THE IMPORTANCE OF CLUSTERING IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

[1]ZEYNEP KARACOR, [2]BAHADIR YORUK, [3]BURCU GUVENEK

[1]Prof., Economy Department, Selcuk University Turkey
[2]Ph.D., Economy Department, Selcuk University Turkey
[3]Asst. Prof., Economy Department, Selcuk University Turkey
E-mail: [1]zkaracor@selcuk.edu.tr, [2]bahadiryoruk@selcuk.edu.tr [3]burcuguvenek@selcuk.edu.tr

Abstract -
Clustering is the concentration of a group of production or service enterprises, relevant economic actors, and institutions in a certain geographical location, showing specialization, producing added value, being close to each other, and creating a synergy resulting from these mutual proximities and connections. By globalization, the appearance of an integrated and homogeneous structure of economies has brought clustering approaches to the fore in regional development approaches. In this context, the basic elements of industrial clustering are vertical or horizontal complementarity in mass production based on sectoral specialization; flexible production relations; agglomeration economies or collective efficiency; geographic proximity, local or regional concentration; SME qualified small-scale companies; cultural homogeneity, similar business structures and production systems with an atmosphere of cooperation and trust; production, trade and employment sharing, etc. between enterprises. can be sorted. In this study, in order to reveal the effect of industrial clustering on regional development, a Three Star Analysis was carried out on the shotgun cluster located in Beyşehir, Konya. As a result of the research, it has been determined that the said cluster has a positive and strong effect on regional development, especially in export. On the other hand, the shotgun cluster in Beyşehir; has been seen that has an indicator far above the Turkey average in terms of added value, employment, size, dominance, and specialization.

Keywords - Regional Development, Clustering, Three Star Analysis, Beysehir.

I. INTRODUCTION

Today, new generation views have begun to be put forward in the regional development process, emphasizing the local and region-based competitive dynamics and at the same time emphasizing the importance of internal potential. In this context, it has come to the fore to reveal regional welfare-creating mechanisms based on the regions' own resources, and to ensure that regions dominate their own development processes and become the subjects of this process (Vatansever-Dviren &Yıldız , 2014, p. 7). In order to be able to talk about clustering regionally and for this cluster to reveal added value and other expected outputs, first of all, the mobility of labor, knowledge, and innovation should be disseminated through company ties concentrated in local locations. In this way, supply at the regional-local level can be revealed and variable demand can be met. In other words, heterogeneous demand in cluster markets can be met by a heterogeneous workforce. However, one of the reasons for the high degree of labor mobility is that it is a factor that helps the market in the structural change process (Yiğit, 2014, p. 111).

Inputs (intermediate goods, services, semi-products, etc.) in regional development clusters have similar characteristics. The effects of the specialist input and service market emerge when specialized input and service producers are located in the cluster. The geographical location of the companies operating in certain production areas creates an incentive for the production to complement and support the related activities in the cluster (UNIDO, 2010; OECD, 2012-2013). The fact that sectors producing complementary activities are in the cluster attracts other industrial establishments to this region. Thus, while the leading sectors in competitive clusters depend on some factors of establishment location, their existence creates a place of establishment for others in terms of regional development (Ayaş, 2003, p. 67). On the other hand, externalities arising from the dissemination of knowledge in local specialized industries contribute to the development of the cluster. In these externalities, called MAR (Marshall-Arrow-Romer) externalities, the source of information is the businesses operating in the same sector, and sectoral density accelerates the information flow. Specialization economies are formed according to sectoral size and degree of specialization; The specialist labor market can be considered as the use of technology similar to the specialist input and service market (Yellice, 2017, pp. 32-33).

II. CLUSTER AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The tendency of researchers from different disciplines and traditions to cluster phenomenon coincides with the last quarter of the 20th century when foreign trade was liberalized and rapid progress was experienced in transportation and communication technology. From this period to the present, the competitive race between companies has accelerated and the competitive advantage has changed hands rapidly.

This situation has caused both researchers and institutions and businesses responsible for regional and national development to focus on the sources of competitiveness (Gordon & McCann, 2000, pp. 515-516). According to the prevailing view in the literature, when it is determined that there are competitive sectors in countries with strong and stable economies and this is achieved by clustering, it is argued that clustering should be used as a tool to be successful in international competition and to gain an advantage (Keskin & Dulupçu, 2010, p. 443; Eroğlu). & Yalçın, 2013, p. 87; Porter, 1990, p. 1-3). In this context, clustering; is the geographical concentration of interconnected businesses and institutions in specific locations. Clusters include interconnected industries and other institutions that are important for competition (Keskin & Dulupçu, 2010, p. 443). Clusters often expand vertically to supply channels and customers, horizontally to those that produce complementary products, and to businesses in industries that are related in terms of skills, technology, or use of common inputs" (Porter, 1998, p. 78). clustering according to UNIDO (2010) and OECD (2012-2013); It is the geographical or sectoral concentration of enterprises that are interrelated, complementary, and supportive of each other, producing, selling products of similar quality, or performing operational transactions (logistics, storage, supply, service, etc.) for them (UNIDO, 2010; OECD, 2012). -2013). Firms in the cluster may have many common features such as a common workforce pool, common technologies and common factors of production, common buyers and distribution channels, a common culture, a common geographical location, common opportunities, and threats. Likewise, firms in the cluster may also be in complementarity relations due to reasons such as input-output relations and production of complementary goods (Halis, 2013, p. 55; Yiğit, 2014, pp. 105-106; OECD, 2012-2013; Türko, 2013, pp. 9-10).

There is no consensus on how clustering can be formed in terms of regional development. Some authors consider initiatives designed by local government units to form clusters risky due to information asymmetry and state that even the best industrial structures will emerge as a result of trial and error in the market at a certain time and area (Halis, 2013, p. 53). Therefore, clusters may not always be formed by "fair directives of public institutions". In most cases, the efforts to create a new cluster artificially in previously destroyed places have led to errors or caused the formation of other clusters of the previously predicted type (Keskin & Dulupçu, 2010, pp. 444-445).

The size of the local economy is another important factor in the regional development process of the cluster. Varieties economies, which are formed depending on the size of the local economy or population density, are defined as the external benefits of businesses operating in different sectors from clustering. The competitiveness of the city, where the cluster develops and carries out its economic activities, is of great importance. The urban economy is the second phenomenon in which competitive development is examined (Ayaş, 2003, p. 72; Eroğlu & Yalçın, 2013, p. 87-9). In the regional development process, activities are shaped according to the economic structure of the city they are in, and a developed city economy provides significant externalities to local development. Business density, marketing opportunities, transportation facilities, and industrial diversity in the city support competitive development (Medical Industry Cluster, 2013). Economies of variety, which express the external benefits of operating in a more crowded and wider economic environment and encompass all businesses, emerge in a structure similar to the economies of specialization. The labor market, which consists of the workforce with the knowledge, skills, experience, and abilities that can be employed in all sectors, benefits all businesses located in the region (Bulu, Eraslan, & Kaya, 2006, pp. 146-148; Karataş, 2006, p. 58).

The size and diversity of the labor force, input and service pool, and the effects that reduce production costs are important in the functionality of the cluster in regional development. Cooperation in regional clustering, where it is about labor and input, also has special and importance. Collaboration in clusters can be examined in two dimensions: horizontal-vertical and bilateral-multilateral. The first distinction is cooperation; deals with the direction of relations horizontally and vertically (Andersson, Schwaag-Serger, Sörvik, & Wise, 2004, pp. 25-28). Horizontal cooperation takes place between competing enterprises of the same production process. Vertical cooperation, on the other hand, occurs between businesses at different stages of the value creation chain (production-distribution-marketing-sales, etc.). The second distinction concerns the parties of the cooperation. Two businesses can establish formal or informal cooperation between them, as well as more businesses can cooperate to achieve a common goal (Medical Industry Cluster, 2013; Hobikoğlu & Hacıoğlu, 2011, pp. 234-236).

The reduction of development from national to smaller clusters is one of the changes and developments that occur through competitiveness and expertise. Along with these processes, the definition of regions with a driving reference in development has been brought forward and the form of interventions against regional development differences has changed. The developmental policy approach, which gives importance to regional clustering, has gained new content with the aim of improving the competitiveness of regions (AHİKA, 2016, p. 38; Özaslan & Ünlü, 2015, p. 68). In general,

the new understanding of regional development refers to the relations between the regional/local geographical area and the economy and the political and social organizations determined by these relations, with the organizations established by the actors that are predominantly in the same economic, social and cultural geography or have interests in these geographies (Pınarcıoğlu, 2005). 2006, p. 290). As a result, technology, knowledge, innovation, etc., are at the center of today's sustainable activities. elements such as It can be said that in order for these to emerge, to produce the expected benefit, to compete, and to be effective in the development process, there is a need for specialization at both the production/trade level and the knowledge level, and therefore a clustering that enables them.

III. THE IMPORTANCE OF CLUSTERING IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF BEYŞEHİR

3.1. Purpose and Scope

Shotguns in the 9303 HS code group; In terms of legal status, they are considered as shotguns other than Law No. 6136 on the "Law on Firearms and Knives and Other Tools" within the scope of Law No. In both Laws, it is mentioned that there is no auger-shaped structure that ensures the rotation of the bullet in the barrel, increases the effect and extends the range for these types of weapons. Acquisition, use, possession, certification, etc. of shotguns in the legally mentioned Laws and the regulations regulating their implementation. situations are described. In Turkey, hunting shotguns are the priority within the scope of the smoothbore industry branch, and they are also called light weapons.

The manufacture of hunting rifles in the category of light firearms constitutes one of the sub-branches of the defense industry. The enterprises and facilities operating in this sector in Turkey have created a significant clustering in the Lakes Region of the Mediterranean Region. In this region, especially in the last ten years, Beyşehir district has shown remarkable development and has become the center of the sector (Çalışkan & Manav, 2014, p. 149). Looking at Turkey in general, approximately 140 enterprises of various sizes export shotguns. Shotgun production is an important part of the arms industry and has significant potential in the production of shotguns in the light weapons industry, which has a market of 10 billion dollars worldwide. When the lower and upper business lines are included throughout the country, approximately 300 companies operate in the hunting and sports rifle industry throughout Turkey (TİM, 2019, p. 47-60). Shotguns are exported to many countries from Turkey to European countries, especially the USA, to Canada, Lebanon, Jordan, and the Turkish Republics (KTO, p. 47-52).

When we look at the general profile of the companies that produce shotguns in Beyşehir, all of them are SMEs and family businesses, except for the Huğlu Shotguns Cooperative, which has been operating since 1962. It is known that more than seven thousand people are directly employed in all of these enterprises. In addition, according to the information obtained when the subsidiary institutions-enterprises, sub-, and subsidiary enterprises are included, it can be stated that approximately 15 thousand people have a direct/indirect positive contribution in terms of employment in this industry branch. However, according to the data/information obtained from official institutions, it constitutes approximately 50% of the tax revenues of Beyşehir district (MEVKA, pp. 9-13; KTO, pp. 47-52).

It has been determined that there is an investment of approximately 1.2 billion TL in the CNC and lathes group as of 2019, with approximate figures to be used in the production of weapons in Beyşehir, and in addition to these, it has been determined that the investment made for the treatment and coating facilities is 30 million TL. In addition, when we look at the export figures from Beyşehir district to the world, there has been a steady increase in recent years. Quality, brand, marketing, institutionalization, change in world markets, etc. It was observed that there was a very good development in exports with repulsive effects such as Turkey's smooth-bore arms export and the smooth-bore arms export from Beyşehir district are shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

			HS Code*	Export (USD)	Quantity
2015	Turkey	World	9303	117.532.457	916.951
2016	Turkey	World	9303	138.456.008	882.182
2017	Turkey	World	9303	125.228.505	1.000.234
2018	Turkey	World	9303	135.493.189	1.026.406
2019	Turkey	World	9303	149.135.965	1.114.465

* HS Code used for shotgun and equipment.
Source: Obtained from Comtrade, 2020.
Table 1. Turkish Shotgun Exports (2015-2019)

			HS Kodu*	Export (USD)	Quantity
2015	Beyşehir	World	9303	76.050.232	641.865
2016	Beyşehir	World	9303	92.490.150	635.171
2017	Beyşehir	World	9303	86.407.320	720.144
2018	Beyşehir	World	9303	86.715.520	748.980
2019	Beyşehir	World	9303	104.394.503	868.920

* HS Code used for shotgun and equipment.
Source: Obtained from interviews with companies
Table 2. Beyşehir Shotgun Exports (2015-2019)

As can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2, exports of 9303 GTIP code shotgun group from Turkey to the world were 916,951 units and 117.53 million dollars in 2015, while this figure was 1,114,465 units and 149,13 million dollars in 2019. Looking at the export in Beyşehir, while it was 641.865 units and 76.05 million dollars in 2015, this figure increased to 868.920 units and 104.39 million dollars in 2019. When looked at comparatively, it is seen that the export made from Beyşehir in 2015-2019 in terms of the amount is in the range of 65%-70% on average in Turkey, and in the average range of 70%-75% on the basis of units. Based on the information given and explanations, the aim and scope of this study are to determine the role and place of the production of smoothbore firearms in the 9303 HS code group in the local development process in Beyşehir.

Within the scope of the information given, the main importance of this research is that the regional/local development analysis was reduced to the Beyşehir location, and the cluster analysis focused on a relatively small region. On the other hand, there are few studies in the national literature in the context of local development and clustering in the production of shotgun firearms, and it is complementary. Another important point of the research is that a business line with an annual export of more than 100 million dollars, only from Beyşehir, and which has been relatively neglected in local institutions and academic studies, is examined in the context of local development. Another important point is that the data obtained can be used by other relevant persons and institutions in terms of policy development and implementation.

3.2. Method

The research was conducted by selecting a sample of 71 companies operating in the code group of NACE 25.40.01 (Manufacture of shotguns, non-military firearms, and similar tools and their parts) in Beyşehir, and their clustering level was “Size”, “Dominance/Dominance (Dominance)”, and “Specialization” units were carried out with the Three Star Analysis technique. As seen in many examples in the literature, "Three Star Analysis" is generally preferred in determining the sectors or business lines that are assumed to have clustering potential and that show development in this direction. The reason for choosing this model, which was developed by the "European Cluster Observatory (ECO)", is that this model is a model currently used in the creation of potential cluster maps in the European Union and allows the determination of agglomeration areas from different perspectives in every sector defined by the NACE code. (Şen & Sandal, 2017, p. 48; Demirdöğen, 2018, p. 94; Seki, Arslan, & Bektaş, 2018, p. 22). The Three-Star Analysis parameters are shown in Table3.

	Three Star Analysis Parameters *		
Analysis Unit	Size**	Doinance**	Specialization**
computable	ei /E	ei /et	(ei /et)/(Ei /Et)

Table3. Three Star Analysis Parameters

(Ei): Number of employment in the relevant sector throughout Turkey
(Et): Number of employment in all sectors in Turkey
(ei): Number of employment in a particular sector in the region
(et): Number of employment in all sectors in the region

Size (Size) (ei / Ei): It is the ratio of the sector employment data in the province to the total employment data of the sector in the country.
Dominance / Dominance (ei / et): It is the ratio of sector employment data in the province to the total employment data in the province.
Specialization/Specialization [(ei / et) / (Ei / Et)]: It shows the ratio of the employment share of the sector in the province to the employment share of the sector in the country.

There is no general standardization in obtaining the threshold/limit values referenced while the calculations are being made. In this regard, the range of 0.05-0.07 is generally used for size and dominance/dominance parameters for Turkey. For specialization/specialization, in almost all studies, the employment share of the sector in the province/region should be equal to the ratio of the sector's share in the country, so it should be 1 (Ünal, 2014; Şen & Sandal, 2017, p. 48; MEVKA; Seki, Arslan, & Bektaş, 2018, p. 22). The general employment data within the scope of the analysis are shown in Table 4.

Years	Turkey	Change (%)	Konya	Change (%)	Beyşehir	Change (%)
2015	14.822.222		314.195		10.448	
2016	15.355.158	3,5%	335.817	6,4%	10.602	1,5%
2017	16.369.073	6,2%	363.660	7,7%	11.289	6,1%
2018	16.054.759	-2,0%	347.405	-4,7%	10.862	-3,9%
2019	16.010.002	-0,3%	348.988	0,5%	11.629	6,6%

* It is a type of definition used by SKG in the classification of 4/a insured employees in employment data.

Table 4. General Employment Data (4/a - Person)*

As seen in Table 2, while the number of 4/a group insured employees was 14.82 million in Turkey, this figure reached 16.01 million in 2019. While the number of people in the same group in Konya province was 314.1 thousand in 2015, it increased to 348.9 thousand in 2019. There is a similar increase in Beyşehir, from 10.4 thousand in 2015 to 11.6 thousand in 2019. Within the scope of the analysis, the employment data of the sector are shown in Table 5.

Year	Turkey		Konya		Beyşehir			
	NACE*** 25	NACE 25.40.01*	NACE 25	NACE 25.40.01*	NACE 25	NACE 25 Related**	NACE 25.40.01	Total Employment
2015	393.638	3.275	15.122	2.457	2.357	943	2.365	3.308
2016	383.438	3.338	14.218	2.541	2.438	975	2.365	3.340
2017	379.581	3.310	14.517	2.496	2.393	957	2.321	3.278
2018	364.546	3.591	13.711	2.616	2.517	982	2.441	3.423
2019	367.186	3.624	14.168	2.748	2.643	1.110	2.564	3.674

Table 5. Sectoral Employment Data

* The data were collected according to the information provided by the companies in the NACE 25.40.01 code group, which are within the scope of the research.

** Although the sub-sector code of NACE 25 is 25.40.01, laser, stock, plastic parts, chrome, chemical enterprises, etc. in this sector. included.

*** Pistol, revolver, shotgun, air pistol, batons, etc. manufacture of non-military firearms and similar instruments and parts thereof.

Table 5 shows the number of employees in the NACE 25 main group and the number of employees in the NACE 25.40.01 subgroup, which is the subject of this research. While the number of employees working in NACE 25 main sector in Turkey was 393.6 thousand in 2015, this number decreased to 367.1 thousand in 2019. In Konya, while the number of employees in the NACE 25 code group was 15.1 thousand in 2015, this figure decreased to 14.1 thousand in 2019. For Beyşehir, the only activity/employment unit in the NACE code group is the shotgun industry. While 2357 people were working in these enterprises in 2015, this figure reached 2564 people in 2019. The number of employees working in NACE 25 main sector NACE 25.40.01 sub-sector in Beyşehir together with its affiliated business lines was determined as 3308 people in 2015, 3340 people in 2016, 3278 people in 2017, 3423 people in 2018, and 3674 people in 2019.

3.3. Results

3.3.1. Size

NACE 25.40.01, located in Beyşehir under the main code of NACE 25, "Pistols, revolvers (revolver), shotguns, air pistols, batons, etc. The size scores of the smoothbore industry defined in “Manufacture of non-military firearms and similar tools and their parts” between 2015-2019 are shown in Table 6.

SIZE				
Years	**Sector employment data in the province**	**Country total employment data of the sector**	**Result**	**Threshold Value**
2015	2.457,00	3.275,00	0,75	0,05
2016	2.541,00	3.338,00	0,76	0,05
2017	2.496,00	3.310,00	0,75	0,05
2018	2.517,00	3.591,00	0,70	0,05
2019	2.643,00	3.624,00	0,73	0,05

Table 6. Size

A formula such as "(ei / Ei)", that is, "the ratio of the sector employment data in the province to the total employment data of the sector in the country" is used for the size value. In the NACE 25 code group, employment in Konya is 14,168 people in 2019. However, when we look at the NACE 25.40.01 group, 2.365 people out of 2,457 people in Konya are in Beyşehir. Therefore, the "size" value data set originates from Beyşehir in the aforementioned code classification. Accordingly, in 2015, the magnitude value was approximately 15 times higher than the threshold value of 0.05 and realized as 0.75. According to the data obtained, NACE 25.40.01 Average 74% of employment in Turkey between the years 2015-2019 is in Beyşehir. It is understood that Beyşehir shows a strong clustering in terms of size data, which is quite high.

3.3.2. Dominance

The dominance scores of the smoothbore industry defined in the NACE 25.40.01 code group in Beyşehir between the years 2015-2019 are shown in Table 7.

DOMINANCE

Years	Sector employment data in the province	Total employment data in the province	Result	Threshold Value
2015	2.365,00	10.448,00	0,23	0,01
2016	2.365,00	10.602,00	0,22	0,01
2017	2.321,00	11.289,00	0,21	0,01
2018	2.441,00	10.862,00	0,22	0,01
2019	2.564,00	11.629,00	0,22	0,01

Table 7. Dominance

For the dominance value, a formula such as "(ei / et)", that is, "the ratio of sector employment data in the province to the total employment data in the province" is used. Accordingly, the dominance value of the smoothbore arms industry in Beyşehir was 0.23 in 2015, 0.22 in 2016, 0.21 in 2017, 0.22 in 2018, and 0.22 in 2019. Between 2015 and 2019, the average dominance level was 0.22. In a situation where the threshold value is 0.01, the calculation of 0.22 for Beyşehir can be accepted as a strong indicator in terms of dominance.

3.3.3. Specialization

The specialization scores of the shotgun industry defined in the NACE 25.40.01 code group in Beyşehir between the years 2015-2019 are shown in Table 8.

SPECIALIZATION

Years	(ei/et)	Turkey Sector Employment	Country Employment	(Ei/Et)	Result	Threshold Value
2015	0,23	3.275,00	393.638	0,0083	27,64	1
2016	0,22	3.338,00	383.438	0,0087	25,27	1
2017	0,21	3.310,00	379.581	0,0087	24,08	1
2018	0,22	3.591,00	364.546	0,0099	22,33	1
2019	0,22	3.624,00	367.186	0,0099	22,29	1

Tablo 8. Specialization

For specialization, a formula such as "[(ei / et) / (Ei / Et)]", that is, "the ratio of the employment share of the sector in the province to the employment share of the sector in the country" is used. Between 2015-2019, the average of specialization points was 24.32 for Beyşehir. In an environment where the threshold value is accepted as 1, Beyşehir's reaching such a high value shows that there is a strong specialization.

NACE 25 Binary Code*									
	ONE STAR			TWO STAR			THREE STAR		
	Size	Dominance	Specialization	Dominance	Baskınlık	Specialization	Dominance	ominance	Specialization
2015							0,75	0,23	27,64
2016							0,76	0,22	25,27
2017							0,75	0,21	24,08
2018							0,70	0,22	22,33
2019							0,73	0,22	22,29

Table 9. Three Star Analysis Results

Table 9 shows the cluster analysis results in Beyşehir in the NACE 25.40.01 subgroup. According to this, it has been determined that there is a very strong cluster in Beyşehir in terms of size, dominance, and specialization between the years 2015-2019 according to the standard threshold values in the code group in question.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this study, Three Star Analysis was carried out on the shotgun cluster located in Beyşehir district of Konya province in order to reveal the effect of industrial clustering on regional development. In the size data, which is the first data of the three-star analysis, "the ratio of the sector employment data in the province to the total employment data of the country", the threshold value was 5%, while this ratio was found to be 73.8% on average between 2015-2019 in Beyşehir. Accordingly, it was determined that Beyşehir showed a strong clustering in terms of size data and received 1 star for this value. While the dominance level threshold value, which is expressed as the ratio of sector employment data in the province to the total employment data in the province, was 1%, the rate in Beyşehir was 22% on average in 2015-2019. Accordingly, Beyşehir gets one star in terms of dominance. In specialization, which is one of the most important indicators of clusters, Beyşehir's average specialization score between 2015-2019 was 24.32. In an environment where the threshold value is accepted as 1, Beyşehir's reaching such a high value shows that there is a strong specialization. Beyşehir, Size, Dominance, and Specialization criteria all received three stars between 2015-2019, well above the threshold values.

In general, it has been determined that there is an important cluster in the production of shotguns in Beyşehir. The most important market of the cluster, especially in 2019 and 2020, is foreign markets. However, the cluster needs sufficient support and development in terms of public support, financing solutions, and institutionalization. It can be stated that the specialization-oriented cluster in Beyşehir is in a better position compared to the past in terms of added value, local development, and competitiveness, but it has long distances to cover when compared to world examples. In order for the sector to compete with its competitors in foreign markets, it needs to be developed in terms of marketing and quality. In this context, it is seen that there are deficiencies in terms of qualified human resources, especially R&D, patents, startups, education, and technology. Employment, added value, exports, business administration, product diversity, etc. It is necessary to carry out more research on this sector, which is well above the average of Turkey in terms of its history, which dates back to 70 years, and which is constantly developing. On the other hand, it is recommended to organize workshops, conduct academic research, give importance to the opinions of stakeholders, establish an active and effective senior civil institution, adopt intraregional standardization principles, and improve the effectiveness of inter-network coordination.

REFERENCES

[1] AHİKA. (2016). Yerel ekonomik kalkınma ve kümelenme rehberi. AHİLER Kalkınma Ajansı, Kırşehir.

[2] Andersson, T., Schwaag-Serger, S., Sörvik, J., & Wise, E. (2004). Cluster policies whitebook. IKED - International Organisation for Knowledge Economy and Enterprise Development.

[3] Ayaş, N. (2003). Bölgesel rekabet gücünü geliştirmeye yönelik alternatif bir yaklaşım: yeni endüstriyel bölgeler yaklaşımı (Denizli örneği). (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). T.C. Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Muğla.

[4] Bulu, M., Eraslan, İ., & Kaya, H. (2006). Türk elektronik sektörünün rekabetçilik analizi.İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 9(1), 49-66.

[5] Çalışkan, V.,& Manav, K. (2014). Sanayi coğrafyası perspektifinden Huğlu (Beyşehir Konya)'da av tüfeği sanayii. International Periodical For The Languages, 9(11), 149-169.

[6] Demirdöğen, S. (2018). Kümelenme Potansiyeli gösteren sektörlerin belirlenmesi: TRA 1 Düzey 2 bölgesi üzerine bir uygulama. AİBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 18(4), 85-113.

[7] Eroğlu, O.,& Yalçın, A. (2013). Kümelenmeye ilişkin literatür taraması. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi(3), 81-96.

[8] Gordon, I.,& McCann, P. (2000). Industrial clusters. Agglemorations and/or Social Networks, Urban Studies, 37(3), 513-532.

[9] Halis, M. (2013). Sektörel rekabet gücü ve kümelenme potansiyeli ilişkisi: Bişkek bölgesi kırmızı et sektöründe bir

araştırma. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). T.C. Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Manisa.
[10] Hobikoğlu, E.,& Hacıoğlu, D. (2011). Kümelenme modeli ve politikaları çerçevesinde bilgi yapılanması ve rekabet ilişkisi. Uluslararası Avrasya Ekonomileri Konferansı(21), 232-237.
[11] Karataş, N. (2006). Firma kümeleşme eğilimleri üzerine ampirik bir araştırma: İzmir AOSB örneği. Planlama Dergisi(3), 47-57.
[12] Keskin, H.,& Dulupçu, M. (2010). Kümelenmeler: bir literatür incelemesi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi, 15(1), 441-461.
[13] KTO. (tarih yok). Lonca. Konya Sanayi Odası, Konya. .
[14] Medikal Sanayi Kümelenmesi. (2013). OSTİM medikal sanayi kümelenmesi raporu. Ankara.
[15] MEVKA. (tarih yok). Beyşehir İlçe Raporu. Mevlana Kalkınma Ajansı, Konya.
[16] OECD. (2012-2013). The cluster scoreboard: measuringthe performance of local business clusters in the knowledge economy . OECD Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Working Papers, 2012/13.
[17] Özaslan, A.,& Ünlü, H. (2015). Türkiye'de bölgesel kalkınma politikalarında değişim ve kalkınma ajansları. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 7(13), 64-83.
[18] Pınarcıoğlu, M. (2006). Eski bir muammaya çözüm arayışları. Bölgesel Kalkınma ve Yönetişim Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı, İçinde, ss. 288-295. Ankara: TEPAV Yayınları.
[19] Porter, M. (1990). The competitive advantage of nations. New York: The Free Press.
[20] Porter, M. (1998). Clusters and new economic competition. Harward Business Review, 76(6), 77-97.
[21] Seki, İ., Arslan, M., & Bektaş, S. (2018). TR222 Çanakkale bölgesi kümelenme analizi. Uluslararası Yönetim ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 5(10), 15-27.
[22] Şen, Ö.,& Sandal, E. (2017). Gaziantep İlinde Üç Yıldız Analizi Yöntemi İle Endüstriyel Kümelenme Analizi. Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi(39), 39-62.
[23] TİM. (2019). Türkiye ihracatla yükseliyor. TİM Faaliyet Raporu 2019, İstanbul.
[24] Türko, E. (2013). Endüstriyel bölgelerde dışsal ekonomiler ve işbirliği Türkiye ayakkabı endüstrisinde bir uygulama. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
[25] UNIDO. (2010). Cluster development for pro-poor growth: the UNIDO approach, business. Investment and Technology Services Branch Technical Paper Series. UNIDO (United Nations Industrial Development Organization), Vienna.
[26] Ünal, V. (2014). TR82 Bölgesi 3 yıldız küme analiz çalışması. uzey Anadolu Kalkınma Ajansı, Kastamonu.
[27] Vatansever-Deviren, N.,& Yıldız , O. (2014). Bölgesel kalkınma teorileri ve yeni bölgeselcilik yaklaşımının Türkiye'deki bölgesel kalkınma politikalarına etkileri. Akademik Bakış Dergisi(4), 1-11.
[28] Yellice, B. (2017). Kümelenme ve ihracat karar süreci: Bursa'da tekstil kümesinde bir uygulama. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). T.C. Erzurum Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
[29] Yiğit, S. (2014). Kümelenme teorisi: kavramsal bir çerçeve. Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Dergisi, 4(6), 104-128.

★★★