

Examining the Relationship between Spatial Structure and Regional Disparities in the Provinces of Iran

Sedigheh Lotfi*

Professor of Geography and Urban Planning, University of Mazandaran, Iran.

Mojtaba Shahbi Shahmiri

M.A. in Urban and Regional Planning, University of Tehran, Iran.

Sasan Roushenas

M.A. in Urban and Regional Planning, University of Allameh Tabatabaee, Tehran, Iran.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

Assumptions about relationship between spatial structure and regional disparities reduction once has attracted the attention of policy makers and scholars alongside with the introduction of polycentric development policies in Europe and national level during the recent decades. Accordingly the present article attempted by examining the economic and experimental test of such assumptions in the country to establish a foundation for supporting the polycentric development policies. In this regard a review on economic growth models show that these theories paid a little heed to the development of city structure and the role which it can play in the reduction of regional disparities. So, there is a weak theoretical base of relations between regional economic growth, polycentric and disparities as assumed by many policies. This study tried to find out an experimental basis for this relation. The main question is that whether a polycentric urban structure is really effective on the reduction of regional disparities?

Research Methodology

The present research is applied by aim and regarding to its nature and procedure include a correctional study. In this regard, to answer the main question of the study; in first step the different provinces of country are measured for their level of polycentricism. Then by using the secondary data of regional disparities of each province extracted from statistical records from Statistical Center of Iran; the correlation between two components were determined using Pearson method. For more detail analysis; firstly the correlation among the components, polycentric indicators and regional disparities were illustrated in 2012 and in next stage such correlation between components and polycentric indexes and the level of variations of each regional disparity index was shown in 2005 and 2012. In this study, the primate city index, focal analyses were applied for measuring the dimensions of polycentricism. Also, Gini coefficient, dispersion index and the poor's share of consumption were used to show the disparity.

Results and Findings

The results from 31 provinces of the country showed no evidences regarding to the association between the spatial dispersion of cities or balanced distribution of centers and in general polycentric/mono-centric can reduce disparities in the region. So that all obtained figures were less than 0.35. This means that correlation coefficient among the variables explained even less than 0.4 percent of their variations. Also the direction of correlation supported mono-centric urban systems. Other variables illustrated even lesser associations such as coefficient of correlations for polycentric/mono-centric development, the variation of Gini coefficient, dispersion index and the share of consumptions of poor. These findings confirmed the results of Sandberg and Meijers (2008) which showed weak connection between polycentric development and regional disparity in European countries. But in the present research there was a weak indirect correlation between polycentric and regional disparity. However these findings showed a less direct significant link of spatial structure on the trend of reduction of spatial disparities; however it supported the

* Email: s.lotfi@umz.ac.ir

polycentric system slightly. While the results of Sandberg and Meijers indicated the positive role of mono-centric system on the reduction of regional disparities. Also assessment of relationship between regional disparity and the most polycentric and mono-centric of different provinces indicated an important point. So that this not only showed the significant and considerable correlation (0.546) between two components but it supported the polycentric structures strongly. While the correlation of disparities and distribution of center size increased the figure to 0.7.

Conclusion

It now can be concluded that at least in the case of Iran; contrary to some assumptions under influence of early intervention and current technological and structural changes; it does not confirm that the concept of inequality and periphery will become more spatial issue. So there is a need of deeper knowledge to theoretical and its backup like regionalism to adopt "polycentric development". From this perspective, further attention should be given to institutional approaches and capacity in the analysis of regional issues like disparity. However the results of these studies have not been able to provide empirical justification for the claim that polycentric development can reduce disparity and lead to solidarity; but it can shift the attention of commentators towards theoretical foundations of polycentric development and the change from a descriptive-analytical conception to a normative concept; and from a mere spatial term to a network of cooperation and coordination. So it seems essential other researches to concentrate not only on the economic-geographical aspects but on institutional and its relations with the claims of polycentric development; certainly such studies could help better understanding of development policies for implementation in the country.

Keywords: Spatial structure, polycentric development, regional disparity, size distributions, centers.

References

1. Angelidis, M. 2005. Polycentricity in Policies: The Greek Case, *Built Environment*, 31, pp.112-121.
2. Baudelle, G. and J. Peyrony, 2005. Striving for Equity: Polycentric Development Policies in France, *Built Environment*, 31, pp.103-111.
3. CEC, (Commission of the European Communities), 1999, *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the EU*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
4. CEC (Commission of the European Communities), 2001, *Unity, Solidarity, Diversity for Europe, Its People and Territory. Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
5. Davoudi, S. 2003, *Polycentricity in European Spatial Planning: From an Analytical Tool to a Normative Agenda*, *European Planning Studies*, 11(8), 979-999.
6. Faludi, A. 2005, *Polycentric territorial cohesion policy*, *Town Planning Review*, 76, pp.107-118.
7. Fujita, M., Krugman, P., and Venables, A.J. 1999, *The Spatial Economy. Cities, Regions and International Trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
8. Fujita, M. and P. Krugman, 2004, "The New Economic Geography: Past, Present and the Future", *Papers in Regional Science* 83, 139-164.
9. Fujita, M., Mori, T. 2005, *Frontiers of the New Economic Geography*, *Papers in Regional Science*, 84, 3. pp 377- 405.
10. Friedmann, J. 1966, *Regional Development Policy: A Case Study of Venezuela*. M.I.T. Press
11. Hague, C & Kirk, K, 2003, *Polycentricity scoping study*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
12. Hirschman, A.O. 1958, *The Strategy of Development*, New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
13. Kaldor, N. 1970, *The case for regional policies*, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 17, pp.337-48.
14. Krieger-Boden, C. 2000, *Globalization, Integration and Regional Specialisation*. Kiel Working Paper 1009. Kiel.
15. Krugman, P. 1991, *Geography and Trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
16. Krugman, P. and R.L. Elizondo, 1986, *Trade policy and the Third World metropolis*, *Journal of Development Economics*, 49, pp.137-150.
17. Krugman, P. and A.J. Venables, 1996, *Integration, specialisation and adjustment*, *European Economic Review*, 40, pp. 857-880.
18. Meijers, E.J., Waterhout, B. and Zonneveld, W.A.M. 2007, *Closing the GAP: Territorial cohesion through polycentric development*. *European Journal of Spatial Development*, 24, October 2007.
19. Meijers, E.J. 2008, *Measuring polycentricity and its promises*, *European Planning Studies*, 16, pp. 1313-1323.
20. Meijers, E. and K. Sandberg. 2008, *Reducing regional disparities by means of polycentric development: panacea or placebo?* *ScienzeRegionali*, 7, pp. 71-96.
21. Meijers, E., Waterhout, B. and W. Zonneveld, 2005, *Polycentric Development Policies in European Countries*, *Built Environment*, 31, pp.97-102.
22. Myrdal, G. 1957, *Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions*, London: Duckworth.
23. Nordregio et al., 2004, *ESPON 1.1.1: Potentials for polycentric development in Europe*. Project Report. Stockholm/Luxembourg: Nordregio/ESPON Monitoring Committee.
24. Ottaviano, G.I.P. and D. Puga, 1997, *Agglomeration in the Global Economy: A Survey of the 'New Economic Geography'*. CEPR Discussion Papers 1699, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers.
25. Parr, J.B. 2004, *The Polycentric Urban Region: A Closer Inspection*, *Regional Studies*, 38, pp.231-240.

26. Perroux, F. 1955, Note sur la notion de pole de croissance, *Economique appliqué*, 1-2, pp.307-320.
27. Portnov, B. and D. Felsenstein, 2005, Measures of Regional Inequality for Small Countries, pp. 47-62 in Felsenstein D. and Portnov B. (Eds) *Regional Disparities in Small Countries*, Heidelberg: Springer.
28. Romein, A. Meijers, E. 2003, Planning Polycentric Urban Regions in North West Europe. Delft: Delft University Press, *Housing and Urban Policy Studies* 25, 7-32.
29. Romer, P.M. 1986. Increasing returns and long-run growth, *Journal of Political Economy*, 94, pp.500-521.
30. Romer, P.M. 1990, Endogenous technological change, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, pp. S71-101.
31. Strategic Research Center. 2006, Income inequity in Iran 2003. The deputy of Economic researches. Tehran (In Persian).
32. Statistical Center of Iran .2013, Income distribution among the urban and rural households in Iran 2001- 2012. Tehran (In Persian).
33. Taghvaei, M & Mousavi, M. 2009, A critique on indicators of primate city and presenting of a new indicator; an analytical view on primate city indexes in Iran. *Journal of Environmental studies*, No 1 (1). Pp. 25-34. (in Persian).
34. Venables, A.J. 1996, Equilibrium location with vertically-linked industries, *International Economic Review*, 37, pp.341-359.
35. Veneri, & Burgalassi, David, 2010. "Questioning polycentric development and its effects: issues of definition and measurement for the Italian NUTS 2 Regions", MPRA Paper 26410, University Library of Munich, Germany.
36. Waterhout, B., Zonneveld, W. and E. Meijers, 2005, Polycentric development policies in Europe: Overview and Debate, *Built Environment*, 31, pp.163-173.
37. Zonneveld, W., Meijers, E. and Waterhout, B. 2004, The Application of Polycentricity in European Countries. Part A: Analysis; Part B: Country Reports. Published as Annex Report B of 'ESPON 1.1.1: Potentials for polycentric development in Europe; Project report'. Stockholm/Luxembourg: Nordregio/ESPON Monitoring Committee.