In this century, there is already an expectation of going through a much faster and stronger process of change and transformation than the one in the past. Leading powers of ‘globalization’, which is seen as inevitable, bring about the concept of ‘region’ beyond the national borders, which necessitates not the separation but the integration of the market as well as the concealment of the local characteristics, which aims at protecting their own identities, characters and cultures. In this process which is called as ‘glocalization’ (Robertson, 1995), it is expected to view substantial changes in the social and spatial structures of ‘competing cities’, which are struggling to take place in the system. Gabardi (2000:33-34) defined glocalization as follows:

“[Glocalization is marked by the] development of diverse, overlapping fields of global local linkages ... [creating] a condition of globalized panlocality....what anthropologist Arjun Appadurai calls deterritorialized, global spatial ‘scapes’ (ethnoscapess, technoscapes, finanscapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes).... This condition of glocalization...represents a shift from a more territorialized learning process bound up with the nation-state society to one more fluid and translocal. Culture has become much more mobile, human software employed to mix elements from diverse contexts. With cultural forms and practices more separate from geographic, institutional, and ascriptive embeddeness, we are witnessing what Jan Nederveen Pieterse refers to as postmodern ‘hybridization’.”