

Academic Trends in European Union Studies in Turkey within the Framework of Turkey- EU Relations

S. Sezgin MERCAN

Associate Professor, Baskent University, Department of Political Science and
International Relations, Ankara

Kıvılcım ROMYA BİLGİN

Associate Professor, Baskent University, Department of Public Relations and
Publicity, Ankara

Haluk KARADAĞ

Associate Professor, Baskent University, Department of Political Science and
International Relations, Ankara

Yelda ONGUN

Professor, Baskent University, Department of Political Science and International
Relations, Ankara

To cite this article: S. Sezgin Mercan, Kıvılcım Romya Bilgin, Haluk Karadağ, and Yelda Ogun, “Academic Trends in European Union Studies in Turkey within the Framework of Turkey-EU Relations”, *Ulusallararası İlişkiler*, Vol. 19, No 76, 2022, pp. 53-68, DOI: 10.33458/uidergisi.1217949

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.33458/uidergisi.1217949>

Submitted: 5 July 2022

Last Revision: 5 December 2022

Published Online: 12 December 2022

Printed Version: 21 February 2023

Ulusallararası İlişkiler Konseyi Derneği | International Relations Council of Turkey
Ulusallararası İlişkiler – Journal of International Relations
E-mail: uidergisi@gmail.com

All rights of this paper are reserved by the *International Relations Council of Turkey*. With the exception of academic quotations, no parts of this publication may be reproduced, redistributed, sold or transmitted in any form and by any means for public usage without a prior permission from the copyright holder. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the author(s)'s and do not reflect those of the *Council*, editors of the journal, and other authors.

Academic Trends in European Union Studies in Turkey within the Framework of Turkey-EU Relations*

S. Sezgin MERCAN

Associate Professor, Baskent University, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Ankara
E-mail: mercan@baskent.edu.tr
Orcid: 0000-0001-9847-4922

Kıvılcım ROMYA BİLGİN

Associate Professor, Baskent University, Department of Public Relations and Publicity, Ankara
E-mail: krbilgin@baskent.edu.tr
Orcid: 0000-0001-8733-5978

Haluk KARADAĞ

Associate Professor, Baskent University, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Ankara
E-mail: hkaradag@baskent.edu.tr
Orcid: 0000-0001-7577-763X

Yelda ONGUN

Professor, Baskent University, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Ankara
E-mail: demirag@baskent.edu.tr
Orcid: 0000-0002-7177-8122

Abstract

The relationship between academics and policymakers has a complex and multi-layered structure, and there are different views on how this relationship should be. While discussing the political processes in the context of Turkey's membership, the interactions between academics and policymakers in the relations between Turkey and the EU have the potential to provide solutions in the steps that need to be taken. However, the academic tendency of EU studies in Turkey will be revealed by answering questions such as what subjects are preferred by academics working on the EU in Turkey to study in the knowledge-production process, which subjects they prioritize in EU studies, what the effects of the ups and downs in Turkey-EU relations are on the academy, and how the academy positions itself in the field of EU studies. It is considered that such a study will contribute to further studies on how the academy's relations with policymakers are and how they should be in studying Turkey-EU relations.

Keywords: Turkey, EU, Academics, Policymakers, Knowledge-Production

Türkiye-AB İlişkileri Çerçevesinde Türkiye'de Avrupa Birliği Çalışmalarındaki Akademik Eğilimler

Özet

Akademisyenler ve politika yapımcılar arasındaki ilişki karmaşık ve çok katmanlı bir yapıya sahiptir ve bu ilişkinin nasıl olması gerektiğine dair farklı görüşler bulunmaktadır. Türkiye'nin AB üyeliği bağlamındaki politik süreçler ele alınırken Türkiye ile AB arasındaki ilişkilerde akademi ile politikacılar arasındaki etkileşimler, atılması gereken adımlarda çözüm sağlama potansiyeline sahiptir. Bununla birlikte Türkiye'de AB konusunda çalışan akademisyenlerin bilgi üretim sürecinde hangi konuları çalışmayı tercih ettikleri, AB çalışmalarında hangi konuları önceliklendirdikleri, Türkiye-AB ilişkilerindeki iniş ve çıkışların akademi üzerindeki etkilerinin ne olduğu ve AB çalışmaları alanında akademinin kendisini nasıl konumlandığı gibi soruların cevaplanması, Türkiye'de AB çalışmalarının akademik eğilimini ortaya koyacaktır. Bu yönde bir çalışmanın Türkiye-AB ilişkileri konusunda akademinin politika yapımcılar ile ilişkilerinin nasıl olduğu ve olması gerektiğine ilişkin ilerleyen çalışmalara katkı sağlayacağı değerlendirilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türkiye, AB, Akademisyenler, Politika Yapımcılar, Bilgi Üretimi

* This article is based on the research titled "Measurement of Academic Tendencies in the Framework of Turkey-EU Relations" conducted between January and December 2021 within the scope of the Scientific Research Project supported by Başkent University.

Introduction

There are discussions on how to establish an efficient and sustainable relationship between academics and policymakers. Although there is literature on the need to develop and maintain a consistent and uninterrupted relationship between the parties, the institutional and cultural differences between the parties are defined as the main obstacles for them to come together. Despite the different views on the development of the relationship between the parties, the complex and multi-layered structure of the relationship based on knowledge and knowledge production should be considered. Which subjects are prioritized by the academy in the knowledge-production process and which topics are preferred to be a focus should initially be studied to understand this relationship, since in the knowledge-production process, the academy prefers to determine the knowledge transfer and exchange (KTE) between the parties and therefore the basis of the relationship that will provide efficiency in the policy production process.

While discussing the political processes in the context of the European Union (EU) membership of Turkey, the interactions between academics and policymakers in the relations between Turkey and the EU have the potential to provide solutions in the steps to be taken to overcome the efficiency problems. However, the choices of academics who study the EU in Turkey during knowledge production will be revealed by answering questions such as what subjects are preferred by academics working on the EU in Turkey to study in the knowledge production, which subjects they prioritize in the relations, what the effects of the ups and downs in Turkey-EU relations are on the academy, and how the academy positions itself in the field.¹ Since the status of EU studies continues to progress in relation to European integration and Turkey-EU relations, this article demonstrates that the ups and downs of the integration and the relations affect the tendency of academics to offer research and projects on the EU and Turkey-EU relations.² Academics and policymakers on EU studies will have the opportunity to have an idea about how the relations are and should be and to initiate a discussion on increasing efficiency in policy-making processes, especially with a discussion on the effect of Turkey-EU relations on the knowledge-production processes of academics working on the EU. In this context, this article tries to reveal the tendencies of the academy in Turkey for EU studies during knowledge production regarding the EU and Turkey-EU relations since 2005, when Turkey's membership negotiations started. From this point of view, the study's main problem is the effect of the relations between Turkey and the EU on the choices of academics working on the EU in Turkey during the knowledge production. With this problem, it is aimed to discover the choices of people in the field of EU studies in Turkey during knowledge production, as well as to understand how the academy positions itself in the field and to reveal the academic tendency of EU studies in Turkey.

There is some research that evaluate academics' positions and tendencies towards the EU and Turkey-EU relations from various perspectives. For example, in a recent study on perceptions of Turkey-EU relations, and the view of Turkish academics on Turkey-EU relations revealed that the perceptions of university lecturers who have the capacity to direct society towards Turkey-EU relations have

-
- 1 The concept of European studies includes a comprehensive study of political, historical, economic, and social developments in Europe regarding the European integration process. European studies necessitate theoretical and practical knowledge of the European system. Conversely, EU studies concentrate on institutions, common policies, decision-making mechanisms and procedures, advisory bodies, and the policy-making circles about the EU specifically. In this article, the authors preferred to use the concept of EU studies to make understand the limits of the EU.
 - 2 John T. S. Keeler, "Mapping EU Studies: The Evolution from Boutique to Boom Field 1960–2001", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 43, No 3, 2005, p. 578-579.

also gained importance.³ Although academics support Turkey's accession to the EU, the idea that the EU has lost confidence in this matter has come to the fore. In the context of harmonization with the EU, attention was drawn to the idea that Turkey's actions were not sufficient.⁴ Shortly, the research shows that academics as a group that can have an impact on public opinion are still willing to join the EU despite the intimidation of negotiation and frustration regarding integration among the Turkish public.⁵

On the other hand, EU studies has the potential to transform itself. Even what would happen after the EU is evaluated in the related studies. There is a question about what post-EU studies would look like. Disintegrative dynamics, societal and political divisions about the role of the nation state in Europe, externalities of socioeconomic and security interdependence would be important points in post-EU studies.⁶ So, EU studies in Turkey have faced disintegrative dynamics and societal and political divisions that necessitate strong consideration for the future of Turkey-EU relations.

In this article, three main hypotheses were desired to be tested. Firstly, EU studies in Turkey have been institutionalized over time, regardless of the historical and conjunctural interest in the field. Secondly, academic knowledge has emerged in the fields of EU and Europeanization by becoming independent from Turkey-EU relations. Finally, a multi-directional understanding that develops cooperation with the public, private sector, and civil society on different topics in EU studies has dominated the field. For this purpose, in-depth interviews were conducted with 11 academics who have the title of Doctor, Associate Professor, and Professor working in EU centers and institutes of universities, EU Centers of Excellence, and the Jean Monnet Chairs located in Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir.

In the first part of the article, the relationship between academics and policymakers in policy making process is presented. The second part includes the reformist and stagnant period in Turkey-EU relations to reveal the tendency in the knowledge production of the academy on EU studies with reference to the conditions under which these tendencies are shaped. The third part defines research subjects and methods based on in-depth interviews. The fourth and fifth parts argue about the issues agreed and disagreed by academics. These parts reflect that there is not only consensus among academics on Turkey-EU relations but also differences of opinion.

Academics versus Policymakers

The relationship between academics and policymakers in policymaking is at the center of efficiency discussions in policy-making processes. Opinions focus on the differences between the parties, emphasizing that academics and policymakers are communities that work with different rules.⁷ Thus even though, at first sight, it seems that both academics and policymakers share an interest in world politics and their events, the approaches of the two sides are radically different.⁸ The gap between aca-

3 Emirhan Göral, Muzaffer Dartan and E. Serra Yurtkoru, "Marmara Üniversitesi Öğretim Elemanlarının Türkiye-AB İlişkilerine Yönelik Algıları Üzerine bir Araştırma", *Marmara Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 29, No 1, 2021, p. 88-89.

4 Ibid., p. 94.

5 Ibid., p. 110.

6 Berthold Rittberger and Michael Blauburger, "Introducing the Debate Section: The EU in Crisis: EU Studies in Crisis?", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 25, No 3, 2018, p. 438.

7 Nathan Caplan, "The Two-Communities Theory and Knowledge Utilization", *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 22, No 3, 1979, p. 459-470.

8 Hiski Haukkala, "The Time, Space and Strategies For Scholarly Analysis In Foreign Policy Making", *The Academia and Foreign Policy Making: Bridging the Gap*, DIIS Working Paper, 2011, p. 21.

demics and policymakers stems from the difference between their professional missions. Academics aim to advance general knowledge and wisdom on International Relations (IR). On the other hand, policymakers are more interested in knowledge that enhances their ability to influence and control the course of events.⁹ While academics are more focused on collecting data and producing knowledge,¹⁰ policymakers are focused on the burning daily issues of the public.¹¹ However, while policymakers desire scientific expertise, they do not find strict scientific methodologies and approaches useful. While they prefer mid-range theories to make sense of the world, especially in fields such as IR, they find short and clear explanations understandable.¹²

It is necessary to develop a continuous and uninterrupted relationship between the parties, either formally or informally, despite their differences.¹³ The knowledge produced by the academy because of the choices made on research topics, theories, and methodology is the main factor that will determine the development of common ground and understanding between the parties, as knowledge is the key to the relationship between academics and the policymakers. In other words, one of the starting points in the decision-making process of the policymaker is the knowledge produced by the academics. However, how academics make their choices in the knowledge-production process should be considered, especially in research publications and engagement in societal and political discussions. In other words, the social, political, economic, and cultural processes affecting the knowledge-production process of academics should be emphasized separately. There is a need for a determination as to whether the policymaker has a request for knowledge production in the academy's knowledge-production process. Poor timing, poor communication, corporate culture, traditional academic performance expectations, lack of time and resources for research, political conjunctures and expectations are the main challenges between the parties in KTE.¹⁴ Academics and policymakers may be partially overcome by understanding these challenges that affect the choices of academics in the knowledge production.

Within the context of academic research on the EU, there are two pillars of published social-scientific and legal research considering aspects of the EU and its member states. Beginning from the Single European Act, EU studies has gradually deepened and developed. Centers of excellence, Jean Monnet chairs, conferences, scholarly associations, and research projects have become some products of this development and created a body of EU knowledge. Beginning from the 1980s to the 2020s, assessment on the policy relevance of EU research and its impact on outcomes has become necessary.¹⁵

Whether scholarship on the EU finds response from the EU policymaking process can be noted with reference to three research strands. In the first strand, ideas impact policymakers in inter-

9 Alexander L. George, "The Two Cultures of Academia and Policy-Making: Bridging the Gap," *International Society of Political Psychology*, Vol. 15, No 1, 1994, p. 149.

10 Beryl A. Radin, "Reclaiming Our Past: Linking Theory and Practice", *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 46, No 1, 2013, p. 1-6.

11 Donald A. Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, Surrey, UK, Ashgate, 1991, p. 34-36.

12 Paul C. Avey and Michael C. Desch, "What Do Policymakers Want from Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No 2, 2014, p. 244.

13 Paul Cairney, "How Can Policy Theory Have an Impact on Policymaking? The Role of Theory-led Academic-practitioner Discussions", *Teaching Public Administration*, Vol. 33, No 1, 2015, p. 22-39.

14 Craig Mitton et al., "Knowledge Transfer and Exchange: Review and Synthesis of the Literature", *The Milbank Quarterly*, Vol. 85, No 4, 2007, p. 730.

15 Francesco Duina, "Is Academic Research Useful to EU Officials? The Logic of Institutional Openness in the Commission", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 29, No 9, 2022, p. 1494.

national settings based on material interests and structural factors. It is applied to international organizations and also the EU. The second strand includes the origins of ideas that impact policymaking. Actors like think tanks, lobbying groups, political party foundations, government research units, and academics may become decisive. Changing origins affect relevance for the EU. The third strand is working on expert-knowledge utilization in organizational settings beyond academic research or the EU. Organizational actors utilize expert knowledge.¹⁶

When the practice is considered, some examples can be highlighted. EU Commission officials accept EU scholarship as relevant and impactful for their work. While some officials indicate the lack of a structured approach for them to reach the related literature, some noted that academics seem uninterested in the practical impact of their studies. There is also a mismatch between EU studies and their needs. Some officials participate in special sessions at academic conferences to get insights and encourage people to write. According to a survey, 33 percent of related respondents reported being very familiar with EU studies and research, while 56 percent is somewhat familiar, and 12 percent is not familiar.¹⁷

A different example can be presented from a Turkish case. For the EU projects regarding civil society and the public¹⁸ implemented by the Directorate for EU Affairs of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the academic staff takes roles in both the project-writing and project-implementation phases. The Directorate organizes meetings with academics and representatives of civil society organizations (CSOs) within the scope of the Communication Strategy. Also, there is a platform supported by the EU Delegation to Turkey called “A-NEST Academic Network for European Union Studies in Turkey,” which could be accepted as a tool for policymaker-academic interaction.¹⁹ Concerning CSOs, the EU allocates a budget for them and their projects. CSO representatives could have opportunities to interact with EU-level policymakers as well. Some established institutions in Turkey such as the Economic Development Foundation (IKV), which holds regular meetings with academics and policymakers, and the current secretary general of IKV is an academic. Therefore, it can be accepted that there is a match between academics and policymakers to a certain extent in the Turkish case.

Other studies focused on the research side and the research/practice gap considering the interaction between academics and policymakers for some sectors like business and management. Sectoral dimension of this type of study involves the use of public funding for research on the cooperation and innovation between industry and universities. In this way, the social value of academic research is tried to be evaluated.²⁰

Some studies about human-resource management reflect that only 3 percent of research was related to solving real-world issues, while 42 percent of the articles did not link to practical applications. Whereas the practical relevance of articles is needed to solve the problems faced in business sector and organizations. So, there is a failure of knowledge transfer in academic research. The mutual knowledge transfer process for academics, policymakers, and society faces disruptions. In other

16 Ibid., p. 1495.

17 Ibid., p. 1498, 1508-1509.

18 For Directorate for EU Affairs Projects see https://www.ab.gov.tr/meu-projects_46008_en.html.

19 “A-NEST-Academic Network for EU Studies in Turkey”, <https://www.avrupa.info.tr/en/a-nest-professors>.

20 Kym Fraser, Xin Deng, Frank Bruno and Tarik A. Rashid, “Should Academic Research be Relevant and Useful to Practitioners? The Contrasting Difference between Three Applied Disciplines”, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 45, No 1, 2020, p. 130.

words, business research has limited impact on business policymakers. There is an argument about business academics, namely that they have followed a way in which theory became uncoupled from the real world. But there is a necessity to meet the needs of academics, policymakers, and society. Meeting this need may increase the usefulness of academic studies.²¹ This necessity is also acceptable for EU studies.

Within the context of academic research on the EU in Turkey, a discussion on the effect of Turkey-EU relations on the knowledge-production processes of academics working on the EU may help overcome the challenges experienced in the KTE between academics and policymakers. Moreover, new policy-making processes may be created to overcome the problems in Turkey-EU relations and improve relations with efficient cooperation between the parties. For this purpose, a historical analysis of Turkey-EU relations, the effect of the change in relations on the knowledge production of the academy, and the views of academics on EU studies on knowledge production in the current situation will be discussed.

Reformist and Stagnant Period in Turkey-EU Relations

While trying to reveal the tendency in the knowledge production of the academy on EU studies, to analyze them better it is necessary to define the conditions under which these tendencies are shaped. The relations between Turkey and the EU have undergone a tough transition from economic issues to political and security issues since the mid-1990s. With this transition, the process of intense influence of the EU on Turkey has also started. While relations focused on the Customs Union issues due to economic cooperation in the first half of the 1990s, Turkey's EU candidacy discussions focused on issues such as the Cyprus issue and security and defense policy in the second half of the 1990s as a result of the transformation of the European security structure after the Cold War.²² Therefore, the academic studies in Turkey regarding the EU have progressed by focusing on the political and normative aspects of Turkey-EU relations and the security aspect in these periods.²³

In the second half of the 1990s, a point seen for the first time in the history of Turkey-EU relations was the cultural differences between the parties. While Turkey's failure to meet the Copenhagen Criteria remains a problem, a cultural difference dimension has also been added. The prominence of cultural differentiation between Turkey and the EU necessitated considering this dimension in academic studies.²⁴ A more important development in relations was the recommendation for the recog-

21 Ibid., p. 131.

22 Özlem Terzi, "Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri: Ekonomik Gündemden Siyasi Gündeme", Faruk Sönmezoğlu (ed.), *Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi*, İstanbul, Der Yayınları, 2004, p. 453.

23 Some examples from the literature: Atila Eralp, "Turkey and the European Community in the Changing Post-war International System", Canan Balkır and Allan Williams (Ed.), *Turkey and Europe*, London, Pinter Publishers, 1993; Barry Buzan and Thomas Diez, "The European Union and Turkey", *Survival*, Vol. 41, No 1, 1999, p. 41-57; Chris Rumford, "From Luxembourg to Helsinki: Turkey, the Politics of EU Enlargement and Prospects for Accession", *Contemporary Politics*, Vol. 6, No 4, 2000, p. 331-341; Emmanuelle Raoult, "The Turkish Case as an Example of Stabilisation in Europe's Periphery", *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 21, No 3-4, 1997, p. 82-92.

24 Some examples from the literature: Onur Bilge Kula, *Avrupa(lılık) Nedir? Türkiye Ne Kadar Avrupalıdır?*, İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2015; Steve Wood, "Turkey and EUrope: Identity and Other Crises", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 14, No 2, 2013, p. 272-291; Kevin Robins, "Interrupting Identities: Turkey/Europe", Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, SAGE Publications, 2011; Çiğdem Nas, "Turkey-EU Relations and the Question of Identity", Muzaffer Dartan and Çiğdem Nas (eds.), *The European Union Enlargement Process and Turkey*, İstanbul, Marmara University Publication, 2002, p. 217-234.

inition of Turkey as a candidate country for full membership in the progress report prepared by the EU Commission on candidate countries in 1999.²⁵ Developments and discussions about the candidacy process revealed that the informative aspect of the academic studies about the institutional structure of the EU needs to be strengthened, and studies have been developed in this direction.²⁶

As a result of the unanimous decision taken at the Helsinki Summit held by the EU on 10-11 December 1999, Turkey was accepted as a candidate country for the EU. Following the Helsinki Summit, the EU became an important external anchor in the reform efforts initiated in these matters in Turkey. It paved the way for government and civil society to legitimize the reforms as a necessity arising from external pressure.²⁷ With Turkey's candidacy status and orientation towards the negotiation process, academic studies on Turkey-EU relations started to approach relations with theoretical references much more analytically. The EU's enlargement and deepening processes were also further examined.²⁸

The European Council decided to start accession negotiations with Turkey in 2005. Thus, in relations between Turkey and the EU, a new contract-based process began, where Turkey's efforts to comply with EU standards were effectively followed.²⁹ With the start of the negotiation process, the divergence rather than convergence between Turkey and the EU has shaped relevant academic studies to first focus on the negotiation process rather than the membership goal, and then the search for the negotiation process to be pushed into the background and the relations to be removed from the shadow of membership.

From this point, the issue of how Turkey-EU relations are evaluated and interpreted gained importance. Elements that were shaped by the historical process and transformed over time or new ones added played an important role in evaluation and interpretation. When these elements were narrated, many stories at various levels and qualities emerged.³⁰ In the first half of the 2010s, the concern starting over with a clean slate freed from the influence of narratives became prominent with the encouragement of regional and global problems. In this way, focusing on the process rather than the result in relations, and the emphasis on development based on the process, even if it is not full membership, has gained weight. In this period, the 'Positive Agenda' proposed by the EU and supported by Turkey has revealed a new three-pillared vision consisting of the economy, the refugee³¹ crisis, and the fight against terrorism. Despite this, there has been a regression in the common policy vision, and the problem of mutual credibility has increased. Particularly, at the end of the 2010s, the parties fol-

25 European Commission, *1999 Regular Progress Report for Turkey*, 13 October 1999, https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/Tur_En_Realitons/Progress/Turkey_Progress_Report_1999.pdf, (Accessed September 2022).

26 Please see Meltem Müftüler-Bac and Lauren M. McLaren, "Enlargement Preferences and Policy-making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey", *European Integration*, Vol. 25, 2003, p. 17-30.

27 Kıvanç Ulusoy, "Turkey's Reform Effort Reconsidered, 1987-2004", *Democratization*, Vol. 14, No 3, 2007, p. 477.

28 Some examples from the literature: H. Tarık Oğuzlu, "Turkey and the European Union: Europeanization Without Membership", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 13, No 2, 2012, p. 229-243; S. Sezgin Mercan, "Siyasal Bütünleşme Kuramları Işığında AB Genişlemesi", *Ankara Review of European Studies*, Vol. 10, No 1, 2011, p. 67-83.

29 Ulusoy, "Turkey's Reform Effort Reconsidered", p. 473, 476.

30 Hanna-Lisa Hauge et al., "Mapping Milestones and Periods of Past EU-Turkey Relations", *FEUTURE Working Paper*, September 2016, https://feuture.uni-koeln.de/sites/feuture/pdf/Deliverable_Narratives_1.2_final_neu.pdf (Accessed August 2022).

31 To understand close relationship between the EU's role as a global actor and migration management, and the 2016 EU-Turkey migration deal see, Fatma Yılmaz-Elmas, "EU's Global Actorness in Question: A Debate over the EU-Turkey Migration Deal", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, Vol. 17, No 68, 2020, p. 161-177.

lowed a wait-and-see policy regarding the course of relations. Turkey and the EU have been dragged into a normative debate by falling into a space about a common future vision. All these developments have created new focal points in related academic studies and promoted the re-evaluation of Turkey-EU relations with new interpretations.³²

The re-evaluation of Turkey-EU relations should include changes of academic tendency to include the other aspects of the EU integration process. To see this tendency, some new publications of academics in Turkey should be considered. For example, an article on the EU's refugee crisis and rising functionalism in Turkey and EU relations reminded problems between Turkey and the EU based on longstanding challenges from Turkey's rising de-Europeanization to the EU's ambivalent policy. Strategic partnership and external differentiated integration were raised as new concepts between two parties.³³ As another example, a book on Turkey and EU relations aimed to reassess the Turkey and EU relationship considering interdependence and the divergence of normative and material preferences between the two parties.³⁴ As a last example from the literature, a different book presented three analytical pillars that facilitate understanding of the relationship.³⁵ All these items have become new focal points of academics and their studies that re-evaluate Turkey-EU relations.

Research Subject and Method

In this research, academics on EU studies were interviewed using the in-depth interview method. An in-depth interview is a qualitative research method that includes conducting intensive and one-to-one interviews with a small number of participants to explore their perspectives on a particular idea, program, or situation.³⁶ This method provides the interviewer with the opportunity to clarify the questions and the opportunity to reach more qualified data. There are several debates about what sample size is appropriate for an in-depth interview. Some experts claim that there is no simple answer for sample size in any qualitative research because sample size is dependent on a variety of epistemological, methodological, and practical considerations.³⁷ In fact, the concept of saturation, includes a top point where the data collection process does not provide new data, is a more important factor than sample size in qualitative research.³⁸ As a result, the question of what constitutes an appropriate sample size in qualitative research can only be answered with reference to conducted research.

32 Some examples from the literature: Serap Yazıcı, "The Impact of the EU on the Liberalization and Democratization Process in Turkey", Richard Griffiths and Durmuş Özdemir (eds.), *Turkey and the EU Enlargement*, İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi University Press, 2004; Uğur Emek, "Understanding Structural Reforms in Turkey", Griffiths and Özdemir (eds.), *Turkey and the EU Enlargement*; Ziya Öniş, "Conservative Globalists versus Defensive Nationalists: Political Parties and Paradoxes of Europeanization in Turkey", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol. 9, No 3, 2007, p. 247-261.

33 For this article see Beken Saatçioğlu, "The EU's Refugee Crisis and Rising Functionalism in EU-Turkey Relations", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 21, No 2, 2020, p. 169-172.

34 For this book see Wulf Reiners and Ebru Turhan, *EU-Turkey Relations: Theories, Institutions, and Policies*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2021, p. 4-5.

35 For details see Senem Aydın-Düzgüt and Nathalie Tocci, *Turkey and the European Union*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, p. 2.

36 For details see Carolyn Boyce and Palena Neale, *Conducting in-depth Interviews: A Guide for Designing and Conducting in-depth Interviews for Evaluation Input*, Watertown, Pathfinder International, 2006.

37 Sarah Elsie Baker and Rosalind Edwards, "How Many Qualitative Interviews is Enough?: Expert Voices and Early Career Reflections on Sampling and Cases in Qualitative Research". National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper, 2012, https://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/id/eprint/2273/4/how_many_interviews.pdf (Accessed August 2022).

38 Mark Mason, "Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews", *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 11, No 3, 2010, p. 1-19.

Within the scope of this study, in-depth interviews were conducted with 11 assistant professors, associate professors, and professors that qualify as sample size.³⁹ Participants have administrative and academic positions working in EU centers and institutes of universities, Jean Monnet Chairs and the Jean Monnet Centers of Excellence working in Ankara, Istanbul, and Izmir provinces. While five interviewees are academics in the Monnet Center of Excellence and the Jean Monnet Chairs programs, six are academics in centers and institutes. Centers and institutes working on EU issues, Jean Monnet Chairs and Jean Monnet Centers of Excellence were chosen because they are relevant institutions in EU studies. Centers on the EU have been established from 1987 with the establishment of Erasmus programs in higher education institutions.⁴⁰ The centers established primarily for the development of Turkey-EU relations have become structures contributing to the development and institutionalization of EU studies and Turkey-EU relations over time. Likewise, the Jean Monnet Centers of Excellence and the Jean Monnet Chairs included in the scope of Erasmus and Erasmus Plus (+) of the EU are also essential programs in the development and institutionalization of EU studies in higher education. The Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence is hosted by a higher education institution, which would involve the cooperation of several faculties and departments. Centers of Excellence are places where EU academics can share their knowledge and skills on various subjects.⁴¹ Jean Monnet Chairs on EU Studies at an institution of higher education is a special teaching position for university professors or senior lecturers. The Jean Monnet Programme is designed to help deepen teaching of EU matters in increasingly demanding areas in the labor market. Turkey had 34 centers and institutes working on the EU, 7 Jean Monnet Centers of Excellence, and 35 Presidency of Jean Monnet Chairs in 20 institutions in 2021 when this study was carried out.⁴² On the other hand, there are a lot of Turkish scholars who currently do not operate any chairs and centers yet act as leading agents of knowledge production on the EU and set the disciplinary agenda for many others.⁴³

In the interviews, questions were designed to test the three basic hypotheses of the study and they were asked to the academics by placing them in four different question groups. The first group of questions aims to understand the establishment and function of the institution where the academic works and the position of the academic in the institutional structure. With the questions in this group, it was also aimed to develop an understanding of the institution's relations with other public, private sector, and non-governmental organizations related to the EU. The second group of questions focused on the academic and administrative studies conducted within the institution on Turkey-EU relations and EU studies. It attempted to understand how the course of Turkey-EU relations and the

39 The ethical approval for this research was obtained from the Social and Human Sciences and Arts Research Committee of Baskent University on 25 November 2020 (ethical clearance number is 17162298.600-489).

40 European Union Research and Application Center (ATAUM) has been the first center in order to develop and proceed Turkey's relations with the EU. For details <http://ataum.ankara.edu.tr>. Marmara University Institute of European Studies was founded in 1987 as well and it has been one of the first centers. For details <https://avrupa.marmara.edu.tr/en/institute/message-from-the-director>.

41 European Commission, "Erasmus+: EU Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport, Jean Monnet Centres of Excellence", <https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/opportunities/opportunities-for-organisations/jean-monnet-actions/jean-monnet-centres-of-excellence>.

42 Turkish National Agency, "Yükseköğretim Alanında Jean Monnet", <https://www.ua.gov.tr/programlar/firsatlar/yuksekogretim-alaninda-jean-monnet-kurum-kuruluslar-icin-ortaklik/>.

43 For different scholars see: Meltem Muftuler-Bac, *Divergent Pathways: Turkey and the European Union*, Berlin, Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2016; Senem Aydın-Düzgüç. "Legitimising Europe in Contested Settings: Europe as a Normative Power in Turkey?", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 56, No 3, 2018, p. 612-627; Bahar Rumelili, "Türkiye'nin Avrupa'yı Yeniden İnşası: Üyelik ve Vatandaşlık", *Marmara Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 23, No 2, 2015, p. 79-98.

political debates within the EU have been reflected in the studies of academics. The third group of questions focused on measuring the interest of undergraduate and graduate students in the center, institute, Center of Excellence, and Chair. In particular, it was aimed to determine the approaches of the academics towards the effect of Turkey-EU relations on the thesis topics that graduate students prefer to work on. In the fourth group of questions, academics were asked their opinions about the research on EU studies in Turkey and the qualities of this research concerning the previous question groups to measure the preferred topics and priorities in the knowledge-production process on EU studies. The answers to the questions were gathered and examined under two main headings as the subjects on which the academics agreed and disagreed. Since in-depth interview techniques will be applied to academics within the scope of the study, analyses for information containing quantitative data such as projects implemented in these centers or number of articles of academics were excluded.⁴⁴

Issues Agreed by Academics

During the interviews, the main points of agreement among those working on the EU were determined. Classifying these under the headings of student/participant interest in EU-related programs, topics preferred by those working on EU issues, and civil society in Turkey-EU studies was possible. The first noteworthy insight was that interest in EU-related certificate programs and graduate programs is affected by Turkey-EU relations. It was stated that the public and private sector's interest in EU-related fundamental educational issues and certificate programs from universities with centers, chairs, modules, and institutes had decreased significantly compared to the period from the acquisition of the candidacy status, where the relations were intense, to the start of the negotiations and suspension. It was pointed out that EU-related education processes are carried out by the institutions themselves, especially public institutions when needed, and there is no demand for external support from the institutions compared to the period when the negotiations started. However, the suspension of some chapters of the negotiation process is not the only reason for the decrease in interest. According to the participants, another reason for the decrease in interest in basic education subjects and certificate programs is that the Europeanization process in Turkey has not stopped, and those working on this process are satisfied. This satisfaction has also reduced the need for training and certificate programs based on basic knowledge. However, it was underlined that those working in the EU continue to carry out their projects through the funds provided by the EU, although the interest in certificate programs has decreased. It was stated that the positive or negative course of relations between Turkey and the EU caused a change in the interest of academics and students towards centers of excellence, chairs, modules, and institutes, and negative developments between the parties could reduce the number of applications. It was also emphasized that interest in EU-related issues continued, and qualified thesis studies were carried out in postgraduate theses in master's and doctoral programs.

There is restructuring for European politics on EU studies. In this respect, it was stated that subjects such as migration, Brexit, the Euro crisis, the EU's foreign relations, and the rising far-right movements have gained popularity in the field. Therefore, it was emphasized that the academy did not simply focus on European integration. Interdisciplinary and sectoral content was also included in the studies,

44 Information about the centres' projects, publication titles, content of certificate programs, number of attendees, etc. could not be reached systematically. It was even stated that there was a data collection gap in institutions in this respect. It was also indicated that a special study should be carried out to eliminate this gap. This subject can be specified as the limitation of the article.

with the EU becoming a current issue through certain topics such as migration and communication strategy, and the interest in EU studies continuing in these topics. From this point of view, participants stated that the importance of looking at the EU as a Europeanization process has become prominent and emphasized that the issue should not be viewed only from an institutional point of view. They also pointed to the new understanding that emerged in EU studies with an approach where the studies were moved to a point independent from Turkey-EU relations. However, it was stated that there is an effort to carry out interaction and joint activities between the institutions with the center, chair, and module. This effort contributes to the field's institutionalization and increases the quality of the studies.

On the other hand, it was underlined that the efforts of those working on the EU are decisive since EU studies progress with individual initiatives due to the regression in Turkey-EU relations despite the interaction between institutions and the effort to realize joint activities, institutional cooperation efforts are also indexed to individuals. In addition, those working on the EU issue stated that they were not sure whether their studies made observable contributions to Turkey-EU relations. In addition to expressing that they could not measure the impact of their studies and research, some academics working on the EU stated that they did not come together with policymakers regarding their study or research in any way and that they had no idea about the impact of their study on the policy-making processes. It was said that EU-related developments related to Turkey are tried to be conveyed to the public if they are not within the knowledge of the public.

The fact that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have become active actors in EU studies is another issue highlighted by participants. In the process, from 2008 to 2020, NGOs between Turkey and the EU have become actors that provide dialogue for the parties to get to know and understand each other better. They tried to provide a wide range of dialogue from environmental protection to justice, from the right to start a business to industrial policy and have become important elements in eliminating mutual prejudices and doubts and ensuring social integration within the scope of Turkey's EU membership negotiations. In this way, it was possible to inform the public in Turkey and EU member states about the opportunities and difficulties that may arise with Turkey's possible membership. In addition, the importance of NGOs can be highlighted with reference to their contributions for revealing the positive and negative aspects of the EU, correcting misconceptions, and presenting relevant information clearly to everyone in Turkey. The participants, who took part in the research and considered these conditions, stated that the studies were carried out on commercial issues and projects, although the tension in Turkey-EU relations increased, and NGOs became visible in this regard. Indeed, it was emphasized that the contribution of civil society is ensured in efforts to improve Turkey-EU relations, and while there has always been a goal to create dynamism between academics and NGOs on EU studies, this approach has recently developed further. It was also stated that the course contents and studies for civil society have become prominent in undergraduate and graduate courses.

Issues Disagreed by Academics

Based on interviews conducted, it was seen that there is both consensus among academics on Turkey-EU relations and differences of opinion. In other words, it was also revealed that the interviewed academics did not show consensus. Academics firstly showed a difference of opinion regarding career opportunities in EU studies. While some academics stated that they do not share their opinion that there is still a career opportunity in EU studies, some academics stated the opposite. Others abstained from answering.

Another differentiating issue for academics is that Turkey-EU relations may be seen as a case study for understanding the EU and Europeanization. Academics with this point of view think that they can no longer study this issue due to the strained relations and turn to search for alternative topics. In their opinion, Turkey-EU relations may only be seen as a case study. Indeed, this case study may be considered a special reference point for understanding the EU and Europeanization. These academics, who think that the EU and Europeanization cannot be understood only with this, may also position the EU as a basis for questioning political science. In other words, the EU may be considered as an integration in which concepts, such as citizenship, democracy, and identity beyond the state that have not yet been discussed will be discussed.

Another issue mentioned by a limited number of academics is that personal initiatives and connections have become prominent in EU studies, and this has become visible, especially during the writing and implementation phases of projects. Academics dealing with this subject stated that the personal connections of academics with other academics and academics working at different universities, representative offices, municipalities, or other institutions in and out of the country might lead to special requests such as getting consultancy services. They pointed out that relations, including such requests, proceed on a personal rather than institutional basis. The weak institutional aspect of relations may disrupt the cooperation when people change. On the other hand, it was also stated that personal connections are instrumentalized to maintain institutional connections. For example, when an academic joins a certificate program opened by an institute working on the EU and takes a higher position in the institution in which he/she works, he/she may transform the personal connection previously established with that institute into institutional cooperation. However, institutional capacity building remains valid in the background and overshadows personal connections.

Another difference of opinion among academics came from the fact that the institutional architecture of the EU is very important for academics working in the EU and academics who are EU citizens; there is still much publication on this architecture. On the other hand, there is a great deficiency in this field in Turkey. Academics drawing attention to this issue criticized the lack of emphasis on the effect of the EU Commission or the European Parliament on Turkey-EU relations. In other words, it was stated that studies on the EU in Turkey focus on popular topics such as migration and do not focus much on the institutional architecture or structuring in the EU. They have positioned this as a feature that distinguishes academics in the EU from Turkish academics. In Europe, it was emphasized that the importance of institutional architecture has drawn attention in the discussions about the future of the EU. It was said that the closest discussion to this in Turkey has recently been made over differentiated integration.

Concluding Discussion

In-depth interviews primarily provided an opportunity to understand the views of academics on EU studies and their approaches towards Turkey-EU relations. In this way, the choices of the academics related to the knowledge-production processes were also revealed. First of all, it was seen that academics had changed their studies over time according to the course of Turkey-EU relations. Turkey-EU relations affected the knowledge production choices of academics working on the EU in Turkey. Therefore, it was seen that those academics have begun to attach more importance to European integration and other EU-related issues than to EU enlargement.

Moreover, it is seen that academics keep their perspectives wide and their interest in the EU alive through associative issues such as migration, free movement, and the problem of terrorism with the EU, and prefer to contribute to EU studies. It may be stated that those working on the EU are in an effort to develop an interdisciplinary perspective in their studies. These studies include governance, migrations, rights, policies, regionalism, law, history, political order, social movements, and the EU economic model. In addition to interdisciplinary character of the EU studies, a multi-directional understanding has developed in cooperation with the public and private sectors, and this understanding has dominated the field. This possible cooperation includes multi-party studies based on different arguments about employment, wages, women's rights, social groups, welfare state, regime types, and civil service. With the start of the negotiation process, it was determined that the tendency to obtain pragmatic results through solving cyclical problems such as the refugee crisis in Turkey-EU relations became prominent. However, issues such as the revision of the Customs Union, which could create progress in integration, remained in the background. The emphasis of the academics that the qualified studies of the graduate students contribute to the institutionalization of EU studies and knowledge production is also essential.

EU-supported projects have become an important tool in the knowledge-production process of EU studies. The fact that non-governmental organizations have become active actors in EU studies shows that knowledge production in the field has further developed through the relationship between the public, private sector, and civil society. Moreover, Turkey-EU relations have become almost a case study for understanding the EU and Europeanization. With the EU, political science has also become a field of study to be questioned. Therefore, the reflex to idealize EU studies in the academy started to develop. However, academics have evaluated EU studies as 'timeless' and 'independent' of Turkey-EU relations and cyclical developments. It was also noticed that it is not easy to do this in the IR. In the discipline, it is possible to conduct a study independent of the context, and a study method following the events has become prominent. Therefore, it becomes a discipline pursuing another event upon its occurrence without being able to explain any event fully. Indeed, this could be seen as a structural problem in IR. Studies on Turkey-EU relations have also taken their share from this. In this research, it was seen that there are academics who think that it is more rational to expect the interest in EU studies not to decrease but to increase with the strained relations. These academics have begun to think that this should be studied now since Turkey's relations with the EU will become a more critical issue. However, they also pointed out that there is no general perception in this regard. When the subject is not on the agenda, it is seen as less important and loses its momentum. However, what is recommended is to conduct studies to understand why this is the case when the issue is problematic or loses momentum.

In this context, academics working on the EU have been able to keep their academic perspectives wide and their interest on EU studies alive. Moreover, it is seen that the knowledge-production process of EU studies is institutionalized in this way. On the other hand, it was also determined that personal working networks and connections have become prominent in knowledge production on EU studies. It was also determined that the relations with the policymakers are not as continuous as needed for policy making.

Considering the response from the EU policymaking process to academics, it can be said that ideas about Turkey-EU relations impact policymakers based on material interests and structural factors.

Besides, expert-knowledge utilization by policymakers elevates the effect of academic research on the EU and Turkey-EU relations. As mentioned before, there is a match between academics and policymakers in the Turkish case. To enhance interaction between policymakers and academics, regular meetings can be held between the commissions to be formed from the IR departments of universities and the representatives of the ministries of foreign affairs. These meetings, which will be held with the logic of monitoring activities of EU projects, can create a sustainable and institutional interaction between policymakers and academics. A reflection paper can be prepared after each meeting to communicate the ideas and emotions that come forth based on the experiences and knowledge provided by policymakers and academics. Therefore, it is considered that the desired level that KTE produced between EU academics and EU policymakers has not been reached yet under current conditions.

Bibliography

- “A-NEST-Academic Network for EU Studies in Turkey”, <https://www.avrupa.info.tr/en/a-nest-professors>.
- Avey, Paul C. and Michael C. Desch (2014). “What do Policymakers Want from Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No 2, p. 227-246.
- Aydın-Düzgüt, Senem and Nathalie Tocci (2015). *Turkey and the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aydın-Düzgüt, Senem (2018). “Legitimising Europe in Contested Settings: Europe as a Normative Power in Turkey?”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 56, No 3, p. 612-627.
- Baker, Sarah Elsie and Rosalind Edwards (2012). “How Many Qualitative Interviews is Enough?: Expert Voices and Early Career Reflections on Sampling and Cases in Qualitative Research”, National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper, https://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/id/eprint/2273/4/how_many_interviews.pdf (August 2022).
- Boyce, Carolyn and Palena Neale (2006). *Conducting in-depth Interviews: A Guide for Designing and Conducting in-depth Interviews for Evaluation Input*. Watertown, Pathfinder International.
- Buzan, Barry and Thomas Diez (1999). “The European Union and Turkey”, *Survival*, Vol. 41, No 1, p. 41-57.
- Cairney, Paul (2015). “How Can Policy Theory Have an Impact on Policymaking? The Role of Theory-led Academic-practitioner Discussions”, *Teaching Public Administration*, Vol. 33, No 1, p. 22-39.
- Caplan, Nathan (1979). “The Two-Communities Theory and Knowledge Utilization”, *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 22, No 3, p. 459-470.
- Duina, Francesco (2022). “Is Academic Research Useful to EU Officials? The Logic of Institutional Openness in the Commission”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 29, No 9, p. 1493-1511.
- Emek, Uğur (2004). “Understanding Structural Reforms in Turkey”, Richard Griffiths and Durmuş Özdemir (eds.), *Turkey and the EU Enlargement*. İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi University Press, p. 103-128.
- Eralp, Atila (1993). “Turkey and the European Community in the Changing Post-war International System”, Canan Balkır and Allan Williams (eds.), *Turkey and Europe*. London, Pinter Publishers, p. 24-44.
- European Commission (1999). *1999 Regular Progress Report for Turkey*, https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/Tur_En_Realitons/Progress/Turkey_Progress_Report_1999.pdf. (September 2022).
- European Commission. “Erasmus+: EU Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport, Jean Monnet Centres of Excellence”, <https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/opportunities/opportunities-for-organisations/jean-monnet-actions/jean-monnet-centres-of-excellence>.
- Fraser, Kym, Xin Deng, Frank Bruno and Tarik A. Rashid (2020). “Should Academic Research be Relevant and Useful to Practitioners? The Contrasting Difference between Three Applied Disciplines”, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 45, No 1, 2020, p. 129-144.

- George, Alexander L. (1994). "The Two Cultures of Academia and Policy-Making: Bridging the Gap", *International Society of Political Psychology*, Vol. 15, No 1, p. 143-172.
- Göral, Emirhan, Muzaffer Dartan and E. Serra Yurtkoru (2021). "Marmara Üniversitesi Öğretim Elemanlarının Türkiye-AB İlişkilerine Yönelik Algıları Üzerine bir Araştırma", *Marmara Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 29, No 1, p. 87-115.
- Hague, Hanna-Lisa et al. (2016). "Mapping Milestones and Periods of Past EU-Turkey Relations", *FEUTURE Working Paper*, https://feuture.uni-koeln.de/sites/feuture/pdf/Deliverable_Narratives_1.2_final_neu.pdf. (August 2022).
- Haukkala, Hiskii (2011). "The Time, Space and Strategies For Scholarly Analysis In Foreign Policy Making", *The Academia and Foreign Policy Making: Bridging the Gap*, DIIS Working Paper.
- Keeler, John T. S. (2005). "Mapping EU Studies: The Evolution from Boutique to Boom Field 1960–2001", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 43, No 3, p. 551-582.
- Kula, Onur Bilge (2015). *Avrupa(lılık) Nedir? Türkiye Ne Kadar Avrupalıdır?.* İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Mason, Mark (2010). "Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews", *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 11, No 3, p. 1-19.
- Mercan, S. Sezgin (2011). "Siyasal Bütünleşme Kuramları Işığında AB Genişlemesi", *Ankara Review of European Studies*, Vol. 10, No 1, p. 67-83.
- Mitton, Craig et al. (2007). "Knowledge Transfer and Exchange: Review and Synthesis of the Literature", *The Milbank Quarterly*, Vol. 85, No 4, p. 729-768.
- Müftüler-Bac, Meltem and Lauren M. McLaren (2003). "Enlargement Preferences and Policy-making in the European Union: Impacts on Turkey", *European Integration*, Vol. 25, p. 17-30.
- Müftüler-Bac, Meltem (2016). *Divergent Pathways: Turkey and the European Union*. Berlin, Barbara Budrich Publishers.
- Nas, Çiğdem (2002). "Turkey-EU Relations and the Question of Identity", Muzaffer Dartan and Çiğdem Nas (eds.), *The European Union Enlargement Process and Turkey*. İstanbul, Marmara University Publication, p. 217-234.
- Oğuzlu, H. Tanık (2012). "Turkey and the European Union: Europeanization Without Membership", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 13, No 2, p. 229-243.
- Öniş, Ziya (2007). "Conservative Globalists versus Defensive Nationalists: Political Parties and Paradoxes of Europeanization in Turkey", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, Vol. 9, No 3, p. 247-261.
- Radin, Beryl A. (2013). "Reclaiming Our Past: Linking Theory and Practice", *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 46, No 1, p. 1-7.
- Raoult, Emmanuelle (1997). "The Turkish Case as an Example of Stabilisation in Europe's Periphery", *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 21, No 3-4, p. 82-92.
- Reiners, Wulf and Ebru Turhan (2021). *EU-Turkey Relations: Theories, Institutions, and Policies*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.
- Rittberger, Berthold and Michael Blauburger (2018). "Introducing the Debate Section: The EU in Crisis: EU Studies in Crisis?", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 25, No 3, p. 436-439.
- Robins, Kevin (2011). "Interrupting Identities: Turkey/Europe", Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. SAGE Publications.
- Rumelili, Bahar (2015). "Türkiye'nin Avrupa'yı Yeniden İnşası: Üyelik ve Vatandaşlık", *Marmara Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 23, No 2, p. 79-98.
- Rumford, Chris (2000). "From Luxembourg to Helsinki: Turkey, the politics of EU Enlargement and Prospects for Accession", *Contemporary Politics*, Vol. 6, No 4, p. 331-341.

- Saatçiođlu, Beken (2020). "The EU's Refugee Crisis and Rising Functionalism in EU-Turkey Relations", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 21, No 2, p. 169-187.
- Schön, Donald A. (1991). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Surrey, UK, Ashgate.
- Terzi, Özlem (2004). "Sođuk Savaş Sonrasında Türkiye-Avrupa Birliđi İlişkileri: Ekonomik Gündemden Siyasi Gündeme", Faruk Sönmezođlu (ed.) *Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi*. İstanbul, Der Yayınları, p. 453-489.
- Turkish National Agency. "Yükseköđretim Alanında Jean Monnet", <https://www.ua.gov.tr/programlar/firsatlar/yuksekogretim-alaninda-jean-monnet-kurum-kuruluslar-icin-ortaklik/>.
- Ulusoy, Kıvanç (2007). "Turkey's Reform Effort Reconsidered, 1987-2004", *Democratization*, Vol. 14, No 3, p. 472-490.
- Wood, Steve (2013). "Turkey and Europe: Identity and Other Crises", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 14, No 2, p. 272-291.
- Yazıcı, Serap (2004). "The Impact of the EU on the Liberalization and Democratization Process in Turkey", Richard Griffiths and Durmuş Özdemir (eds.), *Turkey and the EU Enlargement*. İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi University Press, p. 91-102.
- Yılmaz-Elmas, Fatma (2020). "EU's Global Actorness in Question: A Debate over the EU-Turkey Migration Deal", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, Vol. 17, No 68, p. 161-177.