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Abstract. The emergence of ‘new’ batik industry clusters in the Java mainland in the early 2000s has raised inquiries towards the interplay between indigenous business formation and government intervention. Following the historical trajectories, the batik industry has performed an intergenerational family business model by forwarding long-standing local genius in local development. However, top-down government intervention has also taken a key role in driving the local batik industry. Batik industry clusters in Barlingmascakeb Region may perform differently. This study focuses on scrutinizing how their persistence may contribute to local development where either the tradition root or policy support is missing. A mixed-method approach with sequential strategy was used by conducting case study analysis of the key informants and statistical analysis on the development of batik industry clusters \textit{in situ}. The results show that their persistence is mostly encouraged by opportunistic trading businesses with little multiplier effects to local development. The local government policy merely serves a program matching instead of promoting the so-called cultural heritage preservation. As a result, the localized cultural identity brought by the batik industry clusters is unrecognizable and leaving profit-taking of the batik trading at the place.
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1. Introduction
Batik is both an embodiment of Indonesia’s cultural heritage and an economic lifeline for hundreds of thousands of people. As a business entity that grows from the local wisdom of the community, batik industry clusters develop following the spatial dynamics that accommodate its business activities. Apart from the competitive advantage of industry players in the formation of stages of development (paths of development) of local batik industry clusters, regional internal conditions also play a role in the formation of a conducive institutional framework or hinder the development of the cluster itself. In Indonesia, the implementation of the cluster concept to increase the competitiveness of national and regional industries has been recurring intensively since the early 2000s. Unlike clusters in developed countries, clusters in Indonesia are characterized by small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The experience of the SMEs sector was tested when facing the Asian Economic Crisis 1997-1998 because
of its resilience to the impact of the crisis while continuing to develop to strengthen its production capacity and competitiveness to meet domestic and export markets [1][2]. A number of keys to the resilience of the SMEs sector lie in the ability to create a collectivity of enterprises based on the potential of regional resources and labor [3], the specialization of the flexible division of labor [4], the utilization of low technology [5], the support of informal economic systems [6], the participation of local communities and broad social networks [7], as well as limited market penetration with competitive product prices [8].

Indonesian batik gets recognition for its cultural and economic importance by UNESCO in 2009 by making it to UNESCO’s Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity list 2009. In the midst of the euphoria of batik industry development in Indonesia, it holds occurring problem which the development in various regions takes place sporadically and ignores the unique characteristics of locality. The growing trend is that batik tends to be treated merely as an economic commodity while the preservation of local wisdom and identity is neglected. The root of the problem is closely related to two things: 1) the promotion of the batik industry cluster is still trapped in sectoral and regional interests, and 2) common perceptions in regions that consider clustering as a way of obtaining government assistance (program matching). Thus, the government missing policy in preserving locally sociocultural values that batik product carries lead to the persistence of policy failures of batik industry clusters development. Collectively, the policy failures can occur in the stages of policy-making – formulation and implementation – to examine failures at all levels and stages of policy-making, caused by the nature of political system and its influence in decision making, governance capacity and the impact of its limitations on the chances for policy success, and levels of uncertainty in policy knowledge and practice [9][10].

The emergence of ‘new’ batik industry clusters in the Java mainland in the early 2000s has raised inquiries towards the interplay between indigenous business formation and government intervention. Following the historical trajectories, batik industry has performed an intergenerational family business model by forwarding long-standing local genius in local development. However, top-down government intervention has also taken a key role in driving the local batik industry. Those tendencies come forth in the development of batik industry clusters in Barlingmascakeb Region. The batik industry clusters in Barlingmascakeb is characterized as a young industrial cluster whose business life cycle is around 10 years.

This study focuses on scrutinizing how batik industry clusters persistence may contribute to local development where either the tradition root or policy support is missing. Taking place in five regencies of the Barlingmascakeb Region, this research explores the local government policy pertaining to cultural heritage preservation of batik industry clusters. This paper begins by commencing a brief background of this research. The second part contains methods and data collection which utilizing mixed-method approach with sequential strategy was used by conducting case study analysis of the key informants and statistical analysis on the development of batik industry clusters in situ. The third part elaborate the results and discussions about missing policy for supporting cultural heritage preservation of batik industry clusters in Barlingmascakeb Region. The last part is concluding section which contains remarks and feedback on cultural heritage preservation of batik industry clusters gained from lessons learned from this research.

2. Method and Data Collection

This research utilizes a mixed methods approach by combining quantitative and qualitative approaches. The sequential strategy type was chosen in implementing a mixed approach by starting with quantitative statistical time-series research and followed by qualitative research case studies to confirm previous findings. Quantitative statistical analysis is carried out to measure the performance of the development of the batik industry cluster in terms of the process of forming the input-output chain and its contribution to the region. The qualitative research is carried out based on the perceptions and preferences of key informants in government agencies, industry players, and local communities that form institutions for the growth of batik industry clusters.
The research analysis unit includes batik clusters in Barlingmascakeb Region. Barlingmascakeb Region, located in the southwest of Central Java Province consists of five regencies i.e. Banjarnegera, Purbalingga, Banyumas, Cilacap, and Kebumen. The deepening of the analysis focused on selected batik clusters that have different stages of development. In addition, considerations of the diversity of cluster maturity levels, length of effort, business networks, and industrial orientation are also considered considering that this research is exploratory to raise the uniqueness of locality. The data collection includes desk studies, questionnaires, in-depth interviews, and field observations. Desk study to obtain data and information from previous research, statistical reports, and government documents. Questionnaire to obtain the latest data from local batik entrepreneurs/craftsmen. Perspective questionnaire respondents are done through a purposive sampling technique that limited the respondents' target to only local batik entrepreneurs/craftsmen. In-depth interviews are applied to key informants who have important knowledge, capacity, and position in the cluster. The field observation is carried out by direct observation of research objects.

3. Result and Discussions

3.1. Batik Industry Clusters Development in Barlingmascakeb

There are at least 79 active batik SMEs in Barlingmascakeb Region with the following detail: 7 units (Banjarnegera Regency), 15 units (Purbalingga Regency), 24 units (Banyumas Regency), 13 units (Cilacap Regency), and 20 units (Kebumen Regency). Batik industry clusters in the Barlingmascakeb is characterized as a young industrial cluster whose business life cycle is around 10 years. Theoretically, there is no definite limit to categorizing the periodization of the life cycle of a cluster business according to the length of time it has been tried. Similarly, the stages of cluster development can be categorized in various versions of theory. However, in the early stages of the emergence of a cluster, there is still a minimal number of business actors involved, the level of competition is low, cooperation and innovation power are low, and the cluster organization has not been formed solidly [11][12][13].

Table 1 shows the year of Barlingmascakeb batik producers started their business, 38 batik producers (48.10%) started their businesses in the 2010s, then 22 batik producers (27.85%) in 2000-2009, while the rest (24.05%) before 2000 there were even a small number of SMEs that had been established for more than 40 years, i.e. Purbalingga Regency (3 units), Banyumas Regency (2 units), and Kebumen Regency (4 units). Banyumas Regency and Cilacap Regency are the biggest contributors, as well as indicating the size of the batik market in these two regions to stimulate the emergence of new entrepreneurs. Purbalingga Regency and Banjarnegera Regency as peripheral areas of the Banyumasan batik market also show the same trend, marked by the emergence of new entrepreneurs since the 2000s. In fact, batik SMEs in Banjarnegera Regency is a newly growing industry (infant industry) as a forerunner of the development of the local batik industry that does not have historical roots in batik culture, as well as batik SMEs in Cilacap Regency which only appeared in the 2000s era.

| Regency         | Batik producers (people) | Year Business Started | Business Motive |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
|                 |                          | ~1980 | 1980-1989 | 1990-1999 | 2000-2009 | 2010-~ | Filling free time (recreation) | Continuing the family business | Earning income | Preserving culture |
| Banjarnegera    | 7                        | 0     | 0         | 0         | 2        | 5      | 1      | 1                     | 2                      | 3               |
| Purbalingga     | 15                       | 3     | 1         | 1         | 5        | 2      | 2      | 3                     | 7                      | 3               |
| Banyumas        | 24                       | 2     | 2         | 3         | 6        | 11     | 0      | 8                     | 12                     | 4               |
| Cilacap         | 13                       | 0     | 0         | 0         | 2        | 11     | 2      | 1                     | 4                      | 6               |
| Kebumen         | 20                       | 4     | 2         | 1         | 7        | 6      | 1      | 6                     | 11                     | 2               |
Regency | Year Business Started | Business Motive |
|--------|---------------------|----------------|
|        | 1980 | 1980-1989 | 1990-1999 | 2000-2009 | 2010- | Filling free time (recreation) | Continuing the family business | Earning income | Preserving culture |
| Batik producers (people) | 79 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 22 | 38 | 6 | 19 | 36 | 18 |
| Total | 100.00 | 11.39 | 6.33 | 6.33 | 27.85 | 48.10 | 7.59 | 24.05 | 45.57 | 22.78 |

Hence, the motive of preserving culture dominates the profile of batik SMEs in these two regencies as an effort to create an identity of local batik products (local branding) in order to compete with the three other batik clusters (Banyumas, Kebumen, and Purbalingga) that first existed. In these three regencies, economic motives for earning income and continuing family business apparently dominate the motives of trying to produce local batik. Economic motives are the main impetus for batik producers to start their businesses, with details of the motive of obtaining income as many as 36 producers (45.57%) and the motive of continuing the family business of 19 producers (24.05%). The social motives for preserving culture are 18 producers (22.78%) and the motives of filling free time (recreation) are 6 people (7.59%). This circumstance shows the most dominant business motives, because in fact every batik producer has a variety of plural motives. However, the magnitude of economic motives in starting a batik business shows that batik business opportunities are still large with a growing market. The increase in the added value of batik products and the expansion of their market penetration can occur as a result of the economic agglomeration of batik SMEs, cooperation, and extensive family business continuity. In this case, economic rationality plays a prominent role beyond other motives such as socio-cultural, political, and environmental so that the expectation of mutual benefits is a key driver of the exchange of knowledge, information, expertise, and other resources [14][15][16].

As for the demographic profile of Barlingmascakeb batik industry, more than 60% of batik producers are women and are dominated by the age of 41-50 years (30 people; 37.97%) and 51-60 years (21 people; 26.58%). This fact shows that batik SMEs in the Barlingmascakeb depend on the availability of adult and middle-aged female batik producers. Concurrently, the batik industry clusters are vulnerable due to regeneration problems are given the lack of producers that appear in the younger age group.

Spatially, the location of batik industry clusters in the Barlingmascakeb Region tends to spread to a radius of 15 km from the city center, except for batik SMEs in Banjarnegara Regency and Cilacap Regency which spread to a distance of 35-40 km from the city center. In addition to Banjarnegara Regency, the preference of batik industry clusters locations in the other five districts is not oriented towards the proximity of access to main roads (arterial roads or collectors). In fact, some batik industries are located in remote villages that are not reached by public transportation such as found in Banjarnegara Regency, Cilacap Regency, and Kebumen Regency. This kind of diversity of spatial concentration patterns is commonplace, given that clustering does not require relevant business actors to be geographically close to each other. In addition, there is no guarantee that geographical proximity will create interrelationships among business actors. Sometimes the bonds of primordialism, social relations, as well as the dependence on technology and innovation play a more dominant role in producing functional clusters than territorial clusters. For this reason, understanding the characteristics of the economic agglomeration of a cluster needs to pay attention to the socio-cultural aspects behind it [17][18][19]. Porterian cluster theory pays more attention to the importance of functional linkages between similar and/or related industries and supporting organizations as a deep business strategy in increasing competitiveness [20][21]. The concentration of industries has purpose to support key industries to generate innovation and productivity, from which certain locations can accumulate their competitiveness. Therefore, this theory deals with the mechanism of value addition through the grouping of economic activities [6][22].
3.2. Local Government Policy in Batik Industry Clusters

Formally, the policy support of local governments in the development of batik industry clusters in the Barlingmascakeb Region can be scrutinized through the implementation of local development planning, ad hoc policies of mayor/regent, and related documents of local apparatus organizations. Local development planning documents includes spatial plans (Regional Spatial Plans/RTRW) and sectoral plans (Regional Medium-Term Development Plans/RPJMD, Regional Development Work Plans/RKPD, and other related technical documents).

The intriguing thing in the spatial plan reveals that there is no regency that explicitly and specifically mentions the allocation of batik industry zones in the RTRW except Banjarnegara Regency and Cilacap Regency. In accordance with the Local Regulation (Perda) of Banjarnegara Regency Number 11 of 2011 concerning the Regional Spatial Plan of Banjarnegara Regency for 2011-2031, the development of batik SMEs is directed as part of the development of cultural tourism areas supported by batik center areas in Susukan District (Article 72 Paragraph 3), in which there is also the potential for cultural tourism of Ujungan Dance, Girilangen Tomb, and Ancient Mosques (Article 80 Paragraph 3). Meanwhile, Cilacap Regency Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2011 concerning the Cilacap Regency Regional Spatial Plan for 2011-2031 allocates areas for the batik writing industry in Maos District and Nusawungu District (Article 39 Paragraph 4). The spatial plan document of the other three regencies stipulate that the allocation of small and micro industrial allotment areas spreads in each sub-district mixed with residential areas (Purbalingga: Perda No. 5 of 2011 Article 32 Paragraph 3; Banyumas: Perda No. 10 of 2011 Article 48 Paragraph 3; Kebumen: Perda No. 23 of 2012 Article 36 Paragraph 4).

Subsequently, in Regional Medium-Term Development Plans (RPJMD), only Banjarnegara Regency clearly regulates the development of batik SMEs through the development of batik tourism areas in Susukan District. Based on Regional Regulation Number 32 of 2017 concerning the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan of Banjarnegara Regency for 2017-2022, the development of batik SMEs is directed as an integral part of the development of cultural tourism areas in Susukan District. This means that the Banjarnegara Regency Government is consistent in formulating spatial and sectoral policies to encourage the development of batik SMEs. A number of annual work programs in the Regional Development Work Plan (RKPD) as an elaboration of the RPJMD contain programs to increase the capacity of science and technology (science and technology) production systems, development of SMEs, and development of potential industrial centers.

For Purbalingga Regency, the 2016-2022 Regional Medium-Term Development Plans of Purbalingga Regency mentions batik as one of the potentials of micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) that develop in addition to eyelash handicraft products, glagah brooms, exhaust, bags, footwear, coconut shells, bamboo, crystal sugar, convection and embroidery, and furniture. The development of MSMEs and cooperatives focuses on facilitating capitalization, developing, and increasing the productivity of MSMEs, increasing the competitiveness of small industries and creative industries, and increasing the role and function of cooperatives and community financial institutions as drivers of the people's economy. The formulation of this RPJMD is elaborated into the RKPD which includes, among others, the facilitation program of access to education through the purchase of batik and dye pilot materials, improving the quality of batik products through the procurement of 1 CNC unit including training, and the procurement of batik service clothing.

The other three districts do not explicitly direct the development of batik SMEs. In the case of Banyumas Regency, the 2013-2018 Banyumas Regency RPJMD document only describes the SMEs development program through capital assistance, equipment, training, and institutional strengthening, especially to potential industrial centers. Similarly, the case of Cilacap Regency only contains indications of an SMEs development program similar to Banyumas Regency, but accompanied by a direction for the development of One Village One Product (OVOP) for superior commodities as stated in the 2017-2022 Cilacap Regency RPJMD. For Kebumen Regency, it does not explicitly direct the development of batik SMEs. The 2016-2021 Kebumen Regency RPJMD only directs the overall development of SMEs to be in sync with the superior potentials of the region, focusing on increasing access to capital and marketing in order to increase the productivity of SMEs. However, a number of...
work programs in the RKPD during 2009-2017 in detail directed the development of batik SMEs, including the protection of batik machine IPR, batik equipment assistance in Gemekseti Village and Tanjungsari Village (Kebumen District), Jemur Village (Kebumen District), and Seliling Village (Alian District), batik training in Seliling Village (Alian District) and Jemur Village (Kebumen District), preparation of studies of kebumen batik centers, empowerment of batik craftsmen, data collection of batik centers and SME profiles, fashion design and batik design competitions, data collection of batik motifs, and entrepreneurship training on batik night making.

3.3. Cultural Heritage Preservation of Batik in Barlingmascakeb
The main actors of batik knowledge transfer and entrepreneurship in the Barlingmascakeb Region are the government, parents and families, and batik producers themselves. The government, in this case especially the local government, has the biggest contribution in reviving and preserving the local batik industry. The local government is the most interested party considering that batik industry clusters is a potential creative economy sector for job creation, poverty reduction, tourism development, and preservation of cultural traditions. In general, the usual method of knowledge transfer is carried out by local governments through the provision of training, capital assistance, equipment, and raw materials, promotion, exhibitions, and marketing.

Meanwhile, the role of parents and family is no less important in the inheritance of batik traditions for generations [15]. Referring to Table 1, most batik SMEs in the Barlingmascakeb Region were established in the 2010s and 2000s, thus their emergence was driven more by government intervention than the inheritance of family businesses for generations [13][23]. Only the batik industry clusters in Purbalingga Regency, Banyumas Regency, and Kebumen Regency characterizes it as a hereditary business. Batik SMEs in these three regions at least have historical roots in batik traditions that can be traced to the older generation, and with the help of government intervention local wisdom from local batik cultural traditions and identities can be maintained. However, the roles of these two parties are not enough without being followed by the willingness and tenacity of batik producers themselves to continue to learn by themselves to hone their knowledge and batik skills and develop businesses. Moreover, only 24.05% of existing batik producers continue the family business and only seven of them are armed with a background of experience in the batik industry, both as batik producers and traders.

The process of knowledge transfer, as well as the dissemination of information related to the development of batik business, turned out to be very dependent on conventional communication media, i.e. word of mouth (gethok tular). Overall, batik producers in the Barlingmascakeb considered that the delivery of word of mouth was the most effective. The substance of knowledge and information exchanged is related to production techniques such as making batik designs and motifs, writing and stamping, printing/screen printing techniques, and coloring; and access to marketing ranging from packaging, promotion, exhibitions, to product sales. The use of conventional media is preferred for three reasons: first, the batik industry is characterized as an industry that relies on the spread of knowledge and expertise that is latent, implicit, imaginative talent, and even like dna flowing in the art blood of batik craftsmen. This kind of knowledge and expertise is called tacit knowledge, and is generally possessed exclusively by individuals or groups of people in a particular location as a manifestation of local wisdom. Although tacit knowledge can be learned and disseminated, its mastery (mastery process) is certainly different from the owner of the origin of the knowledge and expertise [19][24][25]. Second, the batik industry is basically a typical home industry that uses part of the residential space for production purposes and buying and selling transactions. The limitations on the use of private space and productive business space that are vague and almost without barriers make communication and interaction of batik business actors with other home residents as well as with batik workers, employees, fellow batik business actors to consumers take place liquid. This situation allows the conventional transfer of knowledge and expertise to occur easily [18][24][25]. Third, the batik industry is a labor-intensive industry that is closely related to the socio-cultural characteristics of rural communities full of kinship, tolerance, mutual cooperation, and togetherness. Patterns of social relations that rely on collectivity contribute to the diversity of local designs and motifs as collective assets [19], [25]–[27].
is not surprising that the process of impersonation, modification, and innovation of impersonation is dynamic, making it quite difficult to claim unilaterally the intellectual property rights of a particular design and motif that has already become a collective asset. This happens as a result of the speed and ease of transfer of knowledge and expertise through conventional communication media that are often intensive and personal.

4. Conclusions
As the batik industry clusters in Barlingmascakeb is considered as an infant batik industry, in its early stages of industrialization the government and related institutions are still focusing on strengthening the production capacity. Consequently, the effort in batik industry clusters persistence is none other related to the government's policy to empower the competitive MSMEs sector as a leading sector for regional development. In addition, the local government policy merely serves a program matching instead of promoting the so-called cultural heritage preservation. As a result, the localized cultural identity brought by the batik industry clusters is unrecognizable and leaving profit-taking of the batik trading at the place.

Acknowledgements
This work is available because of a research grant from Directorate General for Strengthening Research and Development at the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, Indonesia (Direktorat Jenderal Penguatan Riset dan Pengembangan Kementerian Riset, Teknologi dan Pendidikan Tinggi) with reference contract No. 107-74/UN7.P4.3/PP/2019 Year 2019 with the research title “Local Embeddedness Factors pada Variasi Perkembangan Klaster Industri Batik di Wilayah Cepat Tumbuh Provinsi Jawa Tengah: Studi Kasus Kota Semarang dan Kabupaten Kudus”.

References
[1] A. Berry, E. Rodriguez, and H. Sandee, “Firm and Group Dynamics in the Small and Medium Enterprise Sector in Indonesia,” Small Bus. Econ., vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 141–161, 2002. [crossref]
[2] I. Widyaningrum, N.; Dewayanti, R.; Chotim, E. E.; Sadoko, Pola-Pola Eksploitasi terhadap Usaha Kecil. Bandung: Yayasan AKATIGA, 2003.
[3] D. L. Barkley and M. S. Henry, “Rural industrial development: To cluster or not to cluster?,” Rev. Agric. Econ., vol. 19, no. 2, p. 308, 1997. [crossref]
[4] H. Schmitz and K. Nadvi, “Clustering and industrialization: Introduction,” World Dev., vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 1503–1514, 1999. [crossref]
[5] M. D. Parrilli, SME Cluster Development: A Dynamic View of Survival Clusters in Developing Countries. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
[6] F. Belussi, “In search of a useful theory of spatial clustering: Agglomeration versus active clustering,” in Clusters and Regional Development: Critical Reflections and Explorations, B. Asheim, P. Cooke, and R. Martin, Eds. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006, pp. 69–89.
[7] M. Jones and M. Woods, “New Localities,” Reg. Stud., vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 29–42, Nov. 2012. [crossref]
[8] T. Tambunan, “Export-oriented small and medium industry clusters in Indonesia,” J. Enterprising Communities People Places Glob. Econ., vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 25–58, 2009. [crossref]
[9] A. Howlett, M; Ramesh, M; Perl, Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles & Policy Subsystems. Canada: Oxford University Press, 2009.
[10] M. Howlett, M. Ramesh, and X. Wu, “Understanding the persistence of policy failures: The role of politics, governance and uncertainty,” Public Policy Adm., vol. 30, no. 3–4, pp. 209–220, Jul. 2015. [crossref]
[11] M. P. Menzel and D. Fornahl, “Cluster life cycles-dimensions and rationales of cluster evolution,” Ind. Corp. Chang., vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 205–238, 2009. [crossref]
[12] A. Isaksen, “Cluster emergence: combining pre-existing conditions and triggering factors,” Entrep. Reg. Dev., vol. 28, no. 9–10, pp. 704–723, 2016. [crossref]
[13] H. J. Steenhuis and D. Kiefer, “Early stage cluster development: a manufacturers-led approach in
the aircraft industry,” Compet. Rev., vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 41–65, 2016. [crossref]
[14] S. Kukalis, “Agglomeration Economies and Firm Performance: The Case of Industry Clusters,” J. Manage., vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 453–481, Mar. 2010. [crossref]
[15] J. L. Hervas-Oliver, M. Lleo, and R. Cervello, “The dynamics of cluster entrepreneurship: Knowledge legacy from parents or agglomeration effects? The case of the Castellon ceramic tile district,” Res. Policy, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 73–92, 2017. [crossref]
[16] F. Puig and M. González-Loureiro, “Clusters, industrial districts and strategy,” Invest. Reg. – J. Reg. Rex., vol. 2017, no. 39, pp. 5–13, 2017.
[17] C. Felzensztein, E. Gimmon, and C. Aqueveque, “Clusters or un-clustered industries? Where inter-firm marketing cooperation matters,” J. Bus. Ind. Mark., vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 392–402, 2012. [crossref]
[18] F. X. Molina-Morales, P. M. García-Villaverde, and G. Parra-Requena, “Geographical and cognitive proximity effects on innovation performance in SMEs: A way through knowledge acquisition,” Int. Entrep. Manag. J., vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 231–251, 2014. [crossref]
[19] F. Xavier Molina-Morales, J. A. Belso-Martinez, F. Más-Verdú, and L. Martínez-Cháfer, “Formation and dissolution of inter-firm linkages in lengthy and stable networks in clusters,” J. Bus. Res., vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 1557–1562, 2015. [crossref]
[20] M. E. Porter, “The competitive advantage of nations,” Boston, MA, 90211, 1990. [crossref]
[21] M. E. Porter, “Clusters and the new economics of competition,” Boston, 98609, 1998.
[22] B. Asheim, P. Cooke, and R. Martin, “The rise of the cluster concept in regional analysis and policy: A critical assessment,” in Clusters and regional development: Critical reflections and explorations, B. Asheim, P. Cooke, and R. Martin, Eds. London: Routledge, 2006.
[23] D. B. Audretsch, E. E. Lehmann, and M. Menter, “Public cluster policy and new venture creation,” Econ. e Polit. Ind., vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 357–381, 2016. [crossref]
[24] C. Casanueva, I. Castro, and J. L. Galán, “Informational networks and innovation in mature industrial clusters,” J. Bus. Res., vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 603–613, 2013. [crossref]
[25] P. M. García-Villaverde, G. Parra-Requena, and F. X. Molina-Morales, “Structural social capital and knowledge acquisition: implications of cluster membership,” Entrep. Reg. Dev., vol. 5626, no. December, pp. 1–32, 2017. [crossref]
[26] F. Angeli, A. Grandi, and R. Grimaldi, “Directions and Paths of Knowledge Flows through Labour Mobility: A Social Capital Perspective,” Reg. Stud., vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 1896–1917, 2014. [crossref]
[27] J. Eklinder-Frick, L. T. Eriksson, and L. Hallén, “Multidimensional social capital as a boost or a bar to innovativeness,” Ind. Mark. Manag., vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 460–472, 2014. [crossref]