

NEW URBAN DESIGN IN MANAGEMENT: THE CASE OF TURKIYE IN THE CONTEXT OF METROPOLITAN LAW

Cemal Zehir^{1,2}, Hicran Hamza Çelikyay^{2*}, Zahid Mamedov³

¹Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul, Turkiye

²Duzce University, Duzce, Turkiye

³Azerbaijan State University of Economics (UNEC), Baku, Azerbaijan

Abstract. The design of the urban area can be addressed in many respects. Studies that reshape cities with the design of physics-space are affected by spatial as well as social, administrative, and legal formations. The new metropolitan law, which was put into effect in Turkiye in 2014, readdressed metropolitan administrations and shaped cities in legal and administrative terms. There are still ongoing discussions on the law, which is also considered the "design" of new urban management. This study analyzed the post-law local development dynamics of 14 cities, whose administrative features are regarded as metropolitan within the framework of Law No. 6360, and investigated how the process shaped the cities. In the study, the data for the three years before and after 2014, which is the date of implementation of the law, were discussed using the local economic development indicators for 14 cities. This study aimed to reveal how Law No. 6360 shaped the cities legally and administratively and investigate its effects in the context of local economic development.

Keywords: *Urban Management, Urban Managerial Design, Metropolitan Law, Local Development, Turkiye.*

Corresponding Author: *Assoc. Prof. Hicran, Hamza Celikyay, Akcakoca Bey Faculty of Political Sciences, Duzce University, Duzce, Turkiye, Tel.: +905356624569, e-mail: hicrancelikyay@yahoo.com*

Received: 6 August 2022;

Accepted: 2 November 2022;

Published: 8 December 2022.

1. Introduction

Along with the urbanization process that gained momentum in the 1960s, the focus of various discussions was how cities should be managed. The migration from rural areas to cities brought about the concentration of population in unplanned areas. The difficulty of performing urban services emerged, especially in these new settlement areas observed in the urban peripheries, and the development of sustainable urban design and urban planning processes came to the fore. This process, which required the shaping of new urban designs, led to the search for new models regarding the management of cities. This search paved the way for some innovations in the legal and administrative planes.

The 2000s were the years during which policies anticipating significant changes in the management of metropolitan cities were developed. A number of reform studies conducted since these years have provided the opportunity to meet with the management of the "metropolitan area." After those years, studies on the design and reshaping of urban areas also gained momentum in Turkiye as well as worldwide. In

How to cite (APA):

Zehir, C., Çelikyay, H.H. & Mamedov, Z. (2022). New urban design in management: The case of Turkiye in the context of metropolitan law. *New Design Ideas*, 6(3), 335-355.

this regard, the searches for closing small municipalities according to the population scale and expanding the borders of medium-sized cities and metropolitan municipalities have always been up-to-date.

The metropolitan law, known as Law No. 6360 on the "Establishment of Fourteen Metropolitan Municipalities and Twenty-Seven Districts and Amendments at Certain Law and Decree Laws," reshaped the urban management model in Türkiye while bringing a new administrative structure for metropolitan cities. With this law which can be described as the redesign of urban legal and administrative processes, the number of metropolitan cities was increased, and their administrative areas were expanded up to the provincial administrative boundary. Special provincial administrations were removed in these provinces.

The presence or absence of "life" in architectural and urban areas is apparent to almost every person. In the past, people created works, buildings, and urban areas to nourish themselves emotionally. Nowadays, these areas have developed with the industrial revolution and gained different vitality (Salingaros, 2018). Over time, the design of the urban area was also addressed in many respects. Studies that reshape cities with the design of physics-space are affected by spatial as well as social, administrative, and legal formations. This study analyzed the post-law local development dynamics of 14 provinces, which gained the metropolitan status based on only population criteria with Law No. 6360 in 2014, and investigated how the process shaped the cities.

2. A brief legal history shaping metropolitan urban management in Türkiye

The 1980s, when liberal policies prevailed effectively worldwide, affected many regulations in Türkiye. The redesign and administrative formation of cities also came to the fore during this period.

Law No. 2561 on the "Affiliation of Settlements in the Near Vicinity of Greater Cities to Principal Municipalities" was enacted in 1981 by performing an application that can be defined as affiliating the surrounding municipalities to the central municipality through metropolitan cities, in a sense, for merging.

The law includes the statement, "municipalities and villages around metropolises with a municipal population of more than 300,000 according to the results of the latest general census can be affiliated to the metropolitan municipality they are close to in accordance with the principles and procedures specified in this Law in order to ensure that municipal services such as energy, drinking and utility water, sewerage, transportation, public transportation and public works are carried out adequately and efficiently in a harmonious and integrative planning" (Law No. 2561, Article 1). After the law, small municipalities in the city centers in Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Adana, Bursa, Gaziantep, Konya, and Eskişehir were merged with the municipality of their province (Keleş, 2009). This law is also known as the "amalgamation law." These attempts can be considered transition efforts from small scale to large scale. These searches for the management of metropolitan cities led to enacting a provision in the 1982 Constitution. In Article 127, it is stated, "The law may introduce special forms of management for metropolitan settlements." Until that time, there had been no statement of special forms of management for large areas. In this article, both metropolitan settlements and special forms of management were put forward.

Conceptually, metropolitan cities were brought to the agenda with Law No. 3030 dated 1984 in Türkiye. The purpose of the law is stated as "regulating the legal status of

the metropolitan municipality administration to ensure that services are carried out in a planned, scheduled, effective, and harmonious manner" (Law No. 3030, Article 1). It is observed that a planned, effective, and harmonious approach is needed for the execution of urban services in cities. In the law, "Metropolitan City" is defined as "Cities with more than one district within the municipality borders," while district municipality is defined as "municipalities established with districts within the boundaries of the metropolitan municipality" (Law No. 3030, Article 3). The two-tier metropolitan model is defined by the law. According to the Law in which the duties of metropolitan cities are listed in detail, broad authorities are granted to metropolitan cities on issues such as transportation, zoning plans, budget, environment, and human resources. The two-tier metropolitan structure was initiated in Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir with the local elections held in 1984.

The legal regulation dated 1984 paved the way for the administrative and legal regulations to be made in metropolitan municipalities. In the process, metropolitan municipalities gradually differentiated from other municipalities. In Türkiye, in parallel with the world, the metropolitan municipality management model underwent a fast and dynamic course and transformation, and there was a need for legal regulations that could adapt to this change. The law remained in force until 2004. The establishment years and legal status of metropolitan cities are presented in Table 1:

Table 1. Metropolitan municipalities, establishment years and legal status

Years	Legal Satatus	Provinces Where the Metropolitan Municipality was Established
1986	Law No. 3306	Adana
1987	Laws No. 3391, 3398, and 3399	Bursa, Gaziantep, Konya
1988	Law No. 3508	Kayseri
1993	Decree-Law No. 504	Antalya, Diyarbakır, Erzurum, Eskişehir, Kocaeli, Mersin, Samsun
2000	Decree-Law No. 593	Sakarya

Source: (Zengin, 2014).

With the legislation implemented until 2012, the scale of the metropolitan area expanded, and thus, there was a greater need for addressing the management mechanism covering the service area within a coordinated framework. The growth of cities also led to the emergence of new management problems. The developments and trends in the world triggered the change of the management paradigm in Türkiye and brought new searches for the urban management model to the agenda.

On November 12, 2012, Law No. 6360 was adopted. The law is considered an important turning point in the history of local governments in Türkiye in terms of including many innovations and important changes (Law No. 6360, 2014). This period on which the study focuses is discussed in detail in the next section.

3. Design of new urban management introduced by Law No. 6360

Law No. 6360 on the "Establishment of Fourteen Metropolitan Municipalities and Twenty-Seven Districts and Amendments at Certain Law and Decree Laws" also changed the local government model in Türkiye while bringing a new administrative structure for metropolitan cities. The number of metropolitan cities was increased, and

their administrative areas were expanded up to the provincial administrative boundary. Special provincial administrations were removed in these provinces.

Law No. 6360 was put into effect after the 2014 Local Elections. With the Law, the number of metropolitan municipalities was increased from 16 to 30, the municipal boundaries in metropolitan cities were expanded to provincial administrative boundaries, and the legal entities of all town municipalities in metropolitan cities and town municipalities with a population below 2000 in other provinces were abolished. With this regulation, it was aimed to strengthen municipalities administratively, financially, and technically (MİGM, 2013).

Before the enactment of Law No. 6360, 83% and 17% of Türkiye's population lived in urban and rural areas, respectively. While 55% of the people living within the municipal boundaries were in the metropolitan municipality, 45% were within the boundaries of other municipalities. With Law No. 6360, 78% of Türkiye's population started to live within the boundaries of metropolitan municipalities (Ökmen & Arslan, 2014).

The provinces that were turned into metropolitan cities within the scope of Law No. 6360 were Aydın, Balıkesir, Denizli, Hatay, Malatya, Manisa, Kahramanmaraş, Mardin, Muğla, Tekirdağ, Trabzon, Şanlıurfa, Van, and then Ordu[†] provincial municipalities. Thus, urban management, which had been previously limited to the urban area, was extended up to provincial administrative boundaries, and a new urban management approach was put into practice. Therefore, there were fundamental changes in the administration of the provinces brought by Law No. 6360. These fundamental changes can be listed as follows:

- a) The provincial municipalities of provinces with a total population of 750,000 and above were transformed into metropolitan municipalities with the new law;
- b) New metropolitan municipalities were established in 14 provinces. The total number of metropolitan cities reached 30;
- c) All metropolitan municipality boundaries became provincial administrative boundaries;
- d) The legal entity of special provincial administrations was abolished in 30 provinces;
- e) New districts were established;
- f) The boundaries of all district municipalities in metropolitan cities became district administrative boundaries;
- g) Town municipalities, together with their neighborhoods, joined the municipality of the district to which they were affiliated;
- h) All village administrations in these provinces were abolished, and they were turned into neighborhoods;
- i) The administrative affiliation of the districts affiliated to metropolitan cities also changed;
- j) No new neighborhoods with a population of less than 500 would be established within the municipal boundaries;
- k) Town municipalities with a population of less than 2,000 in provinces outside of metropolitan municipalities were transformed into villages;
- l) Partial changes were made in the division of duties and powers of metropolitan municipalities and district municipalities;

[†] Ordu became a metropolitan city with Law No. 6447 adopted on 14/3/2013.

- m) The Department of Investment Monitoring and Coordination (DIMC) was established under the civil administration in 30 provinces;
- n) The shares of the General Budget Tax Revenues (GBTR) were rearranged;
- o) The works of the special provincial administrations were transferred to the provincial organizations of the ministries and their subsidiaries according to their relevance (Law No. 6360, 2012).

With the law, the metropolitan municipality model that will produce services within the provincial border is expected to reveal the following positive developments (Law No. 6360 General Grounds):

- a) Local government units that produce large-scale services will be equipped with advanced technologies.
- b) Qualified technical personnel can be employed in these administrations that will produce services on a large scale, and productivity will increase since the labor force will become specialized.
- c) The local government system consisting of large-scale local units will ensure the effective use of the resources to be sent from the center.
- d) Efficiency will be ensured in the use of resources among the local government units integrated within the provincial borders.
- e) A fairer structure may emerge in terms of the opportunities to be possessed.
- f) Harmonized zoning practices can be realized throughout the province within the framework of regulatory upper zoning plans.
- g) Furthermore, it is stated that efficiency can be provided in delivering local common public services, such as zoning, planning, transportation, and fire services, that should be carried out in a wide range of coordination and integrity.

The reasons listed above were determined as a result of some problems generally observed in the management of cities before Law No. 6360. The realization of positive developments that are considered to occur after the implementation of the law or whether different conditions other than the expectations have occurred is evaluated with different studies during the implementation process of the law.

4. The concept of local development and its basic features

The first systematic theory of Local Development was included in a study conducted by Giacomo Becattini in Italy. It is indicated that the study entitled "Marshall's Industrial Zone," which was published in the mid-1970s, opened new horizons for the development of the concept of local development (Capello, 2011). On the other hand, it is known that the concept of Local Development came to the fore in the 19th century. In the 1980s, it gained momentum with institutional and cultural studies conducted in the field of social sciences (Moulaert & Mehmood, 2020). In those years, the concept was also called "bottom-up development," "endogenous development," and "social development" (Topkaya, 2015).

Globalization, which emerged after the 1980s, led to a differentiation in the approach to economic policies. Regional policies were given priority in places. New policies changed the priorities and decision-making processes in the implementation of local policies in order to bring the local and the potential of the local to the forefront (Eraydın, 2004).

Local development is generally defined through a multifaceted mixed market in which the "local" factors of a particular form of regional development constitute the

basis of entrepreneurial spirit, local firms, or financial institutions. Therefore, this formulation of the concept requires identifying local factors, unlike external factors. Local factors include not only the spatial or physical characteristics of a region (local characteristics, natural advantages, underground sources, etc.) but rather the socio-cultural and behavioral characteristics of the local population in the development process. In other words, the physical and spatial characteristics of a region cannot be changed, but "local" factors are the elements that can be affected or changed by the behaviors of local people. Thus, the identification and analysis of such local factors constitute the main methodological and conceptual challenge in detailing the endogenous regional growth model (Coffey & Polese, 1984).

According to Haughton (1998), Local Development can be achieved by taking into account local opportunities, improving small businesses and environmental potential, developing human capital in a qualified way, local taxes, and strengthening income-generating assets (Haughton, 1998). On the other hand, Marshall used the "tree" metaphor while describing Local Development. Accordingly, the trunk of the tree is the key industry. Its branches represent supplier industries, and its sub-branches represent manufacturers of manufacturers. The soil on which the tree feeds consists of local resources and global demand and also training conditions, job training, and quality control process in connection with in-house production and other local institutions. In his theory, Marshall focuses on the role of local markets and firm networks by emphasizing that local development depends primarily on the knowledge base and secondarily on the natural resource base (Andersen, 1996). Coffey and Polese (1984) describe the stages of Local Development as follows:

- a) Emergence of local entrepreneurship and local firms
- b) Growth and expansion of local firms outside the region
- c) Emergence of a locally developed control mechanism
- d) Establishment of a strong locally controlled economic sector, including head offices, financial institutions, and services

The concept of Local Development expanded over time. The definitions made through Gross National Product (GNP) per capita in the early years were replaced by approaches such as quality of life, reducing poverty, and increasing the level of well-being. In this newly shaped understanding of regional development, local stakeholders as well as national governments took an active responsibility. For example, in the OECD (2013) report, Local Development is considered one of the most important ways to reduce poverty. Local Development is expressed as the capacity building for the construction of the economic future and the improvement of the quality of life of citizens in local governments, the region, or any defined area (OECD, 2013).

Local Development is a participatory development process that encourages a number of cooperative arrangements between the private sector and public institutions of a particular region with the aim of increasing the quality of life and stimulating economic activity. The process ensures the joint design and implementation of a common development strategy by taking advantage of local resources and competitive advantage in the global context (Boekel & Logtestjin, 2004).

Local development focuses on the management of local resources. All features of a region should be taken into account, an effective and sustainable institutional infrastructure should be established, and effective and efficient use of human resources and social capital should be ensured. For the realization and sustainability of Local Development, it is necessary to know the potential status, characteristics, quality, and

impact power of institutions and thus determine their policies and strategies for those institutions (Çayın & Yapraklı, 2019).

It is important to adopt certain strategies and principles for the success of Local Development. The International Labor Organization (ILO) recommends working strategies for local development with the aim of developing local capacity with effective policies and realizing planned and systematic development. The recommended strategies are as follows (ILO, 2020):

- a) Promoting coordination between stakeholders at the local level.
- b) Establishment of employment strategies at the local level.
- c) Strengthening a favorable environment for micro-, small-, and medium-sized businesses at the local level.
- d) Expanding social security coverage to include informal workers and the local population.

Göymen (2004) lists the basic principles of Local Development as follows:

- a) Development should be people-oriented. The approaches that only aim at growth and neglect how growth reflects on individuals and society are insufficient.
- b) Development should be as equitable and inclusive as possible, and municipalities should monitor how the results affect different layers of society while taking the lead in development and implement protective, positive discrimination policies for those who do not receive an equal share from the development process when needed.
- c) Development is a multidimensional (economic, social, political, and cultural) process, and a "complementary effect" should be created between these dimensions.
- d) The good integration of these factors is required to obtain the right results from a local development program consisting of integrated and harmonious projects (Göymen, 2004).

Sustainable success can be achieved when traditional development policies and local development policies are carried out together. The implementation of local development policies should not mean that traditional policies will be ignored. Traditional Development and Local Development approaches and the differences between them are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Traditional development and local development approaches

Traditional Development	Local Development
1. The top-down approach in which decisions on areas where intervention is required are made centrally	1. Promoting development in all regions with local demands
2. Administration of the central management	2. Ensuring decentralized, vertical cooperation between different levels of management and horizontal cooperation between public and private institutions
3. Sectoral approach in development	3. Prioritizing the regional approach (such as locality, environment) in development
4. Development of large industrial projects to promote economic activities	4. Maximizing the development potential of each region for the gradual adaptation of the local economic system to the dynamic economic environment
5. Benefiting from financial support, incentives, and subsidies as the main factor to attract economic activities	5. Providing the basic conditions for the development of economic activities

Source: Rodríguez-Pose (2001).

While observing the success of Local Development, it is important that stakeholders take an active role as well as the need for following policies consistent with the principles and strategies. This approach aims to make the most of local opportunities using the natural, economic, cultural, and technological resources available in the region. To this end, stakeholders such as local governments, businesses, NGOs, local employment agencies, social partners, education and training institutions, local politicians and financial circles work together (DPT, 2004). The strengthening of local development is also associated with the awareness of cities and their being centers of attraction. The branding process of cities and their mottos and/or slogans play an important role in their becoming a center of attraction. Cognitive components such as natural and cultural resources, climate, social areas and environment of cities and peaceful and exciting sensory components support this process (Keskin *et al.*, 2016).

To this end, stakeholders are expected to be able to take collaborative and coordinated action with local communities and governments and businesses in a region that share common local resources, better understand their position and interdependence within the region, provide the necessary environment for efficient and effective work, and reconsider competition and cooperation locally and in larger markets (Gül, 2004).

In this process, public institutions, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations are envisaged to work together (<http://web.worldbank.org>). Table 3 includes the stakeholders of Local Development.

Table 3. Stakeholders of local development

Public sector	Local Governments	Universities
Private sector	Non-Governmental Organizations	Research Centers
Unions	Regional Development Agencies	Think Tanks

Source: (Kessides, 2009).

This table, which also involves Local Governments, primarily includes the main stakeholders. When considered more comprehensively, as part of Local Development, local governments are regarded as key stakeholders and have missions that bring other stakeholders together. Local governments develop local development strategies by taking decisions to create income opportunities by targeting economic development (www.etu.org.za/index.html).

5. New metropolitan cities and urban management designs

After Law No. 6360, 14 new metropolitan cities were added to the existing metropolitan cities. These provinces are Aydın, Balıkesir, Denizli, Hatay, Malatya, Manisa, Kahramanmaraş, Mardin, Muğla, Ordu, Tekirdağ, Trabzon, Şanlıurfa, and Van, respectively (Law No. 6360, Article 1).

The characteristics of cities and distinctive dynamics that define the cities can be addressed in many respects. For example, in a study evaluating the development of medium-sized and small cities in the cities of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut in the "New England" region of the United States of America, urban dynamics were evaluated through population increase, income level, production capacity, and real income per capita (Cuberes & Ramsawak, 2020).

The same study also examined which dynamics were addressed in different studies conducted in previous years. Accordingly, while income sources, administrative capacity, access to services, and grant programs were discussed in the study by Bryce (1977), migration rates, production capacity, and the sustainability of resources were addressed by Cox and Long-lands (2016). The population growth and geographic expansion were discussed in the study by Eeckhout (2004) (Cuberes & Ramsawak, 2020).

In the study by Cubillos-González (2017), the effects of sustainable urban planning and urban design policies of medium-sized cities in Colombia on development were examined, and the main problems faced by cities were discussed. According to the study, the main problems of medium-sized cities were listed as informality, uncertainty, and wrong administration-management (Cubillos-González, 2017).

In a study conducted for the city of Ibadan, Nigeria, in the Sub-Saharan African region, within the framework of the program supported by the UK Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the International Human Development Innovation Program Office, the different dynamics of changing urban forms were considered as urban management, urban economy, physical infrastructure and social services, access to water, transportation, access to health services, urban poverty, and employment (Adelekan, 2020).

It is also known that urban dynamics are evaluated in terms of their place in the global economy, whether they are a world city, their participation and governance potential, foreign partnerships, and whether they are open to new industries (Çakır, 2006). A different study discussed urban dynamics within the framework of physical and social changes of cities, economic activities, potential to become a regional trade center, and housing policies (Özdamar, 2011).

Concerning the subject of this study, 14 new metropolitan cities will be evaluated with a general view according to their characteristics such as population, geographical features and urban area, development region (NUTS), and level of development.

Population

The populations of the metropolitan cities before and after the adoption of Law No. 6360 are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Populations of new metropolitan cities before and after Law No. 6360

New Metropolitan Cities	Before Law No. 6360 (2013)	After Law No. 6360 (2020)	Population Growth Rate
Aydın	1 020 957	1 119 084	9.6%
Balıkesir	1 162 761	1 240 285	6.6%
Denizli	963 464	1 040 915	8%
Hatay	1 503 066	1 659 320	10.3%
Malatya	762 538	806 156	5.7%
Manisa	1 359 463	1 450 616	6.7%
Kahramanmaraş	1 075 706	1 168 163	8.5%
Mardin	779 738	854 716	9.6%
Muğla	866 665	1 000 773	15.4%
Ordu	731 452	761 400	4%
Tekirdağ	874 475	1 081 065	23.6%
Trabzon	758 237	811 901	0.7%
Şanlıurfa	1 801 980	2 115 256	17.3%
Van	1 070 113	1 149 342	7.4%

Source: (TurkStat, 2021)

When the population of 2013 before the implementation of the law was compared with the population of 2020 after the law, it was observed that the increase was at the usual minimum level. The lowest and highest population growth rates were 0.7% and 17.3%, respectively. After the 7-year period, it was seen that the law did not lead to a significant acceleration in the populations of the relevant cities.

Geographical Features, Urban and Rural Areas

The sizes of urban and rural areas and the development region in which they are located are important in evaluating cities. Although Law No. 6360 covers the entire city up to the provincial administrative boundaries, the size of the city's urban area where municipal services are intensively offered and the size of a geographical area in which services must be taken to the rural area are among the main criteria that affect the success of implementing the law. The surface area and urban and rural area sizes of the new metropolitan cities are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Surface areas of the new metropolitan cities

New Metropolitan Cities	Surface Areas (m²)
Aydın	8,116
Balıkesir	14,583
Denizli	12,134
Hatay	5,524
Kahramanmaraş	14,520
Malatya	12,259
Manisa	13,339
Mardin	8,780
Muğla	12,654
Ordu	5,861
Şanlıurfa	19,242
Tekirdağ	6,190
Trabzon	4,628
Van	20,921

The most fundamental characteristic introduced by the new law is the expansion of urban services up to the provincial administrative boundaries. As seen in Table 5, Van, one of the new metropolitan cities, has the largest area with 20291 m² among the other cities. A large part of this area consists of rural areas. The difficulties encountered in delivering urban services to the provincial borders and the solutions for them were discussed in various studies.

Development Regions (NUTS)

The European Union member countries use regional statistics at various dimensions to develop policies for economic and social problems at the regional level. These regional statistics are called the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS). The European Union (EU) Statistical Office (Eurostat) recommends this classification to member and candidate countries to create a certain structure for regional statistics to be produced in EU countries.

Table 6. Regions and provinces classified according to the NUTS in Türkiye

Code	Level 1 (12 Regions)	Code	Level 2 (26 Sub-regions)	Level 3 (81 provinces)
TR1	Istanbul	TR10	Istanbul sub-region	Istanbul
TR2	Western Marmara	TR21	Tekirdağ sub-region	Tekirdağ , Edirne, Kırklareli
		T222	Balıkesir sub-region	Balıkesir , Çanakkale
TR3	Aegean	TR31	Izmir sub-region	Izmir
		TR32	Aydın sub-region	Aydın, Denizli, Muğla
		TR33	Manisa sub-region	Manisa , Afyonkarahisar, Kütahya, Uşak
TR4	Eastern Marmara	TR41	Bursa sub-region	Bursa, Eskişehir, Bilecik
		TR42	Kocaeli sub-region	Kocaeli, Sakarya, Düzce, Bolu, Yalova
TR5	Western Anatolia	TR51	Ankara sub-region	Ankara
		TR52	Konya sub-region	Konya, Karaman
TR6	Mediterranean	TR61	Antalya sub-region	Antalya, Isparta, Burdur
		TR62	Adana sub-region	Adana, Mersin
		TR63	Hatay sub-region	Hatay, Kahramanmaraş, Osmaniye
TR7	Central Anatolia	TR71	Kırıkkale sub-region	Kırıkkale, Aksaray, Niğde, Nevşehir, Kırşehir
		TR72	Kayseri sub-region	Kayseri, Sivas, Yozgat
TR8	Western Black Sea	TR81	Zonguldak sub-region	Zonguldak, Karabük, Bartın
		TR82	Kastamonu sub-region	Kastamonu, Çankırı, Sinop
		TR83	Samsun sub-region	Samsun, Tokat, Çorum, Amasya
TR9	Eastern Black Sea	TR90	Trabzon sub-region	Trabzon, Ordu , Giresun, Rize, Artvin, Gümüşhane
TRA	Northeastern Anatolia	TRA1	Erzurum sub-region	Erzurum, Erzincan, Bayburt
		TRA2	Ağrı sub-region	Ağrı, Kars, Iğdır, Ardahan
TRB	Middle Eastern Anatolia	TRB1	Malatya sub-region	Malatya , Elazığ, Bingöl, Tunceli
		TRB2	Van sub-region	Van , Muş, Bitlis, Hakkâri
TRC	Southeastern Anatolia	TRC1	Gaziantep sub-region	Gaziantep, Adıyaman, Kilis
		TRC2	Şanlıurfa sub-region	Şanlıurfa , Diyarbakır
		TRC3	Mardin sub-region	Mardin , Batman, Şırnak, Siirt

Source: (Şengül *et al.*, 2013).

Since 2001, the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) has been applied to the whole of Türkiye. The State Planning Organization, the State Institute of Statistics, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs were assigned to determine the statistical regions. The NUTS report was published in the Official Gazette dated September 22, 2002 (Directorate for EU Affairs, 2003).

The NUTS classification is based on three criteria. The first is to take the country's previous regional classification as a basis. The second is to classify areas with the same potential by bringing them together. The third criterion is population. NUTS regions are classified as Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. Twelve Level 1, 26 Level 2, and 81 Level 3 NUTS regions were defined in Türkiye by considering the criteria of population, geography, regional development plans, main statistical indicators, and socio-economic development ranking of the provinces. The regions and provinces classified according to the NUTS in Türkiye are shown in Table 6 (Şengül *et al.*, 2013).

The new metropolitan cities are marked in Table 6. Accordingly, among the new metropolitan cities, Tekirdağ and Balıkesir are located in the Western Marmara development region, Aydın, Denizli, Muğla, and Manisa are located in the Aegean development region, Hatay and Kahramanmaraş are located in the Mediterranean development region, Trabzon and Ordu are located in the Eastern Black Sea development region, Malatya and Van are located in the Middle Eastern Anatolian development region, and Şanlıurfa and Mardin are located in the Southeastern Anatolian development region. The new metropolitan cities are located in 6 different development regions of Türkiye. Accordingly, there are 4 cities in Anatolia, 2 cities in the Black Sea region, 2 cities in the Mediterranean region, 4 cities in the Aegean region, and 2 cities in the Marmara region.

6. Data obtained for local development analysis

Socio-Economic Development (SED) Index

The socio-economic development level of the provinces in Türkiye is determined by the SED index developed by the Ministry of Development[‡]. Most recently, in 2013, 61 indicators were used for the SED index calculated based on the values for 2011. The variables used in the SED-2017 study were demographics, employment, education, health, competitive and innovative capacity, finances, accessibility, and quality of life. The data on the Socio-Economic Development Levels of the Provinces in 2011 and 2017 are presented in Table 7.

Table 7 includes the 2011 data for the pre-law period and the 2017 data for the post-law period. According to these data, it is observed that Muğla is 8th, Tekirdağ is 9th, and Denizli is 10th in the top 3 highest metropolitan cities in the SED-2011 ranking. In the same ranking, Van ranked 75th, Mardin ranked 74th, and Şanlıurfa ranked 73rd in the last places. According to the SED-2017 index, Aydın rose by 4 steps, Hatay rose by 7 steps, Kahramanmaraş rose by 2 steps, Ordu rose by 1 step, and Trabzon rose by 5 steps. However, Balıkesir, Malatya, and Van dropped by 2 steps. No change was observed in other metropolitan cities.

[‡] After the 2018 Türkiye general elections, the Ministry of Development and the General Directorate of Budget and Fiscal Control of the Ministry of Finance were combined, and the Department of Strategy and Budget was established within the Presidency.

Table 7. Socio-economic development levels of the provinces

New Metropolitan Cities	SED -2011 ranking	SED -2011 Index Value	SED -2017 ranking	SED -2017 Index Value
Aydın	19	0.5597	15	0.599
Balıkesir	22	0.4764	24	0.476
Denizli	10	0.9122	10	0.923
Hatay	46	-0.1302	39	0.017
Malatya	42	-0.0785	44	-0.113
Manisa	23	0.4711	23	0.490
Kahramanmaraş	60	-0.4677	58	-0.416
Mardin	74	-1.3591	74	-1.396
Muğla	8	1.0493	8	1.175
Ordu	61	-0.4810	60	-0.486
Tekirdağ	9	0.9154	9	1.014
Trabzon	31	0.2218	26	0.389
Şanlıurfa	73	-1.2801	73	-1.350
Van	75	-1.3783	77	-1.452

Source: SED 2011, SED 2017

In conclusion, it is seen that the implementation of Law No. 6360 had no effect for 6 of the 14 metropolitan cities, had a positive effect for 5 metropolitan cities, and a negative effect for the three metropolitan cities of Balıkesir, Malatya, and Van.

OECD Regional Well-Being Indicators

The OECD (2021) regional well-being indicators were determined as Access to Services, Income and Wealth, Environment, Society, Participation, Employment, Security, Housing, Health, Life Satisfaction, and Education. Each city is measured by 11 indicators that are important for well-being. The values of the indicators are scored between 0 and 10. A high score indicates better performance compared to other regions. Table 8 includes the Turkiye-wide rankings of new metropolitan cities after well-being indicators. TurkStat carried out the life index research in 2015. Table 8 shows the data for 2015[§].

Table 8. New metropolitan cities and the well-being Indicators**

New Metropolitan Cities	Income and Wealth	Security	Health	Access to Services	Environment	Participation	Education
Aydın	34	69	17	18	10	58	28
Balıkesir	36	35	33	12	9	36	12
Denizli	17	68	10	25	6	21	11
Hatay	52	67	65	43	46	60	51
Malatya	60	30	23	33	32	53	34
Manisa	50	44	20	14	7	44	47
Kahramanmaraş	63	4	25	50	47	13	61
Mardin	73	36	76	66	64	76	76
Muğla	15	81	12	22	16	28	26
Ordu	56	25	32	61	43	57	49
Tekirdağ	5	55	53	17	24	35	46
Trabzon	20	23	4	11	29	41	19
Şanlıurfa	78	31	74	56	63	69	78
Van	74	60	77	45	57	78	75

Source: TurkStat, 2015

[§] This report has not been published by TurkStat after 2015.

** The data on Housing, Life Satisfaction, Society, and Employment could not be reached.

There are 81 provinces in Türkiye. It can be considered that Türkiye's average ranking is between 40-41. The data obtained immediately after the implementation of Law No. 6360 in 2015 would undoubtedly not show the effect of the law on the application area yet. However, Table 8 provides a general idea about the new metropolitan cities in the first period of the law.

Accordingly, considering that Table 8 includes the rankings of the provinces' well-being levels, it is seen that while Muğla, Tekirdağ, and Denizli have values above the country average in terms of 6 indicators, 4 indicators, and 6 indicators, respectively, Mardin and Şanlıurfa rank above the country average for 1 indicator, but Van is below the country average in terms of all indicators. Likewise, it is observed that Aydın is above the country average in terms of 5 indicators, Balıkesir is above the country average in terms of 7 indicators, Malatya is above the country average in terms of 5 indicators, Manisa and Kahramanmaraş are above the country average in terms of 3 indicators, Ordu and Trabzon are above the country average in terms of 2 indicators and 7 indicators, respectively. However, Hatay is below the country average in terms of all indicators.

United Nations Human Development Index

The Human Development Index (HDI) covers requirements such as a healthy life, a good education, and high living standards, which are considered to be the basic dimensions of human development. The HDI is found by calculating the geometric mean of the indices for each of these three dimensions. For example, Health standards are measured by life expectancy at birth, education is measured by years of schooling for those aged 25 and over and years of schooling for children, and standard of living is measured by gross national income per capita. In HDI measurements, Gross National Income (GNI) and income logarithm are used. Finally, the scores of the three HDI dimension indices are reflected in the composite index using the geometric mean (UN, 2022). Table 9 includes the indicators in this United Nations Human Development Index for 14 new metropolitan cities.

Considering the life expectancy at birth indicator, according to the 2013 and 2017 data, the life expectancy for Muğla, Tekirdağ, and Denizli was close to the country average, and there was no significant change. It was observed that Mardin was 2 years above the country average but did not change significantly; however, Van and Şanlıurfa were below the country average. Nevertheless, Van exhibited a significant increase for nearly 2 years. Şanlıurfa did not show a significant change. It was seen that the other metropolitan cities had a life expectancy close to the country average and did not change significantly.

Concerning the primary education schooling rate indicator, only Ordu and Van were below the Türkiye average according to the data for 2014. However, interestingly, it was observed that Van, Şanlıurfa, and Mardin were above the country average according to the data for 2017. Nevertheless, Muğla, Tekirdağ, and Denizli, as well as Aydın, Hatay, Manisa, Balıkesir, Kahramanmaraş, and Ordu were below the country average, while Malatya and Trabzon had a value close to the country average.

When the indicator of contribution to the country's GDP was examined, it was seen that while Tekirdağ increased its contribution to the country's GDP by 0.17%, Mardin by 0.03%, Hatay and Van by 0.02%, and Ordu increased its contribution to the country's GDP by 0.01% for the period before and after 2014, there was no change in

Kahramanmaraş, and there were decreases in the rates of contribution to the country's GDP of especially other metropolitan cities including Balıkesir by 0.13%.

Table 9. UN human development index

New Metropolitan Cities	Life Expectancy at Birth		Primary Education Schooling Rate (%)		2011	Gross Domestic Product (GDP- Thousand TL)		Contribution %	Variation %
	2013	2017	2011††	2017		2011	2017		
Türkiye	78	78	97.1	96.12	1.404.927.615		3.133.704.267		
Aydın	78.7	78.5	99.32	95.63	14.100.734	1.003	30.056.955	0.95	-0.04
Balıkesir	77.8	77.5	99.12	95.91	19.340.448	1.37	39.034.296	1.24	-0.13
Denizli	78.8	78.2	98.52	94.88	16.196.386	1.15	35.232.717	1.12	-0.02
Hatay	78.1	77.9	98.43	95.99	17.840.030	1.27	40.481.603	1.29	0.02
Malatya	78.7	79	98.37	96.62	8.412.868	0.60	17.626.199	0.56	-0.04
Manisa	77.7	77.1	99.21	95.86	23.376.267	1.66	50.877.135	1.62	-0.04
Kahramanmaraş	79	79.2	98.49	95.5	11.851.364	0.84	26.497.396	0.84	0.0
Mardin	80.7	79.8	98.29	97.59	7.029.030	0.50	16.794.791	0.53	0.03
Muğla	80.5	80.3	98.67	94.97	17.314.078	1.23	35.916.559	1.14	-0.08
Ordu	79.9	79.3	94.64	95.74	7.245.258	0.51	16.384.984	0.52	0.01
Tekirdağ	77.4	77.6	98.94	95.94	20.915.741	1.48	52.032.178	1.66	0.17
Trabzon	80.3	80	98.99	96.33	11.042.424	0.78	22.628.043	0.72	-0.06
Şanlıurfa	77.1	77.7	98.8	97.99	12.759.633	0.90	27.959.184	0.89	-0.01
Van	75.3	77	96.96	97.83	6.802.551	0.48	15.786.378	0.50	0.02

Source: TurkStat, Indicator Application, <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/ilgosterge/?locale=tr>

Other Dynamics Affecting the Local Economic Development

The dynamics affecting the local economic development in growth theories are listed as trade openness, import and export values (TurkStat, 2004), intellectual property system and innovation, number of patent applications, number of industrial design applications, and number of trademark applications (Turkish Patent Institute, 2005). Table 10 includes the values of cities in 2011 and 2017.

Upon examining the effect of Law No. 6360 on the number of patent applications, it was observed that there were decreases in Tekirdağ and Malatya and increases in the other metropolitan cities as the number of changes between 2011-2017. Manisa exhibited a significant increase with 960 patent applications. However, considering the number of patent applications between 2017-2020, a considerable decrease was observed this time in Tekirdağ, Trabzon, Şanlıurfa, and Manisa with a high change, and it was found that there were significant jumps in Aydın, Malatya, Hatay, Balıkesir, and Denizli and slight increases in the other metropolitan cities.

With regard to the number of design applications, large and significant decreases were observed in Hatay, Manisa, Trabzon, and Balıkesir as the number of changes between 2011-2017. Significant increases in Tekirdağ, Muğla, Şanlıurfa, and

†† TurkStat has provided the relevant data since 2012, <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/ilgosterge/?locale=tr>

Kahramanmaraş were remarkable. Considering the number of patent applications between 2017-2020, there were significant increases in Manisa, Aydın, Ordu, and Trabzon, whereas significant decreases were observed in the other metropolitan cities.

Table 10. Intellectual property system and innovation

New Metropolitan Cities	Number of Patent Applications					Number of Design Applications					Number of Trademark Applications				
	2011	2017	2020	2011-2017	2017-2020	2011	2017	2020	2011-2017	2017-2020	2011	2017	2020	2011-2017	2017-2020
Aydın	18	34	63	16	29	83	94	197	11	103	648	1757	1208	1109	-549
Balıkesir	12	30	39	18	9	136	118	76	-18	-42	908	826	1324	-82	498
Denizli	22	37	46	15	9	455	471	445	16	-26	1473	1548	2274	75	726
Hatay	12	33	49	21	16	619	142	130	-477	-12	781	970	1555	189	585
Malatya	11	9	33	-2	24	7	24	29	17	5	404	349	614	-55	265
Manisa	246	1206	301	960	-905	313	134	366	-179	232	710	744	1360	34	616
Kahramanmaraş	9	28	51	19	23	149	207	193	58	-14	452	464	831	12	367
Mardin	3	3	5	0	2	2	19	27	17	8	260	406	609	146	203
Muğla	15	22	27	7	5	35	127	67	92	-60	751	1035	1867	284	832
Ordu	3	6	11	3	5	3	4	93	1	89	137	275	368	138	93
Tekirdağ	113	96	72	-17	-24	225	382	370	157	-12	477	730	1158	253	428
Trabzon	15	48	24	33	-24	129	36	107	-93	71	546	520	806	-26	286
Şanlıurfa	11	23	22	12	-1	3	65	70	62	5	384	497	751	113	254
Van	0	9	12	9	3	3	0	1	-3	1	132	174	297	42	123

Source: <https://www.turkpatent.gov.tr/TURKPATENT/statistics/>

Table 11. Local economic development - trade openness

New Metropolitan Cities	Import			Export		
	2011	2017	2011-2017	2011	2017	2011-2017
Aydın	312652	258221,9	-54431,14	706344	704327,958	-2015,722
Balıkesir	441298	410322,98	-30975,26	409398	536804,535	127406,539
Denizli	2262650	2022644,7	-240005,3	2639582	2778975,499	139393,245
Hatay	4594570	3852349,6	-742220,6	2050555	2333075,942	282521,289
Malatya	106489	145428,99	38939,577	280505	238276,687	-42228,415
Manisa	3632199	3169724,8	-462473,9	4164819	1993510,595	-2171308,456
Kahramanmaraş	1188472	1387263,9	198792,13	711945	955598,619	243653,169
Mardin	134443	148544,55	14101,835	804233	910870,301	106637,422
Muğla	109734	296125,14	186391,15	236727	448361,238	211634,256
Ordu	79176	655263,742	-13912,23	366475	224980,731	-141494,104
Tekirdağ	779629	1071260,5	291631,77	655580	1099563,658	443983,581
Trabzon	122215	71796,374	-50419,05	1088529	1197170,127	108641,17
Şanlıurfa	288954	157433,15	-131520,9	148312	153530,149	5218,272
Van	38565,9	69191,589	30625,685	20127,4	44437,446	24310,229

Source: TurkStat, Export-import by provinces, 2002-2019 (special trading system)

With regard to the number of trademark applications, decreases with a high difference were observed in Balıkesir, Malatya, and Trabzon as the number of changes

between 2011-2017. There were great increases in the other metropolitan cities, especially in Aydın. However, considering the number of trademark applications between 2017-2020, this time, on the contrary, there was a significant decrease in Aydın, while the other metropolitan cities reached significant sizes.

According to the trade openness indicator, in terms of the change in imports between 2011 and 2017, there were significant increases in import values for Tekirdağ, Kahramanmaraş, Muğla, Malatya, Van, and Mardin, respectively, while there were decreases in the other metropolitan cities. In terms of export values for the same period, there were increases in Tekirdağ, Hatay, Kahramanmaraş, Muğla, Denizli, Balıkesir, Trabzon, Mardin, Van, and Şanlıurfa, respectively, and decreases in the other metropolitan cities.

One of the methods used to measure the degree of trade openness in the relevant literature is the ratio of exports and/or imports to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Huchet-Bourdon, 2017). Accordingly, it was observed that Tekirdağ, Kahramanmaraş, Muğla, Van, and Mardin, which had significant changes in both import and export increase values at the same time and in the direction of increase, positively differentiated from the other metropolitan cities in terms of trade openness.

7. Conclusion and Evaluation

This study aimed to examine the effect of the new urban management model applied to 14 new metropolitan cities accepted by Law No. 6360, which was adopted in 2014 and is known as the "metropolitan law" by its general name, on local development in these cities.

The data of the cities were compared for the years before and after the law by making tabulations according to different index indicators related to cities, such as Socio-Economic Development Index, OECD Regional Well-Being Indicators, United Nations Human Development Index, Intellectual Property System and Innovation Index, and Local Economic Development Trade Openness Index. In the study, although the inaccessibility of data for the targeted years on many indicators or the availability of data for different years prevented a holistic evaluation, the following conclusions were reached in general:

According to the SED index that analyzes the Socio-Economic Development Level of cities, there was no effect for 6 of the 14 new metropolitan cities, 5 had a positive trend, and there was a negative trend for 3 metropolitan cities, Balıkesir, Malatya, and Van, at the end of 3 years after the implementation of Law No. 6360, which was put into effect in 2014.

Considering the data for 2015 according to the OECD Regional Well-Being Indicators, Balıkesir and Trabzon in terms of 7 indicators, Denizli and Muğla in terms of 6 indicators, Malatya and Aydın in terms of 5 indicators, Tekirdağ in terms of 4 indicators, Manisa and Kahramanmaraş in terms of 3 indicators, Ordu in terms of 2 indicators, and Mardin and Şanlıurfa in terms of 1 indicator had values above the Türkiye average, respectively, for 7 indicators. It was observed that Hatay and Van were below the country average in terms of all indicators.

Policy, strategy, and improvement studies covering 7 different well-being indicators are mostly under the authority and responsibility of the central government. In order for especially Hatay and Van, which are metropolitan cities bordering Syria and Iran, to catch up with the country's average in the context of these well-being indicators,

many studies should be immediately conducted in these regions, including the development of border trade.

Furthermore, since the 2015 report published by TurkStat has not been updated yet, the effect of Law No. 6360, which was put into effect in 2014, could not be fully analyzed in the context of the relevant index in this study. The fact that a total of 7 metropolitan cities, including 4 rankings and above, exceeded Türkiye's average suggested that the relevant law positively contributed to the new metropolitan cities.

No significant relationship could be observed between the indicator of life expectancy at birth, which is under the United Nations Human Development Index, and Law No. 6360 since the relevant metropolitan cities did not have a large deviation from the country average.

When the primary education schooling rate indicator was examined depending on the United Nations Human Development Index, only Ordu and Van were below the country average according to the data for 2014, whereas Van, Şanlıurfa, and Mardin were above the country average according to the data for 2017. However, it was revealed that Muğla, Tekirdağ, and Denizli, as well as Aydın, Hatay, Manisa, Balıkesir, Kahramanmaraş, and Ordu were below the country average, while Malatya and Trabzon had a value close to the country average.

The fact that especially the data of Van, Şanlıurfa, and Mardin had an increasing trend suggested that the schooling gap from the past resulted from the measures and policies taken by the central government. However, the primary education schooling rate was observed to be relatively low in metropolitan cities such as Muğla, Tekirdağ, Ordu, and Manisa, which were in a better condition in terms of other indicators. It is thought to be caused by factors such as the fact that families living in these cities with higher education and socio-economic levels compared to the other metropolitan cities are mostly nuclear families, the birth rate is low in these regions, and the primary school-aged child population tends to decrease. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the relevant institutions should investigate whether there are different factors.

When the indicator of the new metropolitan cities' contribution to Türkiye's GDP was examined, it was observed that Tekirdağ increased its contribution to the country's GDP by 0.17%, Mardin by 0.03%, Hatay and Van by 0.02%, and Ordu increased its contribution to the country's GDP by 0.01% for the period before and after 2014. Whereas there was no change in Kahramanmaraş, there were decreases in the rates of contribution to the country's GDP of especially the other metropolitan cities, including Balıkesir (0.13%).

Although it does not give an exact idea about the effect of becoming metropolitan cities with Law No. 6360 on the contribution of these cities to the country's GDP, it can be argued that the industrial and agricultural production of Tekirdağ, the border trade and agricultural production of Mardin, Hatay, and Van, and Ordu's strategic agricultural products such as hazelnut and tea were effective.

When the numbers of patent, design, and trademark applications under the Intellectual Property System and Innovation Index were examined for the periods between 2011-2017 and 2017-2020, the number of patent applications of Tekirdağ, which was in a better position in terms of other indicators, decreased in both periods. Although Manisa had the maximum number in the first period, it experienced a considerable decrease during the second period. In terms of the number of design applications, Manisa displayed a decrease for the first period and a great increase for the second period. Trabzon and Tekirdağ followed a completely opposite course. In terms

of the number of trademark applications, Aydın experienced a significant increase in the first period and a significant decrease in the second period, while the other metropolitan cities followed a completely opposite course.

Based on these data, it is difficult to establish a significant relationship between the index and Law No. 6360. It is thought that the fact that this index is very closely related to white-collar workers and that more white-collar workers benefit from the opportunities of metropolitan cities, such as employment, education, entertainment, transportation, and health, which increase their living standards and well-being, will cause migration from other cities to these metropolitan cities. Thus, it can be said that metropolitan cities will be able to provide a sustainable increase in the number of patent, design, and trademark applications by means of the increase they will provide in qualified human resources.

According to the Local Economic Development Trade Openness Index, it was observed that Tekirdağ, Kahramanmaraş, Muğla, Van, and Mardin, which had significant changes in both import and export increase values at the same time and in the direction of increase, positively differentiated from the other metropolitan cities in terms of trade openness. Moreover, high increases in export values of 10 of the 14 new metropolitan cities, namely Tekirdağ, Hatay, Kahramanmaraş, Muğla, Denizli, Balıkesir, Trabzon, Mardin, Van, and Şanlıurfa, revealed that there might be a positive relationship with the implementation of the law.

It is considered that this study will provide preliminary information for researchers and decision-makers who investigate the implementation practices of the existing law and have initiated studies to update it. For future studies, it is recommended to conduct studies to obtain all indicators completely for all years and perform a holistic evaluation in this direction.

References

- Adelekan, I. O. (2020). Urban dynamics, everyday hazards and disaster risks in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Environment and Urbanization*, 32(1), 213-232.
- Andersen, E.S. (1996). Theories of localised resource-based growth and development-From Marshall to new evolutionary economics. In seminar on Regional Development based on Forest Resources <http://www.business.aau.dk/evolution/esapapers/esa96/Joensuu.pdf>
- Arikboğa, E. (2013). Metropolitan municipality model from past to future. *Yerel Politikalar Dergisi*, 1(3), 48-96.
- Boekel, V.G., Logtestijn, V.M. (2004). Applying the comprehensive LED approach: The case of Mozambique, Cooperative Branch International Labour Office (ILO), Geneva, Switzerland, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---led/documents/publication/wcms_111548.pdf
- Capello, R. (2011). Location, regional growth and local development theories AESTIMUM 58, Giugno, pp. 1-25, Firenze University Press.
- Coffey, W.J., Polese, M. (1984). The concept of local development: a stages model of endogenous regional growth, Papers of The Regional Science Association, Twenty-Third European Congress of the Regional Science Association, Vol. 55.
- Cuberes, D., Ramsawak, R. (2020). Understanding recent growth dynamics in small urban places: The case of New England, *City & Community*, 19(1), 44-47.
- Cubillos-González, R.A. (2017). Sustainable urban design criteria in medium-sized, Colombian cities, *New Design Ideas*, 1(1), 59-70.

- Çakır, N. (2006). The Effects of Today's Urban Dynamics on Urban Transformation. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Istanbul Technical University, Institute of Science and Technology.
- Çayın, M., Yapraklı, S. (2019). The effects of institutional structure indicators on local economic development indicators: An application on Erzurum and Batman. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 37(4), 611-662. DOI:10.17065/huniibf.438176.
- Çınar, T., Çiner C.U. & Zengin O., (2009). *Metropolitan Administration Integration Process*. Ankara: TODAİE.
- DPT Development Plan (First Five Years) 1963- 1967. Ankara.
<http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkinma%20Planlar/Attachments/9/plan1.pdf>
- Development Plan (Second Five Years) 1968- 1972. Ankara.
<http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkinma%20Planlar/Attachments/8/plan2.pdf>
- Development Plan (Third Five Years) 1973- 1977. Ankara.
<http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkinma%20Planlar/Attachments/7/plan3.pdf>
- Development Plan (Fourth Five Years) 1979-19 1983. Ankara.
<http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkinma%20Planlar/Attachments/6/plan4.pdf>
- Regional Development Study Group Report, 2004 Turkish Economy Congress, 5-9 May Izmir,
<https://kutuphane.tbmm.gov.tr/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=277149>
- The World Bank. <http://www.worldbank.org/>
- Education and training unit for democracy and development (ETU). What is Local Economic Development? Retrieved from <http://www.etu.org.za/index.html> on June 5, 2018.
- Eraydın, A. (2004). Changes in regional development concepts, theory and policies. *Urban Economic Research Symposium*, 1, Mart 2004, 126-143.
- Göymen, K. (2004). Municipalities as local development leaders and stakeholders. Retrieved from <http://research.sabanciuniv.edu/1427/1/KorelGoymen.pdf> on June 25, 2018.
- Gül, H. (2004). Local Alternatives in Economic Development, *Local Economic Research Symposium*, I, DPT Pamukkale University, 201-219.
- Haughton, G. (1998). Principles and Practice of Community Economic Development. *Regional Studies*, 32(9), 872-877. DOI: 10.1080/0034340985011802
- Huchet-Bourdon, M., Le Mouël, C., & Vijil, M. (2018). The relationship between trade openness and economic growth: Some new insights on the openness measurement issue. *The World Economy*, 41(1), 59-76.
- Keleş, R. (2009). Decentralization and Politics. Cem yay., Istanbul.
- Keskin, H., Akgun, A.E., Zehir, C. & Ayar, H. (2016). Tales of cities: City branding through storytelling. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 10(1), 31-41.
- Kessides, C. (2009). Mobilizing balanced development from the bottom up: a local development perspective based on the 2009 World Development Report, Governance of Local Development, Realization of Local Development International Symposium, October 24-15, 2008, Istanbul Policy Center, Istanbul.
- Moulaert, F., Mehmood, A. (2020). Towards a social innovation (SI) based epistemology in local development analysis: lessons from twenty years of EU research. *European Planning Studies*, 28(3), 434-453. DOI: 10.1080/09654313.2019.1639401.
- OECD Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2013). Delivering Local Development: New Growth and Investment Strategies, Report,
<https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/ngis.htm>
- OECD Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2021). Regional, Rural and Urban Development, Regional Well Being Indicators, <https://www.oecd.org/regional/>
- Ökmen, M., Arslan R. (2014). Newly Established Metropolitan Municipalities in Turkey with Law No. 6360: The case of Manisa metropolitan municipality. *Adnan Menderes University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 1, Special Issue, 88-101.

- Özdamar, E.G. (2011). Rereading the plot of contemporary housing in the context of urban dynamics: Istanbul, Vienna, Amsterdam, Doctoral Thesis, Istanbul Technical University, Institute of Science and Technology.
- Özpinar, E., Koyuncu, E. (2016). How does human development differentiate between provinces in Turkey? Human Development Index for 81 Provinces, TEPAV, https://www.tepav.org.tr/upload/files/14679291229.81_II_icin_Insani_Gelismislik_Endeksi.pdf
- Presidency of the European Union (2003). National Program https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/UlusalProgram/UlusalProgram_2003/Tr/pdf/IV-12.pdf
- Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2001). The role of the ILO in implementing local economic development strategies in a globalized world. International Labour Organization, 1-19.
- Salingaros, N.A. (2018). Socio-cultural identity in the age of globalization. *New Design Ideas*, 2(1), 5-19.
- SEGE (2003). Socio-Economic Development Ranking Research of Provinces and Regions. T.R. Prime Ministry State Planning Organization General Directorate of Regional Development and Structural Adjustment, Publication No. DPT 2671.
- SEGE (2013). Socio-Economic Development Ranking Research of Provinces and Regions SEGE 2011, Ministry of Development, General Directorate of Regional Development and Structural Adjustment, <https://www.sanayi.gov.tr/merkez-birimi/b94224510b7b/sege/il-sege-raporlari>
- SEGE (2019). Socio-Economic Development Ranking Research of Provinces and Regions SEGE 2017, Ministry of Industry and Technology, General Directorate of Development Agencies, Research Report Number 3, Ankara <https://www.sanayi.gov.tr/merkez-birimi/b94224510b7b/sege/il-sege-raporlari>
- Şengül, Ü., Eslemian, S. & Eren, m. (2013). Determination of Economic Efficiency of Level 2 Regions According to the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics in Turkey by the DEA Method and Application of the Tobit Model, *Journal of Management Sciences* 11(21), 75-99.
- Topkaya, Ö. (2015). The role of local development strategies in increasing employment and reducing informal employment. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 29(4), 645-659.
- TÜRK PATENT (t.y.). Turkish Patent and Trademark Office, <https://www.turkpatent.gov.tr/TURKPATENT/statistics/>
- UN United Nations (2022). Human Development Index (HDI), <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-development-index#/indicies/HDI>
- Uyan, B. (2019). Regional Development Dynamics: Factors Affecting Local Economic Development in Gaziantep Province, Çukurova University Graduate School of Sciences, Department of Agricultural Economics, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis.
- Zengin, O. (2014). Transformation of the Metropolitan Municipality System: Evaluation of the Last Decade, *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*, 2, 93-116.
- ILO (2020). [Local Economic Development \(LED\) \(ENTERPRISES\)](https://www.ilo.org/empent/areas/local-economic-development-led/lang--en/index.htm), <https://www.ilo.org/empent/areas/local-economic-development-led/lang--en/index.htm>
- Law No. 2561 (1933). <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/2561.pdf>
- Law No. 3030 (1984). https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanaklar/KANUNLAR_KARARLAR/kanuntbmmc067/kanuntbmmc067/kanuntbmmc06703030.pdf
- Law No. 5019 (2003). https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanaklar/KANUNLAR_KARARLAR/kanuntbmmc088/kanuntbmmc088/kanuntbmmc08805019.pdf
- Law No. 6360 (2014). <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.6360.pdf>