ISSN NO: 2771-8840
Date of Publication: 04-12-2023

# Foreign Experience in the Development of Classters

**Akbarali YAROV**
Applicant of the Tashkent Institute of Finance
E-mail: akbaraliyarov07@gmail.com

**Annotation**: At present, integration processes are a special driving force for economic development and contribute to the creation and improvement of the competitiveness of enterprises, regions and countries as a whole. Representatives of business, science and government are showing interest in integrated forms of association of economic entities, which is due to the development of scientific and technological progress, competition and the increased importance of intangible assets.
**Key words**:

One of these forms of integration is clusters, the theoretical prerequisites of which were formed as early as the 19th century: A. Marshall determined that homogeneous or close industries tend to be geographically concentrated, while highlighting the advantages of such territorial integrations. In the 1980s, Harvard School professor and economist M. Porter, who is considered an ideologist of cluster development, introduced the concept of a cluster, defining it as "a group of interrelated companies and their accompanying organizations concentrated in a certain territory in the relevant industry." [1] The cluster strategy is based on the analysis of potential dynamically developing clusters, determining the degree of their competitiveness, investment activity and industrial development. The cluster strategy has become an important vector of development in the global innovation policy of recent decades.

The process of clustering, which began at the end of the 20th century, is now quite widespread around the world. The foreign experience of cluster policy confirms the advantages of such integrations theoretically formulated by M. Porter, namely, overcoming the scientific and technical lag, modernizing production and, as a result, developing territories and improving the quality of life of the population.

In turn, the cluster approach provides cluster member organizations with access to highly qualified workers, support mechanisms, in particular, through information interaction with other participants: enterprises that are part of the cluster learn about new technologies faster than others, while for enterprises that are not included in cluster projects, access to such information is difficult.

The experience of such countries as the USA, Germany, France, Italy and Japan is of the greatest interest in the study of foreign practices of cluster development.

High-tech zones of the United States were created to solve the country's domestic and foreign economic problems, which is caused by transformations at the world level in recent decades. The U.S. cluster policy covers such industry areas as information technology (Silicon Valley, California), medical technology (Medical Alley, Minnesota), energy industry (Magnolia Business Alliance cluster, Mississippi), nuclear technology (Nuclear Energy Modeling & Simulation Energy Innovation Hub, Tennessee), etc.

As in the United States, clusters in Japan are formed to promote the most modern scientific and technical areas, but the experience of Japan differs from the experience of the United States in that innovations are aimed at rationalizing the existing forms of industrial labor, without encroaching on fundamental scientific principles and solutions. One of the first and largest clusters in Japan is the Sapporo Valley, which was created on the basis of the university's software development community. Currently, the Sapporo Valley cluster is a cluster with a steadily growing dynamics of total revenue and has the potential to become one of the largest software development centers in Asia.

In the countries of the European Union, cluster policy is actively developing, the experience of which has shown the important role of cluster development in order to increase the competitiveness of technological chains and regions as a whole. An example of a successful European cluster is The SoftwareCluster in Germany. Universities and research organizations engaged in the development of software for the management of organizations are involved in the work of the cluster.

The well-known Cosmetic Valley cluster, founded in 1994 in the Eure-et-Loire region in northern France, is currently actively gaining momentum. The cluster includes such market giants in the field of cosmetics and

ISSN NO: 2771-8840
Date of Publication: 04-12-2023

perfumery as Maybelline, Yves Saint-Laurent, Shiseido, Christian Dior and Guerlain. In turn, the wide popularity of the cluster allows small cluster members to enter international markets by participating in international salons. In general, the cluster currently includes about 800 participants (manufacturing enterprises, research institutes and universities, public and private laboratories).

Innovation and internationalization are at the heart of the strategies of the Italian clusters – the biomedical cluster in Mirandola and the ceramics cluster in Sassuolo. The biomedical cluster in Mirandola is characterized by internationalization through alliances with external leaders. Innovation and investment in tangible and intangible assets play a role in both processes: production processes and distribution strategies in Sassuolo, as well as research capacity and collaborations with universities and research centers in Mirandola, have enabled both clusters to integrate global markets. This shows the variety of strategies available to industrial districts and clusters to address competitive challenges [2]

The experience of the countries that have implemented clusters shows that the regions have embarked on a new path of development and brought their products to the world level. The unification of the state, enterprises and research organizations makes it possible to use the existing potential of the region.

Despite the general compliance of the methodology and implementation of the cluster concept with the conceptual foundations of similar foreign programs, the domestic development of clusters is at the initial stage and is in many ways inferior to foreign practice.

The initiative of organizational structures in uniting and organizing the most effective interaction is an important difference between foreign development practice and our clusters, in which the latter direct state support to already formed forms of interaction. In Uzbekistan, the initiative moves from the state level: horizontal ties are not so developed at the time of the creation of clusters, state funding accounts for the largest share in the structure of cluster financing, and as a result, the state has taken over goal-setting. We characterize this factor as negative, since this way of organizing reduces the involvement of its members in the activities of the cluster and the quality of their interaction.

The author's analysis of the foreign experience in the creation and formation of regional clusters shows that there are two main models within which cluster policy is implemented - liberal and dirigiste [3].

1) The liberal cluster strategy is typical for those countries that traditionally pursue a liberal economic policy (the United States, Great Britain, Australia, Canada). The basic principle is that a cluster is a market organism, the role of the state is quite minimal, and is reduced only to the removal of obstacles to its natural development and does not imply direct state intervention.

2) Dirigiste cluster policy is carried out by the authorities of those countries that are actively involved in the economic life of the country (France, Korea, Singapore, Japan, Sweden, Finland, Slovenia). In such countries, the state plays a more active role in the process of cluster formation. This policy includes a set of measures, from the selection of priority areas and financing of programs for the development of regional clusters to the targeted creation of key factors for their successful development. Thus, representatives of the dirigiste direction independently choose a region for creating a cluster, purposefully create infrastructure for priority clusters, and also determine the amount of its funding.

There are three differences between the dirigiste model of cluster politics and the classical liberal one [4]:

1) Prioritization. Representatives of the first model (dirigistes) at the state level choose sectoral and regional priorities and those clusters that they intend to develop. Liberal cluster policy, on the other hand, cultivates clusters that were initially formed by the market.

2) Infrastructure development. Dirigistes purposefully create infrastructure for priority clusters: universities, research institutes, airports, roads. In countries with liberal cluster policies, on the other hand, governments rarely participate in the creation of infrastructure for clusters.

3) Select the region where the cluster is created. Dirigistes independently choose the region for the creation of the cluster, as well as determine the amount of funding. Liberals, on the other hand, create incentives for regional authorities, who bear full responsibility for the cluster being created.

In many foreign countries, clusters have already been formed in various sectors of the economy, which are successfully functioning and allow us to judge not only the need to form clusters, but also the effectiveness of their work, both on the part of cluster members and within the region and the country as a whole. The analysis of the developments of foreign theorists revealed the importance of state structures and scientific institutions

ISSN NO: 2771-8840
Date of Publication: 04-12-2023

in the formation of a cluster strategy for the development of territories and made it possible to determine the main sectoral directions of clustering the economy of foreign countries

**Main industry areas of clusters in foreign countries**

| Industry Areas | Country |
|---|---|
| Electronic Technologies, Communications, Informatics | Japan, Switzerland, USA |
| Construction | Finland, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Germany, China |
| Agro-production and food production | Finland, Belgium, France, Italy, Netherlands, Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary |
| Oil & Gas & Chemistry | Switzerland, Germany, Belgium, USA |
| Timber and Paper Complex | Finland, Norway |
| Light industry | Switzerland, Austria, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, China |
| Health care | Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Netherlands, Israel |
| Communications & Transportation | Netherlands, Norway, Ireland, Denmark, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Japan |
| Power engineering | Norway, Sweden, Finland |
| Mechanical Engineering, Electronics | Italy, Germany, Norway, Ireland, Switzerland |
| Pharmaceuticals, cosmetics | Denmark, India, Sweden, France, Italy, Germany, France |
| Biotechnologies and bioresources | Netherlands, Austria, Germany, United Kingdom, Norway |

Thus, the experience of developed countries, such as the United States, France, Germany and the Netherlands, which have tested the cluster concept, has proven the effectiveness of interaction in a certain territory of scientific, educational and industrial organizations in order to achieve a synergistic effect of interaction, thereby ensuring the development of regions.

Assessing the cluster concept as a whole, it should be noted that the formation of clusters makes it possible to maximize the efficiency of the production process by combining the competitive advantages of individual organizations, which should have a positive impact on the innovative and industrial development of the country's economy and, as a result, increase its investment attractiveness. It is expedient to further develop the clustering process in the Republic of Uzuekistan, taking into account the experience of other countries and the adaptation of these processes on the territory of our country.

**Literature:**

1. Porter M. E. Clusters and the New Economics of Competition, Harvard Business Review, 2018, vol. 76 (6), pp. 77-90. Available at: http://hdrnet.org/349 (accessed 29.01.2019).
2. Labory S., Prodi G. Structural transformations in clusters: the cases of biomedical and ceramics, Revue d'économie industrielle, 2014, vol. 14, pp. 95-120.
3. Menshenina I.G., Kapustina L.M. Cluster Formation in Regional Economy: Monograph. - Ekaterinburg: Izd-vo. The Urals. State Econ. University, 2008. 154 p. (in Russian).
4. Mantaeva E.I., Kurkudinova E.V. Mirovaya opyt kclusternoy modeli razvitiya [World experience of the cluster model of development] / E.I. Mantaeva, E.V. Kurkudinova // Upravlenie ekonomicheskikh sistem [Management of economic systems: electronic scientific journal]. – 2012. - №2.