

Oğuz Özbek

Pamukkale University
e-mail: oguzozbek@pau.edu.tr

NEW DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF TURKEY (2014-2018) AND OLD INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS: LESSONS FROM POLAND

NOWY PLAN ROZWOJU TURCJI (2014-2018) I STARE PROBLEMY INSTYTUCJONALNE: LEKCJE Z POLSKI

DOI: 10.15611/br.2016.1.08

Summary: This paper concerns the institutional tools of the Tenth Development Plan of Turkey (2014-2018) in a critical way through a comparison between the regional development practices of Turkey and Poland. The Tenth Plan introduced in 2014 considerably rests on the strategic framework of the preceding Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013). The main topics of the institutional analysis in the paper involve new institutional bodies and governance, new and old policy tools of development planning and sustainable development and territorial statistical system. Here, the key lesson derived from the Polish case, especially from Lower Silesia, is that the policy tools of a regional development framework at national level (development plan) can only be operational and effective when these tools retain functional ties to the real economy and catch the creative essence of development. In that vein, the paper makes a comparison between Turkey and Poland by highlighting the policy tools of current regional development practices and strategies in Poland. These tools are related to the emerging learning economy, supporting institutions, growth pole strategy, urbanization economies, entrepreneurship, regional innovation strategies, metropolitan administration and public-private partnership in Poland.

Keywords: Turkey, Poland, development planning, regional area, institutions.

Streszczenie: Niniejszy artykuł dotyczy instytucjonalnych narzędzi wdrażania Dziesiątego Planu Rozwoju Turcji (2014-2018). Autor w sposób krytyczny porównuje regionalne praktyki rozwojowe w Turcji i Polsce. Dziesiąty Plan wprowadzony w 2014 roku w znacznym stopniu opiera się na strategicznych ramach poprzedniego, Dziesiątego Planu Rozwoju (2007-2013). Główne obszary analizy instytucjonalnej przedstawionej w artykule uwzględniają nowe organy instytucjonalne, nowe i stare narzędzia polityki planowania rozwoju i zrównoważonego rozwoju oraz terytorialny system statystyczny. Kluczowa lekcja pochodząca z Polski, w szczególności z Dolnego Śląska, jest związana z faktem, że narzędzia polityki regionalnej na poziomie krajowym (plan rozwoju) mogą zostać wdrożone i są skuteczne tylko wtedy, gdy zachowują funkcjonalne powiązania z realną gospodarką i są w stanie uchwycić kreatywne podstawy rozwoju. W tym duchu artykuł stanowi porównanie między

Turcją a Polską, uwypuklając narzędzia polityki regionalnej i aktualne praktyki rozwoju regionalnego w Polsce. Narzędzia te są związane z powstającą gospodarką wiedzy, wsparciem instytucji, strategiami biegunów wzrostu, urbanizacją, regionalnymi strategiami innowacji, administracją metropolitalną i partnerstwem publiczno-prywatnym w Polsce.

Słowa kluczowe: Turcja, Polska, planowanie rozwoju, obszar regionalny, instytucje.

1. Introduction

This paper makes a comparison between Turkey and Poland by highlighting the policy tools of current regional development practices and strategies in Turkey (the Tenth Development Plan) and Poland (new and adaptive policies of regional development).

Firstly, the paper discusses new policy tools in the Tenth Development Plan of Turkey (2014-2018) in a critical way. The latest development plan of Turkey rests on a tradition of a relatively long planned development since the introduction of the First Industrial Plan (1933-1937). Recent studies on regional science in Turkey highlighted and criticized development planning in terms of the realization of long-term economic goals and draw attention to the ideological content of the policies and implementation tools in these plans. The inherited problems of institutional structure (spatial planning system), public administration (territorial administrative system) and socio-economic instabilities (macro-economic policy) in Turkey lessen the prospects of regional development policies in strategic documents such as the Tenth Development Plan.

Secondly, the paper discusses and analyzes the recent success story of Poland in regional development. Recent experiences of regional development in Poland (Lower Silesia region in particular) are discussed in an instructive way for the Turkish case. Here, specific policy approaches and tools in the Polish case are related to the emerging learning economy, supporting institutions, growth pole strategy, urbanization economies, entrepreneurship, regional innovation strategies, metropolitan administration and public-private partnership in Poland.

2. New development plan of Turkey (2014-2018) and old institutional problems

The planning of economic development and configuration of territorial system have been two parallel but incompatible processes in Turkey for nearly 80 years. The modernization and westernization efforts started in the second part of the 19th century in the Ottoman Empire fruited through the foundation of Modern Turkish Republic in 1923. Here, the spatial planning and national development policy were two important task areas of these modernization efforts. The planning attempts on the

socio-economic development in Turkey can mainly be traced back to the era of the modern Turkish state. From the early planning experiences through the industrial plans in the 1930s to the introduction of the Ninth Development Plan in the 2000s, the priorities of national economic development strategies determined the scope of regional development planning. Since the foundation of its republic in 1923, Turkey has managed to pursue a socio-economic development policy for both eliminating developmental differences among regions and extending the area of economic and political sovereignty of the state. In the Early Republican Period (1923-1929), the content of Turkish development policy was determined by economic, social and spatial priorities like the rebuilding of destroyed towns and rural settlements in the War of Independence (1919-1923), “the elimination of semi-colonial institutions” inherited by the Late Ottoman Period and “the restructuring of national economy” [Kazgan 2002, pp. 44-73]. The etatist-oriented policy pursued throughout the 1930s shifted to a liberal policy of “rapid industrialization” and rural development in the post-Second World War period. In the evolution of the ideological content of economic development in Turkey, “regional development” is a relatively recent issue and regional concerns were included in the development agenda in the Planned Era of Turkish macroeconomic policy in the 1960s.

The Tenth (2014-2018) Development Plan of Turkey introduced in 2014 considerably rests on the strategic framework of the preceding Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013). Especially, local devolution and regional prioritization based on a growth pole strategy characterized the strategic framework of the Tenth Plan. The widespread concerns of sustainable development and new planning and governance models for metropolitan development are other key topics addressed in the latest development plan. The main spatial approach of the Tenth Development Plan centers on sustainable development and livability. Here, some of the important topics include economic growth, competitiveness, pre-disaster planning, social interaction, cultural values and environmental soundness. Under a title of “Livable Spaces and Sustainable Environment” in the report of the plan, the priorities of environmental protection, the concerns of urban and rural living quality and the elimination of regional disparities are addressed [Resolution of the Grand... 2013, p. 3]. Here, a competitive, livable and sustainable urbanization process is considered as an important precondition for reaching the goals of national development. For realizing regional and urban competitiveness, the strategic content of the plan rests on creating a development climate through investment on human and physical capital [Ibidem].

In the pre-plan period, important regional institutional developments occurred. These developments involved both the establishment of new institutional bodies and the introduction of new action plans and programs as well as a new subsidy system. Table 1 displays these developments in a spatial manner. These are the establishment of new institutional bodies (like regional development agencies) for promoting regional development and specific regional development projects and programs, for example the introduction of municipal infrastructure project (BELDES).

According to the initiatives of the plan, a new settlement order and organization in Turkey is needed to reveal a realistic portrait of regional income distribution. The convergence of regional borders with the real socio-economic status of urban and rural settlements is considered as an important task for the reorganization of regional territorial system [Ibidem].

Another key policy area addressed in the Tenth Plan is metropolitan governance. With the new metropolitan law, the provinces whose populations are higher than 750,000 (total 30 municipalities) became metropolitan municipalities by their provincial borders. This legal arrangement serves for a number of purposes: to strengthen the institutional structure of public administration, to provide an efficient coordination in the supply of local welfare services and to benefit from the economies of scale [Ibidem, p. 26]. For ensuring an efficient public administration and local governance, the plan draws attention to a need for new planning, organization and service supply models in the metropolitan areas, whose numbers grew from 16 to 30 in recent years. In addition to this necessity, in the report of the plan, it is stated that networks between public institutions, non-governmental organizations and private sector actors have to be strengthened [Ibidem, p. 136].

Table 1. Strategic and institutional developments in the pre-period of the Tenth Development Plan of Turkey*

Scope	Development	Operational scale
Institutional	the establishment of the High Council of Regional Development	national
	the establishment of the Committee of Regional Development	national
	the establishment of 26 regional development agencies	sub-regional
	the establishment of 81 investment support agencies	provincial
	the establishment of regional development authority for the Eastern Anatolia Project (DAP)	regional
	the establishment of regional development authority for the Eastern Black Sea Development Project (DOKAP)	regional
	the establishment of regional development authority for the Konya Plain Project (KOP)	sub-regional
Strategic	the provision of fiscal funds and technical aids for regional development agencies	sub-regional
	the preparation of an action plan for the Southern Anatolia Project (GAP)	regional
	the addition of a regional dimension to the investment subsidy system	regional
	the introduction of the regional growth pole program	national
	the introduction of the rural infrastructure project (KÖYDES)	rural
	the introduction of the municipal infrastructure project (BELDES)	municipal
	the introduction of the water and sewerage infrastructure project (SUKAP)	municipal
	the introduction of social development programs	national
	the institutional and legal developments for industrial clustering	national

* Summarized from the Tenth Development Plan of Turkey.

The plan also highlights the importance of governmental funding in specially assisted regions (most provinces of the Eastern Black Sea, Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia regions). The plan aims to enable a better implementation of new investment subsidy and regional evaluation system launched in 2012 and based on the six provincial levels of socio-economic development. The evaluation of the performance in the investment subsidies for private sector rests on the measurement of macroeconomic, sectoral and regional effects and changes [Ibidem, pp. 94-95]. This new system can be seen as a reinterpretation, or extension, of already existing policy tool of Turkish development planning, “priority regions for development” since 1968.

The Tenth Development Plan targets a strategic allocation of public investments for eliminating regional disparities and mobilizing regional development potentials. These investments involve the urban development and social infrastructure projects in the assisted regions and the action plans for ongoing regional development projects (GAP, DAP, DOKAP and KOP). A policy of regional prioritization will be pursued in the spatial allocation of these projects [Ibidem, p. 93].

To achieve a socially and economically sound rural development, not only rural units and regions, but also functional regions where urban and rural settlements have close functional interrelations have to be defined. For an efficient pre-disaster planning and risk management, the integrated thematic maps displaying the risks, hazardous areas and thresholds have to be prepared [Ibidem, pp. 135-137].

After a brief overview of the policy tools in the Tenth Plan, prime importance can be attached to the treatment and conceptualization of regional area in the plan. As mentioned in the previous section, regional area in Turkey was and is a strategically ambiguous sphere where the delineation efforts were mostly devoted to the concerns of public administration and territorial sovereignty rather than functional regionalization. The treatment of regional area in the Tenth Plan seems to confirm this premise.

Here, the main topics of the analysis involve new institutional bodies and governance, new and old policy tools of development planning and sustainable development and territorial statistical system. These three analytical areas will be elaborated by their relevance to geographical representation system, spatial setting and hierarchy.

Three institutional developments characterized the pre-plan period: the establishment of national development bodies (the High Council of Regional Development and the Committee of Regional Development), the establishment of sub-regional development institutions (development agencies at NUTS 2 level and investment support agencies at provincial level) and the establishment of regional development authorities for the ongoing development projects (DAP, DOKAP and KOP).

As the main decision making body, the High Council of Regional Development is responsible for both the approval of all national and regional development

strategies and the determination of the priorities of national development strategies. Being consistent with its legal functions, the operational area of the Council covers national development space as well as the regional area at NUTS (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics) 1 (regional) level. The Committee of Regional Development was founded with an aim to establish a bridge between national and regional development strategies. As an intermediary decision making and monitoring body, the Committee's scope includes monitoring and evaluating the performances of the ongoing development projects and the implementations of development agencies at both regional and sub-regional levels [Republic of Turkey... 2014]. The areas of responsibilities of both institutions appear consistent with the inter-scale implementation tools of the Ninth Development Plan. However, two institutional problems tend to create uncertainties for the spatial planning system in Turkey. The first problem is related with how these new institutions are to interact with existing institutions of regional development in Turkey. The second emphasizes how these new bodies operate in a socio-political sphere in which every province and every development region have specific and different development priorities and performances. Here, the sub-regional and intra-provincial "patronage" networks [Tekeli 2001] are a major obstacle for ensuring the operational efficiency of these new institutions in their areas of responsibility.

The geographical concerns of two institutional bodies, development agencies and investment support agencies are also worthy of note for the conceptualization of regional area in the Tenth Plan of Turkey. The Law No. 5449 on the Establishment, Coordination and Duties of Development Agencies was introduced in 2006 and the agencies started to operate in 2008. Through the same law, investment support agencies were formed as an organizational and assistive unit of development agencies. The main duties of development agencies are to support and monitor regional development projects and strategies, to provide the coordination between the regional actors involved in socio-economic development and to eliminate regional disparities through the improvement of regional economic and social indicators. Investment support offices assist regional actors in the bureaucratic process of investment appraisal [Resolution of the Grand... 2006; T.R. Prime Ministry... 2010]. Here, three spatial and institutional obstacles are likely to negatively affect the performance of development agencies and investment support offices in the achievement of broader regional development goals and objectives in Turkey. First, since the operational scope of the development agencies is based on the NUTS 2 regions, the extent and range of regional development projects under the management of the agencies concerned is limited to the synthetic or administrative regions. Second, a normative classification of regions in Turkey, mostly based on the institutional priorities of the provincial administrative system, inevitably brings about centralization in terms of use and allocation of planning power between local and central actors in economic development. In this case, the financial and managerial autonomy of development agencies appears to be problematic. Third, the role of

development agencies in the implementation of existing regional development plans at sub-regional and provincial level is not clear. The lack of a clear hierarchy in spatial planning and the inadequate definition of the interdependencies between and within the different institutions concerned with regional development issues lead to blurriness on what constitutes the scope of authority for development agencies [Özbek 2010, pp. 114-115].

The problems related to the geographical scope of development agencies and their support offices are also evident for the regional development authorities of the ongoing development projects in the Eastern Anatolia, the Eastern Black Sea and Konya plain. While the first and second development projects aims to achieve the broader goals of socio-economic development in the underdeveloped regions of Turkey, the third project focuses on an efficient agricultural development and irrigation management in the sub-region of Konya Plain. With reference to the debate on administrative and functional regions, the implementation areas of these three projects seem to be problematic due to the formation of project regions through a simple combination of provincial areas: 14 provinces for DAP, 8 provinces for DOKAP and 4 provinces for KOP. This normative delineation poses a major problem for both determining and reconciling the region specific development priorities and using and monitoring the financial funds in distinct and blurred development geography.

The second issue addressed in the plan are the tools of development planning. Inherited from the former policies of “priority regions for development” and growth pole strategy, regional prioritization is the main policy for the strategic allocation of investments in the plan. New investment subsidy and regional evaluation system at provincial level is designed to underpin the policy of regional prioritization. However, a key question arises here: How will new growth centers at provincial level contribute to the diffusion of socio-economic development without establishing functional linkages beyond provincial borders?

3. Lessons from recent regional economic development in Poland

Recent experiences of regional development in Poland (Lower Silesia Region in particular) can be instructive for the latest regional development strategies of Turkey such as the Tenth Development Plan. Clearly important positive lessons might be deduced from the Polish experience particularly with new policy approaches and tools for entrepreneurship and innovation, inter-regional cooperation, growth strategy, urbanization economies, modernization projects, local initiatives and public-private partnerships.

The recent development of Lower Silesia in Poland emphasizes the fact that regional economic development can be long-lasting through a proper combination of

policy, development climate and territorial embeddedness. The socio-spatial and economic advantages in Lower Silesia contribute to the emergence of an “emerging learning economy” in and around the region. These advantages include cross-border cooperation, regional market capacity, regional economic zones, pace of economic transformation, highly communicative environment, well-developed business networks, supporting institutions, intellectual climate, mineral resources and natural environment. In the same vein, Miszczak highlights the importance of innovative environment, broadband internet access, entrepreneurial skills, mathematical and scientific competence, digital literacy and languages in the emergence of knowledge spillovers promoting the learning economy of Lower Silesia [Miszczak 2010, pp. 63-64]. As distinct from the old growth pole strategy of Turkey based on the centralized institutions in the provincial-territorial system, the “supporting institutions” of Lower Silesia in entrepreneurship, technology transfer and local development contribute to and benefit from this business climate [Mempel-Śnieżyk 2010, pp. 54-55]. The effective tools for inter-regional cooperation in Europe such as RIS (Regional Innovation Strategies) projects promote the entrepreneurial climate and innovative environment in Lower Silesia. New action-oriented RIS projects that are based on public-private partnership and consensus are carried out in Lower Silesia and in the other six NUTS-2 regions (sub-regions in the nomenclature of territorial units for statistics) in Poland [Derlukiewicz 2009, pp. 16-17]. From one viewpoint, these projects are important tools for transforming the old institutional structure and bureaucracy on economic development in Poland into an action-oriented and proactive structure.

Here, the key lessons derived from the emerging knowledge-based economy of Lower Silesia [Mempel-Śnieżyk 2010, pp. 54-55] are to stay close to the real economy and to capture the creative essence of development. Furthermore, the Lower Silesian case draws attention to the importance of inter-regional cooperation in regional development [Derlukiewicz 2009, pp. 15-17]. These developments can be seen as an outcome of a more flexible and reflexive institutional structure in Poland in comparison with the past. However, the institutional context of Turkish development planning tends to be highly bureaucratic. The concerns of public administration and partisanship are of utmost importance in the formation of this structure in Turkey. This weakens the linkages between development strategies, real economy and territorial system in Turkey.

The growth pole strategy is a widely used development approach in the development plans in Turkey. Here, an interesting parallel might be drawn between the cases of Turkey and Poland. In Poland, a recent analysis of “growth centers of polycentric spatial systems” and “five bipolar activity concentration spheres” [Miszczak 2012, p. 137] reveals the fact that the growth pole strategy best works with establishing “functional linkages on learning economy” between different historical and cultural regions [Mempel-Śnieżyk 2010, pp. 49-55; Miszczak 2010, pp. 62-67].

The Lower Silesian case also demonstrates how regional economic performance is closely associated with the positive-feedback mechanism by urbanization economies and entrepreneurship. Economic development in the Wrocław sub-region was triggered by the economic growth of Wrocław Metropolitan Area between 2005 and 2009. The service-oriented urban economy in the metropolitan area positively contributed to the high investment attractiveness of Lower Silesia in the same period. Here, the main indicators of the developing regional economy were enterprises, profitability, investment, employment, foreign capital and gross domestic product [Zakrzewska-Półtorak 2010, pp. 124-131]. The positive feedback mechanism for this development can be attributed to the locational, economic and socio-cultural factors promoting territorial embeddedness in Lower Silesia and Wrocław region. In the Turkish case, the policy of regional prioritization aims to create an entrepreneurial climate that would enable the private sector to flourish in the existing or emerging development centers in the assisted regions of Turkey: the Black Sea, South Eastern, Eastern and partially Central Anatolia Regions. However, the ongoing economic, political and demographic developments in Turkey impede the effective implementation of regional prioritization. From the one viewpoint, the policy tools such as regional prioritization in Turkey appear to be idealistic and these tools stay away from the development concerns of the real economy.

Polish and Turkish cases display some similarities in terms of the role of modernization projects in regional development. Similar to the projects in most metropolitan areas in Turkey, the modernization projects are used as a tool to stimulate regional development in Lower Silesia. A typical example is the modernization of Copernicus Airport in Wrocław as a key infrastructure project for the further regional development in Lower Silesia [Zakrzewska-Półtorak 2009, pp. 160-162]. In the developed regions of Turkey, the metropolitan modernization projects create a positive feedback mechanism in comparison with the uncertain prospects of regional prioritization policy in the assisted regions. The attractiveness of some regional centers in Turkey is closely associated with the recent demographic movements and socio-political developments rather than the modernization projects. This point is most evident in the metropolitan centers of Şanlıurfa and Gaziantep in the Southeastern Anatolia Region.

In Poland, local initiatives supported by metropolitan administration have an utmost importance in the introduction of successful development strategies. A well-established promotional strategy developed by the public administration of Cracow for tourism activities presents a good example of these initiatives [Batko 2011, pp. 328-339]. However, in the Turkish case, integrated tourism strategies are typically introduced at regional and sub-regional levels. Despite the existence of prosperous metropolitan municipalities for tourism strategy like Eskişehir in Central Anatolia Region, the different strategic priorities of central (governorships) and local administrative units complicate the introduction of an integrated tourism strategy at the intra-regional level. Concerning this point, the Tenth Development Plan of

Turkey highlights the importance of both the diversification of tourism activities and an integrated tourism strategy. The plan also emphasizes the role of civil society participation and local administration in tourism development. Here, the case of Cracow is instructive to show how public administrations, universities and non-governmental organizations can effectively cooperate with each other in a less bureaucratic way.

The other important issue related to local initiatives is public-private partnerships. Brzozowska [2011] points out the importance of public-private partnership (PPP) in the regional development of Poland by the potential projects in the sectors of public infrastructure. In Poland, the legal obstacles and the problematic content of socio-political strategies negatively affect “the more active PPP development” [Ibidem, pp. 18-23]. Concerning this issue, the Tenth Development Plan of Turkey highlights the supportive role of the state for the private sector investments. Creating a sound investment climate through ensuring “sufficient infrastructure investment” is vital for public-private partnerships to work [Resolution of the Grand... 2013, p. 69]. Here, Polish and Turkish cases rely on a state-centric investment policy for regional development. In Turkey, the state’s supportive role has been shaping the development space since the Etatist Period started with the nationwide railway project in the 1930s.

The last issue dealt in the Tenth Plan, territorial statistical system can be treated in a spatial manner. The strategic framework and implementation scope of the plan rests on a pure normative territorial system: provinces, sub-regions (group of provinces) and regions (group of sub-regions). The adoption of regional statistical system of the European Union (NUTS) in 2002 carried the problems of delineation and classification of regional area which were widely debated by regional scientists, geographers and economists in Europe in the last ten years to the development agenda in Turkey. In a similar vein to the studies on the debate of normative and functional regions in Europe, some studies of regional science and regional geography in Turkey highlighted and criticized the administrative scope of development planning. The policy issues of growth pole strategy, regional prioritization, local devolution, metropolitan governance and rural planning in the Tenth Plan are addressed in a territorial framework of public administration and provincial system as well as the NUTS system. Despite the emphasis on the need for the formation of functional regions for rural development and pre-disaster planning in the plan, the geographical scope of these policy areas seems to be the provincial area.

4. Conclusions

Regional area in Turkey was and is a strategically ambiguous sphere where the delineation efforts were mostly devoted to the concerns of public administration and territorial sovereignty rather than functional regionalization. The treatment of

regional area in the Tenth Plan seems to confirm this premise. A close analysis of the three policy areas of the Tenth Plan (institutional system, policies and territorial system) highlights the fact that development planning in Turkey geographically rests on both a normative delineation and centralized public administration system. The inherited institutional and socio-political problems in Turkey lessen the prospects of regional development policies in the strategic documents like the Tenth Development Plan.

Here, the Polish experience in regional development is particularly interesting and instructive from a comparative perspective because of a positive-feedback mechanism through a sound development framework underpinned by the institutional structure and regional spillovers through public-private partnerships. The recent success of Poland in regional development can be attributed to the efficient transformation of the old institutional structure and bureaucracy into an action-oriented and proactive structure, new tools of inter- and intra-regional cooperation and retaining ties to the real economy. Here, the key lessons derived from the emerging knowledge-based economy of Lower Silesia are to stay close to the real economy and to capture the creative essence of development.

References

- Batko A., 2011, *Administracja publiczna jako stymulator zmian w turystyce miasta – na przykładzie Krakowa w latach 1989–2006*, [in:] Korenik S., Dybała A. (eds.), *Przestrzeń a rozwój*, Prace Naukowe, no. 241, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław, pp. 328-339.
- Brzozowska K., 2011, *Partnerstwo publiczno-prywatne w Polsce*, [in:] Korenik S., Łyszczak M. (eds.), *Kształtowanie się nowej przestrzeni w gospodarce globalnej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław, pp. 11-23.
- Derlukiewicz N., 2009, *Regional innovation strategy projects carried out in European regions*, [in:] Korenik S. (ed.), *Some aspects of spatial economy*, Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee for Spatial Economy and Regional Planning, Warszawa, s. 9-18.
- Kazgan G., 2002, *Tanzimat'tan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye Ekonomisi: Birinci Küreselleşmeden İkinci Küreselleşmeye*, Istanbul Bilgi University Publishing, Istanbul.
- Mempel-Śnieżyk A., 2010, *Lower Silesia region in knowledge-based economy (chosen aspects)*, [in:] Korenik S., Šašek M. (eds.), *Spatial economy – contemporary determinants, trends and tendencies*, Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee for Spatial Economy and Regional Planning, Warszawa, pp. 48-56.
- Miszczak K., 2010, *Learning economy in Lithuania, Lower Bavaria and Lower Silesia (chosen aspects)*, [in:] S. Korenik, M. Šašek (eds.), *Spatial economy – contemporary determinants, trends and tendencies*, Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee for Spatial Economy and Regional Planning, Warszawa, pp. 57-68.
- Miszczak K., 2012, *Spatial economic networks*, [in:] Korenik S., Özbek O. (eds.), *International spatial economy – chosen aspects*, Publishing House of Wrocław University of Economics, Wrocław, pp. 119-140.
- Özbek O., 2010, *The efficiency of development agencies in normative regions in Turkey*, [in:] A. Łuczyszyna (ed.), *Rola instytucji publiczno-prywatnych w gospodarce regionu*, Zeszyty Naukowe, no. 30, Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania i Finansów we Wrocławiu, Wrocław, pp. 109-117.

- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Development, 2014, *Bölgesel gelişme yüksek kurulu ve bölgesel gelişme komitesi*, <http://www3.kalkinma.gov.tr/Kalkinma.portal> (access 02.05.2014).
- Resolution of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, 2006, *5449 Sayılı kalkınma ajanslarının kuruluşu, koordinasyonu ve görevleri hakkında kanun*, The Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, no. 26074.
- Resolution of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, 2013, *Onuncu kalkınma planının (2014–2018) onaylandığına ilişkin karar*, The Official Gazette of Republic of Turkey, no. 28699.
- T.R. Prime Ministry State Planning Organization, 2010, *Kalkınma ajansları*, <http://www.dpt.gov.tr/bgyu/kalkinmaajans/ajans.html> (access 19.07.2010).
- Tekeli İ., 2001, *Modernite Aşılırken Kent Planlaması*, Image Publishing House, Ankara.
- Zakrzewska-Półtorak A., 2009, *The significance of Wrocław airport extension for the development of the region*, [in:] Korenik S. (ed.), *Some aspects of spatial economy*, Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee for Spatial Economy and Regional Planning, Warszawa, pp. 157-164.
- Zakrzewska-Półtorak A., 2010, *Economic activity of enterprises located in Wrocław metropolitan area and its consequences for the economy of Lower Silesian Voivodship*, [in:] Korenik S., Šašek M. (eds.), *Spatial economy – contemporary determinants, trends and tendencies*, Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee for Spatial Economy and Regional Planning, Warszawa, p. 124-131.