the Kraków Community Holding Company.

The Kraków Metropolitan Area is rather unique in terms of natural environment, social composition, economic characteristics, and cultural heritage, and for these key reasons should not be treated as a model Polish metropolitan area. However, it does share some common traits with other mono-centric metropolitan areas in Poland. This study may be, therefore, treated as a case study of the Kraków Metropolitan Area that does include some conclusions that apply to other key metropolitan areas in Poland including those of Warsaw, Wrocław, and Łódź.

3. Size of the Kraków Metropolitan Area based on current delimitation methods

The official boundaries of the Kraków Metropolitan Area have been evaluated a number of times, but none of these formal evaluations have been accepted as official. Government documents show several sets of boundaries that differ significantly from one another. For example, the 2003 Spatial Management Plan for Małopolskie Voivodeship (Plan Zagospodarowania Przestrzennego Województwa Małopolskiego 2003) produced for the Marshal’s Office of Małopolskie Voivodeship shows a significantly larger metropolitan area than that identified for the Regional Operational Program for the Małopolskie Voivodeship for the period 2007–2013.

The most general approach to metropolitan area delimitation for Kraków is based on two elementary methods: (1) narrow method, (2) broad method. The former yields the urban core plus its immediate vicinity as defined by adjacent township boundaries. The latter yields the urban core plus its entire adjacent urbanized region characterized by the largest number of daily commuters to the city (Figs. 1, 2).

While the two delimitation methods used may differ substantially in terms of the final result, it is important to note that both methods described earlier produce the same suggestion.
tion – that the area northeast of Kraków features fewer metropolitan linkages than other areas surrounding the city.

The predominance of agriculture and the physical barrier of the Nowa Huta Steel Mill have thus far effectively hampered suburbanization and make it difficult for the area to become linked with the city in other ways as well. The eastern fringe of Kraków – east of the steel mill – is not very urban in nature and resembles rural suburban areas found elsewhere in the metropolitan area. On the other hand, all existing evaluation methods assume that Kraków does not affect any areas beyond the eastern boundary of Małopolskie Voivodeship. This is not really the case, as many commuters travel to Kraków on a daily basis from Kazimierski County in Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship.

The next part of the paper is based on the geographic delimitation of the Kraków Metropolitan Area in the 2003 Spatial Management Plan for Małopolskie Voivodeship.
The Kraków Metropolitan Area in this case includes the city of Kraków and 50 other townships including 34 rural and 15 urban-rural townships. The extent of the Kraków Metropolitan Area was determined primarily in functional terms – commuting to work. Other criteria were also used including permanent migration, commuting to high school and college, and travel for the purpose of shopping and other market and non-market services. Not only functional criteria were used in the evaluation process. Social, economic, and spatial issues were also considered. This broad-based delimitation was selected for two basic reasons. It appears to be the most “official” delimitation, as it is used in a key regional planning document. In addition, it is broad-based and allows for an analysis of various linkages between very different geographic areas starting with townships on the border with Kraków (e.g. Zielonki Township) to primarily agricultural townships on the northernmost or southernmost fringes of its metropolitan area.
4. Population changes in rural townships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area

One important characteristic of areas found near large cities is the rapid rate of population change driven by suburbanization. Most parts of the Kraków Metropolitan Area experienced an increase in population in the period 1995–2012. The population increase was notably high in townships found immediately north and south of Kraków (Fig. 3). Four of the five townships with the highest population growth (more than 20%) were rural townships: Zielonki (42.5%), Michałowice (37.9%), Mogilany (28.8%), Wielka Wieś (25%). These increases were largely the effect of immigration and not natural population growth. The one notable exception in the Kraków Metropolitan Area is the area immediately east of Kraków, which has not become an immigration area for many new suburban residents. Some population growth has occurred in Igołomia-Wawrzeńczyce Township, while Koniusza Township has recorded a small decrease in population. Townships located east of Kraków play a different functional role than all others ringing the city from the north, west, and south. Another important fact is the loss of population along the northern fringes of the metropolitan area in the same period of time. The largest population loss (3.5%) was recorded by Gołcza Township in Miechów County located along the northern fringe of the Kraków Metropolitan Area.

Changes in population are only one of the determinants of township development including development in rural townships found within the unofficial boundaries of Polish metropolitan areas. In addition to population change characteristic of areas found near large cities, legislative issues also affect township development. This is especially true of the Physical Planning and Spatial Development Act (Ustawa o planowaniu i zagospodarowaniu przestrzennym), which substantially deregulates investment processes that help accelerate local housing development and make easier the sale of local land. This is especially helpful when the economy is prosperous. Another factor that alters various processes occurring in the Kraków Metropolitan Area and in other large metropolitan areas in Poland is the weakening of government control over the public service sector and the public goods sector in favor of solutions provided by private enterprises (Jaśkiewicz 2013). In addition, the rapid rate of growth in townships neighboring Kraków can be explained by the city’s status as an economic powerhouse in the region. No other city or town in the Małopolska region can match the city of Kraków in terms of the housing market, job market, education, and recreational options.

5. Linkages between rural townships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area

Infrastructural linkages in the Kraków Metropolitan Area are discussed in terms of the work performed by companies part of the Kraków Community Holding Company SA and
its geographic coverage in the region. The holding company currently includes the Municipal Development Agency (ARM SA), Municipal Heat Company (MPEC SA), Municipal Transportation Company (MPK SA), and the Municipal Water and Sewage Company (MPWiK SA). The Municipal Waste Management Company (MPO SA) was also part of the city’s network of companies until waste management legislation recently changed this. The research also covered other metropolitan services such as the Polish State Railways (PKP) metropolitan ticket available to the region’s residents and the functioning of Community Infrastructure and Transportation Management Company (ZIKiT), the company

Fig. 3. Changes in population in Kraków Metropolitan Area townships in the period 1995–2012
Source: based on the Central Statistical Office of Poland data
that manages public transportation in the Kraków region. Figure 4 shows the spatial extent of the services provided by the above companies.

The most “local” of all the public infrastructure services available in the Kraków region is the district heating network. The Municipal Heat Company is the largest provider of home heat in the Kraków Metropolitan Area. The company served a total of three townships in August of 2013: Kraków, Skawina, Wieliczka. The company does not deliver heat to any of the rural townships of the Kraków Metropolitan Area. In addition to providing home heat, it also builds and services heating plants in the metropolitan area and in the rural parts of the urban-rural township of Skawina. Gas-powered plants operated by the company can be found across Skawina Township in small towns such as Krzęcin, Polanka Hallera, Wola Radziżowska, and Zelczyn as well as in midsize cities such as Miechów and Skawina.

The potential for collaboration between townships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area in the area of heat provision is relatively small, given that heat production infrastructure...
is costly and the density of housing in suburban areas is low. Conversely, housing density in Kraków is high and becoming even higher. One opportunity for the Municipal Heat Company in the Kraków region would be the construction of a system of local heat sources at facilities owned by some other entity. The company could then operate these small heat production facilities. This type of solution may be attractive to township governments experiencing budget crises or some other investment difficulties, especially during periods of economic crisis.

The spatial coverage of the Municipal Water and Sewage Company is much larger than that of the Municipal Heat Company. There are two reasons for this: (1) the water and sewer network is regional and not local, (2) water is conveyed to Kraków from the Dobczyce Reservoir located south of the city, which allows several townships found along the pipeline or in adjacent areas to use water from the reservoir.

The Municipal Water and Sewage Company of Kraków operated in 15 townships by August of 2012 including eight rural townships located along the border with the city of Kraków: Igołomia-Wawrzeńczyce, Kocmyrzów-Luborzyca, Liszki, Michałowice, Mogilany, Wielka Wieś, Zabierzów, Zielonki.

The company has been able to acquire new customers in suburban townships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area in the last ten years, resulting in the doubling of the quantity of water sold to suburban customers from 4% in the year 2000 to 8% in the year 2010. The growth rate for handling suburban sewage has been even larger from 3% in 2000 to 6.4% in 2010. There are several reasons for this rate of growth including declining demand for water and wastewater services in Kraków in light of the decline of the city’s industrial sector. Another reason for the increase in services in the suburbs is the growth of the suburbs in recent years.

However, the trends described above are not a straightforward consequence of proportional water consumption in all townships across the Kraków Metropolitan Area. The largest increase in water consumption has occurred in three townships using water from the local Raba River: Wieliczka, Dobczyce, Świątniki Górne. Several townships reduced their water purchases from the Municipal Water and Sewage Company of Kraków starting in the year 2000. This was the case with the township of Myślenice and two rural townships close to Kraków: Liszki, Zabierzów. The three townships decided to reduce municipal water purchases in favor of developing their own sources. This is quite obvious in the case of the latter two townships, both of which have low-cost access to high-quality drinking water.

In the case of wastewater removal, the share of suburban townships is gradually increasing over time and this pattern is quite steady. The sewer network operated by the Municipal Water and Sewage Company company is used by the towns of Wieliczka and Zielonki as well as indirectly by Zielonki Township. The towns of Michałowice and Zabierzów are also customers, as are Wielka Wieś and Świątniki Górne, although to a very limited extent.
The uneven consumption of water and removal of wastewater between different Kraków Metropolitan Area townships results from differences in costs associated with the supply of drinking water and the removal of wastewater. Water provided by the Municipal Water and Sewage Company is relatively expensive, in part due to conveyance costs associated with the distance between the Raba River (source) and the city of Kraków (customer). In response, some suburban townships are taking steps to reduce water purchases and invest in local sources of drinking water in order to reduce unit costs. This is especially true of townships with good hydrogeology that allows for low-cost sourcing of good drinking water (Liszki, Zabierzów). However, in the case of wastewater removal, it is much more difficult to reduce costs below those associated with the Municipal Water and Sewage Company. The construction of a local sewer system is more expensive than the construction of local water mains, which proves to be a problem for suburban townships that ultimately decide to connect with the municipal sewer system in Kraków in order to reduce capital investment costs.

The existing system of water and sewer services in the Kraków Metropolitan Area is strongly decentralized. The Municipal Water and Sewage Company, based in Kraków, serves only 15 townships, although it is not the operator of the water and sewer system in its service region. In fact, township budget entities and other community entities serve as operators of local water and sewer systems. Research has shown that some local government representatives would like to transfer certain water and sewer system management responsibilities to the Municipal Water and Sewage Company. However, the company refuses to accept additional duties, citing company policy. The price paid by the consumer for water and sewer services varies substantially across the Kraków Metropolitan Area due to strong decentralization of services as well as due to subsidies paid by some townships and not others (Tab. 1). Subsidies can be direct or approved by the township council and paid directly from its budget in order to reduce the service unit price. Subsidies can also be indirect or by differentiating rates for commercial customers and non-commercial customers.

A different situation exists in the Poznań Metropolitan Area where the community water and sewer company is also an operator in neighboring townships. Given that the unit prices paid by all customers in the region are the same, the city of Poznań de facto subsidizes water and sewer systems in surrounding townships.

In comparison with all other public services in the Kraków Metropolitan Area, the geographic coverage of the Municipal Waste Management Company was the largest until the waste management reform process changed the situation in July 2013. The company collected waste in 33 townships or more than half the townships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area. New legislation in July 2013 changed the system completely and it has not been possible thus far to establish what coverage will look like under the new waste management system.
In 2008 the City Hall of Kraków signed an agreement with 15 neighboring townships in the area of local public transportation, establishing a fare of 4.20 PLN per vehicle kilometer, with each township subsidizing between 25% and 100% of this fare. The share paid by the township varies depending on the agreement between the township and the city. The vehicle kilometer increased in price to 5.60 PLN in recent years. By 2013 three local townships had joined the Municipal Transportation Company public transportation system including Niepołomice Township and the more distant Słomniki Township. The provided public transportation is available on many routes north, south, and west of Kraków, while east of the city it becomes less available. The company does not provide service at all in two eastern townships – Koniusza and Igołomia-Wawrzeńczyce. This niche market is served by bus operators not associated with the company whose prices are higher and service quality lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Provision of drinking water</th>
<th>Wastewater removal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>households</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skawina</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czernichów</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogilany</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kłaj</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Świątniki Górne</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liszki</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wieliczka</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niepołomice</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wielka Wieś</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielonki</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krzeszowice</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabierzów</td>
<td>2.55 – 3.07</td>
<td>2.55 – 3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Municipal Transportation Company bus schedules in suburban townships – to Kraków and other townships – largely reflect commuting patterns in each respective area. Local governments attempt to adjust bus schedules to real demand in their local area. Few residents of the eastern agricultural townships commute to work in Kraków and the costs associated with the provision of the company services are too high for these relatively poor townships to bear.

The inclusion of suburban townships in public transportation networks is one of the best means of creating metropolitan linkages. According to R. Janecki et al. (2010, 108, 110), “...a common transportation policy is a key feature of a cohesive metropolitan area”. In addition, “...the main purpose of a metropolitan transportation policy ought to be the
creation of conditions (...) facilitating the safe and efficient movement of persons and cargo within a metropolitan area and along its external linkages”. Services rendered by the Municipal Transportation Company are better than those offered by private transportation firms in a number of measurable ways. This includes more comfortable buses, lower ticket prices, more trips per day, more reliable schedules, and full integration with transportation systems in the city. If economics were to be not considered for a moment, it appears that the best way to integrate the Kraków Metropolitan Area is to provide public transportation operated by the Municipal Transportation Company in townships wishing to be part of the metropolitan system.

Another important transportation provider in the Kraków Metropolitan Area is Polish State Railway which serves 15 townships in the Kraków region including 12 metropolitan townships (see 2003 Spatial Management Plan for Małopolskie Voivodeship). Yet another key to metropolitan integration is a metropolitan area public transportation ticket. In the case of Kraków, this type of ticket allows commuters to use the Municipal Transportation Company services and the Polish State Railway services as well. This includes trams, city buses, suburban buses, and regional rail across 23 townships including 21 townships in the Kraków Metropolitan Area.

In addition to infrastructural linkages such as those described above, linkages in metropolitan areas are also established in a functional sense including commuting to work or school or some other type of institution.

In 2006 commuting to work in Kraków was largely a local affair, as shown by data that indicate that more than 44% of all commuters working in Kraków had arrived from nearby townships or those found in the Kraków Functional Area (delimitation provided in 2007–2013 Regional Operational Program for the Małopolskie Voivodeship) (Fig. 5). The largest number of commuters originated in urban-rural townships bordering Kraków – Wieliczka and Skawina – 4,200 and 2,500 persons, respectively (Tab. 2). The next largest sources of commuters were the rural townships of Zabierzów and Liszki. Each township provided more than 1,500 commuters per day. The top ten townships providing commuters to Kraków did not include any townships east of the city. Kocmyrzów-Luborzyca Township, located northeast of the city, ranked 13th on the list of sources of commuters (about 900 daily commuters).

Only 16% of all commuters came from outside the Kraków Functional Area, while another 40% came from outside the Kraków Metropolitan Area.

Kraków is the largest job market in the Małopolskie Voivodeship. In 2006 more than 8,000 Kraków residents worked outside city limits. Most of these jobs were to be found in neighboring townships such as Zabierzów, Skawina, Wieliczka, and Niepołomice (Tab. 2, Fig. 5). A special case here is the rural township of Zabierzów. It is the only neighboring township that has a net positive influx of commuters in general, despite having a net negative influx of workers commuting to work from/to Kraków. This is the result of rapid
investment in the township, which now boasts numerous firms in the BPO/SSC sector located in its Kraków Business Park. The international Kraków Airport (commonly called Balice) is also located in Zabierzów Township. The rural township of Zielonki bordering Kraków from the north is also a special case, with a net negative influx of commuters, but still a large number of commuters from Kraków.
The commuter link between the city of Kraków and townships not bordering the city is markedly weaker. County seats such as Myślenice, Bochnia, and Wadowice now possess their own commuter zones, which are only indirectly linked with Kraków.
Table 2. Townships providing the largest number of commuters to Kraków

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Number of workers commuting to Kraków</th>
<th>Number of workers commuting from Kraków</th>
<th>Net commuters*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wieliczka</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-3,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skawina</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabierzów</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liszki</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niepołomice</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bochnia (urban twp.)</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krzeszowice</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zielonki</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myślenice</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czernichów</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wielka Wieś</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdów</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocmyrzów–Luborzyca</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogilany</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>-807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes commuter flows to and from all townships, not only Kraków.

Source: based on the Central Statistical Office of Poland data

6. Conclusions

Rural townships in emerging large metropolitan areas change substantially in the course of metropolitan integration. Both local spatial management and existing functions change, as does local social structure, which yields cultural change.

Research has shown that easy access to Kraków is a key determinant of the rate of rural township integration with the city’s metropolitan area. This type of inclusion has positive effects on a township’s degree of investment and residential attractiveness. In turn, this drives change supplied by new investors and new residents. Change occurs slowly, as existing residents need some time to adjust to new attitudes, aspirations, and lifestyles.

Metropolitan integration is inversely related with physical distance. The first ring of townships surrounding Kraków from the north, west, and south is strongly integrated with the city. This is manifested by multiple infrastructural linkages, demographic and social changes. There are also trends that suggest that moving to a certain town or village is socially beneficial. In addition to physical proximity, a township’s existing key function indicates its ability to integrate with the metropolitan core. Agriculture is a factor that usually hampers integration for a number of reasons not related to pure economics including the mentality of farmers who generally do not want to change professions or work outside their farm as well as the traditionally lower intensity of economic activity in rural areas.
Factors of this type may cause slower rates of metropolitan integration of eastern and northeastern townships with the city of Kraków. This is especially true of Koniusza and Igołomia-Wawrzeńczyce townships, where the level of integration is more reflective of second-ring and third-ring townships located west and south of the city. However, in this case, the Nowa Huta Steel Mill remains a major obstacle to integration along with its large industrial and post-industrial grounds. The steel mill makes this area much less attractive to potential residents who choose to settle in other parts of the metropolitan area. Potential investors are also discouraged by the few transportation options in the area.

Metropolitan integration in the area of public services is largely forced for several key reasons including close proximity to the urban core, accelerating suburbanization, local government policy designed to make each suburban township more attractive to new investors, and the growing expectations of local residents. The availability of public services increases the standard of living in a given area including suburban townships. The quality of public services helps determine if new residents will migrate to a given area or not. The same is true of working in a given area. Public services are important both to city residents seeking a new suburban home and rural residents seeking work or education in the city. In effect, public services impact the function of rural areas and the ability to maintain a community in the modern age. Public services are a key driver of change in rural townships located in large metropolitan areas. The outcome over time is change in the attitudes and expectations of residents who begin to demand change at the grassroots level in order to modernize the function(s) of their home township.
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1. Introduction

The evolution of functional and spatial structure in large metropolitan areas is a key planning issue in contemporary Poland, which has become an open society that is socially and geographically mobile. This leads to increased economic competition that tends to concentrate resources in specific geographic areas. One area of concentration is the large city, which is evolving towards an integrated system of residential communities and business districts. In a functional sense, large cities are called urban regions or metropolitan areas (Rykiel 2002; Korcelli-Olejniczak 2012).

Large metropolitan areas are a unique form of urban area, which “breaks away” from its surrounding region and interacts with other large urban areas in each given country and in other countries as well (Kaczmarek, Mikula 2007). The process of metropolitan integration yields certain exogenic functions that are commonly called metropolitan functions. Looking from the perspective of spatial organization in complex systems such as metropolitan areas, it is important to observe the transformation of functional space, which is associated with the establishment of certain institutions (new spatial planning determinants) and the reshaping of residential space. According to T. Czyż (2009), a large metropolitan area may be understood as a well-defined system of communities. It is a special type of urban area characterized by internal functional and spatial cohesion as well as relationships with other large metropolitan areas. These relationships are shaped by special types of activity, often called metropolitan social and economic functions.
A. Lisowski (2009, 65) describes the diffusion of metropolitan functions from the urban core to its outlying suburban communities as the decentralization of centralization via the dispersion of metropolitan node areas. Internal, external, and peripheral competitive nodes emerge across an evolving metropolitan area. The decentralization of metropolitan functions leads to a departure from a uni-polar development model to a multi-polar development model with a complex structure of functional and spatial linkages (Gorzelak, Smętkowski 2005, 45). The gradual reshaping of functional and spatial structure in metropolitan areas is a key urban planning challenge in modern Poland, especially in the context of uncontrolled growth in suburban areas and the evolution of linkages between suburban areas and the urban core.

The purpose of the paper is to describe selected forms of rural-urban collaboration in the context of the case study of the Łódź Metropolitan Area (ŁMA) in Poland. The term “rural-urban collaboration”, as opposed to “urban-rural collaboration”, creates a certain context for this issue. This is an evaluation of collaborative efforts between rural communities and other members of the metropolitan community, especially the urban core (the city of Łódź). The theoretical basis in this paper consists of the settlement system theory and one of its main methods of identification – the method for describing functions and functional structures in urban areas. The data in the paper were obtained from previous research works on functional and social change in the suburbs of the Łódź Metropolitan Area (Wójcik 2008, 2013).

2. Settlement system theory as the theoretical basis for “rural-urban collaboration”

The concept of “collaboration” may be defined as a relationship between two or more entities. The basis for this relationship is its sense of reciprocity. Each given entity possesses an equal right to benefit from this relationship based on some established set of rules. In this case, the relationship applies to cities, towns, and villages located in some defined geographic area. This collection of human settlements along with the relationships binding them may be described as a settlement system. According to Z. Chojnicki (1999, 310), a system is a set of entities formed of other entities that constitute its parts, all of which are bound in such a way that together they constitute a separate whole, distinct from its surroundings. The unique nature of collaboration within settlement systems is its territorial specificity. Certain types of relationships will emerge between entities with a specific geographic location including local government institutions, businesses, local organizations, and special interest groups.

Most existing research studies on the cohesion of settlement systems have focused on conceptual models of function and functional structure. This includes the concept of urban regions and metropolitan regions, functions of specialized cities, and land use. According to K. Dziewoński (1990), the field of settlement research involves two traditional approaches.
– the functional approach and the morphological approach. The former is focused on the social aspect of human settlements, while the latter is focused on the material environment. Hence, the functional structure of a human settlement is a simplified version of social structure based on characteristics such as employment, land use, and institutions. W. Maik (1988) believes that the functional structure of human settlements possesses a dual character, which can be analyzed at the macro-structural level and the micro-structural level.

Micro-structural research assumes a social interpretation whose purpose is to evaluate the motivations for various types of human behavior. Macro-structural research focuses on the big picture of human actions in the context of a well-defined human settlement system. These actions are then matched with certain social and economic functions (Maik 1988, 101). The micro-structural approach is rooted, in this case, in sociological and geographic ideas of territorial populations (Maik, Stachowski 1995, 12–13) and connects with the analysis of social groups, their composition, and relationships between their members (Turowski 2001, 58).

3. Rural-urban collaboration in a functional/macro-structural sense

The function of a settlement such as a town or village consists of an array of social and economic pursuits, which may be of varying economic and spatial importance. These pursuits may be analyzed in terms of the settlement itself as well as in terms of settlement systems1. Different forms of social and economic activity – usually placed in statistical groups such as sections and subsections – pursued by the residents of towns and villages constitute functions, which create economic structure and describe the role of the settlement in the settlement system.

One concept in geography and economics that helps to describe the role of different types of economic activity in urban development is the notion of the “economic base”. Studies on this subject divide economic activity into two basic sectors – an endogenous sector and an exogenous sector². The size of the exogenous sector describes the strength of the linkages between different geographic areas. The size of the endogenous sector describes the extent to which the needs of local residents are being satisfied. Exogenous functions help produce “the system” and determine the rank of the given settlement (e.g. township) in a settlement system. One method of evaluating exogenous functions is that of H. Hoyt who proposed an often used indirect approach known as the residual method or excess worker index. The degree of exogenous character in the labor market is determined for a variety of employment groups whose number depends on the economic classification used in the Polish Classification of Activities.

---

1 For more, see A. Suliborski (e.g. 2001, 2010).

2 In systems research, the dualistic approach to the economics of local communities is based on very extensive theoretical and methodological grounds as well as numerous empirical studies (Dziewoński 1971; Jerczyński 1973; Maik 1988; Suliborski 2001).
The key to the organization of settlement systems found in metropolitan areas is non-agricultural economic activity, which is the basis for the functioning of urbanized areas. The diffusion of non-agricultural economic activity to suburban areas leads to the intensification of linkages between villages undergoing transformation and cities in the urban area (Wójcik 2008; Suliborski et al. 2010).

The determination of functional differences in rural areas demands a complex analysis of all available source materials. One important barrier in this process is the relative inability to accurately estimate the number of workers employed by small businesses with at most nine workers. This barrier makes estimates of the non-agricultural sector less accurate. Data on such very small businesses are available via the National Official Business Register, but the system also includes firms that are no longer in business and have not been removed from the system. Hence, it provides a certain estimate of the number of very small businesses in a given geographic area (Śleszyński 2003; Kamińska 2006; Wójcik 2008). An assessment of the significance of the exogenous sector requires average employment numbers, which can be used to estimate the size of the job market or to analyze institutional structure. In the case of companies employing more than nine workers, data can be obtained from Central Statistical Office of Poland. This source provides annual employment data aggregated at the rural township level, rural parts of urban-rural townships, and cities (based on Form Z-06). Data of this type are often used in studies of the economic base of cities and rural areas (Suliborski 2002).

The metrics used to evaluate a function often include employment numbers and structure based on sectors of the national economy and geographic location. Metrics based on employment data tend to be controversial, but A. Suliborski (2001) argues that better solutions have not been developed for macro-scale research and comparative studies. The basic criticism of this approach is that employment data are not directly proportional to function size (Suliborski 2001, 13–14).

Existing research methods and the benefits and limitations associated with them in the course of the identification of economic functions in rural areas (Wójcik 2012) are used in this paper via the following set of research strategies:

1) **Identification of exogenous functions in non-agricultural types of economic activity in the large and midsize business sector.** We will assume that a large or midsize company in rural areas in the Łódź region employs more than nine workers. The key analytical step is to identify which forms of social and economic activity do involve exogenous employment. The determination of the size of the exogenous and endogenous sectors for each employment category demands an indirect analysis of the economic base – in this case, the 2004 Polish Classification of Activities. This type of analysis usually involves the excess worker index by Hoyt in conjunction with the location index by Florenc (Jerczyński 1973; Suliborski 2002). The new index is as follows:
\[ Z_{\text{nad } i w} = Z_{i w} - (Z_{w} \times Z_{i k} / Z_{k}) \]

where:
- \( Z_{\text{nad } i w} \) – exogenous employment in sector “i” in region “w”
- \( Z_{i w} \) – employment in sector “i” in region “w”
- \( Z_{w} \) – total employment in region “w”
- \( Z_{i k} \) – nationwide employment in sector “i”
- \( Z_{k} \) – total employment nationwide

In 2010 approximately 22,100 persons were employed in the non-agricultural sector in rural areas in the Łódź Metropolitan Area, which translates into 7.1% of total employment in the region. The largest number of non-agricultural jobs were found in townships neighboring the cities of Łódź, Pabianice, and Zgierz. The following seven townships – Aleksandrów, Andrespol, Dobroń, Rzgów, Ksawerów, Stryków, Zgierz – account for 63% of all employed persons there. The smallest number of non-agricultural jobs was noted in peripheral townships in the Łódź Metropolitan Area and in the suburbs of small cities in townships such as Brzeziny, Dłutów, Dmosin, Głowno, Jeżów, Parzęczew, Rogów, and Tuszyn.

The indirect method of estimating exogenous employment in selected sectors indicates that approximately 8,900 persons were employed in 2010, which translates into 40.3% of total employment in rural areas in the Łódź Metropolitan Area. The industrial sector was found to be the most important non-agricultural exogenous function in the region with about 69% of all jobs (Fig. 1). The next most important exogenous functions in the region were sales and repair (9.1%), education (approx. 7.4%), and transportation (approx. 6.3%).

**Fig. 1.** Exogenous functions in rural areas in the Łódź Metropolitan Area in 2010
The suburbs of Łódź are characterized by little diversity in non-agricultural exogenous functions. Rural townships do vary substantially in terms of the number of exogenous jobs. In some townships (Stryków, Aleksandrów, Rzgów, Ksawerów), the number of exogenous jobs exceeded 500, while in other townships that number did not exceed 200 (Dłutów, Jeżów, Dmosin, Parzęczew).

A typology was created by analyzing the distribution of values obtained in the course of statistical analysis. The typology was created using two indicators: (1) size of exogenous employment, (2) share of exogenous employment in total employment (Tab. 1, Fig. 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total exogenous employment above average for rural areas in the ŁMA</th>
<th>Share of exogenous jobs above rural average in the ŁMA</th>
<th>Share of exogenous jobs below rural average in the ŁMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE 1</strong></td>
<td>Aleksandrów, Ksawerów, Lutomiersk, Stryków, Zgierz</td>
<td><strong>TYPE 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total exogenous employment below average for rural areas in the ŁMA</td>
<td>TYPE 3</td>
<td>Brzeziny, Dmosin, Głowno, Kóluski, Rogów</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas with the largest number of exogenous jobs, and at the same time, the highest percentage of exogenous jobs were deemed to yield the best functional structure (Tab. 1). The areas with these types of characteristics are also linked with the most important cities in the region including Łódź, Pabianice, and Zgierz. This includes Aleksandrów, Ksawerów, Zgierz, Stryków, and Lutomiersk, all of which are located adjacent to the urban core along important thoroughfares exiting the city. Other important areas are those with a substantial total number of exogenous jobs and a percentage of exogenous jobs that is lower than the average for rural areas (Rzgów, Andrespol, Dobroń, Tuszyn). The least optimal type of functional structure is characterized by low exogenous employment as well as a small percentage of exogenous jobs (Dłutów, Jeżów, Parzęczew). A second least optimal type is one where the percentage of jobs in exogenous areas is high, but the actual number of exogenous jobs is small.
2) **Identification of exogenous functions in non-agricultural types of economic activity in the small business sector.** The analysis of this sector is difficult due to delays in database updates as well as due to a lack of employment data. The evaluation of the economic base in the small business sector is done using a variety of indicators including various types of enterprise indices (e.g. number of firms per 1000 persons), and in some cases, the location quotient (LQ):

\[
LQ = \frac{Z_{iw}/Z_w}{(Z_{ik}/Z_k)}
\]

where:
- \(Z_{iw}\) – number of firms in sector “i” in region “w”
- \(Z_w\) – number of firms in all sectors in region “w”
- \(Z_{ik}\) – number of firms in sector “i” in reference region “k”
- \(Z_k\) – number of firms in all sectors in reference region “k”
Rural areas throughout the whole Łódź region are characterized by uneven development in the small business sector (Wójcik 2012). In 2010 six rural townships in the Łódź region were characterized by a higher business activity index than the average for Poland – 92 firms per 1,000 residents. All six rural townships are found in the Łódź Metropolitan Area: Nowosolna, Andrespol, Rzgów, Pabianice, Ksawerów, Aleksandrów. In addition, all six townships are experiencing the highest rates of immigration in the Łódź region (Ogrodowczyk 2012).

The geographic distribution of small businesses in rural townships suggests immense disproportions in the role of industry and services in the creation of the economic base in this particular sector. No rural township in the Łódź Metropolitan Area plays a significant role in the distribution of service-oriented companies (LQ < 1). This applies both to rural townships and some urban-rural townships located in rural areas. About 30% of the analyzed townships (7 townships) are characterized by a substantial shortage of services (LQ < 0.8). Research has shown that most rural residents look to cities to satisfy their need for services.

4. The social dimension of rural-urban collaboration

The ongoing process of rural gentrification is as complex as the social and economic change taking place in cities. The encounter between native residents and new residents is not only spatial in nature (new neighbors), but it is also a clash of cultures. In small communities such as villages, social diversity is readily observable and close spatial proximity makes this type of observation possible. Both native and new residents have the opportunity to interact in light of their close spatial proximity. The purpose of the research was to identify the social identity of new and native rural residents as well as to assess their views on the rural environment. The goal was to evaluate the potential for collaboration between these two social groups. The research area included 17 villages – a term used in European geography to define a small community of people. The 17 villages were selected out of a larger sample of surveyed villages in the Łódź Metropolitan Area. Villages were surveyed in the following counties: Zgierz County (Zgierz Township, Stryków Township (rural area), Aleksandrów Łódzki (rural area)), Eastern Łódź County (Nowosolna Township, Andrespol Township, Brójce Township, Rzgów Township (rural area)), and Pabianice County (Ksawerów Township, Pabianice Township, Lutomiersk Township, Dobroń Township).

Villages were selected based upon changes in their functional and spatial structure. The selected villages began their transformation usually in the late 1990s and between 20% and 50% of the built-up areas consisted of new plots with new homes. A total of 301 surveys were conducted in the 17 selected villages using a structured interview questionnaire. This included 114 surveys (38%) with new residents and 187 surveys (64%) with native residents.
The main issue in interpersonal collaboration in a given community is interpersonal contact. Both new and native residents were asked to provide an opinion on this subject. The survey participants were to rate this issue from 5 (strong need for contact) to 1 (little need for contact). While most responses were somewhere in the middle, the highest average ratings (4.2) were provided by native residents. Neither new nor native residents expressed a strong desire to get to know one another (average rating: 3.4). Furthermore, new residents were least likely to seek out interactions with other new residents (average rating: 3.3). The conclusion from this research is that the definition of the village as a local community is accurate as long as certain relationships are replicated based on common bonds and interests, which is largely a product of the social and professional nature of the given population or populations.

Social cohesion is largely symbolic in nature, as it refers to a stereotypical view of life in rural areas. Residents with family roots in the local community perceive their village as a place for agriculture with all its social and economic implications. Even if a family farm does not produce substantial income, it is still an important element of local identity and a sense of place as well as an element of family memory. Social mobilization including political activity in the case of native residents has the effect of preserving traditional structures, even though a rural township may appear to experience modernization via technological progress.

Survey participants were also asked to determine the positive and negative effects of the influx of new residents to rural areas. Both groups of survey participants provided similar responses to this question (Figs. 3 and 4). Positive aspects of this process included increasing the village population and general growth in rural areas. Given the problem of depopulation in most rural areas in Poland, population growth and new infrastructure in suburban rural areas is perceived as a stimulus for local business activity and social initiatives. Residents note the better appearance of villages as a positive development driven by the construction of new homes and creation of gardens. Survey participants tended to positively assess the diversity of architecture being introduced in rural areas, while usually overlooking the architectural chaos that often accompanies this new construction boom.

The negative issues mentioned by survey participants included social problems such as social and physical separation of rural residents and increasing disparities in income between social groups in rural areas. While native residents expressed certain negative opinions in the general context of change in suburban rural areas, new residents tended to adhere to a certain double standard. Many new residents would indicate that the relationship between native and new residents is not optimal (social distance), but at the same time would indicate a personal unwillingness to communicate with native residents. In addition, many new residents would not complete the entire questionnaire. One possible explanation could be an individualism of these new residents as well as a focus on their own problems in lieu of becoming involved in the problems of their local communities, simultaneously being unaware of the functioning of local structures treated as a certain whole.
Quite a few survey participants expressed negative opinions on the expansion of built-up areas and the use of open land in general. Increased vehicular traffic was also seen as a key negative effect. Native residents provided a number of negative opinions that were difficult to place in distinct groups. These included conflict over plot boundaries, animosity over profits derived from the sale of land, and inappropriate behavior of new residents.
towards natives (emphasis on higher social status). These responses suggest that rural diversity is becoming a reality not only in terms of new residents versus native residents, but also in terms of conflict between native residents themselves. The sale of land creates social conflict among those who were able to sell land profitably and those who were not. Native residents who were not able to profit from the sale of land often blame those who were supposedly able to alter local land management plans in order to benefit from the sale of land. This type of benefit is believed to be the result of collusion between certain landowners and local government leaders.

The above problems and relationships between new and native residents in rural areas can be supplemented with survey data on the strengths and weakness of rural life in itself (Figs. 5 and 6). No significant differences were noted between responses provided by new and native residents.

![Fig. 5. Structure of responses on the strengths of one’s own village](image)

Survey participants usually indicated that the natural environment and rural landscape are two key benefits of the rural lifestyle. Many described village life using words such as peace, quiet, and harmony. New residents more so than native residents emphasized the value of owning a home with a large lot, which makes recreation and relaxation more attainable. In addition, some survey participants viewed the rural lifestyle as a better way of organizing life in general and as a reflection of conservative values and values associated with rural families. Responses that were difficult to classify (“other”) usually came from native residents who had a platform for discussing personal experiences, local history, family history, and religion.
The shortage of infrastructure was named as the leading weakness of rural areas by survey participants. Roads were the main problem area, which was particularly troublesome for new residents who tend to live in peripheral parts of villages. This problem is primarily a reflection of suburban spatial planning and its shortcomings. Building permits are issued for home construction along low quality roads that are often then extended by landowners along plot boundaries. This is a key source of conflict between local governments and residents, and especially new residents, who demand better road surface quality. In turn, local governments often want to take control of private roads. The problem with road quality is strongly linked with historical issues in central Poland, which saw large scale division of land in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Today many rural areas are characterized by dispersed rural settlements, which creates the need for significant extensions of infrastructure.

Large scale extensions generate significant costs for local governments. This includes water mains, power lines, sewer systems, and roads that constitute pure necessities in the age of the automobile. Many survey participants also pointed to a shortage of community programs and gathering places that could be used by residents, local organizations, local children, and local sports enthusiasts. This issue was also accompanied by the lack of entertainment options on the local scene, although this problem was mostly identified by native residents who tend to be less mobile than new residents. Native residents were also more likely to note the lack of local job opportunities that would suit their needs and desires.
5. **Institutionalization of metropolitan area collaboration in the Łódź Metropolitan Area as an effect of integrative functional and social processes**

The integration of large metropolitan areas has a long tradition in countries where social and economic development has produced rather complex systems of linkages within settlement networks (Kaczmarek, Mikuła 2007). The Poznań Metropolitan Area is the most advanced metropolitan area in Poland in this respect. One key reason for its progress in the area of collaboration is the region’s advantageous administrative division. The city of Poznań is surrounded by Poznań County, which makes collaboration with suburban areas much easier (Mikuła 2009; Suliborski et al. 2000). Another source of social and economic integration in the Poznań region is its stock of social capital. Regardless of any best practices employed by the Poznań Metropolitan Area, collaboration between local governments in metropolitan areas is much more than just testing new solutions, as it is needed in order to manage simultaneous processes of spatial concentration and deconcentration (Kaczmarek 2014).

Large cities in Poland and their surrounding functional areas are currently at the stage of creating or implementing metropolitan area development strategies. This is possible, first and foremost, thanks to the opportunity to receive financing for investment purposes from the European Union in the period 2014–2020. Structural funds play a key role in assisting sustainable development in metropolitan areas in Poland within the framework of Integrated Territorial Investment programs.

The availability of the European Union funding prompted the establishment of the Łódź Metropolitan Area Association in April 2014. The organization includes the central city of Łódź as well as cities and townships in four counties: Pabianice, Eastern Łódź, Brzeźiny, Zgierz. As of July 2014, not all the rural townships in the four counties had decided to join the Association. The basic goal of the Association thus far has been the production of the Strategic Diagnosis and the Development Strategy (*Strategia Rozwoju Łódzkiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego* 2014) for the Łódź Metropolitan Area. Both documents are needed in order to apply for funds from the European Union. The basic goals of the Association, according to the Development Strategy, are:

- support for the idea of local government and defense of its own interests,
- collaboration between local governments and resulting integration of the Łódź Metropolitan Area as well as a collaboration model based on partnership,
- social and economic development in the Łódź Metropolitan Area,
- generate substantial influence for the Łódź Metropolitan Area on the substance and manner of implementation of actions part of the EU cohesion policy (*Strategy...* 2014).
The Development Strategy was produced by a group of experts and its creation was preceded by scientific consultations. As a result, the Development Study for the Łódź Metropolitan Area (Studium Rozwoju Łódzkiego Obszaru Metropolitalnego 2013) was produced. The document has a dual character. On the one hand, it is a general plan of action. On the other hand, it plays an operational role associated with the Integrated Territorial Investment strategy. It serves as a basis for the acquisition of funding from the European Union in the period 2014–2020.

Principal strategic goals refer to the following:

- regeneration of blighted areas, creation of safe and friendly public spaces that would foster social inclusion and increased business activity,
- creation of an integrated metropolitan transportation system,
- creation of an economy that is not resource-intensive and which produces low emissions of chemical toxins in order to help protect the natural environment for all living beings,
- development of human resources and social capital and an advanced information society,
- strengthening of metropolitan functions and cohesion within the Łódź Metropolitan Area.

The realization of the strategic goals in this document will require greater integration based on mutual trust between various partner organizations engaged in social and economic development in the region. This is why the Development Strategy deems it vital to strengthen three types of integration: (1) territorial (spatial wholeness), (2) thematic (problem solving), (3) entity-oriented (cohesion of partner organizations).

The establishment of the Łódź Metropolitan Area Association is a task-oriented idea that serves to achieve specific goals associated with financing available from the European Union. This is accomplished by translating needs into operational functions such as strategic goals and associated tactics. The integration of local government entities around specific tasks should not only lead to the completion of predetermined investment tasks, but should also strengthen the Association in its pursuit of a higher system of planning and governance in the Łódź Metropolitan Area. However, actions of this type will need approval at higher levels of government; hence, the need for a national metropolitan area law. If this does not happen, then the proposed projects will come to a quick end and reduced financing from the European Union (after 2020) may cause a marked decline in the pursuit of cohesion, especially in the realm of functional integration.

---

3 In 2014 a total of 71 applications for EU investment funding were filed as part of metropolitan collaboration efforts; the proposed investments were valued at approximately one billion zlotys (approx. 240 million euro).
6. Final remarks

Metropolitan areas need to be treated as a spatial whole whose strong internal linkages in the realm of society and economics demand the development of institutional and informal forms of rural-urban collaboration. The basic condition for the creation of cohesion based on collaboration between local governments and local institutions is equality. Local governments with a great deal of power due to substantial economic resources should not treat less potent local governments, usually those in rural areas, as less important and effectively subservient. There are two key reasons for this. First, the unique nature of the role played by each given community or collection of communities is important to the overall organization of a given metropolitan area. The function of a community, regardless of its economic, spatial or social status, helps support the settlement system in a metropolitan area in general equilibrium. Particular attention is needed in the area of functions that cannot be described using any type of quantitative category or such a category would not be sufficient. Rural areas part of large metropolitan areas possess such functions including housing functions, environmental functions, landscape functions, recreational functions, primary production functions, organic agriculture, and subsistence farming. The second reason for equality among the constituents of large metropolitan areas is economic diffusion of business and related institutions as well as cultural traditions from the urban core towards the fringe of the metropolitan area. The idea behind this diffusion lies in the context of a human search for a better life and better business opportunities. Diffusion leads to stronger links between the urban core and outlying areas, but it also leads to the disintegration of local linkages in rural areas and their reorganization. This does complicate existing relationships throughout the metropolitan area on the village, town, township, and city level.

The determination of the basic level of metropolitan cohesion based on collaboration between multiple territorial and organizational entities leads one to question its interpretation. G. Gorzelak (2007, 28) argues that the problem of creating cohesion policy largely results from its interpretation. His view is that it is not possible to equate cohesion with convergence. Cohesion must be understood in functional terms. In spatial terms, cohesion is the removal of barriers and limitations resulting from specific forms of spatial management, which hamper the achievement of social and economic cohesion (Gorzelak 2007, 30).

Hence, metropolitan cohesion needs to be viewed in functional and social terms. In short, it is more important to pursue the emergence of relationships between qualitatively different entities in the spirit of the well-known rule that the whole is more cohesive when its constituent parts play very different roles (Wilkęński 2003, 29). In functional terms, cohesion can be understood as the emergence of functional relationships between different parts of the overall metropolitan structure, which is the result of a diversity of types of economic activity and/or spatial management. In social terms, cohesion refers to interpersonal communication. In this sense, cohesion is a social contract with specific development goals.
and agreement in basic areas concerning the community vision to improve living conditions and enhance the feeling of belongingness to a territorial community. Furthermore, it is a desire to be distinct relative to other territorial groups of the same type – competition between metropolitan areas.
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The publication "(…) addresses not only current issues in the European Union, but also spontaneous processes occurring here in Poland.

(…) The authors of each chapter cover both theoretical considerations and case studies. These portray cities as centers of planned integration as well as characterize rural areas from a variety of interesting multi-faceted perspectives.

(…) Do not conceal difficulties associated with the planning and establishment of urban-rural partnerships. The recommendations in the book appear to be quite sensible. However, the general rules described may prove inadequate in light of the decisive power of local potential associated with both urban and rural entities."

Excerpts from the review by Prof. Dr. Hab. Izabella Bukraba-Rylska