A New European Identity in Turkey?

Did the Europeanization Process of Turkey Change Before and After Helsinki '99?

Bachelor Thesis July 2010

Pia Maleen Rabot s0172502
Supervisor:
M.R.R.Ossewaarde

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In the interwar years from 1923 to 1939 Coudehove- Kalergi developed the Pan-European project to ensure freedom in Europe through higher cooperation. He pictured a European federation or `United States of Europe´. The basic assumption was that an organic society should be established on the basis of a common culture. Turkey, as possible partner, was excluded in the initial idea as it was seen to interrupt the organic society because it does not share the same culture as most European states but also because of its geography (Barlas, Güvenc, 2009). Turkey was always assumed to be the "other" based on its ottoman history, Islamic tradition and culture (Deringil, Kösebalaban 2007). But after the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923 the orientation towards Europe, westernization and enlighten modernity occurs (Öniş, Yilmaz, 2004).

Turkey is a country lying between Europe and Asia with most of its area on the Eurasian continental plate and only the Thrace region (resp. half of the Maramara region), which is 7% of Turkey, on the European continental plate. The 7% can be assumed to be a geographical estimation of the area lying in Europe, whereas this region is highly populated. In the Thrace region as well as the region from the Black sea side down to the Aegean cost is populated by around 45% of the whole Turkish population although it is only 25% of Turkish land. Here are also the two biggest cities of Turkey: Istanbul and Izmir. The trend is increasing as this area has the most fertile land and also the highest economic activities and so more and more people migrate to the cities around. Compared to this region, Anatolia is only populated by 40% of Turks although it constitutes around 60% of the Turkish land. 15% are settled at the Mediterranean coast (Yenen, 2003).

It is also important to mention that people increasingly deviate from the rural to the urban life and search for employment outside the agricultural sector. Here Istanbul, as the melting pot of cultures and the city of opportunities for Turks, is the main migration area of Turkey. Because half of it lays on the European and half on the Asian continental plate, which is divided by the Bosporus, one gets the impression of a gateway to Europe. This in turn has a effect on the mindset of Istanbul´s citizens. It is an open minded city that gives the chance to become more westernized and capture the trend of modernization. There exist great differences between the more Westernized, modern Thrace, Marmara, Black-and Mediterranean Sea region and the (eastern) Anatolian region. In east Anatolia people mainly life from agriculture. Tradition and religion coin their lives which divides Turkey into two parts with a rather secular west and a traditional east. The distinction between these areas is crucial as there are many different Turkish identities related to the area they are living in, but constituting one national identity.

Turkey cannot be assumed to be only Anatolia because here the lowest population compared to the land´s size can be found. Furthermore is the capital Ankara named *after* the foundation of the Turkish republic by Kemal Atatürk because it is in the centre of Turkey. Until today most Turks want Istanbul to become the capital as Ankara is only assumed to be the government´s city but not the city of the Turks. Another issue related to it is religion. Most of its citizens are active (Sunnite) Muslims. Although Turkey claims to be secular and tries to abolish military power within the government the army has been very powerful and influential

within the political system trying to ensure secularism and Kemalism but with the AKP religion becomes and more important issue (Giesing et al., 2008).

Turkey is also seen as the connection and political mediator of Europe with the Middle East and Asia. Because of its geographical position it is predestinate to mediate and connect both regions on the one hand but not share the social identity of any of them totally on the other hand. This is due to the fact that most people in Turkey are Sunnite Muslims and most countries surrounding Turkey are Shiites. This makes them partners and enemies at the same time, because of the conflict between the different Islamic groups. This is also a support of Turkey´s drive to the West as they are better able to cooperate with Christians on many issues (Strittmatter, 2010).

In 1950 Turkey applied for associate membership within the European Economic Community (EEC) followed by the 1963 Ankara agreement, where Turkey became member of the European Economic Community meaning a form of custom union and free movement of labor. 1995 a more specific pact was developed which forms a European-Turkish custom union in a more detailed manner with more obligations and possibilities for both partners. Between 1980 and 1983 Turkey had to face domestic economical and political problems which ended in a collapse of democracy. These facts and the fact that Turkish domestic policy is decisively different to European policies pulled Turkey away from a fast entry into the Union. Since 1987 Turkey applies unsuccessfully for the accession into the European Union (Yesilada, 1999).

Finally, the Helsinki summit 1999 gave Turkey the status of "candidate country" and accession negotiations could start. The summit has been able to conclude four main components for Turkey´s accession which were "(...) that Turkey was recognized as a candidate country on the basis of the same criteria as all the other candidates. (...) Turkey would be recipient of co-ordinate pre-accession assistance. (...) the EU would seek enhanced political dialogue aimed at assisting Turkey in reaching the accession criteria, particularly in the field of human rights. (...) Turkey would be included in Community programs and agencies. (...)" (Rumford, 2000). Because of the already existing custom union of Turkey with the EU some of the key points of the European acquis communitaire are fulfilled or assumed to be not problematic (Rumford, 2000).

From the year 2000 onwards major changes have been undergone within the domestic politics already. These refer to the elimination of the death penalty, extension of cultural rights for minorities and respect for human rights. In 2002 the Copenhagen Summit set a date when the accession negotiations between Turkey and the EU should start. The date was set for the year 2004, which meant another postponing of the actual accession of Turkey. Furthermore was a precondition for Turkey that reforms to homogenize the domestic institutional and legislative system according to European standards would be given in the meantime (Öniş, Yilmaz, 2004). Both actors had the problem that further integration may "(...) threaten the social and political self-identification of each to an unsustainable degree. (...)" (Buzan, Diez, 1999).Furthermore different perceptions within Turkey about the accession project contributed to a slowdown in negotiations: Some people think that accession and the related westernization process would lead to a denial of the Turkish right for cultural self-

determination, while others think in line with the Western understanding of citizenship, culture and state (Buzan, Diez, 1999).

Although improvement in the institutional system could be seen by the EU there are certain obstacles for the final accession by Turkey. For full membership a country has to achieve *political stability*, an *economic functioning market,* has to be *European* in a geographical sense and has to be able to take on *obligations of membership* related to the ability to adjust to the economic and political standards of the EU. Regarding these four criteria a candidate has to meet Turkey failed to fulfill two of them, namely the political and economic criteria for membership. Therefore other European member states fear a loss in certain areas. This is mainly true for the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and some structural and regional funds. Turkey with a great agricultural sector and the need for major regional developments would become a net receiver of the funds but would not be able to contribute as much. Also a structurally weak economy with a low industrialized sector, high inflation, low income and a large deficit are characteristics of Turkey´s economy.

The civil society/NGO´s resistance in Turkey could be characterized as weak because it has only limited opportunities to resists the authoritarian role of the army. Civil and political rights especially for minorities are restricted as well. This is also true for human rights (Yesilada, 1999). The military, which assumes itself as the protector of the nation and the Kemalist values has a great share of influence in the national political system which is criticized by the EU and tackled by the leading government today. But although the party in charge, AKP did start the adoption and implementation of many European laws after receiving the candidate status they slowed down the implementation process afterwards due to the European conditionality which disappointed the government several times. Also the "(...) de jure application has been more effective than the de facto expansion of political criteria. (...)" (Aydin, Acikmese, 2007).

 Unofficial fears of the Member States (MS) concern a loss of sovereignty and a set back of the legislation processes within the EU, because of the high voting power Turkey would get, when entering the EU, based on the relative big size of the Turkish population. Furthermore politicians like the German Chancellor Angela Merkel claimed that Europe is a "Christian Union" based on Christian values and traditions. Therefore Turkey could get the status of "privileged partnership" but not be able to fully enter the "Christian club". Many countries also criticize the role of the Military within the government. The military in Turkey is the protector of the basic values like secularism within the government and Turkey. It is criticized that this role has been too excessively used by the military and therefore threatens democratic values. Also the historical impact is one of the arguments by some MS not to accept Turkey as easily within the Union. This is the Austrian fear of an attack by the Turkish Army in 1683, the different historical traditions not only based on different religions but also on (art) epochs, like the Renaissance. Therefore the Austrian and French government decided to have a public referendum before the final accession on Turkey and may block its entry (Deringil, 2007, Öniş, 2001).

Regarding these facts one could assume that a Turkish accession into the European Union will not be possible for the next years to come. This might be true because both sides seem to have

different interests and visions of a possible membership. On the basis of the EU-Turkey relations, which have been coined by de- and increasing communication, rapprochements and breakups it is in the interest of this article to examine how the Turks think and feel about the EU and how the Europeanization process develops in Turkey especially if and how Turkish citizens are able to identify themselves with the EU. To examine the changes of the Europeanization process in Turkey this article will look on the time period around the Helsinki summit 1999 because this is the time when major changes and adjustments to the EU standards took place and Turkey got accepted as a candidate country by the EU. Based on this the main research question will be: How did the Europeanization process in Turkey change before and after Helsinki 1999? To answer this question the focus of the first sub question will be on the Turkish perception towards an EU entry and the influence of the Europeanization on Turkish citizens. Therefore the first sub question that will be discussed is: To which Turkish citizens are influenced and shaped by the Europeanization process? The extent of Europeanization and the influence of the EU on Turkish citizens (positively or negatively) will give information about changes in the Europeanization process before and after Helsinki 1999. The Turkish perception on the EU is important, to answer how the Europeanization process has changed regarding the attitude towards the EU. This is why this research will try to answer the second sub question of whether and how the Turkish perception on the EU entry developed since Helsinki ´99? Another striking point, when talking about changes in the Europeanization process before and after Helsinki 1999, is to focus on possible explanations for these changes in the European identity or better Europeanization process of Turkish citizens. This leads to the third sub question: What are possible explanations for the changes in the Europeanization process of Turkish citizens?

How did the Europeanization process change in Turkey before and after Helsinki ´99? This is the main question this thesis is going to deal with. Therefore it is based on the history of European-Turkey relations mentioned above and in the next chapter. Chapter two will also define the main concepts of this thesis. Europeanization as the major concept will play a crucial role in this thesis as it will try to explain changes in the European identity of Turkish citizens or better the Europeanization process of citizens in a candidate country and it is necessary to understand what is meant, throughout this thesis, with the concept of Europeanization. Furthermore is the relation between Turkey and the EU and the meaning of a European identity defined to get an impression of the relationship between Turkey and the EU to see what the EU means to achieve with an European identity. In chapter three a framework for analysis will be established which will help to analyze the changes in the Europeanization process in Turkey before and after Helsinki ´99 in chapter four. This framework analysis will be based on three framework dimensions that will be introduced. The dimensions are defined, justified and operationalized to establish an analytical framework for the measurement of the changes in the Europeanization process in Turkey. These shall enable to measure the Europeanization of Turkish citizens in different social groups' directly, as all dimensions are assumed to constitute direct effect on Turks. The dimensions are market orientation, cohesion with the EU policy and legal framework and attitude towards the EU. This implies that the link between the dimensions and the concept of Europeanization will be evaluated. A measurement level to answer the question, of changes in the Europeanization process in Turkey, will be developed. Then, in chapter four, the dimensions are going to be

analyzed on the basis of data and according to the measurement level established before. The data used will be mainly secondary scientific literature, the Eurobarometer and the annual progress report by the European Commission. The dimensions will help to lead through the chapter and the answer the three sub questions. In the Conclusion an answer to the main research question will be given.

2. Theoretical framework

In this section the key concepts, that are necessary to answer how the Europeanization process changed before and after Helsinki 1999 are going to be defined and explained. This will serve as a theoretical background for this thesis. The thesis is predominantly dealing with the changes in the Europeanization process. The concept of European accession process will be explained shortly because this is what drives the Europeanization process of countries. Then it is necessary to conceptualize what Europeanization means. Because this process takes place at different levels e.g. political, economical and social the conceptualization will focus on all of them, but put emphasis on the social/individual level as it is in the interest of this thesis to examine the changes in the Europeanization of Turkish citizens. Then the next step will be to conceptualize European identity. The discussion is about how it is established and developed, what it means for political and civil actors and what a possible lack of European identity means for them. The focus will also be democratic legitimacy of an entity that people cannot sufficiently identify with. This implies that the relation between Turkey and the EU is defined, as the process of Europeanization and the establishment of an European identity can only take place where a country is cooperating with the EU and involved in European policy making and adjusting to EU standards as well. These concepts are important to give an answer to the research question concerning the changes of the Europeanization process in Turkey during the time period of 1999 onwards but lso regarding the sub questions.

2.1 Europeanization

Because the enlargement process of the European Union demands adjustment by the accessing country the research on the impact of the EU increased. This process of increasing influence of the EU on member states and candidate countries is called Europeanization and current research is concerned with Europeanization or the impact of the EU on nation states and the impact of the evolution of European integration. Scientists seek to explain the impact of the European Union on member states and individuals although attribution to national changes to the EU is not simply done because there are also other processes influencing domestic politic changes e.g. globalization (Bulmer, Radaelli, 2004). Here Graziano argues that Europeanization provides different goals compared to globalization and "(…) displays institutional effects that globalization is not able to determine. (…)" (Graziano, 2003). Therefore the processes that are going to be analyzed in this research are assumed to fall under the concept of Europeanization. Europeanization is the main concept of this research. In the following the concept of the enlargement process will be discussed shortly before examining Europeanization and its issues. In the first part Europeanization as transformation process of candidate- and member states, also due to the structure of opportunities, is basically explained on a political level. Europeanization as a transformation process that is occurring on various levels will be discussed afterwards. Then an overall definition by Bulmer and Radaelli will be given before discussing the construction of common rules and norms by the Union. As a last point the features of what Europeanization theoretically implies will be given.

The concept *of accession or enlargement process of the EU* can be defined as "(…) a process of gradual and formal horizontal institutionalization of organizational rules and norms. (…)" (Schimmelfennig, Sedelmeier, 2002). Whereas institutionalization is defined by

Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier as "(…) process by which the actions and interactions of social actors come to be normatively patterned. (…)" (Schimmelfennig, Sedelmeier, 2002). Furthermore does horizontal institutionalization occur, when certain groups of organizations become larger and their norms, governed by the organization, become more important and bigger. The authors also mention that these conditions for accession resp. enlargement of the EU are not necessarily important for actually accessing countries but are also true for those having an institutional cooperation with the EU: "(…) Horizontal institutionalization is a matter of degree, and enlargement is best conceptualized as a *gradual process* that begins before, and continues after, the admission of new members to the organization (…)" (Schimmelfennig, Sedelmeier, 2002). Europeanization derives from negotiation. This is also true for enlargement processes. "(...) the extent of Europeanization lies in the extent of convergence of preferences (...) and the learning that takes place over repeated sessions of negotiation. (...)" (Bulmer, Radaelli, 2004). Furthermore is enlargement characterized by the asymmetry of power between the EU and the candidate country, which forces the candidate state to quasi adopt EU policies, implement laws, transform and homogenize institutions etc according to European standards. On the other side does the candidate country get financial and technical help, advice and twinning and benchmarking while transforming their national policies accordingly. This influences the Europeanization process of future member states as they are obliged and willing to change their structures for the sake of homogeneity within the Union and benefits from the transformation of the system (Bulmer, Radaelli, 2004). The table below shows the different mechanisms of Europeanization, identified by Bulmer and Radaelli.

Table 1: Governance, policy and the mechanism of Europeanization

Mode of Governance	Type of Policy	Analytical Core	Main Mechanism
Negotiation	Any type	Formation of EU policy	Vertical (uploading)
Hierarchy	Positive Integration	Market-correcting rules; EU policy templates	Vertical (downloading)
Hierarchy	Negative integration	Market-making rules; absence of policy templates	Horizontal
Facilitated coordination	Coordination	Soft law, OMC, policy exchange	Horizontal

(Bulmer, Radaelli, 2004).

There exist several different explanations for the concept of Europeanization. In its broadest sense it identifies the responses by European actors, economically, politically, judicially and institutionally on the impact of European integration. Europeanization tries to explain "(...) process(es) of change and adaptation (...) as consequence of the development of the European Union. (...)" (Ladrech, 2002). It can also be an explanation for the process of constructing a common European identity through the cooperation and interaction of discourse, language and values (Hay, Rosamond, 2002). Europeanization is assumed to occur on different levels namely the individual and domestic level. It is the impact of the EU on domestic politics and

policy making. This is also influenced by the "structure of opportunities" for domestic actors as Hix and Goetz say (Hix, Goetz, 2000). This structure of opportunities is accomplished by the process of adaption and adjustment of organizations to a changing environment. Therefore actors and institutions need to adjust to the changes as they have a direct impact on the domestic level meaning on the system, recourses and/or organization maintenance. These changes do have a direct effect on national citizens (Ladrech, 2002). This fact is important as the dimensions that are going to be used for analyzing the data are assumed to have a direct effect on the civil society. That is why they have been chosen. These dimensions are going to be explained in the following chapter.

Bulmer and Radaelli define three features of Europeanization. First different stages and forms of policy processes derive policy formulation and implementation. Second they assume Europeanization to be also based on norms, beliefs and values. Third Europeanization is about the impact of European policy within domestic politics. On this basis, an overall accepted definition of Europeanization is that it*:"(…) consists of processes of a) construction, b) diffusion and c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, ´ways of doing things´ and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and sub national) discourse, political structures and public policies."* (Bulmer, Radaelli, 2004). This goes beyond the economic criteria but the latest with the Copenhagen Criteria 1993 the EU tackles human rights, democratic stability as well as economic stability, which makes the Europeanization process for candidate countries even stronger (Visier, 2009). Therefore Europeanization not only influences domestic politics and economy but also individuals and their concerns directly.

Accordingly what could be defined as key feature of Europeanization are the transformation from independent nation states to a construction of a system of common rules, institutions and norms that influence the government and citizens equally. It is the construction of a common European identity based on symbols (e.g. European flag, hymn), history (e.g. renaissance, war and peace, cooperation), culture (e.g. art from different epochs) and deriving tradition (Christian tradition, Christian holidays). It is the trial to construct something that every person from any European nation can identify with and that will bring Europeans closer together. It is the establishment of a supranational social identity. For Turkey this means that it could adjust to the institutional changes asked by the EU and implement EU policies but this is the instrumental phase. Problematic features or issues of Europeanization concern the resistance of different groups within the transformation process. These groups are called Eurosceptics. Eurosceptics can be subdivided into hard- and soft Eurosceptic. Hard-Eurosceptics are against the idea of European integration and membership all together (Önis, 2006). Their perception of a membership in the European Union is that Turkey would be exploited by the EU. They fear a loss of their own culture, tradition and power but also an exploitation of the Turkish economy. For them being part of the Eurasian community is enough in terms of foreign policy because here they are not assumed to be a marginal partner. The transformation of the political and economical system and adjustment to EU policies is equated to a loss of power and influence of Turkey in the world (Sjursen, 2002). This group is constituted out of an extreme leftist and strong nationalist electorate (Önis, 2007). Soft-Eurosceptics are not against

the integration process into the EU but oppose certain reforms asked by the EU e.g. when it comes to sensitive issues like the Kurdish minorities, rights of Christian Turks, Cyprus etc (Önis, 2006). They want to have a double transformation. That means they do not only want Turkey to adjust to the European standards, but also want the EU to transform their system accordingly (McLaren, 2007). For them the accession process and its conditions is the striking point. Groups that can be assumed to be Eurosceptic are supporters of the current ruling party the AKP, the state bureaucracy and entrepreneurs (Nugent, 2007). Another social group that represents the opposite trend is pro Europeans. Pro EU within Turkey is about 30% of the Turkish citizens. They favor a full membership within the EU. For them the terms of the accession process are assumed to be for Turkey´s benefit as well as final membership. Here economic considerations play a crucial role. Current issues like human rights and legal transformation as well as free movement of citizens are important for pro EU groups (Sjurse, 2002; McLaren, 2007). These people can be mainly found within the Kurdish society of Turkey and other minority groups, supporters of the social democratic party of Turkey, the Turkish military and higher educated citizens (Nugent, 2007; Schimmelfennig, 2009). The issue here is that both social groups are differently affected by the Europeanization process. Whereas the first group has difficulties with the transformation process due to the candidate status, the other group strongly supports further changes and is able to identify with the norms and rules given by the EU. One can also assume that most of the pro EU representants come from the most populated region in Turkey (e.g. Thrace, Marmara, Black sea and Aegean Sea).

Concluding one can summaries that, what is necessary for a country to be Europeanized, the EU policy processes and changes need to be implemented and incorporated into the domestic discourse. This is especially hard because Turkey does not share the main features of Europeanization like the history, culture and tradition but also has a lot of citizens that oppose a membership for the sake of the theoretical and practical implications of being Europeanized. The aim of this thesis will be to distinguish the Europeanization of Turkey and whether and how these features of Europeanization have been implemented and accepted by Turkish citizens and might gave them a Europeanized identity. Therefore the next section is going to conceptualize European identity

2.2 European identity
Looking at Europeanization and its related processes leads to focus more on European identity. This thesis shall discuss the Europeanization of Turkish citizens. Regarding this it is important to examine the social identities of Turks to determine changes in the Europeanization process. Therefore European identity and its lacks are defined on the basis of the Copenhagen summit 1973 where an overall European identity was tried to be established.

European identity can be defined as collective identity next to national identity. Schumacher defines the "(...) identification of people towards each other and the naming of commonalities as two key characteristics of collective identity. (...)" (Schumacher, 2002). Furthermore is identity a "(...) feeling of belonging to a distinctive group or more abstract unit. (...)" (Buecker, 2006). Therefore European identity or rather EU identity means a feeling of belonging to the EU, of achieving common goals and supporting common achievements. The Copenhagen summit 1973 tried to define a common European identity with regard to the

variety of different national cultures and identities of the European MS but based on a common perception of peace and democracy to establish a system of social fairness and equality, human rights and economic cooperation as grounding element of a European identity. They assumed European identity to be grounded in mutual understanding, support and dialogue (European Community, 1973). Therefore the European Community established a European identity policy, to develop a European identity within the nation states and for the citizens. This was seen as necessary to get support for the European project because for cooperation and a supranational organization it is crucial to get support by its citizens. Support is only possible if the individual can identify himself with it. The summit further defined European identity to be intertwined with the political institutions and systems. For this purpose political and institutional cooperation developed over the years to become an ever closer Union especially in the dialogue with third actors but also due to the enlargement processes (European Community, 1973). Unfortunately is this only a political European identity, one cannot assume that this feeling of a common identity has emerged on an overall public level, yet.

Concluding this one can state that European identity is a construct which has been established by some political elites but which has not been able to achieve overall acceptance within civil society in Turkey and the EU member states.

2.3 Turkey- EU relations

As discussed above the Europeanization process until now has not have had the impact on Turkey (and many other member states) as wished by the EU. To see why a European identity is hard to achieve in Turkey it is also necessary to look at the Turkey-EU relations and how this coined the Europeanization resp. the European identity of Turkish citizens.

The *Turkish- European relations* can be defined as being coined more by the "logic of conditionality" than by the "logic of identity/ appropriateness" (Aydin, Acikmese, 2007). This means that most EU policies adapted by Turkey so far are rather implemented to please the EU than to provide its relevance to the materialization of EU´s policy interests in Turkey and the Middle East. Furthermore can be argued, that the Turkish perception the EU and its policies is decreasing in terms of European mindset and identity, but coming closer to the European model in terms of agenda, foreign policy and norms and practices (Schimmelfennig, 2009). Another challenge for the Turkish transformation process is that both actors can be defined differently. Whereas Turkey is a typical modern nation state the EU is a postmodern entity marked by its integration process. Therefore both have different preconditions and expectations concerning negotiation and cooperation.

The EU has rather rational interests concerning the integration and transformation of member states which is not compatible with the strong cultural link of politics and culture in Turkey (Önis, Yilmaz, 2009). Concerning the Europeanization process of the Turkish government one can assume that Turkey developed a civilian/soft power that helped to form an EU-like regional cooperation scheme within the Middle East, where the Turkish foreign policy issues getting more and more in line with EU priorities (Aydin, Acikmese, 2007). Also in terms of reforms in the national Security Council, where civilian powers gained primacy over military power, Turkey adjusts its political system more on the European model (Aras, Bicakci, 2006).

The long term expectations for both are that Turkey would become more European and the EU would become more flexible both in terms of ethics/duties, utilitarianism and rights but also especially in terms of the framework dimensions, that are going to be defined in 2.3 (Aras, Bicakci, 2006). This also implies a mutual redefinition of the existing relations.

Based on this it becomes clear that, implementing policies, aiming at a European identity for Turks, can be hard to achieve. There seem to be many issues at stake that need to be solved beforehand to support the Europeanization process in Turkey.

2.4 Conclusion

The concepts discussed in this chapter are necessary to examine the research question. Europeanization as a political and social impact on a candidate country will play the main role in the analysis of the question and will help to explain the reform process and the occurring impact on individuals and groups like Eurosceptics and pro EU units of analysis and the related changes in the Europeanization. Europeanization and European identity will be used to explain the changes in Turkish identity and determine how Europeanized Turks may are. This will be based on the other circumstances that have been defined in this chapter like the Turkish-European relations and the conditionality of the enlargement process of the EU.

All concepts are interrelated with each other. This is true because if the relations between Turkey and the EU would not exist there would not be a transformation and Europeanization process. Then also the enlargement process which is affecting Turkey in several ways for instance through the transformation processes scientists expect a country to adopt to the European way not only concerning instrumental issues but also regarding a social transformation and look towards a European membership. This is affected by the spread of norms and values by the EU towards the accessing country and therefore implies a change in the national identity towards a more European identity. As social scientists argue, identities change over time and are shaped by different influences. Especially social constructivists argue that: "(...) Collective identity is not naturally generated but socially constructed. (...)" (Wagner, 1995). Therefore identities change due to several factors especially those generated by policy programs. This is an important argument supporting the usage of the concept, as the EU appears to influence Turkey and therefore the collective identity of social groups by its policies. Europeanization as it has been defined in this chapter is the construction, institutionalization and diffusion of beliefs, norms, rules and policy paradigms which are consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the national discourse and structures (Bulmer, Radaelli, 2004). This is why one can expect to find out about the effects of concepts that have been defined in this chapter. This is the changes in the Europeanization process which includes changes in the EU-Turkey relations, European identity of social groups and the transformation of the political system within Turkey due to the European conditionality.

3. Methodology

In this chapter the units of analysis are going to be defined. Then the collection of data and literature will be explained and justified. Also, which data is used and for which purpose is going to be discussed. Then the three framework dimensions on which the following research is based are identified, defined and operationalized. This part will justified why the certain dimensions are going to be used and how they are operationalized to measure and analyze the data available in chapter four. The dimensions are market orientation, cohesion with the European Union's policy and legal framework and attitude towards the EU. All dimensions are examined independently and only with regard to Turkish citizens which are the units of analysis for this thesis and that are divided in section 3.1 into two social groups, namely Eurosceptics and pro Europeans. Therefore the focus will be on the social Turkish groups where strong Eurosceptics and pro Europeans can be found. In the end of this chapter the overall approach of how the literature will be analyzed, based on the framework dimensions and operationalzation scheme will be given.

3.1 Units of analysis

The units of analysis in this context are Turkish citizens. These belong to social groups which can be conceptualized as:"(...) collection of individuals who perceive themselves to be members of the same social category, share some emotional involvement in this common definition of themselves and achieve some degree of social consensus about the evaluation of their group and of their membership in it. (...) (therefore) any behavior displayed by one or more actors toward one or more others that is based on actors´ identification of themselves and the others as belonging to different social categories. (...)" (Cottam, et. al., 2004). People categorize themselves into groups that goes conform to their social identity (e.g. gender, ethnicity, and race). Therefore the individuals self concept derives from a social group and shapes the behavior, thinking etc accordingly. For this research these social groups are divided into *Eurosceptics and pro EU* within the Turkish society. The major characteristics of these groups have been set out in chapter two.

3.2 Data collection

The research is an explanatory, secondary literature desk study. The literatures used are scientific articles and documents that are mainly written by Turkish social scientists as it is important to ensure the Turkish perspective while writing this thesis. Many of the authors have worked or still work at one of the main Turkish Universities in Ankara or Istanbul, Turkey. Some of the main authors used for this thesis are Schimmelfennig, Bulmer and Radaelli who are the net contributors to the theoretical framework. They are European scientists that are highly concerned with the impact of Europe on its member states. Önis, who is concerned with the Europeanization process of political parties, entrepreneurs and its impact on Turkish citizens. Kubicek is mainly concerned with the role of NGOs and civil society within the political system in Turkey. Some other authors from Turkey like: Aydin, Yilmaz, Acikmese, Aras are also used to examine the situation in Turkey regarding the sub questions of this research.

The data needed has to "(...) set out and explain and account the descriptive information. (...)" (Punch, 2006). As various aspects can shape a European identity in a country and different

groups perceive the EU and its impacts differently it will be necessary to examine a variety of data to capture different opinions and make the overall picture as complete as possible. Therefore a great amount of literature will be retrieved from scientific journal articles and books specially concerned with the topic of the Europeanization of Turkey, politics concerning the EU, the impact of the EU on social policies and how the two different groups (namely Eurosceptics and pro Europeans) perceive the impact of the Union. The articles used are mainly retrieved from scientific journals like e.g. Mediterranean Politics, Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans, Comparative Politics and Turkish studies. As can be seen most journals are concerned with politics and other issues appearing in Turkey and its neighborhood.

The average size of the research articles is about 20 to 25 pages. It is mainly qualitative explanatory research; most of them are also based on secondary literature. They are officially published by the scientific journals mentioned before. The data is retrieved through the internet and special websites like the Universities library, SFX and scholar.google. These sites promise a scientific background of the articles which is necessary to ensure the validity of this research. Most articles are written between 1998 and 2006. This time period has been chosen because it has been the time, when most changes happened politically, economically, legally and socially concerning the accession process of Turkey and the Turkey-EU relations and therefore also the possible (changes in the) Europeanization process that shall be examined in this article. On the basis of these articles it is possible to measure the impact of the candidacy status on Turkey, which can only be measured if both times (before and after Helsinki 1999) will be taken into account. Another reason why most emphasis is on this time period is, that the reform process is slowed down and the accession of Turkey is not an actual matter of domestic politics and discussion at the moment. While focusing on articles from the period of 1998-2006 one is able to capture more of the different aspects of the development of the Europeanization process in Turkey.

The annual report of 2006 by the European Commission on the status of Turkey's implementation and adjustment to European policies and legal framework will be used to see and measure the progress made by Turkey concerning policy cohesion. The annual report is conducted by the European Commission as measure to see the progress made by Turkey in adjusting its policies and homogenizing their system according to EU´s demands. It consists of several chapters. For this research only three chapters are going to be examined as the others do not have major direct relevance for the Turkish society but are a rather political concern. These chapters are dealing with education, social and cultural policy, consumer and health protection.

The Eurobarometer will be used to measure the attitude of Turkish citizens. These statistics try to measure satisfaction of citizens on different concepts and issues. This thesis will use these statistics to measure positive or negative perception of the EU by the Turkish society. To see a trend throughout the years also an article by Kubicek will be used to see if and how the attitude towards the EU has changed over the years.

The literature that is concerned with the process of the dimensions, meaning the data that gives information about how Turkey implemented certain EU policies, who is affected, why

and how; the history of adjustment processes related to these dimensions and the impact on social groups related to this will be examined throughout the data review.

3.3 Operationalization of the concepts

In this part the logical order of the collected data and information will be explained which is necessary to be able to answer the sub questions in the fourth chapter.

The data that has been retrieved from official reputable scientific journals is going to be divided into three different categories. While studying the collected information special attention will be paid to the operationalization of the concepts. For this purpose a distinction of how "Europeaness" will be measured (which levels and on which basis) is going to be established. This means a level of measurement will be developed to measure the Europeanization (or perception) of the EU of Turkish citizens while analyzing the available literature. Eurosceptics and pro EU citizens are put into this measurement level as they are the source to distinguish European identity of Turkish citizens. Then it will be explained how the level of measurement is also related to the framework dimensions that are going to be identified later in this chapter. Europeanization is going to be measured on the basis of three levels:

(+) is the assessment for people who support the EU. Who support its goals in the certain policy area and is overall satisfied with the rights and obligations of the European conditionality. These citizens are assumed to be pro EU. These people may be positively affected by the EU and have a positive attitude towards the EU and a strong feeling of connection with the EU concerning its values and identity. (European identity, high support for the EU membership)

(+/-) assesses those who are soft Eurosceptics. These people may be supportive of some policy areas but not of others and they do not feel connected with the European identity but also do not object its influence. For these people accession may be alright but rather for rational reasons. They do not want to adopt a European identity. (Strong Turkish identity, support for the EU)

(-) assesses people who are against the European Union and a membership within it. Hard Eurosceptics fear a loss of the own culture and are strongly connected to it. Therefore they object any kind of EU identity and cooperation with it. (Strong Turkish identity, low support for the EU)

The information from the collected data will be analyzed on the basis of the above mentioned measurement level to assess Europeanization of Turks according to the articles. In section 3.3.1 it will be explained on which subjects, regarding the dimensions, the focus will be mainly on and why. For now it is only important to discuss which impact the operationalization of the main concept has on the ordering and analysis of the data. The articles are mainly secondary literature as well as reports by the European Union. These main findings concerning the impact on the different social groups in relation to the dimensions will be examined. The scientific journal articles concerning the influence of the EU on the Turkish market and businesses or vice versa is studied to determine the first

dimension. This data will also be used to determine which groups might be Eurosceptic or pro EU within Turkey and examined under the operationalized concepts. Then the focus will be on the most important chapters from the annual progress report by the European Commission and related scientific literature to discuss the dimension of policy cohesion and legal framework with the EU and the impact on social groups by this dimension again with regard to the operationalized concept. The last dimension is going to be attitude towards the EU and will be mainly examined through the output of the Eurobarometer. Here the distinction concerning social groups will be made with regard to the operationalized concept as well.

When the data has been ordered and analyzed according to the established measurement levels and within the framework dimensions, the next step is, to come to a conclusion for the sub questions out of it. For this purpose the dimensions have been discussed regarding their development and impact on different social groups. This helps to determine the extent to which Turks may have been influenced and shaped, the changes in the perception towards the EU and the possible explanations. These findings will be based on data collected for the dimensions.

Summarizing these steps: First the data will be collected and ordered according to their thematic background. Second the history of the dimensions is examined throughout the articles. Third the information within the data will be ordered according to the operationalization of the concept and then determined in the under each dimension according to the social group and their features concerning Euroscepticism/pro EU tendencies according to the issue of the dimension. Fourth, these findings will be comprised in the answering of the sub question.

3.3.1 Definition, Justification & Operationalization of the Dimensions

Based on the literature, the three dimensions, that are going to be explained in this section, are used to examine and measure the European identity of Turkey's citizens. First the different dimensions are shortly introduced and justified, why they are used for this research. Then they are operationalized. Here it means that the dimensions are ordered to be able to analyze the data available. Based on the main concepts explained in chapter two, the framework dimensions for ordering the data and analyzing the information available are: *market orientation, cohesion with EU policy and legal framework and attitude towards the EU*. These dimensions shall constitute a basis for the data analysis. They shall enable to interpret the structural changes that may affect Turks throughout the adjustment processes. These dimensions are assumed to affect society directly and therefore help to measure the impact of the EU on Turkey.

Market orientation can be defined as the orientation on European standards concerning exports and imports, recognition of rules of procedure, rights and obligations but also the adjustment on the European market in terms of market structure and market policies. It is an important dimension as it is necessary for the EU and Turkey to adjust to existing standards. Furthermore has the EU been primarily an economic union and the primary interest of Turkey was to benefit from that. This is also why market orientation has been chosen to constitute the first variable. Furthermore is this dimension rather rational/ instrumental and constitutes a great interest area for many actors.

It is not only in the interest of the Turkish government to implement more economic relations and an ever closer market. Turkish citizens are directly affected by the customs union (CU) and the economic rules and procedures impact on the Turkish market by the EU because as working and living within the system affects citizens in a workable age. This is because of the impact on working situation, welfare and insurance standards and working contracts for low and high skilled workers. Therefore it can be assumed that the orientation of the Turkish market towards the European market does have an impact on the Europeanization process within civil society. This is because of the adjustment of rules and procedures within the open market, closer cooperation and impact on the job market. Also production and trade appear to be affected which also constitutes changes that are felt by the Turkish working society and may affect their perception of Europe which then affects their Europeanization in a positive or negative way.

To measure the Europeanization of Turks with regard to this dimension, market orientation will be measured on several facts. How domestic workers and entrepreneurs adjust to European standards, cooperate and orientate according to the European market. Second, the rights and obligations of Turkish workers and how they perceive them. Furthermore it will be clearly distinguished which social groups within Turkey are pro European or Eurosceptic within the economic system. This shall enable to see possible changes within the Europeanization process as the impact of the EU is more directly here than for many other policy areas the EU is trying to affect.

Cohesion with EU policy and legal framework is concerned with the implementation of an adjustment on EU policies, legislations and a European legal framework. For this research policies especially concerning education, human rights, minorities and the Turkish- European culture and relation are going to be focused on.
The implementation of several different laws to adjust to the European standard and regulations as well as rights and obligations affect Turkish citizens indirectly and directly. Policies concerning education, human rights, and the role of women, democratization, and the free movement of persons, services and capital and others also deal with the everyday life of the average citizen (Chalmers et al., 2006). Policy implementation also needs the support of the citizens. A government would not be able to implement a policy or legislation properly, if the citizens (who have to deal with it in the end) are not involved or do not implement what is given. Therefore cohesion of EU policy and legal framework affects people and the Europeanization of them directly and can be measured within the country (Moravsic, 2004). Furthermore people who are affected by any of these policies can respond directly, positively or negatively how they feel within the changing system and whether or not they appreciate the changes, initiated by the EU. Also does the European idea of a mutually cooperating, collective European society affecting the peoples´ identity. As many of these projects aim to have a cohesive European Union with a Europeanized national identity it is necessary to affect Turkish citizens. It is chosen to be the second dimension because it is affecting Europeanization in several ways. Because it is not simply a rational process but needs the support of the civil society and because it is partly affected by the first dimension, policy cohesion is chosen to be the second dimension to be analysed.

It will be measured on the following basis: European policies concerning education. How these are implemented by the Turkish government and how they affect Turkish citizens. Human rights, as this is still a sensitive but important issue when talking about the Turkey – EU relations. Certain minorities and the gender issue are the main issue here and how NGOs may impact on them. This will be measured on the basis of annual reports by the Commission on the status of Turkey's adjustment. The measurement level will show the direct impact on people and is assumed to detect where changes occur that also influenced changes within the Turkish society and therefore also affect the Europeanization of Turks.

Attitude is the (positive) feeling towards an object. A standard definition of attitude is "(...) an enduring system of positive and negative beliefs (...), affective feelings and emotions, and action tendencies regarding attitude objects, that is the entity being evaluated. (...) (Cottam et.al. 2004). Therefore the positive attitude of citizens means an enduring system of positive beliefs towards the EU whereas a negative attitude can be defined as negative beliefs and dissatisfaction towards the same object. This affects feelings, trust and support into this institution. Both social groups are going to be examined on the basis of their attitude towards the EU. Attitude is an important dimension to measure the perception of Turkey towards the EU and how according to the (dis)-satisfaction the changes within the Turkish identity could be explained. Satisfaction with a political system/institution has a crucial impact on the support of a possible membership within the Union as well as the willingness to perceive oneself as European and implement European policies good and easily (Moravsic, 2004). It will be measured according to the Eurobarometer. Important factors determined by this institutions are attachment to the EU, support for membership of the EU, perceived benefits of membership, trust (in the European institutions), image of the EU (and its institutions). It has been chosen to be the last dimension as it is the (logical) consequence of the impact of the other two dimensions.

The attitude is firstly measured on the basis of the foregone dimensions as well as overall willingness and support for the EU and European membership. The level of measurement is: positive attitude and negative attitude. The social groups and their possible reasons why they are dis/satisfied will be shortly mentioned. This will help to determine the support of further adjustment processes as well as overall support for the EU. This, in turn, will help to detect changes in the Europeanization process, as a positive attitude towards the EU is strongly connected with a positive Europeanization and an increasing European identity whereas a negative attitude is showing a negative trend in the Europeanization of individuals.

The dimensions that are introduced for this research became important only after Helsinki 1999 for Turkey. Then it was obliged to harmonize its policies, legal framework and market according to European standards. Therefore the changes in perception on the EU before and after Helsinki ´99 and how these changes influenced and shaped Turkish citizens can be assessed on the basis of the data, retrieved from the EU webpage and scientific journals, given these dimensions. Also the attitude towards the EU can be measured within this time frame as the EU became more important and more actual for Turkish citizens with the accession process and therefore shaped the Turkish perception on the EU in some way. These dimensions are closely related to the concept of Europeanization and European identity as

well as the conceptualized Turkey-EU relations. This is because Europeanization occurs where changes and reforms, due to the EU demands and adjustment to the European standards, occur. These changes first impact the governmental level, as this is where reforms are made, but these dimensions are assumed to have a direct effect on citizens due to the implementation of the changes and therefore should have an effect on the Europeanization process of Turks and may change their European identity as the contact platform and impact of the EU is assumed to increase due to the ongoing negotiations and accession process of Turkey.

This thesis will first measure the European identity on the three levels above based on each dimension. This is necessary to give an overall picture of how Turks perceive the EU, to then determine the changes in the Europeanization of Turkey. Because the measurement level defined assume an either European or Turkish attitude one is able to assess the collective feeling respectively the European identity of the Turkish population. The level of measurement will help to asses Europeanization (also within different social groups) based on the literature and therefore gives a possible explanation of the changes in the Turkish identity. All three dimensions are used to explain the Europeanization of a country. Based on literature and other data sources the dimensions are going to be examined and then, based on the concepts of Europeanization resp. European identity of Turkish citizens it will be analyzed and measured with the help of the measurement levels established before.

3.4 Conclusion

Throughout this chapter the focus has been on the data and how this data is going to be analyzed. For this purpose the concept of Europeanization has been operationalized. Then the three framework dimensions have been introduced and defined to order the collected information logically. This will be the first step to analyze the data on the basis of them but always with regard to the concept of Europeanization. This shall enable this thesis to receive a conclusion to answer the sub questions of this research. This chapter delivered a clear framework of how the analysis in chapter four is going to be conducted and gave an overview on the data that is going to be used. This is also necessary to ensure a high validity of this thesis.

In the next chapter the analysis will be conducted. For this purpose the history of the different dimensions are examined. Then the perception of Turks resp. the social groups that belong to either Eurosceptic or the pro EU group are analyzed on the basis of the foregone measurement levels and concerning the dimensions as the social groups examined are directly affected by changes in these dimensions. These findings give the basis to examine the Europeanization of Turkey. The last step for the analysis would be to put these findings together to answer the sub questions and finally be able to answer the main research question.

4. Analysis

This chapter is concerned with the analysis of the three dimensions to answer the question of how the EU shaped Turkey´s citizens and their European identity before and after Helsinki 1999 to give answers to the sub questions of this thesis. The analysis is based on the operationalization and the established measurement level of chapter three. For this purpose first the dimension and its historical background is mentioned. The dimensions represent variables that have an effect on the Europeanization process of candidate countries. Additionally progresses, backlashes as well as deadlocks within the dimensions are discussed and possible effects on different social groups are distinguished. Hence then the impact on the Europeanization / transformation process of Turkey will be examined by looking at the different social groups that might be affected by the dimension and categorize them into Eurosceptics and pro EU units. By doing this the chapter is aiming at answering the sub questions through the findings within the dimensions. This will be done in the last part of this chapter and is going to be a summary of what have been found and analyzed throughout the dimensions.

4.1 Market orientation

This dimension is examined first because Turkey has established a CU with the EU for a long period already. The impacts of the harmonization process are occurring since a longer period than for the other variables. Also the fact that the European Union used to be an economic union founded to support economic cooperation and a non-tariff area. Many member states joined just for these benefits, which makes it applicable to discuss this dimension first. The collected data will be reviewed based on the three points mentioned in the methodology chapter: implementation of the CU, adjustment by workers and entrepreneurs to EU standard and rights and obligations of Turkish workers.

The data examined gives information about the evolution of the Turkish market and how it adjusted to the EU´s demands. These adjustments are taken into account when discussing the impact orientation of the Turkish- on the European market.

Turkey established a liberal, outward oriented market economy in 1980. This means that import restrictions were abolished resolving in no trade tariffs and quantitative restrictions. This development is based on the Ankara agreement, which was followed by the establishment of the Custom Union (CU) with the European Community (EC). Here Turkey received financial help to improve their economic system. Turkey was obliged to establish common tariffs for EC members and EC partners whereas the EC removed all restrictions on industrial products coming from Turkey. It is important to mention, that agricultural products were not included. EU standards on industrial products affect Turkey´s product exports negatively as well. Another striking point, which has negative effects for Turkish citizens, is that the freedom of movement, capital and a different currency are restricted and therefore does not support a greater exchange or orientation on the European market in many market sectors. This is also true because the Turkish export products are mainly low-technology products like clothing, carpets, food and textile (Utkulu, Seymen, 2004).

Joining the EU means to implement and adjust to the entire EU legislation concerning market structures. Turkey needs to attain macroeconomic stability, liberalize its services, network

industries, privatize the energy sector and adjust environmental protection systems. Most important is that Turkey has to adopt the Common Agricultural Policies (CAP). With 14% of the national GDP coming from agriculture and a total employment of 33% in this sector adjusting this sector means a large burden for Turkey. Togan assumes that adjusting to the European standard of CAP will have a high impact on distributional, social and political effect because many farmers would receive fewer subsidies from the government and therefore lower their income. Also a regulatory framework for the banking sector is necessary (Togan, 2004).

It becomes obvious that there exist certain inequalities concerning the effect of the Turkish orientation on the European market. In 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 the impact on citizens from different social groups will be examined, based on these findings to find out, which group may be rather Eurosceptic/ pro EU concerning the outcome of dimension of market orientation.

4.1.1 Hard/Soft Eurosceptic

In the following the negative impact of market orientation for groups in civil society will be examined based on the concept of Europeanization. Therefore features of Europeanization are examined and put into the measurement level to give an overall picture of how certain groups perceive the EU regarding the dimension of market orientation.

Before 1999 MÜSIAD (Organization of young Industrials and entrepreneurs) was having a lot of influence as a lobby organization within Turkey. MÜSIAD is an organization of large scale firms mainly from the Anatolian region and has a large number of members. A strong Islamic relation exists in this association. Therefore MÜSIAD opposed the Europeanization process as it was seen as threatening Turkey´s Islamic values and would abolish a possible re-Islamization of Turkey and the protection of secularism by the EU. But since the ´90´s MÜSIAD lost its influence because of the growing conflict about Islamization of the Turkish state (Önis, Türem, 2002). Regarding MÜSIAD and its members, who can be assumed to be mainly Anatolian industrials and entrepreneurs' one can define this group as Eurosceptic because they do not have any advantages concerning the accession into the EU nor do they favor a stronger relation with the Union. This is also true when talking about the above mentioned facts concerning market orientation of Turkey. For the members of MÜSIAD it would not be favorable to join the EU as they would have to adjust even more to European standards, which has a negative economic effect on them.

Also citizens in blue collar jobs and farmers do not necessarily benefit from the EU accession because income inequality and job rights are not tackled by any institution throughout the accession process in particular. Especially farmers do not benefit as business organizations are not concerned with their demands. The government has to adjust to the European standards regarding the CAP which again is a disadvantage for the farmers. Another fact is that farmers are rather located in the east of Turkey. There tradition and religion play a major role. Most farmers are also not able to export their products as in Turkey most agricultural products are consumed domestically. Therefore these people are opposing the accession because of religious and economic reasons as for them entering the EU would not be economically sound (Önis, Türem, 2002).

4.1.2 Pro EU

After having examined the negative effects that occur by the Turkish orientation on the European market the focus will now be on people who perceive the impact of the European market as positive. Again this is linked to the concept of Europeanization and measured according to the operationalized concept.

The business association of Turkish Industrials and Businessmen (TÜSIAD) can be named as one of the representatives of a pro Europe attitude within the Turkish society. TÜSIAD consist of representatives of large scale businesses but has only a small representation of 450 businesses throughout Turkey. The businesses that are member of this association have the biggest economic impact in Turkey. For them, not being able to be in the EU and not being involved in the democratization process and the adjustment to European standards means a considerable economic loss. Because of financial help of the EU in the adjustment process these businesses would be able to export and increase their international economic relations better. This process would make the Turkish economy more stable and predictable which is an advantage for in- and outsiders when being involved in economic relations. Other reasons, why TÜSIAD can be assumed to be strongly oriented to the European market are the development of a stable, reliable legal and political environment for the state. This ensures citizenship rights as well as consumer protection and norms for a free market. Market orientation therefore has potential economic benefits for some businesses (Önis, Türem, 2002). Also white collar workers would be positively affected as the exchange and movement of work would be easier and would provide new possibilities for them regarding job chances, finances and education.

4.2 Policy Cohesion and Legislative Framework

Policy and legal framework cohesion have been chosen as the second dimension because the political Europeanization process is coined by the adjustment of policies and legislative framework by the candidate country. This is assumed to have an impact on the civil society as well. Therefore this thesis chose three policy fields that can have a strong direct impact on citizens.

Turkey´s civil society is weak when talking about participation in political matters. Most changes in the policy framework are made due to EU demand or economic and political interests but not on demand of Turkish citizens. But, and this is necessary to mention, the impact of the political process of Europeanization does have an effect on citizens in particular (Önis, 2003). The changes made by the government as answer to the annual progress report by the Commission show the changes in the Turkish system. The annual progress report by the Commission started in 1998/99. From this onward the Commission demanded more transparency, higher administrative standards and less centralization (Önis, 2007). But also other areas that affect citizens even more directly are tackled by the EU; these are for example: Education and Social policies, Consumer Protection and Health, Democracy and Human Rights and Employment and Social Policy. Because consumer protection has been discussed under market orientation already we are not going to discuss it here in detail again.

Regarding education and culture the Turkish government extended the compulsory education and ensured that education is free available and achievable for everybody. These changes went along with an increase on education spending to receive more efficiency and to adjust the curricula to PISA and the Bologna process which ensured a deeper exchange also for students and young people (European Commission, 2006). To ensure the effectiveness of its policies also teacher education has been transformed (Grossmann et al., 2007). Cultural diversity which is mainly important for minorities living in Turkey shall be supported by cooperation with other states, NGOs and the UNESCO. This is especially important for the eastern youth who have less access to information concerning education and cultural expression (Commission, 2006).

As analyzed by Kubicek there exists no real political competition in Turkey. Furthermore does the military still have too much power compared to the civilian powers, which is also due to low active and effective NGOs in Turkey. This is true because the government hinders the organization of NGOs, as he argues. Kubicek argues that the Turkish society is not only not able to mobilize for changes but also not able to implement changes directly. Therefore any changes in democracy and human rights issues are done as a top down process activated by the Turkish government. The Europeanization process is facing the same problem in these matters: Turkish citizens and NGOs are executing the decisions made by the government if possible therefore Europeanization as an active process of citizens and the evolving support cannot occur (Kubicek, 2002). A lack of structure, recourses and a legal and ethical basis make it hard for the public society to organize for human rights issues (Aycan, 2001). To take part in the European Social Fund (ESF) Turkey has to ensure a better basis for human rights and democracy (Commission, 2006).

Regarding employment and social policy Turkey needs to develop regulations against discrimination, equal payment and health. The integration of disabled people into the market needs to be approved. A better establishment of community based services as institution for disabled people concerning care, educations etc are still necessary according to the Commission. Also child labor and social inclusion are still issues to be tackled by Turkey. Child labor is still common in Turkey especially in Eastern Anatolia. Therefore education is neglected which may result in a vicious circle of poverty and social exclusion. The risk here is higher than in the rest of the Union and special programs need to be launched and further developed to ensure social inclusion for poor, old and disabled people. This means also that there is a high need for social institutions to fight poverty resp. social exclusion but also higher support and understanding by the citizens (Commission, 2006).

This part has examined the implementation of different policies asked by the EU and how they progressed so far. As can be seen policy cohesion has different areas and various effects within these fields. Therefore one can assume that people are affected in different ways. This is why 4.2.1 part and 4.2.2 will explain how these affected Turks within different social groups in particular and how it shapes their perception towards the EU.

4.2.1 Hard/Soft Eurosceptics

In the following social groups that are negatively affected by the changes in the Turkish system due to the reforms are named and how their identities have been shaped negatively by the Europeanization process of Turkey concerning the reforms discussed before.

Those changes in the policy- and legal framework to establish higher cohesion with the European Union are perceived differently. People who are rather concerned with the Kemalist idea of the Turkish republic and who want to protect the reforms Kemal Atatürk established in the 1920/30s see the Union and its reforms as a threat for the Turkish republic and its democracy. They think that those, supporting the accession only want the EU to back up a re-islamization of Turkish politics. Therefore the military and those concerned with it are against an accession under EU conditionality. Especially in the Turkey´s west people are higher educated and less concerned with religion anymore but strong Kemalists. Therefore these social groups oppose an accession if Turkey has to adjust too much on European standards (Kubicek, 2005).

4.2.2 Pro EU

The positive impact of the reform process and how it may shape some social groups towards a pro EU attitude is discussed in this section. The focus is again on the reforms and their impact discussed in 4.2.

People, which support the AK-Party and supporters of an Islamization of Turkey are pro- EU as they perceive a possible accession as opportunity to enforce more religion in public issues and in the government. Under the human rights- and equality issue they think that re-establishing Islam in politics would be supported by the EU and the European Court of Justice (ECJ) which would decrease the power of the Kemalist movement (Patton, 2007; Dai, 2005). As Dai describes it: the Islamists emerge a new identity towards the hope for a possible coexistence of the West with the Islamic culture (Dai, 2005). It is not possible to make the distinction that easily because the AK party could also defined as being soft euro skeptic as they want the EU to adjust to Turkey as well and they do not want every reform the EU wants them to make although they hope for support concerning the re-islamization of Turkish politics.

Students and higher educated Turks especially in bigger Cities (in the West of Turkey) have been supporters of the accession of Turkey. They knew about the benefits they may have through the adjustment and exchange processes with the European partners. Deeper cooperation and exchange regarding education and culture make them supportive. One has to mention here that this support decreases the longer the EU is not letting Turkey enter the Union. Increasing frustration also due to limitations in the movement of labor and the never ending accession discussion makes it less attractive to be a member in the Union for these people (Carkolu, 2003).

People from social groups that form social minorities within Turkey like for example women, disabled and poor people can be assumed to be supportive of an EU accession. This is the case because NGOs supporting minorities receive strong acknowledgement by the EU through different channels and get a platform for greater influence and support. These are

financial help, network building, transnational cooperation and exchange of knowledge and ideas. Especially women concerned with the gender issue in Turkey have strong relations with comparable European organizations (Kubicek, 2005).

4.3 Attitudes

The last dimension that is used to discover the Europeanization of Turkey is attitudes. This is because the positive or negative attitude towards an object also consists of the aspects that have been discussed within the other dimensions (additional variables that have not been discussed throughout this thesis may also influence and shape the attitude of Turks toward the Union). The findings of the Eurobarometer and political tensions are examined within this section. The focus will be on the attitude towards the European institutions and the possible benefits of an EU membership and how political parties may influence these happenings during the accession processes. This will measure the trend in the attitude towards the EU.

In the Eurobarometer 2000 the Turks seemed to be positively disposed toward the possible membership. 64% of Turks backed up an EU membership with 58% expecting their lifestyle to improve as result of the membership also the majority of Turks did not know much about the EU. In 2003 the attitude towards the EU decreased and Eurosceptic tendencies evolved increasingly. 55% of Turkish citizens said that with establishing all the EU demands it would end the Turkish state and corrupt the moral values of the youth and weaken religious tradition and values but also support Kurdish separatism (Kubicek, 2005). Also the current Eurobarometer shows decreasing support for the European Union. About 63% of Turks distrust the EU at all and around 58% distrust its institutions. Now only 39% of Turks backed up a possible membership in the Union compared to 64% in 2000 and 42% in 2008 the trend is clearly decreasing. 31% have a positive image of the EU. 25% perceive the economic situation in the EU as good but only 10% perceive their own national economy as good. This is a clear sign that is also underlined by a high percentage of people who think they would benefit from accessing the Union [47%] (Commission, 2009). This trend shows that Turks do know about the materialistic benefits of a membership but do not want to be patronized by any other authority (Kubicek, 2005).

Elections show an increasing trend towards more nationalism and less compliance with the European standards. Canefe and Bora argue that the 2002 elections showed the awareness of the Turkish society of the changes due to the accession process but seem to be sensitive about it. Therefore, a lot of votes went to the MHP (National Action Party), a nationalist party that stands for re-identification of traditional heritage and Turkish culture (Canefe, Bora, 2003). That the AKP is in power could be declared as a paradox of the Turkish society. On the one hand Turks want a re-identification of the Turkish and Islamic culture on the other hand Turks see the materialistic advantages of being part of the EU (Patton, 2007).

The discussion of the information found in the Eurobarometer and by Kubicek show that a former trend of a positive attitude towards an EU membership and the EU is decreasing and becoming more and more negative concerning trust in the EU and its institutions. This becomes also obvious when looking at the voting behavior of Turkish citizens although this is rather paradox concerning materialistic and traditional issues. In 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 the attitudes

are going to be examined based on social groups and their reasoning for a positive resp. negative attitude towards the EU.

4.3.1 Hard/Soft Eurosceptics

After having examined the trend in attitudes towards the EU it is now necessary to focus on the groups that have a negative attitude towards the EU and their reasoning for being Eurosceptic.

Attitudes of hard Eurosceptics are overall negative towards the EU. As mentioned before Eurosceptics see the EU as possible threat for their nation. They do not want European integration especially not on the basis of European conditionality. They do not trust any of the European institutions and think Turkey would be better off if she would not be patronized by the EU. As already mentioned, soft Eurosceptic Turks may see the materialistic advantages of a membership but reject the idea of loosing sovereignty. Hard Eurosceptics can be assumed to belong to the electorate of the MHP, other strong nationalist parties or extreme leftist parties that can be found in the eastern and rather poor parts of Turkey mainly (Önis, 2007). Soft Eurosceptics belong to the voters for the AK party, hard-liner Kemalists and the military. Önis defines these people as "defensive nationalists" who think that the risk of negative effects and social inequality outweigh the benefits of Europeanization (Önis, 2007).

4.3.2 Pro EU

People who are supporters of the EU are assumed to have a positive attitude towards the EU. Therefore it is also important to focus on groupings with a positive attitude towards the EU and their reasons for being positive towards the EU.

For people with a pro EU mindset the attitude towards the EU is positive. They perceive the impact of European integration as positive and trust the EU and its institutions. These people form the group that perceives the EU as good and its impact as necessary and helpful. They can be found in NGOs, business associations and persons with a higher educated background mainly coming from the western parts and bigger cities of Turkey. People that support the secular nation, liberals, moderate Islamists and Kurdish reformers are also mentioned by Önis as supporters of the EU. Önis defines them as "reformists" that see the changes of Europeanization as positive to capture with the trend of globalization and help to make the country able to enjoy the advantages of increasing globalization through the channels of Europe (Önis, 2007).

4.4 How did the Europeanization process change in Turkey before and after Helsinki ´99?

The next step to answer the research question of this article is to answer the three sub questions that have been stated. The answer of these questions will be based on the findings of the dimensions. Certain crucial corner points that are assumed to be consequent points of the information gathered and assessed within the dimensions are named and brought into a context to first answer the sub questions that will result in an answer of the research question in the next chapter. For this purpose the first sub question is strongly related to the findings from 4.2 whereas the second question is mainly based on data gathered under the dimension discussed under 4.3. To find possible explanations for the changes in the Europeanization

process, information found within 4.1 and the other variables are used. Whereas the dimensions shall be seen as a help to give an answer to the research questions to base this answer on explicit data given within the examination of the dimensions.

In the following a short introduction of how changes in the Europeanization process could be classified will be given. After that the next three sections will deal with the sub questions to then answer in which direction the Europeanization process tends to go. This enables to give a conclusion of the research question in chapter five.

Based on the findings and the trial to answer the questions of the influence of Europeanization and how Turkish citizens are shaped by it, the changes in the perception of the Turks towards the EU and by giving possible explanations for the changes in Europeanization the main research question, this article is dealing with, which is about the changes in the Europeanization process before and after Helsinki ´99 is tried to be answered. Therefore four possible outcomes are introduced that will help to determine how the Europeanization in Turkey developed. Radaelli argues in his article "Whither Europeanization? Concept stretching and substantive change." that to organize the analysis of Europeanization one needs to answer the question of the object that is Europeanized and the direction it has been Europeanized (meaning: how much change has occurred to the object).

He uses four possible outcomes identified by Heritier and Knill, which are: inertia, absorption transformation and retrenchment (Heritier, Knill, 2000). These outcomes cover "(…) both the magnitude of change and its direction (…)" (Radaelli, 2000). Inertia can be described as a lack of change within a member state due to dissimilarities of the EU and domestic systems. It can become a problem and lead to a crisis in the long run as a resistance to EU-induced change is not sustainable on an economic and political level (Radaelli, 2000). Absorption means that a country is able to change domestic structures but only in certain non-fundamental areas. The core is maintained by the national government which means no real modification to the important structures necessary for an effective European wide cooperation (Radaelli, 2000). Transformation is the fundamental change of a domestic system due to EU-induced change whereas retrenchment means that a country becomes less European than it used to be (Radaelli, 2000). To answer the question of how the Europeanization process changed in Turkey the four possible outcomes will be used in the end of this section to determine which direction is occurring in Turkey in the period before and after Helsinki 1999.

4.4.1 Extend of Europeanization that influenced and shaped Turks

To answer the above stated question focus will mainly be on information and data gathered under the dimension of policy cohesion and legal framework. This is because the influence of Europeanization that shaped Turks can be measured by the impact of the Europeanization reforms. The changes of policies that have been assessed here are assumed to have direct effect on people and therefore shape them to some extent. Also the perception of the different social groups that are divided into Eurosceptics and pro EU are crucial as these are the people that are directly shaped by the Europeanization process.

Önis mentioned the important distinction made by Turks, that most of them in civil society, as well as the government and political parties, make a sharp distinction between the reform processes due to the EU´s demands and accession to the Union. For them membership and

reforms are independent categories that are not related. They do not see the need to ensure a sustainable reform and Europeanization process in order to enter the Union (Önis, 2007). This has an impact on the extent to which a society is influenced and shaped by an integrative process and constitutes a great paradox as these processes are strongly interrelated and affect the outcome in the accession process. As the Copenhagen summit 1973 tried to establish a European identity through the creation of common symbols, values and norms this process would only take place to a limited extend in Turkey if the reform and accession process are perceived as different independent and instrumental constructs (European Community, 1973). The identification process with European formal and informal rules, norms and values would not take place within this social system. Therefore an increasingly occurring oddity is a reform process which cannot have the wished impact on Turkish citizens. This is because the identification process which should develop at the same time is not existent to a sufficient extend.

As can be seen in the findings above Turkey made major progress in its reforms, especially in the time between 1999 and 2006 before the AKP slowed down the reform process due to the European conditionality (Patton, 2007). In this time people perceived the EU as an entity that is beneficial to belong to. But did these changes affect the Turks? Are they affected by any kind of Europeanization through these reforms and did they shape their European identity? What about their differentiation between accession and transformation of their nation? As discussed before Turks have a weak political culture and it is not easy for them to organize in NGOs or comparable systems for several reasons. This means that a lot of the impact the EU could have on Turks is not available as there exists no platform for both actors for cooperation and mutual exchange (Kubicek, 2005). This also means that Europeanization of the civil society has not been shaped and their social identity remained rather national.

Although the Commission tries to support the establishment of institutions and organizations for various subjects the outcome is limited because every project needs a ground and support from parts of the society. Therefore people are not affected considerably unless they have a basis to come into contact with the EU like e.g. a NGO, University and other public institution. But also in these institutions the differentiation between accession and transformation are existent. This means that people may have a basis to get an impact by the EU but they may not use it as they do not perceive it as necessary or do not understand it. This is a great paradox as the EU is using these platforms to get in contact with the people, which in turn is not possible as it is not heard. Also because the Commission´s progress report stated that many reforms have been implemented well and sufficiently one should assume that progress has been made also concerning the extend of the Europeanization of Turks, which is not true due to the arguments given above.

Most NGOs and projects have a limited number of members (European Commission, 2006). One can clearly see that these members support the EU and are Europeanized to a great extend as they understood the concept of EU membership. These people can be claimed to be shaped and influenced by the Europeanization process considerably. But what about the majority of people not taking part in one of the organizations and not being touched by the EU directly? After 1999 many Turks fell back on their old values even more. This has been

shown in the high outcome in the elections where the strong nationalist party received a lot of votes (Önis, 2007). They might be afraid of changes and may do not understand what is happening throughout the accession and transformation process. This might be due to a lack of information and the top down process of reforms by the Turkish government. This is an unexpected fact as the Europeanization and accession process normally assumed a greater participation of citizens within this processes which then supports mutual understanding and an increase in the European identity or feeling of belonging. It is an alarming issue that the reverse happens in Turkey and will have impact on the future EU-Turkey relation.

One explanation for this reverse effect of Europeanization is that the EU is asking for transformation of the domestic system, which is hard to justify and explain by the government in front of their voters (Ulusoy, 2009). Certain negative effects that result from this transformation as e.g. less income for farmers, possible losses in some production businesses due to the application of European standards, and other impacts on the economic, production and export system in Turkey have a rather Eurosceptic impact on Turks (Utkulu, Seymen, 2004). This is also true for administrative changes in Turkey (Celenk, 2009). It shapes the people´s identity but rather in a way that the national identity is growing than Europeanization is. This is why until now one could *not* talk about a great extent of Europeanization of the Turkish society.

It is the opposite effect of Europeanization. Due to the growing Eurosceptic groups, that have been mentioned before in this chapter and regarding the different dimensions examined that affected people within this time period. First people are not able to benefit enough from the Europeanization process as it is too instrumental and rational and not near on the average citizen. There are too many negative aspects especially for certain social groups that cause a negative Europeanization. Second it has not been possible to establish an overall European identity neither in Europe nor in Turkey as aimed for by the Commission since 1973. As examined there are only small pro EU groups supporting the EU and transforming their social identity accordingly. The major population in Turkey does either fall back on old values and becomes hard Eurosceptic or does not agree with the European conditionality and therefore becomes increasingly (soft) Eurosceptic. Therefore the Europeanization process has shaped and influenced Turks only to a very limited extend and has had a rather backward effect in terms of a stronger national identity. This also affects the Turkey-EU relations negatively as many reforms are not sufficiently conducted and performed by the Turkish government and society due to decreasing understanding, support and a connected declining Europeanization of the society.

Summarizing these findings one can assume to have two groups that are influenced by the Europeanization process. The first group is affected positively and is shaped to a great extend by the Europeanization process. The second group is not or negatively affected by the EU and turns back to old values rather than being shaped by the Europeanization process.

4.4.2 Did the Turkish perception on EU change before and after ´99?
The Turkish perception of the EU is strongly related to the dimension of attitude towards the EU as they are concerned with the feeling or perception towards an object. Therefore, what is going to be assessed in this section is retrieved from the findings of the dimension "attitude".

In the years, when Turkey got accepted as a candidate for EU membership the perception of Turks towards the EU was very positive. One can assume that between 1999, after the candidate status, and 2006 the positive attitude was the highest. As shown above in 2000 support for the EU was about 64% but with a negative trend over the years. In 2003 only 55% of Turks were positive about the EU accession and in 2009 the decrease was almost two thirds since 2000 (Kubicek, 2005, Eurobarometer, 2009). This shows a negative trend in the perception of the EU. One can assume that this trend was fastened by the frustration of the leading AK party that slowed down the reform process. The slow down by the AKP can be explained by the high reform processes in Turkey the great efforts to meet European standards and many of the issues and conflicts that exist in Turkey that are tried to be solved. But Turkey did not receive any of the promised benefits by the EU nor were accession negotiations brought forward but rather slowed down by the EU and its member states (Aydin, Acikmese, 2007).

This is also true because different member states increased their discussion on Turkey and showed a negative support of the possible accession by Turkey. Especially France and Austria, who want to hold a national referendum if Turkey´s accession will become an actual issue showed low support by EU MS for Turkey´s accession (Deringil, 2007, Öniş, 2001). These matters have had an impact, which became obvious in the discourse of the reforms especially after 2006 as Turkey´s society and the Turkish government felt set back by the European Community (Patton, 2007).

The paradox is, that the Turkish perception on the EU has been positive shortly before 1999 although even the candidate status has been denied by the EU. This can be explained by the fact that people wanted to belong to the EU. They saw the benefits evolving from the CU and getting the candidate status would provide possible further benefits (Müftüler-Bac, 1998). Turkey also needed a strong partner and an actor with whom to cooperate also because Turkey was always in the middle between the Middle East and the West (Europe) and not being fully connected with one entity (Patton, 2007). It seemed to be attractive to be part of a developing strong Union for once, because of a strong economy and its Western values and connection that has been tried to be achieved by Turkey since the establishment of the Turkish Republic. This increased Europeanization within the Turkish society as support for a membership was high and people could identify with this Union due to the same aims, values and benefits they assumed to get.

One can assume that the Turkish perception on the EU has changed to a considerable negative trend. This trend is not easy to stop or reverse. This is true as the pro European group is fairly small and still decreasing as can be seen above. There are too many issues that hinder the people to fully support the entry of Turkey into the Union. As discussed on the basis of the dimensions one could see that many people are affected in different ways. Therefore people who have business interests that see positive effects of a further integration still perceive the EU as positive and do not fear any losses. For them the candidacy status has only had advantages, which is also true for blue collar workers who have a better job security through the EU. Minorities still perceive the EU as positive with increasing trend as they are the ones that benefit through the networks and mutual help by the EU (Önis, 2003).

On the opposite insufficient information and knowledge about the EU contribute to a blurred perception within the Turkish society which can be mainly found in supporters of extreme leftist or nationalist party groups, the military and the AKP as these actors are not sure where they stand and how they should perceive the EU (Bilgic, 2009). They do not feel connected to the Union which becomes fully true through the decrease in support for the EU and an increase in the negative perception of the EU also due to miscommunication and misunderstandings (Canefe, Boras, 2003). As mentioned already some social groups even perceive the EU and the European integration process as a threat to their institutions, norms, values and sovereignty, which they do not want to give up for a foreign institution. To stop the negative trend of the perception Europe needs a fast conclusion about the accession and negotiations have to be deepened again. This negative perception leads to less understanding, cooperation and exchange with the EU and therefore to less Europeanization. The ambivalence here is that people, who may benefit, support the accession process and feel Europeanized whereas those who fear any losses or perceive the EU as a threat to their old system strongly oppose an Europeanization process in technical and social terms.

Based on these findings one can assume that the Europeanization process of the Turkish society follows a negative trend which is becoming increasingly higher. Therefore it is necessary to examine possible explanations for the changes in the Europeanization process.

4.4.3 Possible explanation for changes in Europeanization process of Turks

This section is looking at the changes in the Europeanization process. For this purpose the first and second dimension and the occurring changes there are taken into account. Then their effects are assessed and used as explanation for the changes.

As partly discussed in the foregone section the changes in the Europeanization process are due to several factors. One is a changing attitude towards the EU and the increasing negative perception of the EU. Also the impact on the Turkish market and policies do have a rather paradox effect on the Europeanization process. On the one hand are there the reforms implemented since 1999 that have various effects on different social groups. On the other hand other issues affect the changes in the Europeanization of Turkey: Turkey and its citizens feel as if they did not receive anything back from the EU yet although they did many things the EU asked for and tried to solve many conflicts that remained before. A great frustration which may also be due to partly misinformation or miscommunication is the outcome which affected the Europeanization process: "If the EU doesn´t want us we don´t want the EU." This reflects the attitude of many Turks especially of the higher educated and those who worked for an accession on different levels for years (Kiraboglu, 2009). The more people get frustrated the less they are willing to implement European reforms. This in turn decreases the Europeanization of these people and makes cooperation and support for further negotiation harder. What is developing at the moment is a vicious circle with regard to the dimensions and their insufficient implementation, the European identity and Europeanization of state and society related to this.

The "average" Turk did not and still does not receive many of the benefits an EU membership could possibly provide like the European passport, free movement of capital and labor etc. The Europeanization process remains still a top-down process where the government decides

and implements policies and reforms but the citizens are not affected directly most of the time. The ambiguity here is that Europe is only in the interest of groups that feel a sustainable effect of Europeanization due to their social environment, participation in institutions and/or positive effects in everyday life through the changes within the dimensions (Taspinar, 2007). No new identification with the EU or integration of norms, rules and values of Europe can occur as the exchange between EU and Turkish citizens remains limited. Also the fact that people start increasingly to perceive the EU as a threat for their country and identity is changing the Europeanization process a lot. This perception of the EU as a threat is used by Eurosceptic politicians, political parties and media to increase lower support for an EU entry/ For them Europeanization should be an instrumental process to be inside the EU but remain different. The materialistic values may be acceptable for them but the ability to implement the Copenhagen idea of a European identity or identify themselves as European is not given. This is especially true because Turkey is perceived by Europe as different and therefore identifies itself as different due to the mechanism of identifying a social group through the role/identity which is given by others (Taspinar, 2007; Cottam, et.al, 2004).

Another fact that had an impact on the change in the Europeanization process of Turkey is, that Europe itself is too much concerned with its own problems and other enlargement processes. The Copenhagen summit stated in 1973 already that European identity shall be based on a common history, culture and tradition, which is assumed to be based on Christian values. For a Europe that has to handle a great workload already to support an European identity and community within its member states it is hard to open up for a state that appears so different in the eyes of many European citizens and governments. The need of opening up for new ideas, values, norms and religion seems to be impossible at the moment because the EU is still struggling to Europeanize and develop a European identity for its already existing states and citizens (Taspinar, 2007). The other striking point is that the threat of terrorism affects the European perception on an Islamic country. The negative signals send out by Europeans towards Turkey as an Islamic country contribute to a backlash in the Europeanization process as well as the gap between these two identities is broadened because Turkey is seen as even more different and a possible threat to the security of Europe (Oguzlu, 2006; Taspinar, 2007).

These facts can be assumed to be possible explanations for the changes in the Europeanization process of Turkey.

4.4.4 Conclusion

Based on these findings it is necessary to define the changes in the Europeanization process with one of the four outcomes identified by Hertier and Knill (2000). Throughout the first observation one could assume that the Turkish Europeanization process is retrenchment as the transformation and adaption of new reforms went well and people felt supportive towards the EU with a trend to westernization of their social identity. This trend has been coined by a negative direction towards fewer reforms, low implementation rates and an increasing negative perception of the EU by the Turks also marked by a turn back to the Turkish identity. But during the examination of the dimensions and their impact on Turks one could see that this process rather tends to be *absorption* because the reforms that have been tackled by

Turkey only touched the periphery of the Turkish systems but ensured that the core of institutions as well as simple everyday life issues and systems have not been touched. Therefore the reforms made, did not imply a change in the basic structure which was also due to the military that sees its rule as protector of the republic in acts like these. Another reason why the direction of Europeanization can be described as absorption is that the adjustment and homogenization of EU policies has been a top down process by the government. The citizens have not been directly affected in most cases as. Europeanization or the establishment of a European identity did not occur due to the direction of absorption but also due to the decreasing attachment of people on the EU.

Based on this, one can summaries that the Europeanization process since 1999, on Turkish citizens, has changed to a negative trend. This is because of a lack of information and due to not fully or insufficiently implemented reforms and a missing connection to the local level by the EU. Another fact is that only minority groups benefit from the EU framework and increasing negative signs send by the EU towards a possible accession of Turkey can be seen as a backlash in the relation of the EU and Turkey and affect the negative change in Europeanization resp. social identity of Turks as they fall back on their old values rather than trying to identify with a political entity they do not feel connected with as the outcome is unknown and not foreseeable at the moment. Therefore one can also assume that the Europeanization process may go on but only on a political and economic level but without the society which shows a decreasing interest in the EU accession also due to the time span it takes for Turkey until they may access the Union in an unknown future. This is a paradox as the Europeanization process has been defined by many researchers as an automatic process where people feel more connected with the EU, its norms and values through the implementation of European standards and the adjustment of domestic institutions, policies, market and legislative framework. It is also claimed that these processes are strongly connected to a supportive society and only with and through them an organic society can be sustainably established. In Turkey it seems as if the changes in the legislative and institutional framework are possible without the support or understanding of the Turkish society and therefore work against an Europeanization on a civil national level.

Given the concept of Europeanization one should expect that due to the logic of the accession and enlargement process Turkey should have Europeanized considerably. It is assumed that when the influence by the EU increases a European identity will develop as necessary consequence of the reform and adjustment process, which is also connected to the dimensions discussed throughout this thesis. One should assume that a diffusion and institutionalization of rules and norms would occur within this discourse on a social, political and economical level. An European identity, which is the collective identity or feeling of belonging to a community next to the national identity, is needed to be able to develop a process of Europeanization for individuals. When looking at the findings of this thesis one can see that, although Turkey seems to adopt the policies asked by the EU, the Europeanization process does not occur as it does within other member states. It does not seem as if a European identity has been developed by the majority of citizens. One could speak of an instrumental Europeanization that only affects policies but which is not for the benefit of the people and does not affect them enough to feel related with the Union at all. Another oddity, when

looking at the findings of this thesis, is the paradoxical attitude of most Turks towards the EU. Whereas they seem to be supportive of some aspects of the membership they try to avoid others. Furthermore they do not perceive the reforms as necessary precondition for a membership. This is also why a European identity cannot evolve. Also due to the low involvement of individuals in projects and cooperation with the EU. There is no ground for it as the conceptualized Europeanization process does not occur sufficiently within Turkey.

Regarding the Turkey-EU relations which, have been conceptualized as coined by the logic of conditionality one can understand the occurring paradoxes more easily. Also regarding the differences within the conceptualization of the European identity by the Commission, compared with the Turkish identity one can see why the outcome of the Europeanization process is paradox. The Commission tried to develop a common identity based common values that are grounded in a common history and traditional background and supports mutual understanding. European member states regard Turkey as an outsider and Turkey itself does not assume to have the same background of values and norms as most member states do also with regard to religion. Therefore the results seen in the analysis correspond with the theoretical expectations defined before meaning that the Europeanization process in Turkey does not end in a transformation of an independent state towards a nation that is shaped by the EU and shares a collective identity next to its national identity. The relations between Turkey and the EU are of a rather theoretical nature, where Turkey does what the EU demands. But this is only a top down process where the individuals are not touched. Therefore the expected outcome of a Europeanized Turkish citizen cannot develop under the given conditions especially regarding the issues of the frame dimensions discussed.

5. Conclusion

In this chapter the main question of this thesis will be answered and summarized first. For this purpose the main findings of the frame analysis are going to be named. This is done by focusing on the three dimensions and their effects. Then a conclusion will be drawn from these findings about the changes in the Europeanization process. As a concluding step policy implications of these findings and possible changes in the negotiation process by the EU and cooperation by NGOs are going to be discussed and a reflection of the answer will be given which may result in further research questions.

Based on the gathered information and assessed data the Europeanization process in Turkey can be assumed to follow a negative trend after Helsinki 1999. Therefore the changes in the Europeanization process after Helsinki 1999 do not lead to an increased European social and political identity of Turkish citizens. Before and shortly after the candidacy status the Europeanization of Turks and the perception of the EU were rather positive, this decreased considerably throughout the negotiation process. Therefore the Europeanization process of Turks, before and after Helsinki 1999, has changed towards less Europeanization and more Eurosceptisicm within the Turkish society. It can be assumed to be a rather reverse process where the civil society of Turkey falls back on old norms and values as it does not get in touch with the EU positively enough. This is also true when looking at the main findings of the dimensions and their effects:

The dimension of market orientation affected Turks in two different ways and therefore had impact on their perception of- and attitude towards the EU and shaped their European identity accordingly. First the ones in Turkish society that gained or expect to gain from the accession on an economic basis. For them orientating on the European market is crucial to ensure a sustainable development of the Turkish economy. Second the social groups like Turkish farmers or low scale producers who loose or fear to loose through the political Europeanization process. Because farmers constitute about 33% one can assume that a great part of the Turkish society is rather cautious in the support for the political and economic Europeanization of Turkey (Togan, 2004). Furthermore they cannot identify themselves with the Union as a negative attitude and perception is connected with "the other" but not with issues/things oneself would identify with (Cottam et. al. 2004). Therefore market orientation is only shaped by a few actors that support the process as they benefit from them. But these groups are not necessarily Europeanized as they might take the economic benefits into account but do not identify themselves with the EU. Although this group is easier to reach by the Commission and its European identity policy one can assume that effects on them are limited because most people regard the accession process as instrumental and rational process which in turn does not have an effect on the individual national identity. As already discussed before, the Europeanization and integration process of Turks shaped their identity insignificantly. This is also true due to the fact that economic relations existed before already based on the customs union.

Policy cohesion and legal framework is the next dimension, which is assumed to have an effect on Turks concerning the Europeanization process. As has been shown did the adjustment of certain policy areas affect Turks directly as they are aimed to improve the social

network, institutional design and legal framework to ensure a similar outlook to the EU system and ensure better cooperation and had to be implemented by the civil society. This was also important because otherwise the EU would not be able to communicate its policies most effectively to Turkey (Önis, 2005). Here the effect on minority groups within the society is positive towards European integration. Their attitude and perception of Europe is a positive as they seek further cooperation with the EU due to the benefits they receive by cooperating with the EU and European institutions. Other social groups in Turkey do not assume this process to help the Turkish system and fear a loss of power. Furthermore they do not take the EU as a serious partner to cooperate with. This implies that for them European identity cannot evolve as they do not take the other actor and its values and norms as serious compared to the own culture and norms. Whereas the first group is able and willing to develop a European identity and even supports deeper Europeanization on a political, social and economical basis the second group rejects this. Within this dimension it has even more effect on the Europeanization process as the policies discussed in this context are mainly concerned in aiming at a better mutual understanding, developing higher cooperation especially on a local, regional level and impact on the society. Although there have been major reforms since 1999 which is shown by the annual progress report by the Commission one cannot assume a sustainable Europeanization on a local level for most social groups.

The Attitude of the Turks towards the EU is decreasing. People do not feel connected with the European institutions and do not put any trust in it. There is a negative trend since Turkey received the candidate status. What is important to mention here is that changing attitude towards the EU is also strongly connected with the changes in the Europeanization process. People with a negative attitude towards an object (here the EU) feel less connected to it (Cottam et. al, 2004). This change in attitude can end in a change in the Europeanization process not only on a discursive social, but also political, legal and economical basis.

The foregone chapter also analyzed the direction of change and concluded that the direction after Heritier could be called absorption as EU-induced changes occurred but never touched the core and the local level of the Turkish system. Due to this it is assumed that people have not been able to identify themselves with the EU as only a minority of Turks came in (positive) contact with the EU. Euroscepticism is rising because people do not feel connected to the Union which is also true when looking at the effects European (identity) policies have had on Turkish society until now. As symbols, rules, norms and values of the 1973 established, and since then continued, European identity policy by the European Commission do reflect a European culture which is too far from the average Turkish social identity. This is reflected in the Turkish perception of the European Union and the decreasing positive attitude towards the EU.

It is also based on religious differences between the EU and Turkey. Whereas Turkey is a rather Muslim country the EU is trying to build its identity on Christian values. There seems to be no ground for both actors to develop a common identity which contributes to their cooperation and may deepens the international convergence towards a possible Europeanization in Turkey or "Turkeysation" of Europe. Turks do not feel accepted by the EU member states and do not want to be patronized by an outside authority. This affects the

social identity as one cannot identify with something which is assumed to be "the other". Otherwise it would have been easier for Turks to identify with the EU. Regarding the European identity on the other hand is not able to change as the EU is too concerned with developing a common identity and culture within the existing member states and busy with holding these different nations together.

An implication of these findings concerning EU policies and the negotiation process between Turkey and the European Union is that cooperation and adjustment to European standards should occur increasingly on regional and local level. This is important because Europeanization can only occur when many people are involved in this process, politically and socially. The positive impact of the EU and its rules, norms and values needs to be implemented more directly. This means that a top-down process would not imply the necessary changes but that NGOs and individuals need to be more involved in the reform process which then affects these groups more and result in a Europeanization of the people. What is also necessary is, that the negotiations between Turkey and the EU need to start over again and that results need to be shown. This means that the open chapters for discussion need to reach a conclusion. Furthermore does the EU have to make allowances for Turkey regarding the issues of the open chapters, to reverse the process of conditionality towards a process of common cooperation and mutual rights and obligations. It also implies that the EU should reach *one* opinion concerning the accession of Turkey and its conditions and then negotiate accordingly. This is true because as long as the European member states do not share the same opinion concerning Turkey´s accession they hinder the process considerably regarding different conditions and opinions. But to end the deadlock of the Turkey-EU relations it is necessary to conclude some of the open chapters of negotiations to reward Turkey´s efforts concerning the adjustment- and reform process of the Turkish government.

 Also NGOs need to increase cooperation with comparable Turkish NGOs to increase an exchange of ideas, norms and values which also increases mutual understanding. This is also true regarding policies like the lifelong learning funds etc. This thesis shows that it is an urgent matter to react now. The decrease in the perception of Turkey towards the EU and the related negative change in the Europeanization process of Turkey imply that the positive impact of the EU on all levels is diminished. Therefore, to ensure a good long-term cooperation with Turkey one should be aware of this and increase the dialogue leading to a positive outcome which could resolve/end in several outcomes. For example are there voices in the European member states that become more and more supportive of a "preferred membership" of Turkey. This might be a conclusion for the ongoing discussion within the EU about the accession of Turkey for both actors. It would solve the problem of a lack in a European identity of Turkey. Cooperation and mutual negotiations would remain and constitute a basis for a better exchange of the EU and Turkey. This would encourage a better mutual understanding which may result in a new change of the Europeanization process within Turkey. At the moment I would rate the relations as deadlock which can be solved by contributions by the EU towards Turkey which can be a joint statement by all member states together towards Turkey regarding the future relation between them.

One important aspect of this thesis is that it is necessary to point at the unclarities, ambivalences and doubts that are part of the social reality. One should keep that in mind as this is part of social science and social research. Especially regarding the answer of this research it is always possible to have further explanations for the events and effects that occur. Another truth is that not all policy areas have been discussed, that might affect some social groups apart from the two dimensions, in this research one can assume that the changes in the Europeanization process may also have different influences and contributes to the shaping of a social identity. A Further differentiation between the social groups within Turkey could have been done for further research that would be necessary to give a deeper answer about the Europeanization of Turkey´s society. Especially when looking at different electorates and their motivation to vote for a certain party or members of NGOs or associations. There are various reasons and people are also affected differently by the EU which is also due to different relations towards/within the EU, information accessibility and educational background. Therefore further research could be done on certain NGOs, business associations, political parties and their voters, military, particular politicians that contributed in any way to the EU-Turkey relations, behavior of European member states and their perception, different trends in European parties or European institutions towards the EU etc. The areas for further research are increasing as long as negotiations between Europe and Turkey are going on.

References:

Aras, B., Bicakci, S. (2006). Europe, Turkey and the Middle East: Is Harmonization Possible?. *East European Quarterly, 15 (3).*

Aycan, Z. (2001). Human resource management in Turkey. Current issues and future challenges. *International Journal of Manpower, 22 (3), 252- 260.*

Aydin, M. & Acikmese, S.A. (2007). Europeanization through EU conditionality: understanding the new era in Turkish foreign policy. *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans, 9 (3), 263-274.*

Babbie, E. (2007). *The Practice of Social Research (11th Ed.).* Belmont/USA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Buecker, N. (2006). *Returning to where? Images of 'Europe' and support for the process of EU integration in Poland.*

Bulmer, S.J. & Radaelli C.M. (2004). The Europeanization of National Policy? *Queens Papers on Europeanization 1, 1-22.*

Buzan, B. & Diez, T. (1999).The European Union and Turkey. *International Institute for Strategic Studies: Survival, 41 (1), 41-57.*

Barlas, D. & Güvenc, S. (2009). Turkey and the Idea of a European Union during the Inter-War years, 1923-1939. *Middle Eastern Studies, 45 (3), 425-446.*

Canefe, N., Bora, T. (2003). The intellectual Roots of Anti-European Sentiments in Turkish Politics: The Case of Radical Turkish Nationalism. *Turkish Studies, 4 (1), 127-148.*

Carkolu, A. (2003). Who Wants Full Membership? Characteristics of Turkish Public Support for EU Membership. *Turkish Studies, 4 (1), 171-194.*

Celenk, A.A. (2009). Europeanization and Administrative Reform: The Case of Turkey. *Mediteranean Politics, 14 (1), 41-60.*

Chalmers, D. Hadjiemmanuil, C. Monti, G. Tomkins, A. (2006). *European Union Law.* Cambridge University Press.

Cottam, M., Uhler, B.D., Mastors, E., Preston, T. (2004). *Introduction to Political Psychology.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dai, H.D. (2005). Transformation of Islamic political identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and westernization. *Turkish Studies, 6 (1), 21-37.*

Deringil, S. (2007). The Turks and `Europe`: The Argument from history. *Middle Eastern Studies, 43 (5), 709-723.*

European Commission (2006). *Screening report Turkey; Agriculture and rural development.* Retrieved, May 4, 2010 from: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/ turkey/ screening_ reports_en.htm4.2.1

European Commission (2006). *Screening report Turkey; Social policy and employment*. Retrieved, May 4, 2010 from: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/ turkey/ screening_ reports_en.htm4.2.1

European Commission (2006). *Screening report Turkey; Consumer and health protection.* Retrieved, May 4, 2010 from: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/screening_reports_en.htm4.2.1

European Commission (2006). *Screening report Turkey; Education and Culture.* Retrieved, May 4, 2010 from: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidatecountries/turkey/screening_reports_en.htm4.2.1

European Commission (2009). The Europeans in 2009. Special Eurobarometer 308. *Eurobarometer71.1, 1-144.*

European Community (1973). Dokument über die europäische Identität. *Bulletin der Europäischen Gemeinschaften, 12, 131-134.* Retrieved May 13, 2010 from: http://www.ena.lu

Giesing, B., Grutzpalk, J., Wanderer, H. (2008). *Thema Geschichte. Der Islam und die westliche Welt- Konfrontation, Konkurrenz, Kulturaustausch.* Schroedel, Hannover.

Graziano, P. (2003). Europeanization or Globalization?: A Framework for Empirical Research (with Some Evidence from the Italian Case). *Global Social Policy, 3 (2), 173-194.*

Grossman, M.G., Onkol, P.E., Sands, M. (2007). Curriculum reform in Turkish teacher education: Attitudes of teacher educators towards change in an EU candidate nation. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27, 138-150.*

Hay, C. & Rosamond, B. (2002). Globalization, European integration and the discoursive construction of economic imperatives. *Journal of European Policy, 9 (2), 147-167.*

Heritier, A. & Knill, C. (2000). Differential Europe to European policies: a comparison. *Max Planck Projektgruppe Recht der Gemeinshaftsgüter Preprint 2000-3, Bonn.*

Hix, Simon & Klaus H. Goetz (2000). Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems. *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems*, 1–26. London: Frank Cass

Kiraboglu, M. (2009). Lecture Slides, Bilkent University. *Bilkent Üniversitesi, Ankara.*

Kösebalaban, H. (2007). The Permanent "Other"? Turkey and the Question of European Identity. *Mediterranean Quarterly, 18 (4), 86-110.*

Kubicek, P. (2002). The Earthquake, the European Union and Political Reform in Turkey. *Mediterranean Politics, 7 (1), 1-18.*

Kubicek, P. (2005). The European Union and Grassroots Democratization in Turkey. *Turkish Studies, 6 (3), 361-377.*

Ladrech, R. (2002). Europeanization and Political Parties. Towards a Framework for Analysis. *SAGE Publications 8 (4), 389-403*.

McLaren, L.M. (2007). Explaining Opposition to Turkish Membership of the EU. *European Union Politics, 8 (2), 251-278*.

Moravsic, A. (2004). Is there a `Democratic Deficit´ in World Politics? A Framework for Analysis. *Government and Opposition, 39 (2), 336-363*.

Müftüler-Bac (1998). The never-ending story: Turkey and the European Union. *Middle Eastern Studies, 34 (4), 240-258*.

Nugent, N. (2007). The EU´s Response to Turkey´s Membership Application: Not just a Weighing of Costs and Benefits. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40 (3), 481-502*.

Öniş, Z. (2001). An Awkward Partnership: Turkey´s Relations with the European Union in Comparative-Historical Perspective. *Journal of European Integration History, 7 (1),*

Önis, Z. (2003). Domestic Politics, International Norms and Challenges to the State: Turkey-EU Relations in the post-Helsinki Era. *Turkish Studies, 4 (1), 9-14*.

Önis, Z. (2007). Conservative Globalists versus defensive nationalists: Political parties and paradoxes of Europeanization in Turkey. *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans, 9 (3), 247-261*.

Önis, Z., Türem, U. (2002). Entrepreneurs, Democracy, and Citizenship in Turkey. *Comparative Politics, 34 (4), 239-456*.

Öniş, Z. & Yilmaz, Ş. (2004). Turkey-EU-US Triangle in Perspective: Transformation or Continuity? Revised Draft- December 2004, Istanbul.

Önis, Z., Yilmaz, S. (2009). Between Europeanization and Euro-Asianism; Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey during the AKP era. *Turkish Studies, 10 (1), 7-24*.

Oguzlu, T. (2006). The changing Turkish approach towards the European Union after 9/11. *International Journal, Winter 2005-06, 83-104*.

Patton, M.J. (2007). AKP Reform Fatigue in Turkey: What has happened to the EU Process? *Mediterranean Politics, 12 (3), 339-358*.

Punch, K.F. (2006). *Developing Effective Research Proposals*. Sage , London 2nd Edition.

Radaelli, C.M. (2000). Whither Europeanization? Concept stretching and substantive change. *European Integration online Papers (EIoP), 4 (8), 1-25*.

Rumford, C. (2000). From Luxembourg to Helsinki: Turkey, the politics of EU enlargement and prospects for accession. *Contemporary Politics, 6 (4), 331-342*.

Schimmelfennig, F. (2009). Entrapped Again; The Way to EU Membership negotiations with Turkey. *International Politics, 46 (4), 413-431*.

Schimmelfennig, F., Sedelmeier, U. (2002). Theorizing EU enlargement: research, focus, hypotheses, and the state of research. *Journal of European Public Policy, 9 (4), 500-528*.

Schumacher, C. (2002). *Konzepte europäischer Identität – Die europäische Union und ihre Bürger.*

Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., Campbell, D.T., (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Sjursen, H. (2002). Why Expand? The Question of Legitimacy and Justification in the EU´s Enlargement Policy. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40 (3), 491-513*.

Strittmatter, K. (2010). Auf gute Nachbarschaft. Die Türkei stimmt gegen die neuen Iran-Sanktionen. *Süddeutsche Zeitung, 66 (131), 10*.

Taspinar, O. (2007). Turkey´s Fading Dream of Europe. *Current History, March 2007*.

Togan, S. (2004). Turkey: Toward EU Accession. *Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Oxford/UK, 1013-1047*.

Ünlü Bilgic, T. (2009). The Military and Europeanization Reforms in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies, 45 (5), 803-824*.

Ulusoy, K. (2009). The Changing Challenge of Europeanization to Politics and Governance in Turkey. *International Political science Review 2009, 30, 363-384*.

Utkulu, U., Seymen, D. (2004). Trade and Competitiveness Between Turkey and the EU: Time Series Evidence. *Turkish Economic Association, Discussion Paper, 2004/8*.

Visier, C. (2009). Turkey and the European Union: The sociology of engaged actors and of their contribution to the candidacy issue. *European Journal of Turkish Studies 9, 1-11*.

Wagner, H. (2006). *Bezugspunkte europäischer Identität. Territorium, Geschichte, Sprache, Werte, Symbole, Öffentlichkeit – Worauf kann sich das Wir-Gefühl der Europäer beziehen?*

Yenen, S. (2003). *Population Estimation*. Retrieved June 2, 2010, from: http://translate.google.de/translate?hl=de&langpair=en|de&u=http://www.turkishodyssey.com/turkey/pop/pop.htm

Yesilada, B.A. (1999). The Worsening EU-Turkey Relations. Turkey´s Role in the Twenty-First Century. *SAIS Review 19 (1), 144-161*.

Tables and Figures:
Table 1: Bulmer, S.J. & Radaelli C.M. (2004). The Europeanization of National Policy? *Queens Papers on Europeanization 1, 1-22*. Pp. 8.