

Regional Development Policies in Turkey in Globalisation Context

Esra ÇELEBİ ZENGİN¹

¹Department of Local Governments, Niğde Vocational School of Social Sciences,
Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University, 51000, Niğde, Turkey

Abstract:

The concept of public administration can be defined differently in terms of scope and function, yet generally indicates states' public policies and the actors of these policies. The extent of the states' active role in planning and implementation processes of these policies varies according to their ideology in political and economic terms. Nonetheless, regardless of the ideology, it is seen that globalisation and process of change worldwide have led to partial or rooted reform movements in public administration systems. This process is called a transition from traditional public administration to new public administration, and it is based on neoliberal policies. In this new order where states are embracing a more passive role, Turkish public administration experiences this change due to the impact of several factors. The approach followed involves, particularly, coexistence of global and local, and increasing value of privatisations and global actors within the system. A clear reflection of this is seen through principles and strategies embraced within provincial and regional development policies.

Keywords: *public administration, globalisation, change, regional development, Turkey.*

1. Introduction

Change exists in every episode of individual and social life. It indicates a process that is irreversible once started influencing political and economic order, and that forces all other areas to change with a knock-on effect. Named as globalisation, this process leads to serious reformist movements in almost every country beyond national borders. Public administration is one of those areas anticipated to change due to globalisation with its promoters and deprecators. This requires a change of understanding from traditional to new, from state to enterprise, and from centralisation to decentralisation. The most important practical implication of ideological change occurs in the development approach and development policies implemented at regional level. Consequently, it creates a lessened state with minimised economic and political activity, replaced by market actors and local and volunteer organisations.

Standing in the focal point of important events and problems from a historical perspective, Turkey is one of those countries trying to keep up with the change introduced by globalisation. Hence, Turkey experiences a change along with such international terms as free market economy, localisation, competitiveness, and governance. Nevertheless, problem of interregional inequality continues to be relevant as one of the basic challenges in the country. In this regard, a reformist approach is seen to be followed in local, regional and national development moves. It is possible to see significant changes both in five-year development plans with strategic importance as well as in the actors implementing these policies. Direction of the change is from central to local in compliance with global approaches and new public administration.

Comprised of three sections, this study aims to examine the change in development percept during the globalisation process along with its reflection onto the regional development policies in Turkey. First section examines globalisation and change in public administration, and the second section examines new understanding of development and competition. The last section studies the change of regional development policies with a focus on Turkey. The study also includes a literature review along with data and information obtained from World Economic Forum (WEF), Turkish Statistics Institute (TUIK), and Ministry of Development.

2. Globalisation and Change in Public Administration

Developments experienced worldwide bring along a change in individuals, societies, economies and political structures. Scale of such changes may be small or else large enough to influence all countries in the world. One, perhaps the most important, of such developments is considered to be globalisation with its all approaches and institutions. Notwithstanding perceived differently by countries and societies, globalisation generally points out a process naming an era where countries get close to each other in economic, political and social terms, economic basis of which is rooted back to Classical Economists (Bakkalcı, 2008: 1-2). From a wider perspective, this process is dealt with through varied angles including economic, political, legal, socio-cultural, scientific and technological angles (Günsoy, 2004: 331). Globalisation, “accepted as a modern phenomenon and reality despite all rejections” (Yörükoğlu & Peker, 2011: 139), reveals new actors through new regulations such as free market, civilisation, individualisation, privatisation, non-governmental organisations, multi-national companies and international institutions (Eroğlu, 2010: 197-198), and is generally evaluated by its economical dimension. From this perspective, it is possible to list developments marking the globalisation process as follows (Korkmaz, 2013: 152): globalisation of the capital and considering foreign trade as a prerequisite for economic development, essentialness of regional and international organisations like European Union, increased importance of local administrations, non-governmental organisations, and participatory democracy.

It is important to note here that the main element of the transformation caused by globalisation occurs by shifting the dynamism of development to private sector (Şaylan, 2003: 545). Reflecting this view, “there happens an international market where actions and control of the national states are removed in economy and commerce, and international companies are decisive” (Özdil & Yılmaz, 2005: 472). Hence, in the globalising world, “where states withdraw and private sector comes to the fore, industry, commerce and production have priority” (Kapucu & Gündoğan, 2010: 579). Besides, it is possible to witness in this process such trends as downsizing the state, focus on customer/citizen, public participation and governance, administrative transparency, decentralisation, human resources management, performance-based management, and new management approaches (Yüksel, 2004: 2-11).

The experienced ideological changes are defined, in practice, new public administration or even new public management (or business administration). Within this process evolved from administration to management, that means from public to private sector, we see a more flexible, minimal, and market-oriented public administration with a narrower focus, based on governance, quality and performance, and that delegates and takes risks (Eryılmaz, 2016: 58). The most significant reflection of this transformation in public administration is observed in cities, local administrations, and development concept.

3. New Concept of Development and Competitiveness

The concept of development, commonly used starting from the restructuring period following the end of World War II (Türkay, 2006: 8), is defined as “modernisation of the economic structures of developing countries” (Kaplan, 2004: 13-14) in the strict sense, and “the process of improving the quality of life” (Palabıyık, 2005: 612) in broader terms.

Generally defined as “improvement of human lives materially and morally and increase in public welfare through a change in economic, social and political structures of a country” (Parlak, 2011: 419), development indicates an area larger than economic growth. Growth is defined in the economy literature as gradual increase in the basic indicators of the economic system (GNP, total production, etc.) without any change in the organisational structure, and quantitative change in the system (Tekeli & Soral, 1978: 6). In this regard, economic growth refers to a concept regarding the tools used by a country to increasing her capacity. Development, on the other hand, refers to a country’s progression in economic, social and cultural areas, strengthening her institutional capacity, improvement in the quality of human resources, improved environmental awareness, and increase in individual welfare (SEGE, 2013). A review of the literature shows that the concept of development is examined in six main areas: human dimension, employment, environment, dominance, freedom, production, and technology (Kaynak, 2014: 77-80). Thus, it is possible to list major fundamental policies to be followed for the development to occur in a country (Korkmaz, 2013: 16-17):

- National income should be increased, increased revenues should be allocated more equable, and economic policies should be implemented to decrease the number of poor and to increase the poverty threshold.

- Economic sources should be used in accordance with the social structure, distribution of population, and existing conditions.
- There should be balance between the state and the market to increase savings and investments, and to improve the productivity.
- The state should be more active to minimise the differences as to regional development.

In view of the increasing problems worldwide and differentiation in demand, there are certain changes to the concept of development historically. At this point, it is known that development philosophy of the countries comes into being with their regional development policies. Hence, regional development approaches summarising the political realities of ideological structures embrace a new form within the historical process.

The concept of regional development has entered into the economy literature following the World War II, and problem of economic and social development has gained a spatial dimension thereafter (İldırar, 2004: 16). Regional development policies are generally defined as “policies implemented to remove interregional development differences resulting from accumulation of economic activities and industrialisation at specific locations within a country” (Karabulut, 2007: 738). Having different content and meaning depending upon different contexts, regional development policies have been developed by different actors in different periods. Paradigmatic phases of such policies, which are shaped by economic and political developments, are sometimes considered as classical and modern (Bachtler, 2001; Doğruel, 2012) or sometimes as traditional and new periods; yet, based on historical development, these periods are described as period of traditional policies (1945-1970), transition period emphasising internal growth dynamics (1970-1990), and period of competitiveness based on information society (from 1990s onwards) (Kara, 2008: 43).

Table.1 Characteristics of Traditional and New Regional Policies

Characteristics	Traditional Regional Policies	New Regional Policy Approach
Objectives	Regional equality National economic growth Investing in underdeveloped regions Infrastructure development	Development of regional competitiveness Improvement of regional economic capacity Supporting intrinsic growth dynamics
Main Concepts	Industrial geographic theory Main factors e.g. production costs and labour force supply	Learning region theory; intrinsic growth theory Aggregation, networks, innovativeness, human capital
Structure of decision making – implementation process	General national policies and selection of specific regions Selection by centralised governments Gradual structure	Joint decision making process by regional and local governments Governance-oriented decision-making process Non-gradual organisation forms
Policy tools	Incentives	Regional Development Programmes
Support Type	Direct aid/assistance, basic infrastructure needs e.g. drinking water, electricity	Improvement of investment climate, infrastructure based on advanced technologies and knowledge (e.g. industrial parks, technology centres)
Action Type	Project-based, reactive	Based on strategic plan
Spatial Objective Policy Development Method	Problematic regions Centralised, top-down	All regions Collective, bottom-up based on local consensus
Partners	Centralised government (investor) institutions	Local administrations, volunteer organisations, special segments, etc.
Implementing agencies	Centralised government, provincial units of the centralised government Bureaucratic relations	Regional units, semi-autonomous units, business management instead of bureaucracy

Source: Kara, 2008: 55.

Even though it was previously stated that state should be more active to minimise inter-regional development differences, examination of the periodic progress of such policies indicates a more market-oriented process rather than state control. This new understanding, in a way, removes development problematic from being a “responsibility” of the state, and identifies all stakeholders as responsible in development (Akyıldız, 2013: 107). A more minimal and participatory state conception has aroused since 1990s dominating globalisation and public administration, and countries has established their post-2020 vision based on developing this new institution and principles. Hence, it is seen that such principles as participation, local democracy and governance have caused new development types such as sustainable

development, and embraced regional policies have been shaped around these principles. Besides, in this new era, competition among companies have forced a change in all organisations, public or private (Aktan, 2003: 13), and *competitiveness* or *competitive power* has become a popular concept. In this regard, competitiveness levels of countries, regions and even cities are determined based on several variables. One of the most important of these research studies is the Global Competitiveness Index annually updated by the World Economic Forum (WEF). Main variables of this index are based on 12 basic criteria: organisational structuring, infrastructure, health and basic education, higher education and on-the-job training, effectiveness of commodity markets, market size, innovation, labour markets, macroeconomic environment, development of financial markets, technological readiness, and competence of the business world. Based on these criteria and many sub-variables, a total of 137 countries are examined in the Global Competitiveness Report 2017-2018. Accordingly, countries with highest and lowest competitive power are listed. Table 2 shows 10 countries with the highest competitiveness along with their places in the previous year. Ten countries with lowest competitiveness are listed as Venezuela, Haiti, Burundi, Sierra Leone, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritania, Liberia, Chad, Mozambique, and Yemen (WEF, 2017).

Table 2 The Most Competitive Countries Ranking (2017-2018)

Top 10 Countries	Ranking based on Global Competitiveness Index 2017 (among 137 countries)	Ranking based on Global Competitiveness Index 2016 (among 138 countries)
Switzerland	1	1
USA	2	3
Singapore	3	2
Netherlands	4	4
Germany	5	5
Hong Kong	6	9
Sweden	7	6
UK	8	7
Japan	9	8
Finland	10	10

Source: <http://ref.sabanciuniv.edu/tr/content/d%3BC3%BCnnya-ekonomik-forumu-k%3BC3%BCresel-rekabet%3CA7ilik-raporu-2017-2018>, 18.12.2017.

Being a specific part of the general competitiveness, regional competitiveness is determined based on various factors including employment concentration in the sector, emigration and excessive elderly population, investments, direct foreign capital investments in the region, investments in knowledge economy assets and innovation, infrastructure, and education level (Özer, 2005: 392-393). Subject to expansion of the competitiveness phenomenon, new emerging concepts frame both regional and national policies. Accordingly, competitiveness-oriented regional policies give way to competing cities and municipalities.

4. Reflection of the Change on Turkey's Regional Development Policies

Having experienced significant events throughout history with a strategic place in geographical terms, Turkey has a general population of 79,814,871 (TÜİK, 2017), and hosts 2,834,441 Syrian refugees under temporary protection (www.goc.gov.tr/, 12.09.2017). Turkey is ranked 53th among 137 countries in the Global Competitiveness Report (WEF, 2017).

Table 3. Turkey's Competitiveness Level (2017-2018)

Competitiveness Index Component	Turkey's Rank Among 137 Countries (2017)	Turkey's Rank Among 138 Countries (2016)	Turkey's Rank Among 140 Countries (2015)
organisational structuring	71	74	75
infrastructure	53	48	53
health and basic education	84	79	73
higher education and on-the-job training	48	50	55
effectiveness of commodity markets	53	52	45
market size	14	17	16
innovation	69	71	60
labour markets	127	126	127
macroeconomic environment	50	54	68
development of financial markets	80	82	64
technological readiness	62	67	64
competence of the business world	67	65	58

Source: <http://ref.sabanciuniv.edu/tr/content/d%3BC3%BCnnya-ekonomik-forumu-k%3BC3%BCresel-rekabet%3CA7ilik-raporu-2017-2018>, 18.12.2017.

Although her progress is appreciated, Turkey is a country struggling with political and economic crisis besides several social problems including immigration, and also struggles with inter-regional inequality for long years. Since its foundation, the Republic of Turkey tries to solve this historical problem while trying to keep up with modernisation process. In this regard, there are varied problems, and solution policies, stemmed through the international integration process started following the World War II. Within this framework, the concept of development planning has emerged in Turkey, and new institutions established in this period have shown that the most influent actor is development is centralised administration. Nonetheless, the experienced integration processes, particularly the European Union, and liberalisation trends in 1980s have caused a transformation in principles and actors of the development policies. Hence, in the light of political and economic developments, it is seen that regional development policies implemented in Turkey have different characteristics. Significant periods shaping these policies include the period from the foundation of the Republic until 1963, from 1963 to 1999 Helsinki Summit where Turkey was given candidate status and when the planned development has started, and finally from 1999 onwards (Sungur, 2014: 67).

Initial development studies in the history of Turkey were conducted on 1 March 1922, and İzmir Congress of Economics was organised on 17 February 1923 (Akgül & Efe, 2011: 146). This Congress has started to build a new economic model where representative of merchants, businessmen, workers, tradesmen and farmers from all provinces can come together and discuss in a democratic way (Aksoy, 1998: 37-45). In the following years, Industry Stimulation Law was issued on 28 March 1927 to ensure development, two five-year industrial plans were prepared between 1933-1939, and the First Five-Year Industrial Plan was implemented in 1934 (Dinler, 2012: 177). Following this plan, which is the first systematic step of the planned development studies (Çokgezen, 2012: 36), the Second Five-Year Industrial Plan was prepared, yet could not be implemented due to Atatürk's death and the impact of World War II. However, governmental policies were continued, and with the establishment of the State Planning Organisation in 1960s, development was started to be planned by the state through determination of development strategies in five-year periods.

The first development plan was prepared to cover 1963-1967. Today, 10th development plan is in implementation for 2014-2018 period. With the establishment of the Ministry of Development in 2011, the State Planning Organisation became a unit of this Ministry, and development plans were started to be prepared by the Ministry of Development. Significant changes were experienced within 50 years since the First 5-Year Development Plan due to political, economic and global changes. From this perspective, it is seen that actors shifted from central to local while principles were transformed from national to global.

Table. 4 Tools and Actors of Regional Development Policy in Turkey

Period	Principles	Approach and Policies	Objectives	Tools
1st Plan (1963-1967)	- Penetration of economic development into regions - Regional economic integration	- Regional planning - Growth poles (e.g. East Marmara, Çukurova, Antalya, Zonguldak)	- Balanced urbanisation - Interregional balance (public services and income distribution) - Investment efficiency	- Financial incentives - Investment-based alternative measures for underdeveloped regions
2nd Plan (1967-1972)	- Focus on population problems caused by rapid urbanisation	- Regional and provincial planning - Indirect regional planning	- Balanced interregional development - Balanced distribution among regions for social equality - Investment efficiency	- Tax deductions - Financial incentives for private sector investment - Pilot projects - Keban
3rd Plan (1972-1977)	- Overcoming regional differences - Development of specific underdeveloped regions	- Sector and provincial planning	- Balanced interregional development - Balanced distribution among regions for social equality - Investment efficiency	- Financial incentives - Industrialisation programmes for underdeveloped regions - Inventory studies - Provincial planning - Sectoral planning - Package projects - Priority provinces for development
4th Plan (1977-1982)	- Mobilisation of resources for regional problems	- Strengthening ties between sectors and regions	- Development of underdeveloped provinces - Mutual dependence between sectors and regions - Spatial organisation	- Interest rate deductions for investments - Various financial aids - Package projects - Investments at provincial and regional bases - Çukurova Urban Development Project

				-GAP (SPO-JICA)
5th Plan (1985-1989)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accelerating development through rationalisation of use of resources in underdeveloped regions with potential sectoral capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct regional planning involving regional impact of the projects - 16 functional region proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balanced distribution among regions for social equality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of regional development programmes to determine potential resources - Selection of relevant investments according to these programmes - Development of infrastructure in priority regions and sectors for industrialisation projects - Financial assistance for investments in priority provinces for development
6th Plan (1990-1994)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approaching social, administrative and financial dimensions as a whole - Adaptation of a statistical system compliance to international standards (particularly in EU context) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning at regional and sub-regional level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balanced development in regions - Supporting district to prevent migration from rural to urban 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing financial resources for priority settlements for development - Incentives for priority provinces for development and establishment of a private fund for this purpose - Industrial zones
7th Plan (1996-2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integration of sectoral and spatial studies - Sectoral specialisation of provinces - Urban planning - Removing regional differences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional and sub-regional projects - Mobilisation of regional skills - Sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rationalisation of migration and demographic change - Dealing with problems of metropolitan regions as a separate category - Policy development studies for housing problem - Regional differences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuing priority provinces for development policy - Emergency support programme for Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia, GAP - Legal regulations - Housing projects - Supporting SMEs in priority provinces for development - ZBK, Yeşilirmak Basin, DOKAP, DAP
8th Plan (2001-2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participatory planning - Sustainability - Efficient use of resources - Rapport to EU's regional policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic regional planning - Provincial development plans - Regional specialisation - Supporting new industrial focus points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local entrepreneurship and mobilisation of local resources - Minimisation of regional differences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SME support - EU funds - Human capital
9th Plan (2007-2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activation of regional policies at central level - Development based on intrinsic potential - Increasing institutional capacity at local level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spatial prioritisation and focusing in public investment implementation and service supply - Centres of attraction - Determining and supporting pioneer sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing productivity of the regions - Increasing contribution to national development, competitiveness and employment - Minimisation of developmental differences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional development strategy at national level - Participatory and applicable development plans - State aid with a spatial focus - Entrepreneurship capital, micro-credit - Aggregation, improving innovation infrastructure, techno-parks, innovation transfer centres, management incubation

Source: 9th Five-Year Development Plan ÖİKR, 2013: 14-15.

10th Five-Year Development Plan aims to place Turkey among countries within high income group, and to mitigate poverty. To this aim, it is aimed at increasing the GDP to 1.3 trillion US Dollars, income per capita to 16 thousand US Dollars, and export to 277 billion US dollars in 2018, decreasing unemployment rate to 7.2 per cent, ensuring country's growth performance in a higher, stable and sustainable form, and increasing competitiveness and public welfare (Kalkınma Bakanlığı, 2013: 28). Nevertheless, as of end-2017, it does not seem possible to achieve these objectives in the light of country's status and statistical data.

Table. 5 Gross Domestic Product Results (2016-2017)

Year	Quarter	GDP at Current Prices (Million TL)	GDP at Current Prices (Million \$)	GDP Change Ratio (%)
2016	1	563 891	191 396	4,8
	2	631 233	217 634	4,9
	3	666 176	225 232	-0,8
	4	747 226	228 482	4,2
2017	1	649 481	175 918	5,3
	2	735 543	205 175	5,4
	3	827 230	234 550	11,1

Source: <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/HbGetirHTML.do?id=24569>, 14.12.2017.

Although the Plan foresees a GDP of 1.3 trillion US Dollars in 2018, figures as of December 2017 are given in Table 5. However, GDP ratio is at a regular increase in 2017 despite its fluctuating course in 2016. Particularly in the 3rd quarter of 2017, there is an increase more than twice as much in the 2nd quarter. Although it does not seem possible to achieve the target figures, growth in the last quarter of 2017 and throughout 2018 will give a more concrete picture in terms of achieving the targeted aim.

Table. 6 Foreign Trade as of Years 2014-2016 (thousand US\$)

Years	Export		Import		Foreign Trade Balance	Foreign Trade Volume	Export-Import Coverage Ratio (%)
	Value	Change (%)	Value	Change (%)			
2014	157,610,158	3.8	242,177,117	-3.8	- 84,566,959	399,787,275	65.1
2015	143,838,871	-8.7	207,234,359	-14.4	- 63,395,487	351,073,230	69.4
2016	142,529,584	-0.9	198,618,235	-4.2	- 56,088,651	341,147,819	71.8

Source: http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1046, 23.12.2017.

It is also aimed at increasing the amount of export to 277 billion US Dollars. Nonetheless, an outlook to export-import ratio since 2014, the implementation year of the 10th Five-Year Development Plan, issued by the Turkish Institute of Statistics indicates a possible problem in achieving the target figures. The plan specifically and frequently emphasises the importance of export, and necessity to increase exporting figures in view of interregional inequality problem and competitiveness. A review of the years within the scope of the 10th Plan shows that there is more importing than exporting. At this point, despite the disadvantage of exporting in the foreign trade balance gradually decreases over the years, there is a foreign trade deficit of -56,088,651.000 US\$ as of 2016. Decrease in the import figures may well be interpreted as a positive progress in terms of national economy; yet, there is also a decrease in the export figures. A rapid increase in the production within the country, along with reflecting this increase onto exporting and decreasing import rates, will help to get closer to the set target, relatively, and to decrease foreign trade deficit.

It should be noted that important steps are being taken to achieve the targeted objectives in the plan. Besides, the Plan not only focuses on economic growth but also tries to improve the current conditions and introducing new policies to overcome interregional inequalities as well as to ensure integration with new concepts. In all these policy processes, it is aimed to consider human-focus, participation, coverage, accountability and transparency as basis, to have public investments for decreasing interregional development differences, and to provide guidance to assess regional development potential. Nevertheless, emphasising excessive and low-quality growth in cities as well as problems regarding accommodation, traffic, safety, infrastructure, social cohesion and environment, the plan states that it is necessary to ensure basic life quality standards in rural and urban areas, and to minimise limitations caused by spatial disadvantages for development and equal opportunities. Also comes to the fore is increasing the attractiveness of cities for living and investing through improving infrastructure and superstructure, improving institutional and human infrastructure of the regions, improving role and efficiency of development agencies in resource management, starting from EU funds, increasing participation of NGOs in decision-making processes, improving their financial management and technical capacity, and improving project development and implementation skills (Kalkınma Bakanlığı, 2013). In this regard, there are efforts to introduce new institutions and concepts for Turkish public administration such as development agencies or governance.

In terms of battling with interregional inequality, one should not limit the prepared plans and projects implemented in Turkey within five-year development plans. There are other policies focusing on specific structure and problems of the regions, prepared for increasing investment and development figures at regional basis, some of which could not be implemented successfully including Southeast Anatolia Project (GAP), Keban Project, Eastern Anatolia Project (DAP), Eastern Black Sea Regional Development Plan (DOKAP), and Yeşilirmak Basin Improvement Project (YHGP).

Being in a process of change regarding regional development plans due to global developments, Turkey takes several steps for adapting to competitiveness. In this effort, an Urbanisation Council was

established in 2009 by the Ministry of Public Works and Settlement¹. Special and important commissions were formed under the Council to form a basis for activities of the relevant institutions, an important one of which being the “Sustainable Urban Development Strategy and Action Plan Preparation Project (KENTGES) (www.csb.gov.tr). KENTGES Project, once prepared in compliance with the policies foreseen by the United Nations, the Council of Europe, European Union and international agreements, has been updated as Integrated Urban Development Strategy and Action Plan to cover the years 2010-2023. KENTGES considers urban development as a fundamental element of regional development. Besides, the main goal of KENTGES is stated as “to improve habitability level, spatial quality and life quality in the settlements, and to establish a roadmap to strengthen economic, social and cultural structures”. Also, other goals include axis of economic and social development, increasing competitiveness, strengthening human development and social solidarity, and improving quality and efficiency of the public services (www.csb.gov.tr).

Another study towards interregional inequality problem is Study on Socio-Economic Development Ranking of Provinces and Regions (SEGE) prepared by the General Directorate of Regional Development and Structural Cohesion in 2013. This study uses demography, employment, education, health and finance indicators besides other variables from areas of *competitive and innovative capacity*, *accessibility* and *life quality*, and classifies 81 provinces under six groups based on their development level. Based on this classification, provinces in the first group (e.g. Ankara, İstanbul, İzmir, Kocaeli, Bursa, Eskişehir) represent developed provinces while those in the sixth group (e.g. Van, Hakkâri, Şırnak, Şanlıurfa, Muş, Iğdır) represent the provinces with the lowest development level (SEGE, 2013).

The National Strategy on Regional Development (BGUS) is another strategy paper prepared to ensure local and regional development throughout the country as well as to safeguard competitive capacity of the cities. This paper, which determines several strategies and objectives to be achieved between the years 2014-2023, has been prepared by the General Directorate of Regional Development and Structural Cohesion. The paper lists those principles for assessing potentials of all regions, improving their competitive capacity, and contributing to national development as compliance and complementariness with national priorities, equal opportunities in development, sustainability, productivity, participation, cooperation and partnership, multi-level governance, localness, and subsidiarity (BGUS, 2014: 103).

BGUS defines the vision of regional development as “a country that is socio-economically and spatially integrated, more balanced through regions with high levels of competitiveness and welfare, and total development”. BGUS has analysed regions on the basis of human capital and employment, income, economic structure, entrepreneurship and innovation, social and physical infrastructure, accessibility, digital life and communication, natural structure, environment and climate change, energy, institutional structure and social capital, settlement patterns and development trends, and development and income levels (BGUS, 2014: 31). At this point, it is necessary to point out that Turkey has started to consider provinces at three different levels based on Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) under the EU Accession Period, and accordingly there is a region-based examination in general. For instance, all 81 provinces throughout the country are named under Level-3. There are 26 regions under Level-2, and 12 regions under Level-1. In line with this classification, development agencies have been established in 26 regions under Level-2. Map 1 shows dissemination of regions’ development levels for Level-2 both in SEGE and BGUS studies, where development levels are grouped under four levels. Darker colours represent higher levels of development.

Map 1. Development Levels of Level-2 Regions



Source: BGUS, 2014: 94.

¹ Name of the Ministry of Public Works and Settlement was changed in 2011 to the Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation. <http://www.csb.gov.tr/turkce/index.php?Sayfa=sayfa&Tur=webmenu&Id=15>, 16.12.2017.

This strategy paper, which includes the latest policies on regional development in Turkey, is shaped around global developments. Within this framework, it can be said that this new strategy created to mitigate interregional inequality and to ensure a nation-wide development is parallel to the changing concept of development. In line with the said changes, policies to be implemented under the BGUS are considered as spatial and lateral goals. Such spatial goals are determined as improvement of global competitiveness of metropolitans, improvement of international competitiveness of growth focal points, triggering development in low-income regions through regional attraction centres, variation of economic activities and reinvigorating the economy in structural transformation provinces, converging priority provinces for development to whole country, and accelerating development in rural areas (BGUS, 2014: 102).

The lateral goals in the BGUS are grouped under six titles with a focus on developing competitiveness of the regions. The lateral goals of the strategy are defined as betterment of the governance of regional development and improving the institutional capacity, harmonisation of public investment and support programmes with regional development goals, improved competitiveness of the regions, development of cross-border and interregional cooperation, supporting sustainable environment and green economy, and development of transportation network and accessibility. The strategy paper determines six sub-goals for developing competitiveness in line with the global developments listed as introduction of investment opportunities and supporting investment process, development of entrepreneurship environment and culture, production organisation and cluster development, development of regional innovation strategies, efficient use of tourism potential for local and regional development, and improving contribution of universities to their located region (BGUS, 2014: 121).

5. Conclusion

Herakleitos' famous quote "The only thing that is constant is change" is accepted today beyond doubt. Change is experienced in several areas from politics to economy, technology, and to socio-cultural structures. Sometimes being regarded as positive and sometimes as negative, this process of change has a conceptual significance with globalisation. Main concepts at the focal point of this process include liberalisation, competition, privatisation, governance, localisation, and participation. Departing from a point of inevitable change, it is seen that these new principles are embraced in almost all areas including public administration.

The evolutionary process of the public administration system is defined as traditional and new approaches to public administration. At this point, there is a transition from state to business management, which brings a new perception of state with limited intervention and partially replaced by market and local mechanisms. This change is primarily reflected on development policies. Here, state both tries to battle with the existing problems and to step aside as foreseen in the process. In this regard, there is a new approach for development policies shifting from central to local, and from public resources to market and local economies. In summary, structure and actors of development policies change in line with the changes in the concept of public administration.

Turkey is one of those countries experiencing this transformation process within the framework of international integration in addition to national problems. Considering the interregional inequality as her historical heritage, it is clear to see from which aspects that the development policies implemented in Turkey are influenced by the globalisation process. In this regard, one can see the effects of this ideology change in development plans and strategies prepared by the state. Changes in ideology and policies are cyclically classified under three periods: from the foundation of the Republic to 1960s, from 1960s to the Helsinki Summit marking the Turkey's candidacy, and from the Summit until today. Having been shaped in parallel with the countercyclical changes worldwide, these policies have also transformed the actors of regional development in Turkey. Rather than the concept of development by etatism, this change tries to trigger local and regional potential, and accordingly creates new actors in development policies such as local economies, private entrepreneurs, development agencies, international partners, NGOs, and local administrations.

References

1. Akgül, Birol ve Efe, Mercan. (2010). Kalkınma Ajanslarının Bölge Planlamadaki Yeri, *Türkiye'de Bölgesel Kalkınmanın Yeni Örgütleri Kalkınma Ajansları*, Ed.: Birol Akgül ve Nisfet Uzay, Bursa: Ekin Basım Yayın Dağıtım. ss. 415-445.

2. Aksoy, Yaşar (1998). *Atatürk'ün Ekonomi Devrimi Kalpaklı Kalkınma*, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık
3. Aktan, C. Can (2003a), Değişim Trendleri ve Değişim Dinamikleri, *Moderniteden Postmoderniteye Değişim*, Ed.: Coşkun Can Aktan, Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi. ss. 3-17.
4. Akyıldız, Fulya (2013). Binyıl Kalkınma Hedefleri ve Kalkınma Ajansları, *Küreselleşme-Yerelleşme Sarmalında Kalkınma Ajansları –Yapılar, Sorunlar ve Çözüm Arayışları*, Ed.: Mustafa Ökmen, Güven Şeker ve Fatih Yaman, Ankara: Orion Kitabevi. ss. 107-137.
5. Bachtler, John (2001), Where Is Regional Policy Going? Changing Concepts of Regional Policy, *European Policies Research Center*, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK.;
6. Bakkalcı, Ahmet Can (2008). *Küreselleşme, Bölgesel Entegrasyonlar, Ülkeler Üstü Kurumlar, Entegrasyon Teorisi ve Avrupa Birliği*, Ankara: Nobel Kitabevi.
7. BGUS (2014), Bölgesel Gelişme Ulusal Stratejisi (2014-2023); [http://www.bgus.gov.tr/dokuman/BolgeselGelismeUlusalStratejisi\(2014-2023\).pdf](http://www.bgus.gov.tr/dokuman/BolgeselGelismeUlusalStratejisi(2014-2023).pdf)
8. Çokgezen, Murat (2012). *Türkiye'de Devlet, Girişimcilik ve Yerel Kalkınma*, İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası, Yayın No: 2010-110.
9. Dinler, Zeynel (2012). *Bölgesel İktisat*, Dokuzuncu Baskı, Bursa: Ekin Yayın Dağıtım.
10. Doğruel, Fatma (2012). *Bölgesel Kalkınma ve Kalkınma Ajansları*, TÜRKONFED.
11. DPT (2008). Dokuzuncu Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı (2017-2013) Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu; <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/zel%20ihtisas%20Komisyonu%20Raporlar/Attachments/10/oik702.pdf>
12. Eroğlu, H. Tuğba (2010). *Kamu Yönetiminde Esnekleşme: İzmir ve Çukurova Örneklerinde Kalkınma Ajansları*, Edt. M. Akif Çukurçayır ve Orhan Gökçe, V. Kamu Yönetimi Sempozyumu, Türk Kamu Yönetiminin Yapısal ve İşlevsel Sorunları, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 13-14 Mayıs 2010. s. 207-216.
13. Eryılmaz, Bilal (2016). *Kamu Yönetimi*, Kocaeli: Umuttepe Yayınları.
14. Gayrisafi Yurtiçi Hâsıla Sonuçları (2016-2017); <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/HbGetirHTML.do?id=24569>, 14.12.2017.
15. Günsoy, Bülent (2004). *Küreselleşme ve Kalkınma*, Kalkınma Ekonomisi -Seçme Konular-, Ed.: Sami Taban ve Muhsin Kar, Bursa:Ekin Kitabevi. ss. 329-352.
16. <http://ref.sabanciuniv.edu/tr/content/d%3C%BCnya-ekonomik-forumu-k%3C%BCresel-rekabet%3C%A7ilik-raporu-2017-2018>, 18.12.2017.
17. <http://www.csb.gov.tr/turkce/index.php?Sayfa=sayfa&Tur=webmenu&Id=15>, 17.12.2017.
18. İldırar, Mustafa (2004). *Bölgesel Kalkınma ve Gelişme Stratejileri*, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
19. İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü (2016), Türkiye Göç Raporu; http://www.goc.gov.tr/files/files/2016_yiik_goc_raporu_haziran.pdf, 17.09.2017.
20. Kaplan, Muhittin (2004). *Gelişmekte Olan Ülkelerin Özellikleri*, Kalkınma Ekonomisi -Seçme Konular-, Ed.: Sami Taban ve Muhsin Kar, Bursa: Ekin Kitabevi. ss.7-25.
21. Kapucu, Naim ve Gündoğan, Ertuğrul (2010). *Yönetişim, Ekonomik Kalkınma ve Demokrasi, Yönetişim, -Kuram, Boyutlar, Uygulama-* Ed. M. Akif Çukurçayır, H. Tuğba Eroğlu ve Hülya Eşki Uğuz, Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi. ss. 553-584.
22. Kara, Murat (2008). *Bölgesel Rekabet Edebilirlik Kavramı ve Bölgesel Kalkınma Politikalarına Yansımaları*, DPT Başkanlığı Ekonomik Modeller ve Stratejik Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü, Yayın No: 2774, Uzmanlık Tezi, Ankara, Ağustos 2008.
23. Karabulut, Tahsin (2007). *Türkiye'de Bölgesel Kalkınma Politikaları ve Kurumsal Gelişmelerle İlgili Genel Bir Değerlendirme*, Yerel Yönetimler Üzerine Güncel Yazılar-II Uygulama, Ed.: Hüseyin Özgür ve Muhammet Kösecik, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım. ss. 738-761.
24. Kaynak, Muhteşem (2014). *Kalkınma İktisadı*, (5. Baskı). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
25. KENTGES (2010); Bütünleşik Kentsel Gelişme Stratejisi ve Eylem Planı (2010-2023); http://www.csb.gov.tr/db/kentges/editordosya/kentges_tr.pdf, 17.12.2017.
26. Korkmaz, Esfender (2013). *Küresel Süreçte Ulusal Kalkınma*, İstanbul: Himalaya Yayınları.
27. Özdil, Tuncer ve Yılmaz, Cengiz (2005). *Küreselleşen Dünyada Yerel Ekonomilerin Uyumu*, 1. Yerel Ekonomiler Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı, 1-2 Ekim 2005, Karaman: Selçuk Üniversitesi Karaman İİBF. ss. 437-480.
28. Özer, M. Akif (2005), *Yeni Kamu Yönetimi*, Ankara: Platin Yayınları.

29. Palabıyık, Hamit(2005). *Sürdürülebilirlik ve Yerel Yönetimler: Uygulanabilirliği ve Ölçümü Üzerine*, Yerel Yönetimler Üzerine Güncel Yazılar-I Reform, Ed.: Hüseyin Özgür ve Muhammet Kösecik, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım. ss. 611-627.
30. Parlak, Bekir (2011). *Kamu Yönetimi Sözlüğü*, Bursa: MKM Yayıncılık.
31. SEGE (2011); İllerin ve Bölgelerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Sıralaması Araştırması; file:///C:/Users/LZ/Downloads/SEGE-2011.pdf, 18.12.2017.
32. Sungur, Onur (2014). *1980 Öncesi Türkiye Ekonomisinde Bölgesel Kalkınma Politikaları*, Bölgesel Kalkınma Üzerine Yazılar, Ed. Metin Berber, Deniz Özyakışır ve H. İbrahim Aydın, Ankara: Savaş Yayınevi. ss. 65-97.
33. Şaylan, Gencay (2003). *Bir Yapısal Değişim Sorunu Olarak Yönetim Reformu*, Türkiye’de Kamu Yönetimi, Derleyen Burhan Aykaç, Şenol Durgun ve Hüseyin Yayman, Ankara: Yargı Yayınevi. ss. 413-429.
34. Tekeli, İlhan ve Soral, Erdoğan (1978). *Kalkınma Yazını Üzerine Genel Bir Değerlendirme*, Eskişehir: Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Yayınları, Yayın No: 196/126.
35. TÜİK (2017). Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi Sonuçları, 2016; Kaynak: file:///C:/Users/LZ/Downloads/Adrese_Dayal%C4%B1_N%C3%BCfus_Kay%C4%B1t_Sist_31.01.2017.pdf, 17.09.2017.
36. Türkay, Mehmet (2006). *Devlet, Ulusal Kalkınma ve Kapitalizmin Dinamikleri*, Bölgesel Kalkınma Politikalar ve Yeni Dinamikler, Der.: F. Aylan Arı, İstanbul: Derin Yayınları. ss. 1-21.
37. WEF, The Global Competitiveness Report 2017–2018; <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2017-2018>, 21.12.2017.
38. Yıllara Göre Dış Ticaret (2014-2016); http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1046, 23.12.2017.
39. Yörükoğlu, Fuat ve Peker, Kadir (2011). *Küreselleşme ve Yerelleşme Eğilimleri Bağlamında Yerel Yönetim Reformları; Yönetişim Modelleri ve Yerel Ekonomilere Getirdiği Fırsatlar*, Üçüncü Yerel Ekonomiler Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı, Ed.: Abdulkadir Buluş ve Savaş Erdoğan, 26-27-28 Mayıs 2011, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi İİBF. ss. 138-147.
40. Yüksel, Fatih (2004). *Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Eğilimler Perspektifinde Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Reform İhtiyacı ve Kamu Yönetimi Reform Yasa Tasarısı*, (Ed.: Abdullah Yılmaz ve Mustafa Ökmen), *Kamu Yönetimi*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi, ss. 1-22.

Author Profile:

Esra ÇELEBİ ZENGİN received her undergraduate degree from the Department of Public Administration of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences at Selçuk University in 2007, her Masters’ and PhD degrees on Public Administration at the Graduate School of Social Sciences at Selçuk University. She is an assistant professor in the Niğde Vocational School of Social Sciences. Her areas of interest include local administrations, animal rights, urbanisation, regional development and competitive cities.