

TERRITORIAL MANAGEMENT IN THE SPHERE OF SOCIAL-SPATIAL PLANNING, SPATIAL ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL AS A PRACTICE OF REPRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SPACE*

Vahan Yengidunyan , ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9038-2642>
PhD student, Department of theory and history of sociology, Yerevan State University.
E-mail: vahan.engidunyan@ysu.am

Abstract: Interactions between society and social spaces due to the continuous increase in the complexity of social relations are subjected to permanent reinterpretations. In this context, the previous mechanisms of development and reform of spaces are being replaced by more systematic and multi-vector practices. Currently, socio-spatial planning approaches are considered the most applicable in the context of spatial development and reform, which, based on the representativeness of planning processes and decision-making, offer an effective toolkit for the interaction of society, the expert community and state institutions. At the same time, however, emphasizing the need to ensure the technical standards of spatial reform, strictly professional processes of reform are relatively separated, placing them under the system of spatial organization. The engagement of the professional community, state institutions and society in the process of spatial reforms inevitably leads to the formation of a specific role-status decision-making system, where each subject is endowed with a certain right to make decisions and the power. In this way, the interactions between place leadership and process management emerge, which as a result reproduce the existing system of spatial control. As it becomes clear from the analysis of approaches related to spatial reform, there is a comprehensive system of knowledge on socio-spatial planning, spatial organization and control, but there is a lack of knowledge in the context of highlighting the interrelationships between the above-mentioned concepts, which is also a consequence of not considering the mentioned components in one general conceptual unit. In the framework of this work, an attempt is made to overcome this limitation by offering a new approach to the concept of territorial management (which is already in use) as a practice combining the components of socio-spatial planning, spatial organization and control of spatial reform, within the context of which a new definition of territorial management is also given.

Key words: *social space, engagement, socio-spatial planning, spatial organization, spatial control, territorial management*

*



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Received: 28.04.2024
Revised: 24.05.2024
Accepted: 02.07.2024
© The Author(s) 2024

**ՏԱՐԱԾՔԱՅԻՆ ԿԱՌԱՎԱՐՈՒՄԸ ՍՈՑԻԱԼ-ՏԱՐԱԾԱԿԱՆ ՊԼԱՆԱՎՈՐՄԱՆ,
ՏԱՐԱԾԱԿԱՆ ԿԱԶՄԱԿԵՐՊՄԱՆ ԵՎ ՎԵՐԱՀՄԿՄԱՆ ՏԻՐՈՒՅԹՈՒՄ ՈՐՊԵՏ
ՍՈՑԻԱԼԱԿԱՆ ՏԱՐԱԾՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՎԵՐԱՐՏԱԴՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՊՐԱԿՏԻԿԱ**

Վահան Ենգիդունյան, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9038-2642>

ԵՊՀ սոցիոլոգիայի տեսության և պատմության ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ:

Էլ. Փոստ՝ vahan.engidunyan@ysu.am

Ամփոփում: Հասարակության և սոցիալական տարածությունների միջև փոխազդեցությունները, պայմանավորված հասարակական հարաբերությունների բազմաբարդության շարունակական աճով, ենթարկվում են մշտական վերաիմաստավորումների: Այս համատեքստում տարածությունների զարգացման և բարեփոխման նախկին մեխանիզմներին փոխարինելու են գալիս առավել համակարգված և բազմավեկտոր պրակտիկաները: Ներկայումս տարածությունների զարգացման և բարեփոխման համատեքստում ավելի կիրառական են համարվում սոցիալ-տարածական պլանավորման մոտեցումները, որոնք, հիմնվելով պլանավորման գործընթացների և որոշումների կայացման ներկայացուցչականության վրա՝ առաջարկում են հասարակության, փորձագիտական հանրության և պետական ինստիտուտների փոխգործակցության գործունարարունավետ գործիքակազմ: Միևնույն ժամանակ, սակայն, կարևորելով տարածական բարեփոխման տեխնիկական չափանիշների ապահովման անհրաժեշտությունը, հարաբերականորեն տարանջատվում են բարեփոխման խիստ մասնագիտական գործընթացները՝ տեղավորվելով տարածական կազմակերպման համակարգի ներքո: Մասնագիտական հանրության, պետական ինստիտուտների և հասարակության ներգրավվածությունը տարածական բարեփոխումների գործընթացում անխուսափելիորեն հանգեցնում է որոշումների կայացման դերաստատուսային կոնկրետ համակարգի ձևավորման, որտեղ յուրաքանչյուր սուբյեկտ օժտված է որոշումներ կայացնելու որոշակի իրավասությամբ և իշխանությամբ: Այդպիսով ի հայտ են գալիս տեղի լիդերության և գործընթացների ղեկավարման միջև փոխառնչություններ, որոնք արդյունքում վերարտադրում են տարածական վերահսկողության առկա համակարգը: Ինչպես պարզ է դառնում տարածական բարեփոխմանն առնչվող մոտեցումների վերլուծությունից, առկա է սոցիալ-տարածական պլանավորման, տարածական կազմակերպման և վերահսկման վերաբերյալ գիտելիքի համապարփակ համակարգ, որտեղ, սակայն, կա գիտելիքի սղություն վերոնշյալ կոնցեպտների միջև առկա փոխկապվածությունների վերհանման համատեքստում, ինչը նաև նշյալ բաղադրիչները մեկ ընդհանուր հասկացության միավորում չդիտարկելու հետևանքն է: Սույն աշխատանքի շրջանակներում փորձ է արվում հաղթահարելու այդ սահմանափակումը՝ առաջարկելով արդեն իսկ կիրառվող տարածքային կառավարման հասկացության նոր մոտեցում, այն է՝ տարածական բարեփոխման սոցիալ-տարածական պլանավորման, տարածական կազմակերպման և վերահսկման բաղադրիչները միավորող պրակտիկա, որի համատեքստում տրվում է նաև տարածքային կառավարման նոր սահմանում:

Բանալի բառեր - *սոցիալական տարածություն, ներգրավվածություն, սոցիալ-տարածական պլանավորում, տարածական կազմակերպում, տարածական վերահսկում, տարածքային կառավարում*

ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ В СФЕРЕ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПРОСТРАНСТВЕННОГО ПЛАНИРОВАНИЯ, ПРОСТРАНСТВЕННОЙ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ И КОНТРОЛЯ КАК ПРАКТИКА ВОСПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЯ СОЦИАЛЬНОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА

Ваган Енгидунян, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9038-2642>

аспирант кафедры теории и истории социологии ЕГУ.

Эл. Почта: vahan.engidunyan@ysu.am

Аннотация: Взаимодействия между обществом и социальных пространствах в силу постоянного усложнения социальных отношений подвергаются постоянным реинтерпретациям. В этом контексте прежние механизмы развития и реформирования пространств заменяются более системными и многовекторными практиками. В настоящее время наиболее применимыми в условиях пространственного развития и реформирования считаются подходы социально-пространственного планирования, которые на основе репрезентативности процессов планирования и принятия решений предлагают эффективный инструментарий взаимодействия общества, экспертного сообщества и государственных институтов. Однако при этом, подчеркивая необходимость обеспечения технических стандартов пространственного реформирования, строго профессиональные процессы реформирования относительно обособляются, помещая их в систему пространственной организации. Вовлечение профессионального сообщества, государственных институтов и общества в процесс пространственных реформ неизбежно приводит к формированию специфической ролевой-статусной системы принятия решений, где каждый субъект наделен определенным правом принятия решений и властью. Таким образом, возникают взаимодействия местного лидерства и процессов управления, которые в результате воспроизводят существующую систему пространственного контроля. Как становится ясно из анализа смежных подходов относившийся к пространственным реформам, существует комплексная система знаний по социально-пространственному планированию, пространственной организации и контролю, но отсутствует знание в контексте освещения взаимосвязей между вышеперечисленными понятиями, что также является следствием того, что упомянутые компоненты не наблюдаются под одним общим понятием. В рамках данной работы предпринята попытка преодолеть это ограничение, предложив новый подход к уже используемой концепции территориального управления, изучая его как практику, объединяющую компоненты социально-пространственного планирования, пространственной организации и контроля пространственной реформы, в контексте которой также дается новое определение территориального управления.

Ключевые слова: *социальное пространство, вовлеченность, социально-пространственное планирование, пространственная организация, пространственный контроль, территориальное управление*

Socio-spatial planning as a representative process of spatial reform

The process of reproduction of social spaces conditions the possibilities of consumption of the space for the subjects operating in it. The continuum of intersubjective relations creates complex systems of relations that can no longer be served by previous mechanisms of space consumption. In the context of reorganizing relations and increasing their effectiveness, there is a need to change the logic of social space reproduction, moving from simple reproduction to space planning. Spatial planning is an approach to the reproduction of space, in which the idea of space consumption is reinterpreted, linking it to group demands, interests and rationality. According to Hall (Hall, 1990), the consumption of space can be achieved through spatial

planning that balances the form of space with function and content with structure.

From the point of view of structuring and development of space, spatial planning is based on a number of processes such as: development of efficient construction, preservation of agricultural land, improvement of quality of life, etc. The mentioned approaches show that the reproduction of the space from the point of view of its planning requires special knowledge and, therefore, not all individuals sharing the same space can be involved in the planning processes. Thus, specialization of spatial planning takes place and a professional community of planning is formed. Although spatial planning develops in the direction of specialization, at the same time, subjects operating in planned spaces reproduce a system of spatial perceptions, which conditions their cognitions about the desired type of social space, in the conditions of continuous accumulation of memories and experience. Under such conditions, there is a risk that professional-rational approaches to spatial planning may be opposed to the everyday knowledge of local identities about space, leading to disruption of the planning process.

In the context of overcoming the discussed contradiction in the process of spatial planning, it brings forward the inevitability of rethinking planning knowledge, thus changing the conceptual basis of spatial planning (Վերսիշյան, Ենգիկունյան, 2023). Thus, the idea of socio-spatial planning is formed, in which professional knowledge is combined with the sense of place of subjects operating in the local space, which are the fundamental components of the cognitive aspect of planning. Note that sense of place is defined here as "...people's subjective perceptions of their environments and their more or less conscious feelings about those environments ...involving both an interpretive perspective on the environment and an emotional reaction to the environment" (Hummon, 2012: 262). The concept of socio-spatial planning, developed by Erdiaw-Kwaise and Basson, is defined as "...the branch of planning focused on understanding why different groups of people embrace, contest or reject spatial changes, how they take a lead in shaping their own space, and ways to make them active in spatial transformations» (Erdiaw-Kwaise, Basson, 2017: 3). The socio-spatial planning approach enshrines the vital importance of professional community-society mutually agreed and equal relationship in spatial planning processes, as well as ensuring public engagement in planning decisions.

Socio-spatial planning enables the process of harmonizing the physical and social components of space by attaching a social sensibility to the spatial structure. In the context of planning, the engagement of new social groups and the entry of new structures of spatial cognition into the existing system of knowledge not only transforms that system, but also leads to a redistribution of planning decision-making power. Socio-spatial planning has a development trend and is directly related to the growth of participation of entities operating in local spaces. With the continued growth of participation, socio-spatial planning is being redefined as participatory planning. According to Horelli, participatory spatial planning is a "...social, ethical, and political practice in which individuals or groups, assisted by a set of tools, take part in varying degrees at the overlapping phases of the planning and decision-making cycle that may bring forth outcomes congruent with the participants' needs and interests"(Horelli, 2002: 611-612). The participation of different groups in spatial planning decisions is variable, which means that depending on the situation, the above can be manifested in different degrees. This idea finds its place in the eight-level system of participation developed by Arnstein (Arnstein, 1969), which is completed by three main

types. They are: non-participation, tokenism and citizen (group) power. Non-participation of non-professional groups in planning processes is manifested by difficult access to necessary planning information and false engagement in the decision-making process. At the tokenistic level of engagement, the public is partially informed about planning processes, participates in consultative discussions, but their influence on the process is symbolic. Finally, at the level of citizen (group) power, groups operating in planned spaces are considered not only as beneficiaries, but also as partners who can have a dominant influence on decision-making.

The aforementioned approaches document the existence of a connection between engagement in planning processes in social spaces and a sense of place, which is also discussed by Manzo and Perkins (Manzo, Perkins, 2006). According to the authors, in the context of connectedness in significant spaces, not only the sense of connectedness with the specified space is worthy of attention, but also the connectedness between the members of the social group operating in that space, which reproduces the social capital of the group (Jenson, 2010). In this context, social capital "...refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Putnam, 2000: 225): Ongoing spatial reforms, mainly related to the consumption of space, are designed and implemented through collective action with various stakeholders. Therefore, according to Zhou and others (Zhou et al., 2023), the successful development and implementation of reforms is also determined by social capital, which consists of cognitive, structural and relational dimensions. The cognitive dimension relates to the public's perception of the changes and goals being implemented and satisfaction with the work being done. The structural dimension refers to communication with other people about the changes, and the relational dimension refers to the trust and willingness to share the received information with both policymakers and the community population.

In the framework of socio-spatial planning, the effective functioning of the population is also characterized by the ability to adapt to changes. Adaptability, according to Jakku and Lynam (Jakku, Lynam, 2010: 10) "...comprises the properties of a system that enable it to modify itself in order to maintain or achieve a desired state in the face of perceived or actual stress". Research shows that, in particular, the indicators measuring this concept at the level of households relate to the population's awareness of changes, skills, household well-being, access to services, etc (CARE International, 2022), as well as indicators characterizing socio-economic status, such as unemployment rate, median household income, percentage of households living in their own home (Edgemon et al., 2018).

The above-mentioned approaches to social capital and adaptability allow us to assert the possibility of viewing these components within a single conceptual unit. That unit is resilience, which "... is a measure of the sustained ability of a community to utilize available resources to respond to, withstand, and recover from adverse situations" (Bosher, Chmutina, 2017: 32). In fact, engagement and resilience together form the component of social sustainability, which in turn, together with sense of place, completes the concept of socio-spatial planning.

The specialized practice of space reform: the spatial organization

If in the context of socio-spatial planning we are talking about the development of the spatial planning discourse in society and the engagement of different social groups in planning decisions, then its further implementation is mostly connected with the idea

of spatial organization. It, according to Deprez and Tissen "...involves the design and management of 'spatial arrangements', i.e. of the purposeful mix of 'physical', 'virtual' and 'mental' spaces as part of and shaping the organizational landscape" (Lekanne Deprez, Tissen, 2008: 3). In the framework of spatial organization, it is possible to implement a number of such processes as: differentiation of consumption spaces, redistribution of residents in the space, distribution of labor force, differentiation of income and other socio-economic indicators (Wong, 2001). In this context, the approaches of Volpati and Barthelemy (Volpati, Barthelemy, 2018) deserve attention. The authors propose a heterogeneity measure called the Gini coefficient (an adapted version of a coefficient widely used in economics) and an index of dispersion at the marginal population level. Contrary to the mentioned authors, Bertaud (Bertaud, 2003) proposes to use population size, density (including in built space), built space per capita and dispersion index to overcome the limitation of lack of specific secondary data. However, the indicators proposed by both Volpati and Bertaud do not characterize the socio-spatial impact of spatial organization and therefore are not sufficient to reveal the existing picture of spatial organization. The dimensions of the socio-economic component of spatial organization are related to the population's access to infrastructure, services and facilities that form the microclimate necessary for the consumption of space (Shafique et al., 2021). Thus, spatial organization turns into a system of actions aimed at increasing the social vitality of space. The Australian Institute of Urban Studies has a unique place in the international research effort on the relationship between spatial organization and social vitality, and the social infrastructure index created by it simultaneously identifies both the existence of various infrastructures and services and their accessibility for the population (Davern et al., 2017).

The above-mentioned approaches show that in contrast to socio-spatial planning, in the case of spatial organization, the engagement of community groups decreases, giving way to professional activities. At the same time, it would be wrong to claim that spatial organization is related exclusively to the activities of spatial planning specialists. Those social groups that operate in social spaces, if not directly, then indirectly affect the organization of space. The value system, the demands, the lifestyle, the cultural elements characterizing the group are those that reinterpret the organization of the space, as according to Rapoport (Rapoport, 1994), since the existence of a social group is conditioned by the need for self-organization, the organization of space is also defined as an essential component of self-organization.

Spatial control in the domain of multi-stakeholder processes of spatial reform

In the context of spatial development and planning, due to the existence of interactions between different groups of society, the phenomenon of leadership is put to the fore. The existing decision-making system in spatial planning and organization processes implies leadership relationships within and between social groups, which are based on authority derived from formal and informal interactions. Concepts of social space and leadership intersect in concepts of place leadership. According to Sotarauta (Sotarauta, 2016), the research question of place leadership is within the framework of the analysis of the relationship between the latter and governance and power. In this context, governance is seen as a factor that strengthens or hinders place leadership. It is worth noting the fact that place leadership is representative in nature, which implies diversification of the leadership function in spatial development processes and decisions.

Thus, the power over the management of space is divided between formal and informal leaders, whose intersubjective relationships define and legitimize the existing system of place leadership. Given the complexity of relationships, Colledge, Parker, and others (Colledge et al., 2022) propose a collaborative circle approach to place leadership. The authors distinguish three main functions of place leadership: initiative, cooperation development, and system and operation. The initiative function includes: engaging other stakeholders, inspiring, having a vision, communicating. At the same time, the development of cooperation implies the sub-functions of creativity, decision-making, creating connections, and the function of system and operation: the sub-functions of strategy, management, regulation. Thus the definition of a place leadership is given. Place leaders, are those who "...display common leadership traits but are motivated by a personal connection to place, believe they have a civic responsibility to it and have professional skills and knowledge to undertake their job with a high degree of competence" (Colledge et al., 2022: 11).

As it was mentioned, place leadership is closely related to governance, therefore, moving to the phenomenon of governance, we should note that a number of relationships are put forward, characterize the governance system. These interactions, according to Hewege (Hewege, 2012), are attributed to the governor, the governed, the governance method and the governance context. In particular, there are power and authority relations between the governor and the governed, the connection between the governor and the governance methods is provided by rules and regulations, and the interactions between the governor and the governance context operate in the fields of rules, norms and information. Hewege's approach to governance presents the static aspect of governing, which can be complemented with processual components. These, in turn, range from defining problems to measuring performance and correcting deviations (Misun, 2017). The relationship discussed between the theoretical approaches of place leadership and governance is the primary basis on which the concept of control of spatial change is formed.

Socio-spatial planning and spatial organization, as the result of processes determined by the relationship between planners and the population in the context of spatial development, are controlled by both the mentioned actors and other interested entities. From the point of view of the sociological interpretation of control, the conceptual approach of spatial equality is worthy of attention, according to which spatial inequalities arise from ineffective management, which in turn is manifested within the framework of access to space, consumption and redistribution of this consumption. Achmani and others (Achmani et al., 2020) state that the consumption of space should mean how the space is developed (for example, the creation of public structures, social houses, green spaces, etc.). At the same time, access to space refers to the possibilities of control over the resources of the space and the transfer of land rights, while redistribution is more related to the division and redistribution of space by planners, as well as ensuring equal access to them. Analyzing the relationship between spatial equality and control, we can claim that control aimed at spatial equality is based on the state strategy and policy of spatial development.

In the modern society, however, the control of socio-spatial planning is related not only to the existing state policy of spatial development, but also to the actions carried out by local self-government bodies. As an institution for ensuring the sovereignty of the population in a limited space, local state governments (LSG) are endowed with the tools of management and management of public life, which makes it possible to exercise control in various

spheres of public relations and, in particular, in the context of spatial development. At the same time, control by LSGs is a multi-stakeholder process and is based on the expectations of the parties involved. Thus, prerequisites are created for the structuring of the role of local governments as capable and democratic agents of control in spatial reforms.

Territorial management as a practice integrating the processes of socio-spatial planning, spatial organization and control

The approaches discussed, which refer to socio-spatial planning, spatial organization and control, separately, provide the knowledge and a system of measurable indicators necessary for the research of the latter. However, in the context of in-depth research on the interrelationships between them, the lack of knowledge remains relevant. The identification of interrelationships between socio-spatial planning, spatial organization and control will make it possible to form such approaches to spatial development, which will no longer be limited to the extraction of certain trends, but will create a cause-and-effect system of the processes taking place and allow to realize predictions of the manifestation of realities. Therefore, the primary question remains how the connection between the above phenomena is possible in the context of existing conceptual differences. At first glance, a vague connection can be observed within the framework of the concept of "management". In this context, the approaches of Henri Fayol (Fayol, 1954) regarding the definition of general management functions deserve attention. According to Fayol, the fundamental functions of management are planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and leading. Currently, in the context of the modification of Fayol's model of management functions, the function of leadership is introduced instead of the functions of command and coordination (Lloyd, Aho, 2020). Because the above-mentioned functional separation refers to general management, therefore, its application in other manifestations of management becomes possible. Thus, the concept of territorial management is proposed as a conceptual unit combining the discussed socio-spatial processes.

Territorial management is a multidimensional phenomenon, which determines the diversity of existing theoretical approaches to it. When we analyze the existing knowledge on territorial management, we are faced with two fundamental systemic approaches to the definition of territorial management. According to the first approach, territorial management is equated with place management and, therefore, a number of definitions are given according to which it is "...a coordinated, area-based, multi-stakeholder approach to improve locations, harnessing the skills, experiences and resources of those in the private, public and voluntary sectors" (The Institute of Place Management, 2021: 1). The other approach establishes territorial management as a relatively isolated and self-sufficient concept from other spatial practices. Here, the approaches to the interpretation of territorial management provided by Wafa, are worthy of attention. According to abovementioned author, territorial management is "... a mode of governance that takes into account the impact of various actions and structures implemented on social cohesion, strategies for economic diversification, environmental protection and conservation, as well as the ability to clearly define its actions ... ensures the coherence of these actions, their feasibility, and their effects on the development of a community or region ... also involves ... management, and environmental changes to enhance the resilience of territories and societies" (Wafa, 2024: 84). This approach to territorial management, in contrast to the above, is more practical, because it allows to distinguish the main principles of territorial management, which refer to both territorial

efficiency, equality, stability, as well as representativeness of the management process.

Emphasizing the territorial and non-local or spatial component of management with the proposed approach is justified by the fact that the processes of organization, planning and control of social spaces are inevitably combined with role-status relations between different social groups, which condition engagement in the above processes due to the redistribution of power. From this point of view, space turns into a phenomenon in which and over which different social groups exercise their power. There is a transformation of space into territory that according to Delaney is a "...social space the "meanings" of which implicate the operation of social relational power. It is, in a sense, an expression of the fusion of meaning, power, and social space" (Delaney, 2009: 219). In the context of territorial management, the principle of multidimensionality of management of spatial development is emphasized. The state, local government, self-government bodies and the community population, often acting through groups, unions, or organizations, act as agents of territorial management. As a result, the relations between the above-mentioned management agents are institutionalized. In particular, if the state government, with its management system, acts as a coordinator of actions aimed at the realization of the universal priorities and goals of the territorial management, then the local self-government bodies play the role of a mediator between the state and the population. Territorial management with the mentioned mechanism leads to the increase of territorial cohesion, which is simultaneously a consequence of the harmonization of both sectoral and territorial policies and territorial engagements (Crespo, Cabral, 2010). Also worthy of attention is the fact that the representativeness of territorial management provides an opportunity to form participative planning mechanisms conditioned by the specificity of the territory, which according to Jouini (Jouini et al., 2019) and Eraso (Eraso, 2021) are applicable not only in urban but also in rural areas.

Although the above-mentioned approaches to territorial management provide knowledge about territories, as unique manifestations of social spaces, as well as socio-spatial characteristics of territorial management, there is a knowledge gap, especially in the context of extracting the fundamental components of territorial management, which will make it possible to define territorial management in its conceptual schematization. Within the framework of the solution of this problem, taking into account the existing approaches to territorial management and applying Fayol and Lloyd's approaches to management, a new approach to territorial management is proposed, which is based on the dimensions of socio-spatial planning, organization and control. The above-mentioned approach to territorial management is justified in the context of connections between the latter and socio-spatial planning, spatial organization and control. In essence, socio-spatial planning is an alternative to traditional approaches to space consumption, where the bureaucratic and insensitive system of spatial management is replaced by the inclusion of professional and non-professional decision-making groups. In this way, socio-spatial planning is introduced into territorial management, linked to spatial organization.

In parallel, spatial control turns into an instrumental unit of the conceptual system of territorial management, which mainly fulfills the role of ensuring stable interactions of socio-spatial planning and spatial organization. The choice of control as a component of territorial management is justified by the fact that, the conclusions made in the previous paragraphs, command, coordination and leadership approaches are combined under the function of control. Therefore, according to the proposed approach, control is accepted

as a separate comprehensive unit and component of territorial management. The three-dimensional model of territorial management creates an opportunity to give a new meaning to the system of knowledge about social spaces and, therefore, the spatiality of the relations taking place in it. The proposed approach to territorial management, which is considered in the context of combining socio-spatial planning, spatial organization and control processes, defines territorial management as a socio-spatial practice, which, thanks to its tool set, is flexible enough to effectively influence both on urban and rural settlements. In particular, the permanent or temporary outflow of the population, which is one of the problems of the management of rural areas, is correlated with the lack of jobs in the village. In the context of solving this problem, the territorial management strategy can find such solutions that will be relevant, cost-effective and give sustainable results. Really effective solutions, in this context, are linked to the principles of universal freedom of choice of residence and free movement, which are among the characteristics of freedom in modern society. The application of the freedom factor is one of the ideological pillars of territorial management, which allows to increase the interest in the most vulnerable and, in particular, rural settlements. For example, the above manifestation of freedom in the territorial management strategy can be applied in the context of the development of co-working, enabling the village become the territorial unit where it becomes possible to implement such type of works (Hölzel, De Vries, 2023). At the same time, the necessary conditions for the implementation of joint work are also provided (for example: the new social infrastructures are built). As a result, the introduction of the joint labor institution maintains a number of able to work villagers, providing the necessary conditions to function in their own settlement.

Thus, taking into account the aforementioned considerations, we propose the following definition of territorial management: *territorial management is a process of planning, organizing and controlling the use and development of a territory, which includes various strategies, policies and actions carried out by public administration/self-government bodies, organizations and community representatives to ensure sustainable and efficient use of resources and infrastructure of populated and non-populated places in the defined territory.*

REFERENCES

- Achmani, Y., Vries, W. T. D., Serrano, J., & Bonnefond, M. (2020). Determining Indicators Related to Land Management Interventions to Measure Spatial Inequalities in an Urban (Re)Development Process. *Land*, 9(11), 448. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land9110448>
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01943366908977225>
- Bertaud, A. (2003). Metropolis: A Measure of the Spatial Organization of 7 Large Cities. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238775276_Metropolis_A_Measure_of_the_Spatial_Organization_of_7_Large_Cities
- Bosher, L., & Chmutina, K. (2017). *Disaster Risk Reduction for the Built Environment* (1st ed.). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119233015>
- CARE International. (2022). Framework of Milestones and Indicators for Community-Based Adaptation (p. 19). CARE Climate Change. <https://careclimatechange.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/2022-CARE-Framework-of-Milestones-and-Indicators-for-CBA-Copy.pdf>

- Colledge, M., Parker, C., Sonderland Saga, R., & Kalendides, A. (2022). Place Leadership in English Local Authorities: A critical success factor for vital and viable high streets (p. 26) [Research Report]. Manchester Metropolitan University, New York University. <https://squidex.mkmaps.com/api/assets/ipm/place-leadership-in-english-local-authorities-hstf.pdf>
- Crespo, J. L., & Cabral, J. (2010). The institutional dimension to urban governance and territorial management in the Lisbon metropolitan area. *Análise Social*, 45(197), 639–662.
- Davern, M., Gunn, L., Whitzman, C., Higgs, C., Giles-Corti, B., Simons, K., Villanueva, K., Mavoa, S., Roberts, R., & Badland, H. (2017). Using spatial measures to test a conceptual model of social infrastructure that supports health and wellbeing. *Cities & Health*, 1(2), 194–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23748834.2018.1443620>
- Delaney, D. (2009). Territory and Territoriality. In *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography* (pp. 219–231). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102295-5.10996-5>
- Edgemon, L., Freeman, C., Burdi, C., Trail, J., Marsh, K., & Pfeiffer, K. (2018). Community Resilience Indicator Analysis: County-Level Analysis of Commonly Used Indicators From Peer-Reviewed Research (p. 39). Argonne National Laboratory. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331232094_Community_Resilience_Indicator_Analysis_County-Level_Analysis_of_Commonly_Used_Indicators_From_Peer-Reviewed_Research
- Eraso, J. P. M. (2021). THE INTEGRATED MODEL OF TERRITORIAL MANAGEMENT: A BET FOR PUBLIC MANAGEMENT. *Revista Brasileira de Gestao e Desenvolvimento Regional*, 17(3), 30–44.
- Erdiaw-Kwasie, M. O., & Basson, M. (2017). Reimagining socio-spatial planning: Towards a synthesis between sense of place and social sustainability approaches. *Planning Theory*, 17(1), 1–19.
- Fayol, H. (1954). *General and Industrial Management* (Translated by Constance Storrs from the French Edition (Dunod)). Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, LTD.
- Hall, E. T. (1990). *The hidden dimension*. Anchor Books.
- Hewege, C. R. (2012). A Critique of the Mainstream Management Control Theory and the Way Forward. *SAGE Open*, 2(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244012470114>
- Hölzel, M., & De Vries, W. T. (2023). Rural Development Policy in Germany Regarding Coworking Spaces and Effects on Vitality and Versatility of Rural Towns. *Urban Science*, 7(3), 86. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci7030086>
- Horelli, L. (2002). A Methodology of Participatory Planning. In R. B. Bechtel & A. Churchman (Eds.), *Handbook of environmental psychology* (pp. 607–628). J. Wiley & Sons.
- Hummon, D. (2012). Community Attachment: Local Sentiment and Sense of Place. In I. Altman & S. Low (Eds.), *Place Attachment* (Reprint of the original 1 st ed., pp. 253–278). Springer US.
- Jaku, E., & Lynam, T. (2010). What is adaptive capacity? (p. 21) [Report for the South East Queensland Climate Adaptation Research Initiative]. CSIRO Climate Adaptation National ResearchFlagship. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259117037_What_is_adaptive_capacity
- Jenson, J. (2010). *Defining and Measuring Social Cohesion*. e Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Jouini, M., Burte, J., Biard, Y., Benaissa, N., Amara, H., & Sinfort, C. (2019). A

- framework for coupling a participatory approach and life cycle assessment for public decision-making in rural territory management. *Science of The Total Environment*, 655, 1017–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.269>
- Lekanne Deprez, F., & Tissen, R. (2008). Towards a Spatial Theory of Organizations: Creating New Organizational Forms to Improve Business Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 61. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1105664>
- Lloyd, R., & Aho, W. (2020). *The Four Functions of Management—An essential guide to Management Principles*. Fort Hays State University. <https://doi.org/10.58809/CNFS7851>
- Manzo, L. C., & Perkins, D. D. (2006). Finding Common Ground: The Importance of Place Attachment to Community Participation and Planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 20(4), 335–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412205286160>
- Misun, J. (2017). Changing Views on Organizational Control in the Countries of the Eastern Bloc. In *Knowledge – Economy – Society. Selected Problems of Dynamically Developing Areas of Economy* (pp. 49–63). Foundation of the Cracow University of Economics.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital: Originally published in *Journal of Democracy* 6 (1), 1995. In L. Crothers & C. Lockhart (Eds.), *Culture and Politics* (pp. 223–234). Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-62965-7_12
- Rapoport, A. (1994). Spatial organization and the built environment. In T. Ingold (Ed.), *Companion encyclopedia of anthropology* (pp. 460–502). Routledge.
- Shafique, A., Majid, R. A., & Faculty of Built Environment, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Malaysia. (2021). Determining Attributes of Spatial Organization in Public Open Space. 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.17501/26731029.2020.1204>
- Sotarauta, M. (2016). Place leadership, governance and power. *Administration*, 64(3–4), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1515/admin-2016-0024>
- Vermishyan H., & Yendigunyan V. (2023). The Socio-Cultural Aspects of Planning of The Historical and Cultural Spaces of Yerevan City Center. *Herald of Social Sciences*, 208–219. <https://doi.org/10.53548/0320-8117-2022.3-208>
- The Institute of Place Management, (IPM). (2021). 25 'Vital and Viable' Priorities: Place Management. <https://squidex.mkmaps.com/api/assets/ipm/place-management-vital-and-viable.pdf>
- Volpati, V., & Barthelemy, M. (2018). The spatial organization of the population density in cities. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1804.00855>
- Wafa, A. B. (2024). Territorial Management: A Tool for Local Development. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences*, 32, 80–84. <https://doi.org/10.55549/epess.1412822>
- Wong, S. (2001). Cities, Internal Organization of. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (1 st ed., pp. 1825–1829). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/04396-5>
- Zhou, L., De Vries, W. T., Panman, A., Gao, F., & Fang, C. (2023). Evaluating Collective Action for Effective Land Policy Reform in Developing Country Contexts: The Construction and Validation of Dimensions and Indicators. *Land*, 12(7), 1401. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land12071401>

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research.

Ethical Standards

The author affirms this research did not involve human subjects.