

Theme 3: Putting Things Together?

"I do think economic progress and social progress have to go hand-in-hand. You can't have a winning economy and a losing society, or the winning economy will lose eventually."

-David Pecaut, 2009

Neil Bradford

MCRI Meetings, Toronto

May 2010



Presentation Overview

Part 1: Setting the Scene: The 'Local Turn'

Part 2: Interpreting Governance and Strategy:
A Capital(s) Framework

Part 3: Variations on a Theme: Different
"Tents"



Part 1. Setting the Scene: The 'Local Turn'

A by now familiar narrative about “globalization” that informs the MCRI

- *Going Local: place and context matter; policy implementation gaps; learning for innovation*
- *Associational: multi-sectoral, inter-municipal representation/engagement of city-region players (eg. business, community, education, talent)*
- *Multi-level: targeted, tailored, and aligned upper level interventions to leverage unique configuration of local assets*

Our Theme 3 explores how these three social dynamics play out institutionally at the city-region scale to shape development strategies/trajectories



The 'Local Turn' ...

We observe locally institutionalized networks supplying economic governance – “strategic management of local development”

Interesting questions arise:

- **How inclusive of local interests?**
- **How embedded in decision making routines?**
- **How influential in driving development?**

An ideal type often projected: the “big tent” that includes economic, cultural, social, (ecological) in strategic planning process (eg. Wolfe 2009)

But the form, nature, purpose, even existence of the tent is an empirical question

Appropriately, our Theme 3 research explores governance and strategy through city-by-city analysis of organizational relations, institutional arenas, leadership styles, galvanizing issues



Part 2. Interpreting Governance and Strategy: A Capital(s) Framework

Theme 3 Meta-question: How to interpret the patterns of collaboration/competition in city-region governance and strategy?

Two helpful concepts: social capital (Putnam, 1993) and civic capital (Wolfe and Nelles, 2008)

Bring the two capitals together for analysis of local state-society relations and economic governance/development strategy



Social Capital ...

Historically-evolved trust relations that enable cooperation

Three distinct forms:

- **Bonding: (within sector)**
- **Bridging: (between sectors)**
- **Linking: (across levels)**

Social capital helps us understand certain institutionalized partnerships,

Yet for our purposes the concept has limitations: static rather than dynamic, not centrally directed at public governance and policy processes, and not scaled to city-region



Civic Capital ...

Organizational relationships that emerge from interpersonal networks tied to a specific locality, contributes to shared development vision and common policy goals

For our purposes, a dynamic concept, attuned to city-region scale, directed to strategic economic governance

Flows of civic capital can leverage stocks of social capital:

Civic entrepreneurs forge development coalitions through dialogue and experimentation in governance settings



Part 3. Variations on a Theme: Different Tents

Across our city-regions unique configurations of social and civic capital find expression in governance and strategy

Three ideal types to order our case findings:

- 1. *Institutional Collaboration*: “Big Tent” with inclusive governance, holistic development**
- 2. *Instrumental Partnerships*: “Tent City” with various issue-specific join-ups, balanced development**
- 3. *Independent Sectors*: “Tent-ative” with sectors pursuing own priorities, contested development**



Comparative Matrix:

Theme 3 Institutional Logics

	Institutional Collaboration	Instrumental Partnerships	Independent Sectors
Where	collaborative body	cooperative projects	competitive visions
What	holistic development	balanced development	contested development
Who	multi-sectoral and open to new voices	partnerships but mostly 'usual suspects'	economic, social, cultural in respective silos
How	boundary crossing dialogue	interest-based negotiation	zero-sum debate
Why	Bridging social capital/civic entrepreneurship	Bonding social capital/civic cooperation	Bonding social capital/civic competition
Literature exemplars	Henton et al. (1997) OECD (2007)	Cohen and Fields (2002) Safford 2008 (Allentown)	Saxenian (Route 128) Safford 2008 (Youngstown)
Selected city-region examples?	Montreal (CMM, CEDC) Waterloo (Prosperity Council) Calgary (TBL planning)	Vancouver (VEDC/DTES UDA) Ottawa (OCRI/LASI) Halifax (GHP/Seaport)	London (LEDC v. Smart Growth Network) Kingston (KEDCO v. inclusive city advocates)



Five Takeaways: Learning, Hybrids, Contingency, Diversity, Size

1. ***Learning:*** a soft path dependency, with trajectories open to change either through “incremental layering” or “crisis rupturing”
2. ***Hybrids:*** governance and strategy can mix forms and projects in ‘less than ideal types’
3. ***Contingency:*** social learning processes are not linear; city regions may jump governance ‘stages’ or revert to earlier forms
4. ***Diversity:*** Theme 2 cultural issues often the mobilizing common ground for economic *and* social coalitions
5. ***Size doesn’t determine:*** different “tents” appear across large, medium, small cases; social and civic capital not size-dependent