

Conceptualizing local and regional economic development in the United States

Valler, David; Wood, Andrew

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Valler, D., & Wood, A. (2010). Conceptualizing local and regional economic development in the United States. *Regional Studies*, 44(2), 139-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400802378768>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Conceptualizing Local and Regional Economic Development in the United States

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2007-0271.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	O51 - U.S. Canada < O5 - Economywide Country Studies < O - Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth, P16 - Political Economy < P1 - Capitalist Systems < P - Economic Systems
Keywords:	Local and Regional Economic Development, Regulation Theory, USA



Conceptualizing Local and Regional Economic
Development in the United States

Dave Valler

Oxford Brookes University

Department of Planning
Oxford Brookes University
Gipsy Lane Campus
Headington
Oxford OX3 0BP
UK
dvaller@brookes.ac.uk

AND

Andrew Wood

University of Kentucky
Department of Geography
University of Kentucky
1457 Patterson Office Tower
Lexington, Kentucky
40506-0027
USA
andrew.wood@uky.edu

First received: September 2007

Accepted: May 2008

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Conceptualizing Local and Regional Economic Development in the United States
9

10
11 Abstract
12

13
14 Contemporary literature on local and regional economic development (LRED) in the
15 United States is predominantly empirical and pragmatic, focusing on the conduct and
16 efficacy of economic development policy. While this work is valuable in evaluating the
17 detailed operation of LRED activity, the broader conceptual foundations which underlay
18 economic development practice have been underplayed. We reflect on research and
19 writing around LRED in the U.S. and address some key conceptual and theoretical
20 limitations. We call for a stronger focus on contextualization and set out a theoretical
21 approach grounded in regulationist insights which offers significant advances in
22 theorizing U.S. LRED.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Key Words: Local and Regional Economic Development; Regulation Theory; United
39 States
40

41 JEL Classifications: R58 - Regional Development Policy; B52 - Institutional;
42 Evolutionary; O18 - Regional, Urban, and Rural Analyses; P16 - Political Economy
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Conceptualiser le développement local et régional économique aux Etats-Unis.
50
51

52
53 Valler & Wood
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

La documentation contemporaine sur le développement local et régional économique (DLRE) aux Etats-Unis est dans une large mesure empirique et pragmatique, portant sur la conduite et l'efficacité de la politique de développement économique. Alors que ce travail s'avère précieux dans l'évaluation du fonctionnement de l'activité DLRE, les fondements conceptuels plus larges qui étayent le développement économique en pratique ont été minimisés. On considère la recherche et la documentation à propos du DLRE aux Etats-Unis et aborde quelques-unes des limites conceptuelles et théoriques. On réclame que l'on mette l'accent plutôt sur le contexte et on établit une façon théorique fondée sur des aperçus réglementaires qui fournit des progrès non-négligeables quant à la théorisation du DLRE aux E-U.

Développement Local et Régional Economique / Théorie de réglementation / Etats-Unis

Classement JEL: R58; B52; O18; P16

Konzeptualisierung der lokalen und regionalen Wirtschaftsentwicklung in den USA

Dave Valler and Andrew Wood

Abstract

Die aktuelle Literatur über lokale und regionale Wirtschaftsentwicklung in den USA ist vorherrschend empirischer und pragmatischer Natur, wobei der Schwerpunkt auf der Führung und Wirksamkeit der Wirtschaftsentwicklungspolitik liegt. Diese Arbeit ist zwar eine wichtige Hilfe bei der Bewertung der detaillierten Funktionsweise der Aktivitäten im Bereich der lokalen und regionalen Wirtschaftsentwicklung, doch die breiteren konzeptuellen Grundlagen für die Praxis der Wirtschaftsentwicklung werden dabei vernachlässigt. Wir untersuchen die Forschung und Literatur über lokale und regionale Wirtschaftsentwicklung in den USA und befassen uns mit einigen wichtigen konzeptuellen und theoretischen Beschränkungen. Wir argumentieren für eine stärkere Betonung der Kontextualisierung und entwickeln einen theoretischen Ansatz, der auf regulationistischen Erkenntnissen aufbaut und bei der Theoretisierung der lokalen und regionalen Wirtschaftsentwicklung in den USA signifikante Fortschritte ermöglicht.

Key Words:

Lokale und regionale Wirtschaftsentwicklung
Regulationstheorie
USA

JEL Classifications: R58 - Regional Development Policy; B52 - Institutional; Evolutionary; O18 - Regional, Urban, and Rural Analyses; P16 - Political Economy

Conceptualizar el desarrollo económico local y regional de los Estados Unidos

Dave Valler and Andrew Wood

Abstract

La literatura contemporánea sobre el desarrollo económico local y regional (DELR) en los Estados Unidos es predominantemente empírica y pragmática y se centra en la conducta y la eficacia de la política de desarrollo económico. Si bien este trabajo es valioso a la hora de evaluar la operación detallada de las actividades del DELR, los cimientos conceptuales más amplios que subyacen en las prácticas del desarrollo económico están mal representados. Analizamos los estudios y la literatura sobre el DELR en los EE.UU. y exponemos algunas limitaciones conceptuales y teóricas principales. Es necesario prestar más atención a la contextualización y establecer un enfoque teórico basado en las perspectivas regulatorias que ofrecen ventajas significativas en la teorización del DELR de los EE.UU.

Key Words:

Desarrollo económico local y regional
Teoría regulatoria
Estados Unidos

JEL Classifications: R58 - Regional Development Policy; B52 - Institutional; Evolutionary; O18 - Regional, Urban, and Rural Analyses; P16 - Political Economy

1. Introduction

Fifteen years ago, in an influential paper in *Urban Geography* Susan CLARKE (1993) highlighted a growing concern and discomfort with the study of local economic

1
2
3 development activity in the United States. It was apparent that work in the field was
4
5 “informative but often uncritical and with little theoretical grounding” (1993: 78), and
6
7 that opportunities to exploit a distinctive window into fundamental theoretical questions
8
9 were being substantially missed. Clearly, major changes were underway in the economy
10
11 and the state which would have the most profound implications for the nature and
12
13 practice of economic development. Transformations in economic production, global
14
15 competitiveness, information and communications technologies, state-market relations,
16
17 welfare, central and local governance, and public-private relationships, to name just some
18
19 of the more influential themes, could hardly avoid significant impacts on sub-national
20
21 economic development activities. Indeed, change was already well underway with
22
23 localities increasingly being seen as pivotal sites of competitiveness in a new global
24
25 economy, and with the concomitant rise of entrepreneurialism in U.S. cities and regions
26
27 (EISINGER 1988; HARVEY, 1989). In this context a central task was to understand and
28
29 interpret such changes, and thereby provide convincing foundations for future policy. As
30
31 CLARKE describes, a number of serious questions faced academics and policy-makers in
32
33 the field, including “...most basically, what is the meaning of these current shifts from
34
35 national to subnational initiatives in development policy?” (1993: 87).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 This would seem, on the face of it, to present a straightforward rallying cry for a broader
47
48 contextualization of economic development activity, and in particular the formulation of
49
50 a more comprehensive and wide-ranging political-economy of economic development.
51
52 Yet to date there is little evidence of a serious or sustained effort to establish such a
53
54 framework. Rather, authors have continued to decry a ‘myopic tunnel vision approach’
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (IMMERGUT, 1992, quoted in WILSON, 1999: 5) and a 'narrow evidentiary base'
4
5 which omits 'critical variables and dynamics' (CLARKE, 2001: 320; REESE and
6
7 ROSENFELD, 2001), often reinforcing the view of WIEWEL et al (1993: 94) that we
8
9 have 'little in the way of an integrated theoretical framework' which might lend
10
11 coherence to the analysis of U.S. local and regional economic development (LRED).
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 In this paper we reflect on the nature of research and writing around LRED in the U.S..
19
20 We argue that the literature is predominantly empirical and pragmatic in nature, focusing
21
22 on the conduct of economic development policy and the relative efficacy of different
23
24 policy choices. Though this work is enormously valuable in understanding and evaluating
25
26 the detailed operation of LRED activity, the broader conceptual foundations which
27
28 underlay economic development practice and its place in contemporary political-
29
30 economic analysis have been comparatively underplayed. We address some of the key
31
32 conceptual and theoretical limitations and, in calling for further reflective work that
33
34 focuses on conceptualizing the policies and practices of economic development, we argue
35
36 for a stronger contextualization of LRED activity in the U.S.. We then set out a
37
38 theoretical approach grounded in regulationist insights, which in our view offers
39
40 significant advances in establishing a comprehensive and rigorous theorization of U.S.
41
42 LRED.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Before we embark on such a project, however, a brief note of caution. Plainly, any
52
53 attempt to establish such a broad commentary is, by its very nature, an imprecise task.
54
55 For a start, delineating the field of local and regional (or for that matter 'neighbourhood',
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'local', 'regional', 'state', 'community', 'urban', 'metropolitan') economic development
4 is problematical. Clearly it is difficult to define any obvious boundaries around the LRED
5 literature, not least given the more flexible and holistic approaches to such activity which
6 have developed in recent years. Also, a vast amount of important work across politics,
7 geography, sociology, economics, law, urban studies and a number of other disciplines is
8 influential in the field, even if not ostensibly directed at local and regional economic
9 development *per se*. As a result our discussion is necessarily selective and we recognize
10 that comments on the field as a whole must remain somewhat impressionistic, but this
11 seems inevitable given the diversity and potential scale of the field. Given these
12 complexities we adopt a pragmatic focus on 'local and regional economic development'
13 in the hope that this can incorporate distinctly urban, metropolitan, state and other
14 economic development literatures. We hope, however, that some broad commentary can
15 assist in distilling key characteristics, and in prompting further discussion.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 2. The place of theory in the U.S. economic development literature

44
45
46
47

48 The question of how best to develop and deploy theory in the U.S. economic
49 development literature has troubled authors for some time. While on one hand several
50 contributions have bemoaned an apparent lack of a formal or convincing theory of local
51 development (see for example CLARKE, 2001; FASENFEST et al 1997; KIRBY, 1985;
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BEAUMONT and HOVEY, 1985), others have highlighted the confusion engendered by a multiplicity of very specific and narrow theoretical frameworks. Overall there is concern that theoretical approaches in LRED have been variously unconvincing, incomplete, or inappropriate (see, for example, CLARKE, 1993; 2001; FASENFEST et al 1997; REESE and ROSENFELD, 2001; WIEWEL et al, 1993; WILSON, 1999). For WIEWEL et al previous theoretical contributions in the field have been unable to grapple effectively with the range of tasks required, such that economic development theory ‘on the whole... does not do well’ (WIEWEL et al, 1993: 94). In summarizing some of the limitations of extant theory WILSON notes, albeit somewhat ambiguously:

“Perhaps the most serious weakness of these models is the inadequate conceptualization of state economic development with respect to the lack of substantiated theory. Ironically, researchers are not hesitant in introducing new theories; there is an ample supply in the literature. What concerns scholars... is that in trying to understand the economic development process we are not confronted by a lack of a theory, but instead a multiplicity of theoretical models. Yet, in many cases, the theory underlying empirical examinations of the effects of development policies is assumed, or is not made explicit” (1999: 4)

In turn a variety of contributors have noted the potential impacts of such theoretical shortcomings on policy development and implementation, as well as on the prospects for

1
2
3 a comprehensive theoretical account of local economies and their dynamics (WIEWEL et
4 al, 1993). REESE and FASENFEST (1997: 196), for example, argue that theoretical
5
6 under-development has been associated with piecemeal and incremental policy, over-
7
8 generalized goals and objectives, highly unsophisticated strategy, and a very limited
9
10 understanding of the causal mechanisms which link policy formation, implementation
11
12 and outcomes. Similarly, WILSON (1999), drawing on IMMERGUT (1992), argues:
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 This myopic tunnel-vision approach to state activism in economic
21
22 development has fragmented initiatives resulting in diluted policy content
23
24 (KING, 1992), in addition to frustrating scholars attempts to read
25
26 wholesale shifts in policy direction (IMMERGUT, 1992, quoted in
27
28 WILSON, 1999: 5)
29
30
31
32
33

34 Unravelling the reasons for such theoretical limitations is a complicated task, and we
35
36 restrict our comments here to some initial speculation around a number of potentially
37
38 contributory factors. First, we might note the tendency in the U.S. LRED literature
39
40 towards instrumental and pragmatic concerns which results in a rather indirect
41
42 engagement with more abstract or contextual questions. To a large extent it would appear
43
44 that the overwhelming concern in the U.S. literature has been to advance the *practice* of
45
46 economic development (see BINGHAM and MIER, 1993: ix; MIER and FITZGERALD,
47
48 1991), and that authors have been convinced by the argument that "...the profound
49
50 meanings of local economic development policies rest in the distributional dimensions
51
52 and substantive effects of these policies, the areas least understood by scholars and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practitioners” (CLARKE, 1993: 88). In many ways this chimes with a long-established
4
5 pragmatism in American philosophy, politics and culture which continues to resonate
6
7 across a variety of spheres. As CRUNDEN (1996: 146) sets out in reviewing the
8
9 emergence of this distinctively American philosophy in the late 19th and early 20th
10
11 centuries, pragmatism:
12
13

14
15
16
17 ...argued against abstractions that had no results; it argued against an
18
19 ethics that did not affect ordinary lives; it assumed that solving daily
20
21 problems was more important than achieving abstract truths; it tried to tell
22
23 people that what everyone thought and did was important, and that
24
25 Americans did not need extensive technical philosophical training to lead
26
27 meaningful lives. Europeans were entangled in class and metaphysical
28
29 systems that were inappropriate for American democracy; and the
30
31 pragmatists were trying to achieve a means of procedure which eliminated
32
33 them.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In this context a characteristic feature of social scientific enquiry in the U.S. has been an
42
43 orientation to the concrete, and we would argue that to a large extent this has been
44
45 reflected in the literature around LRED. Certainly the economic development literature
46
47 has emerged predominantly from pragmatic concerns for declining urban and rural
48
49 communities and in the search for social justice (WIEWEL et al, 1993: 95), and much
50
51 theoretical and empirical work in the U.S. has been dedicated to advancing the *practice*
52
53 of LRED in the U.S. *per se* (MIER and FITZGERALD, 1991: 268-69). The tendency has
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 been to develop 'instrumental' theory and 'guidance for action', often regarding the
4 usefulness or otherwise of individual initiatives (WIEWEL et al, 1993: 93), and to turn
5
6 directly to the sphere of practice for theoretical guidance and inspiration. The outcome is
7
8 a rather fragmented literature which has lacked a clear sense of overall direction, and
9
10 often militated against more abstract and more comprehensive theoretical accounts which
11
12 might fully contextualize LRED activity. The implications of this concern for the
13
14 concrete have been identified in another context by Richard LEHNE (2006), writing on
15
16 the literature around business-government relations in the U.S.:
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Most Americans evaluate political issues concretely. They are more
26
27 concerned about immediate problems than about the ideological
28
29 implications of potential policies. The relationship between governments
30
31 and business is rarely addressed directly in the United States. It is usually
32
33 fought out, instead, on the margins of such topics as working conditions,
34
35 environmental costs, campaign contributions and health care costs.
36
37 Implicit in such disputes is an intense rivalry over the influence of
38
39 business and non-business groups in society. Various scholars address this
40
41 rivalry by presenting models that express their understanding of what the
42
43 relationship among government, business and non-business groups in the
44
45 society is or should be (LEHNE, 2006: 31)
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 A corollary of this more concrete focus is the nature of the urban politics literature in the
54
55 U.S.. Here pluralist models, for example, have established an 'empirical descriptive'
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approach to the autonomous political realm, together with normative and prescriptive
4 implications, rather than attempt to interrogate the structural or class foundations for such
5 a political form. Similarly, growth machine theory and regime theories, which have
6 assumed a dominant position in urban political analyses, have a limited theoretical focus
7 and have been criticized as underplaying broader structural features which would be key
8 to any comprehensive explanation of local political forms and dynamics (DAVIES, 2002:
9 2; JESSOP et al; 1999).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 A second contributory factor to the pattern of theoretical development derives from the
23 real material conditions of the U.S. political economy, and not least the remarkable
24 disorganization and fragmentation of American politics and government (GORDON,
25 1998). Of course, the U.S. system of federal government effectively fragments power
26 among different levels of the state and parts of the state apparatus. But additionally,
27 national political institutions have been largely unable to exert long-term strategic
28 leadership in the domestic arena. As GORDON argues:

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 Political disorganization is rooted in constitutional design. The American
40 state has always been premised on practical and intellectual doubts about
41 the scope and reach of national politics. A few core concerns made
42 national government necessary; a multitude of regional interests ensured
43 that, especially in domestic economic affairs, such government would
44 have little power (GORDON, 1998: 31).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Further, it is apparent that U.S. political culture and institutions have effectively
4
5 'discouraged substantial programmatic debate' (GORDON, 1998: 31), with concomitant
6
7 impacts on the nature of policy development and implementation. In this context it might
8
9 not be wholly surprising that theoretical accounts have to some extent mirrored such
10
11 fragmentation and lack of cohesion. Added to this the 'sheer scale and diversity of
12
13 industrial development' across the continental U.S. (GORDON, 1998: 35) further
14
15 problematizes attempts at comprehensive and integrated theorization.
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 A third factor here is the notable stability of economic development activities in recent
23
24 years. Despite radical changes in the political-economic context for LRED policy, and
25
26 claims of a significant re-ordering of policy and institutional responses at local, regional
27
28 and other scales, REESE and ROSENFELD (2004) highlight the limits of change in the
29
30 day-to-day practice of economic development activity on the ground. Thus 'a relatively
31
32 traditional set of policies is becoming institutionalized and provides a common
33
34 framework for the practice of economic development' (2004: 286), and we might at least
35
36 tentatively suggest that this apparent stasis has not encouraged attempts at comprehensive
37
38 theoretical analysis and development.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 In the light of ongoing theoretical shortcomings a number of contributors have called for
47
48 further development which might transcend the current impasse. Yet the limited progress
49
50 in this sphere to date suggests that the task of 'theorizing U.S. LRED' does not lend itself
51
52 to a straightforward resolution. Indeed, we might note the lack of any clear agreement
53
54 over the central objectives for a 'theory of economic development'. For CLARKE
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (2001), for example, the emphasis is on establishing a ‘causal theory of local economic
4 policy making’ which can explain the overall trajectory of economic development
5
6 activity:
7
8
9

10
11
12 If we are aiming for some ever grander causal theory of local economic
13 development policy making, then the weak and widely varying
14 coefficients produced by mostly incommensurable quantitative studies are
15 important. They signify how far we are from that goal—mis-specification
16 is indeed worth worrying about to the extent that it obscures causality. But
17 if we seek to explain, at best, clusters or classes of events, problems, or
18 dynamics, we need analytic frameworks to help us understand those
19 patterns (CLARKE, 2001: 321)
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Alternatively, WIEWEL et al (1993: 93) identify a number of requirements for a
35 convincing theory of economic development which in their view needs to be
36 simultaneously contextual and agential, explanatory and instrumental, positive and
37 normative:
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 First, the theory should concern itself with the neighborhood economy and
47 its linkages. It should deal explicitly with economic variables and tell us
48 something useful about them... The theory must also be socio-political
49 because the activity with which it is concerned is rooted in a particular
50 form of social institution and its practitioners act explicitly within a
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 political framework... The actual experience of practitioners suggests
4
5 three additional, more abstract requirements for a theory. First, the theory
6
7 must be *instrumental*, that is it should provide guidance for action rather
8
9 than simply a positive explanation of how things behave. Second, it should
10
11 also be *normative*, that is, it must embody a set of objectives and
12
13 arguments for their realization... Third, a neighborhood economic
14
15 development theory requires a positive understanding of the contextual
16
17 world in which the action that it deals with will be played out. This term
18
19 describes the kind of understanding of relationships and interactions that is
20
21 necessary for effective action.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 This is, of course, ambitious. Indeed WIEWEL et al (1993: 84) admit the possibility that
30
31 'the formulation of one single theory would... be of such an abstract character as to be
32
33 useless: perhaps these criteria need to be applied to a set of inter-related theories'. Also,
34
35 they recognize that 'a broadly accepted theory of community economic development is a
36
37 long way off' (1993: 95), and that despite the existence of some elements which might
38
39 contribute to such a theory, formidable obstacles remain. In this context they turn to the
40
41 sphere of practice and set out a number of normative themes upon which successful
42
43 economic development programs might be constructed. Similarly, BINGHAM and MIER
44
45 (1993: ix) set out with positive intent:
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The pivotal assumption behind this book, however, is that research should
54
55 and can lead to general statements about economic development. This
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 assumption implies that the behaviour of firms and the development
4
5 process can be explained and predicted in terms of general laws
6
7 established by observation.
8
9

10
11
12 Yet they quickly retreat to the admission that the field of economic development is ‘a
13 very confusing place indeed’ (ix), drawing on multiple theoretical frameworks across
14 numerous disciplines, to the point at which ‘we recognize the folly of our initial goal...
15 that of articulating a synthetic theory of local economic development’ (xv). Instead they
16 turn to a series of metaphors (i.e. economic development as: ‘problem solving’; ‘running
17 a business’; ‘building a growth machine’; ‘preserving nature and place’; ‘releasing
18 human potential’; ‘exerting leadership’; and ‘seeking social justice’) which can produce
19 ‘distinctive yet partial’ (xv) insights into particular meanings of economic development
20 activity.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In our view, however, a shift to analytical methods based around ‘metaphors of economic
37 development’ provides very little guidance to inform systematic analysis. It undermines
38 attempts to engage with the overall meaning of LRED activity as it develops over time
39 and space, and is limited in terms of the interrelationships between diverse areas of
40 activity. Also it provides no clear theoretical foundation upon which to construct
41 explanatory and evaluative judgements. We argue instead for an approach based in
42 regulation theory, a conceptual framework introduced in France in the 1970s which has
43 subsequently come to exert considerable influence in studies of the state and social and
44 economic policy more generally across a wide variety of contexts, both in Europe and in
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the U.S.. This theoretical stance can assist significantly in locating LRED activity in a
4
5 broader political-economic context, in explaining the evolution of LRED and its
6
7 distinctive institutional and policy forms with reference to the evolution of the political
8
9 economy and the state, and in establishing a framework within which to evaluate the
10
11 scale, nature and overall contribution of LRED activity. Extending such insights might
12
13 also inform deliberations over the development of future LRED policy and its role in
14
15 addressing contemporary and future challenges (cf. PRIOR, 2005). In these senses a
16
17 regulationist approach can provide a much stronger and more sophisticated
18
19 *contextualization* of LRED, and in turn offer significant potential to advance the overall
20
21 approach to theorization in U.S. LRED.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

3. Contextualizing U.S. economic development: A regulationist contribution?

The Regulation Approach

41
42
43 By now the contours of the original regulationist account are well known. Beginning
44
45 from an assertion of the contradictory and crisis-prone nature of capitalist society,
46
47 regulation theory emphasizes the social norms, mechanisms and institutions which may
48
49 come together to derive a contingent and necessarily temporary stability in capitalist
50
51 accumulation processes (AGLIETTA, 1979, 1998; BOYER, 1990; JESSOP, 1990, 1997;
52
53 LIPIETZ, 1987; PECK and TICKELL, 1992, 1995). This establishes a distinctive
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 theoretical starting point in which the economy tends neither to an automatic equilibrium
4 as in conventional economics, or to an inevitable breakdown as in Marxist theory
5 (FRIEDMAN, 2000: 61). Rather, an 'accumulation system', or characteristic set of
6 relationships between production and consumption, emerges to a position of dominance
7 within an economic arena and may come to be sustained in the medium term by a 'mode
8 of regulation' (variously 'mode of social regulation', 'social mode of economic
9 regulation') or collection of social and institutional supports which together provide a
10 degree of coherence and stability to an overall 'regime of accumulation'. Such stability is
11 necessarily temporary, acting only to mute or disguise both the inherent contradictions of
12 capitalist production and the tensions which necessarily exist within institutional forms.
13 Each regime of accumulation thus contains the seeds of its own destruction, beyond
14 which capitalist production and regulation must be thoroughly transformed to secure its
15 future survival. Capitalism therefore proceeds historically through periods of stability and
16 growth, when accumulation and reproduction are relatively steady, and periods of crisis,
17 when the conditions for capitalist social reproduction are found wanting.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Within this overarching and essentially methodological framework (see BOYER, 1990;
42 JESSOP, 1990; GOODWIN and PAINTER, 1996), regulationists have offered specific
43 accounts of political-economic restructuring, most notably around the emergence and
44 consolidation of Fordism (AGLIETTA, 1979) and the putative transition to post-Fordism
45 (LIPIETZ, 1987). Much of this early literature is well known and there is no need to
46 rehearse it here. Additionally, a wide range of authors have deployed regulationist
47 insights to position and inform their analyses across a variety of spheres, including, for
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 example, U.K. urban politics (GOODWIN, DUNCAN and HALFORD, 1993), U.K.
4
5 urban and regional development (PECK and TICKELL, 1992; 1995), U.S. urban policy
6
7 (FLORIDA and JONAS, 1991), and U.S. housing (FLORIDA and FELDMAN, 1988).
8
9
10 Such accounts have achieved notable advances in these various spheres by
11
12 contextualizing particular policy fields in a broader political-economic and institutional
13
14 arena, and making critical connections between economic, social, political, cultural and
15
16 institutional practices. Regulationists have also elaborated on a number of apparent
17
18 weaknesses in initial formulations of the regulationist approach, most notably in
19
20 responding to accusations of structuralism and economic determinism. Hence a number
21
22 of authors have recognized explicitly the contingency inherent in regulationist accounts,
23
24 and stressed a concern for agency and practice (GOODWIN, 2001; JENSON, 1989;
25
26 1990; 1993; JESSOP, 1997; PAINTER, 1997; PAINTER and GOODWIN, 1995) as well
27
28 as emphasizing political and institutional dynamics (PURCELL, 2002). Yet the central
29
30 theoretical and methodological contribution of regulation theory has proved notably
31
32 robust, and it might be argued that as “a perspective and form of analysis” (GOODWIN
33
34 and PAINTER, 1996) regulation theory has come to exert significant influence.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 From a regulationist standpoint contemporary local and regional economic development
44
45 activity is best viewed within the context of overall patterns of institutional change and
46
47 policy experimentation directed towards the establishment of some form of post-Fordist
48
49 mode of regulation (GOODWIN, 2001: 74). On the one hand the structures and practices
50
51 of economic development activity at sub-national scales will be critically influenced by
52
53 broader processes of restructuring in state-market relations, innovation and competition
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 systems, formal regulatory frameworks, governance structures, patterns of social
4 organization, political and ideological commitments, and economic, social and cultural
5 policy. Clearly national policy shifts will impact directly on institutional forms and policy
6 development and implementation in localities and regions. Yet this cannot in any sense
7 be seen as a simplistic or undifferentiated projection of national changes onto localities.
8 Rather, regulatory practices operating at a variety of scales necessarily find expression
9 locally, both reflecting the pre-existing character of uneven development, and being
10 actively constituted locally. As GOODWIN et al (1993: 69) point out,
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Economic, social and political experiences of regulation vary between
26 places within a country, often significantly so... differentiated spaces of
27 regulation arise not only because these experiences reflect localized
28 conditions of production and consumption, and local constellations of
29 social forces and cultural practices, but also because local agencies are
30 often the very medium through which regulatory practices are interpreted
31 and ultimately delivered.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Additionally, of course, localities and regions come to play different roles, with different
45 degrees of success or failure, within overall national regimes of accumulation. For it is
46 apparent that regions and localities are characterized by distinctive accumulation-
47 regulation couplings and will be inserted differentially into both wider spatial divisions of
48 labour and regulatory structures (see PECK and TICKELL, 1992; 1995). As PECK and
49 TICKELL point out (1992: 352) “some regional economies... will be favoured by
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 national accumulation strategies while others will not". But it is also clear that different
4
5 regulatory functions operate at different spatial scales (GOODWIN, 2001: 78; PECK and
6
7 TICKELL, 1992: 352), and that a whole variety of social, cultural and institutional forms
8
9 contribute to distinctively local or regional regulatory effects. PECK and TICKELL, for
10
11 example, highlight the potential role of local growth coalitions, inter-firm networks,
12
13 labour market structures and institutions, housing markets, venture capital arrangements,
14
15 forms of local governance, local economic policies and relations in civil society (1992:
16
17 353). As a result economic development activity will also reflect the search for a
18
19 'regulatory fix' at the local or regional scale, as localities with distinctive economic,
20
21 social, political, cultural and institutional histories seek to position themselves within the
22
23 context of a broader accumulation strategy (GOODWIN, 2001: 78).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Overall, then, regulation theory promises significant advances both in contextualizing
33
34 LRED activities broadly within the search for a resolution to the crisis Fordism and the
35
36 experimentation over new post-Fordist regulatory forms, and in approaching the diverse
37
38 mechanisms and forms of regulation operating in particular (sub-national) spatial
39
40 contexts. This has important theoretical implications which we explore further in the
41
42 following discussion.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 *Explaining and Evaluating Local and Regional Economic Development in the United*
52
53 *States: Regulationist Insights*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A regulationist approach offers distinctive and potentially powerful insights into U.S.
4 LRED in two key areas: Firstly, in developing an explanation of the evolving nature of
5
6 sub-national economic development activity founded in the overall restructuring of the
7
8 U.S. state and political-economy; and secondly in developing a more sophisticated
9
10 approach to the evaluation of economic development activity as a whole, sensitive both to
11
12 the multiplicity of roles that such policy can play in diverse contexts, and to the overall
13
14 limits of evaluation *per se*. We develop each of these themes in turn.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 *Explanation*

25
26
27 A useful corrective to the original regulationist account is provided by GOODWIN
28
29 (2001) and GOODWIN and PAINTER (1995: 18-23) in their critique of the ‘mode of
30
31 regulation’ concept. Such a notion, they argue, substantially downplays the emergent
32
33 nature of regulatory processes, as well as the empirical reality of ongoing change, conflict
34
35 and upheaval in capitalist society. Rather than ‘sharp breaks and radical discontinuities’
36
37 (1995: 19) they stress a more fluid ‘ebb and flow’ of *regulatory processes* across time
38
39 and space (1995: 21), accompanied by more or less successful regulatory effects. This, in
40
41 turn, elevates a concern for strategy and practice in the ongoing reproduction of capitalist
42
43 society, rather than a more static reading of structure and form within a particular mode
44
45 of regulation. In place of the supposed structural demands of particular accumulation
46
47 regimes, therefore, regulatory processes are ‘the product of material and discursive
48
49 practices’ themselves ‘conditioned by social and political institutions’ (GOODWIN and
50
51 PAINTER, 1995: 21). In this context regulation theory requires allied theories (of the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 state, governance etc), together with detailed empirical and historical research to
4 illuminate processes of change within particular institutions and political forms, rather
5 than explaining change as the straightforward expression of capitalist structural
6 requirements (see GOODWIN, 2001: 85-6). In this context neo-Gramscian state
7 theoretical insights have been deployed to approach processes of state restructuring,
8 through analysis of 'the political forces and regulatory practices and discourses' which
9 become hegemonic through particular state projects and societal paradigms (GOODWIN,
10 2001: 85-6). Explaining change in the state thus requires an emphasis on practice and
11 strategy in the achievement of hegemony, and particularly on exploring how political,
12 intellectual and moral leadership is:
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 “mediated through a complex ensemble of institutions, organizations and
30 forces operating within, orientated toward or located at a distance from the
31 juridico-political state apparatus” (JESSOP, 1997: p. 52; quoted in
32 GOODWIN 2001: 85).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In what ways might such a framework inform our understanding of the dynamics of the
42 U.S. state and hence the restructuring of U.S. LRED? In developing this for our present
43 purposes we can draw upon a brilliant historical synthesis by Robert BRENNER (2007),
44 which situates the evolution of U.S. politics and political strategy within the context of
45 underlying shifts in the balance of class forces, structural movements in the American
46 polity, and changes in the pattern of capital accumulation. Here the historic structural
47 weaknesses of organized labour, in particular with regard to its problematical relationship
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 with the Democratic Party and its underdevelopment in the South, provide the basis for a
4 distinctive political-economic trajectory in the U.S.. Despite the 'unprecedented
5 explosion' of working class power in the 1930s and the influence of liberal reformism
6 throughout the postwar era, the U.S. polity never seriously challenged corporate
7 hegemony. This reflected the continual subordination and emasculation of organized
8 labour in the U.S. which, along with other leading social movements, was largely
9 'domesticated' within a Democratic Party which itself prioritized capitalist profitability.
10 As a result the 'Great Society' version of the Keynesian welfare state which developed in
11 the U.S. became a form of 'growth liberalism', predicated upon the effective
12 incorporation of organized labour and other social pressures within the social compact,
13 and critically underwritten by corporate expansion. However, this arrangement was
14 wholly dependent on sustained economic growth and profitability. Once this was
15 challenged by economic slowdown in the 1960s and subsequent stagflation into the 1970s
16 conditions were ripe for the breakdown of the liberal welfare state system. Here, as
17 BRENNER argues, it was the debilitated state of the labour movement in the U.S. which
18 crucially enabled the onslaught of the corporations in the drive to restore profitability.
19 This formed part of a broad agenda designed to undermine the whole foundation of the
20 welfare state, and would be dependent on the construction of a broad base of support:
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 With the onset of the long downturn, and the political vacuum left by
49 liberalism's collapse, American corporations became the driving force that
50 would shift the polity to the right. But the growing success of the business
51 agenda within the halls of government is inexplicable purely in terms of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 corporate mobilization. Its scope depended on the ability of the
4
5
6 Republicans to develop a new hegemonic project that would replace
7
8 'Great Society' liberalism and offer an alternative model to significant
9
10 sections of the working class (BRENNER 2007: 44-5).
11

12
13
14 For BRENNER, this proceeded in three overlapping phases. First, Nixon's 'southern
15
16 strategy' in the 1960s began to destabilize Democratic support amongst the white
17
18 working class, albeit within the context of continuing federal identification with 'Great
19
20 Society' liberal reform, and accepting the persistence of the electoral strength of the
21
22 Democrats overall. Second, economic crisis in the 1970s, together with increasing
23
24 concern over federal taxation and spending, facilitated an anti-statist Republican ideology
25
26 which resonated with a weakened and demoralized working class. The resulting 'tax
27
28 revolt' forged a 'cross-class alliance with business' (2007:46), setting the context for the
29
30 effective naturalization of the business agenda under Reagan. Third, the Republican Party
31
32 forged a 'historic increase' in its national power by mobilizing right-wing business
33
34 interests and social conservatives in the emergent and increasingly dynamic South, where
35
36 strong free market and anti-statist sentiment provided a propitious environment for the
37
38 already staunchly pro-business Party. This gradually gave rise to the Republican's broad
39
40 hegemonic project which could finally break fundamentally with the Great Society
41
42 settlement:
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The answer, as we have seen, was to look to the South, both as model and
54
55 as electoral base, to construct an anti-statist individualist ideology founded
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 on white supremacy, defence of the patriarchal family and Protestant
5
6 fundamentalism. It was the Republican right's success in constructing this
7
8 ideological formula, and in identifying the liberal state as a central threat
9
10 to the racial status quo and 'traditional family values', that provided it
11
12 with the wherewithal to contend for power on a brazenly pro-business
13
14 programme. Its targets were the key aspects of the New Deal–Great
15
16 Society settlement that no administration, Democrat or Republican, had so
17
18 far dared to touch: Social Security, progressive taxation and (a good part
19
20 of) the business regulatory regime, including the EPA [Environmental
21
22 Protection Agency] and OSHA [Occupational Safety and Health
23
24 Administration] (BRENNER 2007: 48)
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The power of BRENNER's neo-Gramscian account derives from a critical interweaving
33
34 of economic, social, political and cultural change, focusing on the dynamics of political
35
36 strategy and moral and intellectual leadership within a distinctive institutional
37
38 framework. It demonstrates that the course of political-economic strategy and state
39
40 restructuring cannot be reduced to a simplistic unfolding of structural dynamics, for
41
42 example through the exhaustion of Fordism and the natural emergence of a new regime
43
44 (GOODWIN, 2001: 85). Rather, it avoids such economism by recognizing, as
45
46 GOODWIN (2001: 86) suggests, that such a transformation "is narrated, manifested and
47
48 resolved within the ideas, spaces and times of particular state projects and societal
49
50 paradigms".
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Within this overarching hegemonic project the U.S. has operated to a large extent as the
4 exemplar of neoliberalism. As the prototypical liberal market economy the U.S. has been
5
6 at the forefront of deregulation, privatization, welfare state retrenchment, labour market
7
8 flexibilization, business-oriented taxation reform and broader reorientation of economic
9
10 and social policy to the perceived needs of the private sector (JESSOP, 2002: 260). This
11
12 market-oriented restructuring might be seen as a composite strategy for competitiveness,
13
14 incorporating several major strands of neoliberal reorganization, including, for example:
15
16 cost reduction and increased flexibility in the labour market, a distinctive neoliberal and
17
18 property-based approach to the expansion of the knowledge based economy, and the
19
20 liberalization of finance capital. Each of these elements of a neoliberal accumulation
21
22 strategy faces distinctive problematics and regulatory challenges, and is associated with
23
24 particular forms of institutional and policy change. Yet what is clear is that the
25
26 Republican hegemonic project has incorporated major changes in the state, governance
27
28 and a wide range of economic, welfare, and regulatory policy which critically influence
29
30 the form and nature of sub-national economic development policy in the U.S.. These
31
32 include, *inter alia*: An overall commitment to welfare state retrenchment; federal
33
34 government withdrawal from urban policy (HENDRICKSON, 2004); the effective
35
36 restatement and fiscal reinforcement of the long-established decentralization of American
37
38 politics, together with an extended devolution of responsibility for economic
39
40 development (KANTOR, 2007); maintenance of the federal government's relatively
41
42 marginal involvement in employment and job training policies (CAMPBELL and
43
44 PEDERSEN, 2006); ongoing resistance to any serious attempt at coordinated industrial
45
46 policy in favour of market, macroeconomic and overall regulatory controls (CAMPBELL
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and PEDERSEN, 2006: 16); and a free market approach to the knowledge based
4
5 economy based in property rights, rather than explicit *dirigiste* industrial policy.
6
7

8
9
10 Clearly this is only a schematic listing. Yet it illustrates just some of the key policy
11
12 spheres through which the overarching neo-liberal strategy has exerted the most profound
13
14 influence on the evolution of LRED in the U.S. since the 1970s. In some instances local
15
16 and regional responses may be substantially hemmed in or, indeed, wholly negated by
17
18 national policy, though they may also reflect local economic and fiscal conditions, and
19
20 cultural and political factors. Local social relations, organisational arrangements and
21
22 patterns of political hegemony, for example, might alter the objectives and actions of
23
24 local political coalitions, shift the tactics of economic development organisations, or
25
26 engender conflict between federal and local government (see CLOKE and GOODWIN,
27
28 1992). In addition, policy developed at local or regional levels may work to exert
29
30 influence at higher levels of government and then in turn impact on the evolution of sub-
31
32 national policy. However, in our view it is impossible to fully understand the nature, form
33
34 and meaning of LRED activity without a clear sense of the overall national accumulation
35
36 strategy set out above.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 A brief example here is illustrative. KRINSKY (2007; see also KRINSKY and REESE,
47
48 2006) has recently demonstrated how workfare programs have been experienced
49
50 differently across a number of U.S. cities as national welfare restructuring processes
51
52 intersect with distinctive urban political dynamics such as labour market conditions,
53
54 fiscal management arrangements, institutional rules, policy networks and urban regimes.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

New York City's initial experience with workfare in the mid-1990s, for instance, is distinct. Here Mayor Giuliani enacted the nation's most ambitious public sector-based workfare program in 1995, one year prior to the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), and significantly expanding an existing municipal workfare programme. This reflected particular fiscal and labour market conditions in the city, as budgetary difficulties forced the lay-off (under previous Mayor David Dinkin) of thousands of municipal workers who were then, in the context of high levels of unemployment and welfare dependency, largely replaced by welfare recipients on 'work experience programmes'. However, as KRINSKY (2007) illustrates in detail, the prosecution of public sector-based workfare policy was also critically dependent on the strength of the Mayor's office in the city's institutional system, the political capacity to manoeuvre effectively in the face of opposition to workfare, and the presence of partners committed to anti-welfarism within the hegemonic urban regime. New York City's early experience was thus distinguished by the widespread use of work experience program placements, in contrast to cases in Milwaukee and Los Angeles (KRINSKY, 2007). In Milwaukee an influential conservative policy network at the state level in Wisconsin effectively prevented the public sector from running workfare programmes in the city, where workfare placements were concentrated in the private sector; while in Los Angeles County oppositional unions were able to demand effective 'anti-displacement' controls on public sector workfare placements in the face of a weak executive board.

1
2
3 Subsequently New York City's initial response gave way to a revised policy focus as
4
5 unemployment fell and the city's finances stabilized. The public sector-based work
6
7 programme was replaced by predominantly job-search activities and private labour force-
8
9 attachment measures. However, KRINSKY (2007: 787-788) shows how the welfare
10
11 reformers of Giuliani's administration were then able to 'jump scale' to join conservative
12
13 think-tanks, foundations and the Federal Department of Health and Human Services, and
14
15 thereby propagate New York City's 'full engagement model' which subsequently became
16
17 part of federal law. In this sense workfare has a complex multi-scalar 'fix' between
18
19 national, state and local scales, and it is clear that local workfare regimes have been
20
21 cultivated to introduce, experiment and refine workfare strategies and to guide Federal
22
23 reform (Jessop and Peck, 1999). Yet as Jessop and Peck (1999: 26) go on to argue: 'the
24
25 decisive strategic context for this upsurge in state and local level welfare reform has been
26
27 set by changing priorities, frameworks and incentives in federal policy'. In sum, further
28
29 research is required to investigate the complex and multi-layered political, economic and
30
31 cultural dynamics which shape the expression of workfare policy in particular places. For
32
33 Krinsky (2007: 791-2):
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The complex rescaling of policy in the wake of the FSA and PRWORA suggests,
45
46 however, that comparisons among cities and states will have to grapple
47
48 theoretically and methodologically with the nonindependence of cases. The
49
50 interweaving of global players, such as bond-rating agencies and real estate barons;
51
52 national-scale players, such as conservative think tanks, policy research institutions
53
54 and academics, and welfare-to-work services companies; state-level actors such as
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 state governments and suburban politicians; and local-level actors such as mayors,
4 council members, other landowners and businesses, nonprofit service providers,
5 and labor unions into policy networks around welfare reform means that their
6 particular configurations will mediate, in different ways, the labor market demands
7 and fiscal-management demands of “those who control the levers of economic
8 activity”.

21 22 *Evaluation*

23
24 The past 20 years or so have witnessed the development of a substantial critique of
25 evaluative work in U.S. LRED. As CLARKE and GAILE argued in 1992, efforts to
26 evaluate local economic development policy had become ‘a quagmire of good intentions
27 and bad measures’ (1992: 193), and a variety of contributions have since sought to
28 change the bases for evaluative work. In general these have problematized traditional
29 evaluative measures and methods, such as the focus on basic job creation/retention
30 measures, and argued for a shift from narrow ‘process’ or ‘formative’ evaluation to a
31 broader concern with the overall ‘outcomes’ and ‘impacts’ of policies (see, for example,
32 BARTIK, 2002; BARTIK and BINGHAM, 1995; REESE and FASENFEST, 1997). This
33 has also been associated with calls for a much wider range of criteria in evaluating LRED
34 (REESE and FASENFEST, 1997; MOLOTCH, 1991), albeit accepting the added
35 complexity which would inevitably arise. Additionally, a number of contributions have
36 exposed the essentially value-laden nature of evaluative processes and judgements and
37 the often implicit theoretical positions adopted in evaluative work. Yet despite this
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sustained period of attention there is little substantive basis upon which to frame
4
5 judgements on some of the most basic questions regarding LRED. What counts as the
6
7 'success' or 'failure' of LRED in a locality or region, and why? Is the form of LRED in a
8
9 place appropriate given the economic, social, political and cultural challenges being
10
11 faced? Is the program of LRED sustainable? In our view the lack of clear guidance on
12
13 these questions derives from the theoretical tendency to underplay both the broader
14
15 context of economic and state restructuring and locally specific conditions within which
16
17 economic development activities are situated, and within which their distinctive
18
19 contributions are defined. In this context a regulationist approach can contribute
20
21 significantly by informing the overall approach to the evaluation of U.S. LRED (see
22
23 Valler, Wood and North, 2000 for related discussion).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Given the recent regulationist focus on ongoing regulatory processes outlined above, we
33
34 can derive two very broad basic criteria upon which to construct evaluations of changing
35
36 policy forms and institutional frameworks. These relate to the specific *contributions* of
37
38 economic development activities in (i) managing ongoing crisis tendencies, and (ii)
39
40 facilitating the reproduction of capitalist social relations. Clearly, this is not to suggest
41
42 that individual economic development initiatives could in any way be evaluated in these
43
44 abstract terms *per se*. Rather, LRED activity, operating *in conjunction with* an array of
45
46 socio-political, institutional and cultural forces and processes, may come to play
47
48 distinctive roles in the production of 'regulatory effects', which are themselves
49
50 necessarily 'greater than, or qualitatively different from, the sum of individual effects'
51
52 (PAINTER and GOODWIN, 1995: 335). Such effects are emergent properties of a social
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 system and are inherently relational. They may incorporate specific political
4
5 compromises, institutional forms, social expectations or fiscal and organisational
6
7 arrangements, but it is important to note that regulatory effects do not emerge directly
8
9 from these individual elements, but through critical interrelations amongst these and other
10
11 forms, and may therefore be specified only in terms of the broader system.
12
13

14
15
16
17 In this context the starting point for understanding the ‘meaning’ of LRED activity is in
18
19 defining the ways in which localities and regions come to find a degree of ‘local
20
21 economic integrity’ (EISENSCHITZ and GOUGH, 1993) or ‘structured coherence’
22
23 (HARVEY, 1985) which temporarily stabilizes capitalist reproduction in particular times
24
25 and places. This emerges from the combination of a wide variety of processes and
26
27 practices operating at multiple scales, each with their own geographies and spatial
28
29 structures, and will therefore vary spatially (Painter and Goodwin, 1995: 335). For
30
31 HARVEY:
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 At the heart of that coherence lies a particular technological mix – understood not
40
41 simply as hardware but also as organizational forms – and a dominant set of social
42
43 relations. Together these define models of consumption as well as of the labour
44
45 process. The coherence embraces the standard of living, the qualities and style of
46
47 life, work satisfactions (or lack thereof), social hierarchies (authority structures in
48
49 the workplace, status systems of consumption), and a whole set of sociological and
50
51 psychological attitudes towards living, enjoying, entertaining and the like (1985:
52
53
54
55 140)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 This, in turn, suggests a distinctive approach to evaluation focusing on the extent to
7
8 which, and the ways in which, LRED activity reinforces, reshapes or even undermines
9
10 such coherence in particular places. Clearly, LRED activity may be implicated in many
11
12 aspects of such coherence, ranging across production and consumption relations, social
13
14 and political forms, and cultures and attitudes. Indeed LRED policy may come to play a
15
16 variety of roles - simultaneously economic, political, institutional and cultural - in the
17
18 construction of successful regulatory processes. HARVEY notes, for example:
19
20

21
22
23
24
25 innovation in production requires parallel innovation in consumption. It also
26
27 requires innovation in social and physical infrastructures, spatial forms and broad
28
29 social processes of reproduction. Innovation must extend to lifestyles,
30
31 organizational forms (political, cultural and ideological as well as bureaucratic,
32
33 commercial and administrative) and spatial configurations. (1985, pp. 126-7)
34
35
36
37
38

39 Yet, as we have outlined earlier, localities and regions are inserted differently in wider
40
41 spatial divisions of labour and regulatory structures, and are characterized by distinctive
42
43 social, cultural and institutional forms. Patterns of structured coherence therefore vary
44
45 widely between places, and the contribution of LRED activities to such coherence will be
46
47 similarly diverse. Evaluation must in turn be a more complex and comprehensive
48
49 exercise than it has been to date. For if regulatory processes and effects are different in
50
51 different places, evaluating the contribution of any one particular type of institution or
52
53 activity across these places may involve measuring different things (see Valler, Wood
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and North, 2000).). To return, briefly, to the case of workfare policy in New York City,
4
5 we might reflect on the potential contributions of such a policy form in reinforcing a
6
7 globally competitive, finance- and consumption-oriented regime. Here the key emphases
8
9 of workfare, “flexibility for enterprise; geographic rescaling of economic and social
10
11 intervention; replacement of entitlements with obligations on the part of citizens; and
12
13 coalitional power-holding spanning governmental, civil society, and profit motivated
14
15 actors” (Krinsky, 2006: 158) might perform roles in, for example, responding to fiscal
16
17 crisis, channeling and containing political opposition, enhancing labour market
18
19 flexibility, overcoming important institutional scleroses and managing social polarization.
20
21 However, the key point is that the contribution of these diverse roles in establishing or
22
23 reinforcing effective regulation in New York City specifically, will be distinctive. From
24
25 this viewpoint it is only once we have defined the form of structured coherence in a place
26
27 that we may distill the contribution of LRED activities in these particular arrangements.
28
29 In turn the broadest evaluative questions around LRED activities – of their ‘success’ or
30
31 ‘failure’, ‘appropriateness’ or ‘sustainability’ - can only be determined *in context*, that is
32
33 with regard to their specific contributions to particular accumulation-regulation couplings
34
35 in localities and regions. Evaluative work should therefore reflect the particularity of
36
37 place and the distinctive character of regulation in any given case. In our view this
38
39 promises a more rigorous and flexible starting point for a comprehensive evaluation of
40
41 LRED activity, in contrast to more limited analyses of the specific goals, tasks or
42
43 methods of any one particular institution or process.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4. Concluding Points

In this paper we have argued for an approach which puts U.S. LRED in context. Exploiting the insights of a regulationist approach allows us to explain the evolution of LRED within the broader political-economic dynamics of capitalist development, to judge the distinctive contributions that LRED makes in a broader spatio-temporal 'fix', to locate it as a particular set of activities within a much broader policy context, and to more clearly understand the practical limitations of LRED policy. It provides an explicit theoretical framework within which to interrogate what might count as 'success' or 'failure' in this sphere, and the senses in which LRED policy might be come to be seen as 'sustainable'. Here a regulationist account recognizes that local and regional economic development policy is simultaneously economic, social, political, ideological and cultural, and its contributions to regulatory processes may operate in complex ways across these various spheres. Also, we would argue that in exposing critical aspects of contemporary political-economic dynamics, it can prove extremely valuable in the design and implementation of future policy.

In calling for a deeper engagement with the conceptualization of LRED we recognize that research and writing in the field would become less clearly targeted on straightforward measures of program outputs. The potential of individual LRED schemes for job creation, value for money, investment attraction and the like are best measured through alternative theoretical frameworks and methodological approaches. Yet such analyses lack the

1
2
3 capacity to understand and interpret the overall contribution of LRED within particular
4 political-economic contexts. In this sense the ‘profound meanings’ of LRED policies not
5
6 only rest ‘in the distributional dimensions and substantive effects of these policies’
7
8 (CLARKE, 1993: 88), but critically *in their interrelation with broader economic, social,*
9
10 *political and cultural conditions.* It is only in this broader context that the overall
11
12 meaning of LRED can be appraised.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Of course we would not want to throw the baby out with the bathwater. While the U.S.
21
22 literature in this field has perhaps been preoccupied in recent years with the detailed
23
24 evaluation of particular LRED policies, there is little doubt that this aspect of the
25
26 discipline has developed strongly and has made important contributions to our
27
28 understanding of the practice, and, importantly, the limits, of LRED activity. Indeed, a
29
30 number of key recent contributions in the U.S. have problematized many of the founding
31
32 assumptions regarding the effectiveness of LRED activity (see, for example, PETERS
33
34 and FISHER, 2004). Also, it is apparent that conceptual work alone can become arcane
35
36 and somewhat detached from practice. In the UK, for example, there has been increasing
37
38 recognition that recent theoretical contributions around LRED policy have tended to
39
40 disengage from questions of the material impacts of institutional and policy change (see
41
42 JONES, 1999: 246). This can create its own tensions, as GRANT (1993: 20) wryly
43
44 observes: “As is often the case in Britain, the capacity for analysis is not often matched
45
46 by an ability to bring about change”. What is required then is a rebalancing of the focus,
47
48 and the further development of a conceptual framework which can provide a convincing
49
50 connection between the profound and the apparently mundane.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

AGLIETTA,M. (1979) *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation* London. New Left Books.

AGLIETTA,M (1998) Capitalism at the Turn of the Century: Regulation Theory and the Challenge of Social Change *New Left Review* 41-90

BARTIK,T.J. (2002) 'Evaluating the Impacts of Local Economic Development Policies On Local Economic Outcomes: What Has Been Done and What is Doable?' Upjohn

1
2
3 Institute Staff Working Paper No. 03-89. W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment
4
5 Research
6
7

8
9
10 BARTIK,T.J. BINGHAM,R.D. (1995) 'Can Economic Development Programs Be
11
12 Evaluated?' Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper No.95-29. W.E. Upjohn Institute for
13
14 Employment Research.
15
16

17
18
19 BEAUMONT,E.F. HOVEY,H.A. (1985) State, local and federal economic development
20
21 policies: new federal patterns, chaos or what? *Public Administration Review* 45. 327-32
22
23

24
25
26 BINGHAM,R.D. MIER,R. (1993) *Theories of Local Economic Development* Newbury
27
28 Park, CA. Sage.
29
30

31
32
33 BOYER, R. (1990) *The Regulation School: A Critical Introduction* Columbia University
34
35 Press, New York, NY.
36
37

38
39
40 BRENNER,R (2007) Structure versus conjuncture: The 2006 elections and the rightward
41
42 shift *New Left Review* 43. 33-59
43
44

45
46
47 CAMPBELL,J.L. PEDERSEN,O.K. (2006) 'Institutional competitiveness in the global
48
49 economy: Denmark and the United States' Available at [http://brie.berkeley.edu/conf/DK-
50
51 USA%20Competitiveness-11.pdf](http://brie.berkeley.edu/conf/DK-USA%20Competitiveness-11.pdf) Downloaded June 2nd 2007
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 CLARKE,S.E. (1993) The Profound and the Mundane. *Urban Geography* 14: 78-94.
4
5

6
7
8 CLARKE,S.E. (2001) Well, Maybe . . . : Taking Context Seriously in Analyzing Local
9
10 Economic Development *Economic Development Quarterly* 15.4. 320-322
11

12
13
14
15 CLOKE, P. GOODWIN, M. (1992) Conceptualizing Countryside Change: From Post-
16
17 Fordism to Rural Structured Coherence *Transactions of the Institute of British*
18
19 *Geographers, New Series* 17.3. 321-336.
20
21

22
23
24
25 CRUNDEN, R.M. (1996) *A Brief History of American Culture* North Castle Books.
26
27 Armonk, New York.
28

29
30
31
32 DAVIES,J.S. (2002) Urban regime theory: A normative-empirical critique *Journal of*
33
34 *Urban Affairs* 24.1. 1-17
35

36
37
38
39 EISENSCHITZ, A. and GOUGH, J (1993) *The Politics of Local Economic Policy*
40
41 Basingstoke. Macmillan
42

43
44
45
46 EISENSCHITZ, A. and GOUGH, J. (1998) Theorizing the state in local economic
47
48 governance. *Regional Studies* 32. 759–68.
49

50
51
52
53 EISINGER, P.K. (1988) *The Rise of the Entrepreneurial State* Wisconsin. University of
54
55 Wisconsin Press.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 FASENFEST,D. CIANCANELLI,P. REESE,L.A. (1997) Value, Exchange and the
7
8 Social Economy: Framework and Paradigm Shift in Urban Policy *International Journal*
9
10 *of Urban and Regional Research* 21.1. 7–22.

11
12
13
14
15 FLORIDA, R. and FELDMAN, M. (1988) Housing in US Fordism, *International*
16
17 *Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 12, 187–210.

18
19
20
21
22 FLORIDA, R. and JONAS, A. (1991) US urban policy: The post-war state and capitalist
23
24 regulation *Antipode* 23, 349–384.

25
26
27
28
29 FRIEDMAN, (2000) Microregulation and post-Fordism: critique and development of
30
31 regulation theory *New Political Economy* 5.1. 59-76

32
33
34
35
36 GOODWIN,M. (2001) Regulation as process: Regulation theory and comparative urban
37
38 and regional research *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 16: 71–87

39
40
41
42
43 GOODWIN, M., DUNCAN, S. and HALFORD, S. (1993) Regulation theory, the local
44
45 state and the transition of urban politics *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*
46
47 11, 67–88.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 GOODWIN, M. and PAINTER, J. (1996) Local governance, the crisis of Fordism and
4 the changing geographies of regulation *Transactions of the Institute of British*
5
6
7
8 *Geographers* 21, 635–648.

10
11
12 GOODWIN, M. and PAINTER, J. (1997) Concrete research, urban regimes and
13 regulation theory, in *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory* (Ed., Lauria, M.), Sage,
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 13–29.

22 GORDON, C. (1998) Why No Corporatism in the United States? Business
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Disorganization and its Consequences *Business and Economic History* 27. 1. 29-46

29 GRANT, D.S. Wallace, M. and Pitney, W.D. (1995) Measuring State-Level Economic
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Development Programs, 1970-1992 *Economic Development Quarterly* 9. 2. 134-145.

36 GRANT, W (1993) *Business and Politics in Britain* Macmillan. Basingstoke

41 HARVEY, D. (1985) *The Urbanisation of Capital* Blackwell. Oxford

46 HARVEY, D. (1989) From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation of
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler* 71B. 3–17.

53 HAY, C. (1995) Re-stating the problem of regulation and re-regulating the local state
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Economy and Society 24.3. 387–407.

1
2
3
4
5
6 HENDRICKSON, K. (2004) Bush and the Cities: Urban politics with a moral touch
7
8
9 *Policy Review* 126, August/September

10
11
12 IMMERGUT, E. (1992) 'The Rules of the Game: The Logic of Health Policymaking in
13 France, Switzerland, and Sweden' In Steinmo, S., K. Thelen and F. Longstreth (Eds.),
14
15
16
17 *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* Cambridge,
18
19 MA: Cambridge University Press.

20
21
22
23
24
25 JENSON, J. (1989) Paradigms and political discourse: legislation in France and the
26
27
28 United States before 1914. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 22, 235–58.

29
30
31
32 JENSON, J. (1990) Representations in crisis: the roots of Canada's permeable Fordism.
33
34
35
36 *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 23, 653–83.

37
38
39 JENSON, J. (1993) Naming nations: making nationalist claims in Canadian public
40
41
42
43
44
45 discourse. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 30, 337–58.

46
47
48 JESSOP, B. (1990) Regulation theories in retrospect and prospect. *Economy and Society*
49
50
51
52 19, 153–216.

53
54
55 JESSOP, B. (1997) A neo-Gramscian approach to the regulation of urban regimes. In
56
57
58
59
60 Lauria, M., editor, *Reconstructing urban regime theory*, London: Sage, 51–73.

1
2
3
4
5
6 JESSOP,B. (2002) *The Future of the Capitalist State* Cambridge. Polity Press.
7
8
9

10 JESSOP,B. PECK,J. (1999) Fast policy/local discipline: the politics of time and scale in
11 the neo-liberal workfare offensive *Mimeo*, Department of Sociology, University of
12 Lancaster.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 JESSOP, B., PECK, J. and TICKELL, A. (1999) Retooling the machine: economic crisis,
21 state restructuring and urban politics. In JONAS, A. and WILSON, D., editors, *The urban*
22 *growth machine*, New York: SUNY Press, 141–59.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 JONES,M. (1999) *New Institutional Spaces*. London. Jessica Kingsley.
30
31
32
33

34 KANTOR,P (2007) Globalization and the American model of urban development:
35 making the market *Revue électronique consacrée à l'analyse interdisciplinaire des villes*
36 *et du fait urbain* No.1
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 KING, D. S. (1992) 'The Establishment of Work - Welfare Programs in the United States
44 and Britain: Politics, Ideas, and Institutions' In Steinmo, S., K. Thelen and F. Longstreth
45 (Eds.), *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 KIRBY,A. (1985) Nine fallacies of local economic change *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 21.
4
5 207-20
6
7

8
9
10 KRINSKY,J. (2007) The urban politics of workfare: New York City's welfare reforms
11 and the dimensions of welfare policy making *Urban Affairs Review* 42.6. 771-798
12
13

14
15
16 KRINSKY,J. (2006) The dialectics of privatization and advocacy in New York City's
17 workfare state *Social Justice* 33.3. 158-174
18
19

20
21
22 KRINSKY,J. REESE,E. (2006) Forging and sustaining labor-community coalitions: The
23 workfare justice movement in three cities *Sociological Forum* 21.4. 623-658
24
25

26
27
28 LEHNE,R. (2006) *Government and Business: American Political Economy in*
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

MOLOTCH,H. (1991) The political economy of urban growth machines *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15.29-53

PAINTER, J. and GOODWIN, M. (1995) Local governance and concrete research: Investigating the uneven development of regulation *Economy and Society* 24, 334-356.

1
2
3
4
5
6 PECK, J. and TICKELL, A. (1992) Local modes of social regulation? Regulation theory,
7
8 Thatcherism and uneven development *Geoforum* 23.3. 347-363
9

10
11
12 PECK, J. and TICKELL, A. (1995) The social regulation of uneven development:
13
14 'Regulatory deficit', England's South East and the collapse of Thatcherism *Environment*
15
16 *and Planning A*, 27, 15-40.
17
18

19
20
21
22 PETERS,A. FISHER,P. (2004) The failures of economic development incentives *Journal*
23
24 *of the American Planning Association* 70.1. 27-37
25
26

27
28
29 PRIOR,A. (2005) UK Planning Reform: A Regulationist Interpretation *Planning Theory*
30
31 *& Practice* 6.4. 465-484
32
33

34
35
36 PURCELL,M. (2002) The state, regulation, and global restructuring: reasserting the
37
38 political in political economy *Review of International Political Economy* 9.2. 298-332
39
40

41
42
43 REESE,L.A. FASENFEST,D (1997) What works best? Values and the evaluation of
44
45 local economic development policy *Economic Development Quarterly* 11.3. 195-207
46
47

48
49
50 REESE,L.A. ROSENFELD,R.A. (2001) Yes, But . . . : Questioning the Conventional
51
52 Wisdom About Economic Development *Economic Development Quarterly* 15.4. 299-312
53
54

1
2
3 REESE,L.A. ROSENFELD,R.A. (2004) Local economic development in the United
4 States and Canada: Institutionalizing Policy Approaches *American Review of Public*
5
6
7
8 *Administration* 34.3. 277-292
9

10
11
12 TICKELL, A. and PECK, J. (1995) Social regulation after Fordism, *Economy and*
13
14
15 *Society* 24. 357–386.
16

17
18
19
20 TROGEN,P. FEIOCK,R. (1996) “Public Policies and Economic Growth: Stretching the
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Public Dollar.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society for
Public Administration

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
VALLER,D. WOOD,A. NORTH,P. (2000) Local governance and local business
interests: A critical review *Progress in Human Geography* 24.3. 409-428

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
WIEWEL,W. TIETZ,M. GILOTH,R. (1993) ‘The economic development of
neighbourhoods and localities’ Chapter 4 in R.D.BINGHAM and R.MIER (eds) *Theories*
of Local Economic Development Newbury Park, CA. Sage. 80-99.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
WILSON,J.J. (1999) ‘An institutionalist take on state activism in economic development:
A theoretical system’ *International Journal of Economic Development* 1.3. 1-29.
Available at: <http://www.fsu.edu/~spap/archive/symposium/WILSON.pdf> (Downloaded
March 1st 2007)