



| Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi |

## Effect of European Union Education Policy on Turkish Education System in Scope of European Union-Turkey Relations

### Avrupa Birliği-Türkiye İlişkileri Bağlamında Avrupa Birliği Eğitim Politikasının Türk Eğitim Sistemi Üzerindeki Etkisi

Omca ALTIN<sup>1</sup>

#### Keywords

1. European Union
2. Turkey
3. Education
4. European Union Education Policy
5. Turkish Education System

#### Anahtar Kelimeler

1. Avrupa Birliği
2. Türkiye
3. Eğitim
4. Avrupa Birliği Eğitim Politikası
5. Türk Eğitim Sistemi

#### Received/Başvuru Tarihi

07.10.2020

#### Accepted / Kabul Tarihi

21.06.2021

#### Abstract

By unifying on the basis of common culture and values, the European Union (EU) is aiming to develop cooperation and deepen integration between 27 member countries. Education issue which holds great importance at the point of reaching these targets also plays a great role at the success of Union's policies. Turkey, who wants to partake in such a Community, concurrently realized various regulations in the education field in the scope of the EU harmonization process as well as the other political fields during the full membership process. In this study; EU education policy was handled within the course of history in the context of EU-Turkey relations and the effect of EU education policy on the Turkish education system is going to be evaluated. This is a literature review study conducted on written sources, and it was based on the scanning model of the qualitative research method. At the result of the study; it was seen that EU education policy is very effective over the Turkish education system which on its course to the EU full membership process. In this context, Turkey realized significant regulations in the education field within the frame of criteria designated for candidate countries by the EU. However, it has been observed that there are deficiencies in the regulations. Thus, Turkey should properly designate the root causes of problems regarding the education field and strictly accelerate the realization of studies in terms of criteria designated by the EU in this field in order to be a society with a higher level of development.

#### Öz

Avrupa Birliği (AB), ortak kültür ve değerler temelinde bütünüleşerek 27 üye ülke arasında işbirliğini geliştirmeyi ve aynı zamanda entegrasyonu derinleştirmeyi hedeflemektedir. Bu hedeflere ulaşma noktasında büyük bir öneme sahip olan eğitim konusu, Birlik politikalarının başarısında da oldukça etkin bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu Topluluk içerisinde yer almak isteyen Türkiye, tam üyelik sürecinde diğer politika alanlarında olduğu gibi eğitim alanında da AB'ye uyum kapsamında çeşitli düzenlemeler gerçekleştirmiştir. Bu çalışmada; AB-Türkiye ilişkileri bağlamında AB eğitim politikası tarihsel süreç içerisinde ele alınarak, AB eğitim politikasının Türk eğitim sistemi üzerindeki etkisi değerlendirilmeye çalışılmıştır. Çalışma, yazılı kaynaklar üzerinde yürütülmüş bir literatür tarama çalışması olup, nitel araştırma yönteminin tarama modeli temel alınarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Verilerin toplanmasında ise belge tarama yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonucunda; AB eğitim politikasının AB tam üyelik sürecinde olan Türk eğitim sistemi üzerinde oldukça etkili olduğu görülmüştür. Bu kapsamda Türkiye, AB tarafından aday ülkeler için belirlenen kriterler çerçevesinde eğitim alanında önemli düzenlemeler gerçekleştirmiştir. Ancak bu düzenlemelerde eksiklikler olduğu görülmüştür. Dolayısıyla Türkiye, bu düzenlemeleri geliştirmeli, özellikle eğitim alanına ilişkin sorunların temel nedenlerini doğru bir şekilde saptayarak, gelişmişlik düzeyi yüksek bir toplum olabilmek adına bu alanda AB tarafından belirlenen kriterleri tam anlamıyla gerçekleştirme çalışmalarını hızlandırmalıdır.

<sup>1</sup> Asst. Prof. Omca ALTIN, Kastamonu University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Relations, Kastamonu, TURKEY; oaltin@kastamonu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2529-4979>

## INTRODUCTION

Education is the main way to achieve quality living standards and to become a society with a high level of development. It is also a fundamental element of creating and developing a political and social system that respects both democratic and human rights (Özyılmaz, 2013). The globalization process has made a difference in the needs of societies, and the needs for information societies that constantly renew themselves and aim to reach different information have increased, especially within the framework of the developments in the fields of science and technology in the world (Turan, 2005). Training the people needed for the information society, and accordingly, producing information, accessing information, being able to use the information and transforming it into technology come to the forefront in the focus of innovation movements in education. Therefore, education plays a very important role in this process of change of societies (Göksoy, 2013).

The EU is developing cooperation between the Member States in many areas, from economy to politics. Common policies are also the most important elements in developing these collaborations. The EU aims to create a high awareness of Europeanness by mutual interaction between different languages, cultures and understandings of the citizens of the Member States. One of the policies created to achieve these goals is the education policy (Çelebi, 2007). The EU first considered education a tool contributing to the development of economic integration, and vocational education was focused on within the framework of the economic objectives of the European Union. However, especially science and technology-based developments led the EU to develop common policies in the field of education in the following period. It has been tried to establish partnerships covering the Member States by respecting the content and implementation methods of the national education systems of the Member States in the EU in this context. Therefore, the EU wants to create a European dimension in this area by strengthening cooperation between the Member States in the field of education policies.

Turkey's efforts to join the EU, which started in the 1960s, accelerated even more during the 2000s. Therefore, Turkey is obliged to fully meet the criteria set by the EU for candidate states in the process of full EU membership. Therefore, Turkey makes many regulations in the field of education as in other policy areas and tries to adapt to EU standards in this field within the framework of these criteria.

The development of the EU education policy in the context of EU-Turkey relations was examined within the historical process, and the impact of the EU education policy on Turkey's education system in the EU full membership process and how successful Turkey was in meeting the EU criteria in the field of education were tried to be evaluated in this study.

## METHOD

The study is a literature review study and aims to integrate existing information on the historical development of EU education policy on the basis of EU-Turkey relations and the impact of EU education policy on the Turkish education system. A literature review is a research method that allows the systematic, understandable and repeatable synthesis and evaluation of information obtained by researchers, academicians or practitioners on a subject. This study was conducted on written resources (Göksoy, 2013).

The screening model of the qualitative research method was used in the study. Screening models are research approaches aiming to describe a past or still present situation as it is or as it was. In other words, the event, individual or object, which forms the basis of the research and is the subject of the research, is tried to be defined in the current conditions without any effort to change or influence it (Karasar, 2005).

The document screening method was used in the collection of the data in this study. Collecting data by examining existing records and documents is described as document screening. Document screening involves screening, reviewing, taking notes and evaluating resources for a specific goal (Karasar, 2005). The current research has been examined based on related articles, books, legislation and reports.

### European Union-Turkey Relations

Turkey has been involved in very important international formations such as OECD, Council of Europe and NATO in the historical process. Therefore, Turkey did not remain indifferent to European integration, which is defined as the most important peace project in history, and applied for membership in the European Economic Community in 1959. This application for membership made by Turkey was stated by the Community Council that the level of development of Turkey would be insufficient to fulfill the obligations required by the full membership, and it was suggested that relations would progress within the framework of the partnership until the conditions required for full membership are fulfilled on the basis of Article 238 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community. The Ankara Agreement, also known as the Agreement Establishing a Partnership between Turkey and the European Economic Community, was signed in 1963 upon the adoption of the Community Council proposal by Turkey (Can, Balkır, Tonus et al., 2013). Thus, Turkey has a joint member status with the Ankara Agreement (Sözen and Shaw, 2003).

It is envisaged that this partnership, which was established between Turkey and the European Economic Community in the Ankara Treaty and whose main objective is Turkey's full membership of the European Community, be realized with the completion of three sections consisting of preparation, transition and the last period. Therefore, this Agreement has been an important step

for Turkey's full membership in the European Community in the future (Tekeli and İkin, 2000). However, Turkey applied for full membership in the European Economic Community in 1987 without completing the gradual integration process stipulated in the Ankara Agreement. It has been reported by the Commission that a new member cannot be included in the Community without fully realizing the Community's own integration, and it has been recommended that Turkey first continue its development in the social, economic, and political fields and that the relations be maintained within the scope of the partnership agreement (Can, Balkır, Tonus, et al., 2013).

The Customs Union Treaty was signed between Turkey and the EU Association Council in 1995 and entered into force in 1996 after its ratification by the European Parliament (Klauss, 2000). The Customs Union Agreement has been seen as an important step for Turkey's full membership (Özkılıç and Haspolatlı, 2008), but Turkey achieved its candidate state status with the European Union Summit of Heads of State and Government in Helsinki in 1999 (Duman, 1991).

It was unanimously decided that Turkey would be elected as a candidate state, and it was clearly stated that it would have an equal position with other candidate states at the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the European Union in Helsinki (Tuzcu, 2002). The Council of the European Union adopted the Accession Partnership Document on 8 March 2001, which clearly sets out the objectives that Turkey should achieve in the field of human rights and within the scope of its compliance with the Copenhagen Criteria following the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the European Union. Subsequently, a national program was announced by Turkey on March 19, 2001, which included a calendar for the achievement of the objectives set out in the Accession Partnership Document. Important regulations have been made in this field in Turkey in this context (Can, Balkır, Tonus, et al., 2013).

It was stated that accession negotiations with Turkey would be initiated from 2005 if the Copenhagen political criteria were met by Turkey until December 2004 at the Summit held in Copenhagen in December 2002 (Can, Balkır, Tonus et al., 2013).

The Commission stated that the Copenhagen political criteria were met by Turkey and made some recommendations to the Member States regarding the opening of negotiations with Turkey before the December 2004 Summit (Aygül and Güvemli, 2005). It was stated that Turkey's steps in this process were welcomed at the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the European Union in Brussels on 16-17 December 2004 (Özkılıç and Haspolatlı, 2008). Therefore, it was decided to initiate the negotiation process with Turkey on October 3, 2005, in accordance with the framework stated in Article 23 of the Summit final text. It was stated in the Recommendation Document published by the Commission in October 2004 that Turkey would be deemed to have fulfilled the Copenhagen criteria when it put 6 regulations into effect. The Commission was given two main tasks as the revision of the Framework Document and the 2001 Accession Partnership Document, in other words, the preparation of a new Accession Partnership Document at the Summit. The Commission was requested to conduct a Civil Society Dialog involving activities to be carried out with the help of non-governmental organizations in order to ensure the promotion of both Turkey in the Member States and the EU in Turkey at the same time. The Commission adopted a framework that set the path for the EU in the negotiation processes in June 2005 (Can, Balkır, Tonus et al., 2013). Therefore, the EU decided to open negotiations with Turkey in Luxembourg on October 3, 2005 (Özkılıç and Haspolatlı, 2008). Turkey has entered the process of restructuring in many areas such as education, environment, health and social security for full membership in the EU since then (Bağcı, 2011).

## **Formation of the Education Policy of the European Union and Historical Development Process**

The legal infrastructure of the European Community is based on the 1951 Treaty of Paris and the 1957 Treaty of Rome (Phillips and Ertl, 2003), and the main objective of the treaties was cooperation in the economic field (Hoggart and Johnson, 1987). The countries that established the European Coal and Steel Community Treaty associated education with national identities and opposed the development of education policy by the Community (Mikl, 2003). Therefore, neither treaty included specific provisions for general education. However, vocational education, which is thought to be directly related to the economic field, is mentioned in the treaties in addition to this (Ertl, 2003).

Article 128 of the EEC Treaty laid the foundations for the creation of a common policy for vocational education within the Community in particular (Ertl, 2003). Therefore, principles related to the creation of a common policy on vocational education were determined based on Article 128 with the General Principles Decision on the Establishment of Common Policies in Vocational Education dated 2 April 1963 and numbered 63/226 adopted by the Council of Europe (Denac, Cagran, Denac, and Sicherl Kafold, 2011). These principles in particular focused on the education required for all individuals to choose the profession they want, the adaptation of individuals working in the Member States to the changes in general economic conditions and production technologies, the increase of employment and the circulation of workers (Tuzcu, 2006). However, these principles are not considered legally binding by the Member States. In other words, all of the activities carried out in this field were conducted with the interstate cooperation method, not within the scope of the Community. Therefore, limited activities have been carried out for vocational education as well since these principles are not legally binding on the Member States (Ertl, 2003).

Approaches to vocational education mentioned in the founding treaties are an indicator of states' commitment to economic integration. Established to ensure economic integration, the Community primarily aimed to create a common market and the cooperating Member States based on the free movement of goods, capital, services and persons. It was thought for this reason that the creation of a common vocational education policy would both be extremely important for the free movement of these four fundamental factors of the common market and would increase the likelihood of finding a job outside the free movement of

people receiving vocational education. Therefore, a common vocational education policy would be created and contribute to the development of the common market (Denac, Cagran, Denac, and Sicherl Kafold, 2011). Vocational education has been considered a tool contributing to the development of economic integration as can be understood from all of these (Ertl, 2003), in other words, EU initiatives on vocational education have been carried out in line with the economic objectives of the European Union (Cankaya, Kutlu and Cebeci, 2015).

However, it is seen that the obligations regarding the Community institutions are not clearly stated in Article 128. In other words, the job descriptions for the Community institutions are not fully clarified. There are inconsistencies between the objectives and general principles of common vocational education policies. Article 128 contradicts the way in which decisions are taken and the policy instruments throughout the treaty. Therefore, this situation made it difficult to interpret Article 128 in European law. For this reason, the Member States interpreted Article 128 in a more limited way and claimed that the Community was given more limited powers in this field while the European Commission interpreted Article 128 widely (Ertl, 2003).

It was seen in the 1970s that the perspectives of European politicians towards education policies started to change, and the interest in education increased even more during this period. Political education was seen as an important element of creating European citizenship in the following periods, especially in these years. A European University Institute was established with an interstate agreement in Florence as a reflection of this idea (Özkılıç and Haspolatlı, 2008). This situation has been an indication that cooperation and activities for education have an inter-state nature, not a supra-state nature (Ertl, 2003).

An education committee consisting of the education ministers of the Member States was established, and a meeting was held by this committee to ensure future cooperation in the field of education in 1971. It was decided to make the cooperation on education more comprehensive not only to include vocational education after the meeting (Köksal, Yıldırım and Özdemir, 2013). Therefore, cooperation and permanent programs for general education were initiated by the education committee. However, all these activities have not been very comprehensive due to the lack of financial and personnel support by the European Commission. Economic factors such as young unemployment caused by the economic depression brought about by the oil crisis in 1973 and especially young individuals aged 16 and under taking part in the labor market without any qualifications after leaving school have also played a role in increasing interest in education in the 1970s at the same time (Ertl, 2003). The globalization of the economy in particular and, therefore the increasing need for a high-quality labor force (Brine, 1995) necessitated a reconsideration of the issue of education at the national and also Community level. The Community reached a consensus on the establishment of a social action program with full employment as a priority with the decision taken by the Council in 1974 (Ertl, 2003).

Vocational education has been seen as an essential element for economic recovery in this context. It has been accepted as a result of the economic problems experienced in these years that general education and vocational education are directly related and inseparable whole at the same time (Ertl, 2003).

General education and vocational training were included together in the report titled "Community Policies in Education" prepared by Belgian Minister of Education Henri Janne in 1973 and also defined as "Janne Report". The fact that vocational education and general education are not considered as a whole is an important obstacle to the establishment of a Community common education policy according to the report. On the other hand, it was stated considering the link between economy and education that education should be included in EC policies in the following periods, and the importance of creating a European dimension in education was emphasized (Ertl, 2003). It was also stated that education policies should take into account the national education systems of the Member States and that national education systems and teaching methods should not be standardized (Sevinç, 1996).

The Education Ministers' Decision to establish cooperation in education in 1974 is one of the most important decisions of the EU on education. European cooperation in education is based on three fundamental principles. Social and economic policies in the EC should be harmonized, education should not only be seen as an element of economic improvement, but the traditions of each country should be taken into consideration in the field of education in this context. It was decided to create a joint action in areas such as providing efficiency in both cultural and vocational education, taking into account the issue of transparency in education systems in Europe, obtaining documentation and statistical data, increasing cooperation between higher education institutions, mutual recognition of diplomas by countries, allowing teachers, students and researchers to learn the language better by encouraging the circulation and creating equal opportunities for full access to various types of education at the same time (Ertl, 2003).

The Ministerial Decree of 1974 had been further expanded by 1976. The Community Education Action Program was adopted as a result of the studies carried out (Brock and Tulasiewicz, 2000). It was decided to establish an education committee by the education ministers in order to increase coordination in the field of education at the same time (Ertl, 2003). It is aimed to develop cooperation in the field of education between the Community Education Action Program and the education committee, and the Member States (Commission of the European Communities, 1993; Brock and Tulasiewicz, 2000). The Commission is empowered to explore options to facilitate the exchange of education experts and the transition from schools to labor markets with the 1976 Community Education Action Program. It is the first time that the Council of Ministers has taken a decision on education policy in the legal regulations that make the Community Education Action Program important. This action program has played an important role in the realization of many projects for education (Ertl, 2003).

However, it appears that the Community has limited authority in all educational activities despite all this. In particular, the legal infrastructure of educational activities was formed within the scope of the decisions interpreted by the European Court of Justice due to the unclear provisions of Article 128 of the Treaty of Rome. It has been stated in the decisions made by the European Court of Justice that the Community may adopt regulations binding Member States and that vocational education is very important for higher education. The Community has further increased its activities based on these decisions. The Council and Commission developed various programs and projects on education as a result of these decisions made by the Court of Justice in the 1980s. Especially the COMMENT program, which facilitates cooperation between universities and research institutions and then Erasmus, which was created to establish cooperation in the field of higher education, are some of these activities. PETRA, which also plays an important role in providing vocational training opportunities to young people by the Member States, is one of these programs. Programs, which were initiated especially in the mid-1980s, played an important role in recognizing professional qualifications as well as competencies. More than two hundred professions were recorded, and the characteristics of the professions and the professional conditions required for the award of diplomas were determined (Ertl, 2003).

Some revisions were carried out on the aforementioned programs within the scope of preliminary preparation for the Single European Market, which was introduced with the Single European Act in 1986 and then entered into force on 1 January 1993. There is a consensus that it is very important to focus on the issue of education among the Member States even though the issue of education is not directly mentioned in the Single European Charter (Ertl, 2003; Brock and Tulasiewicz, 2000). The duration of the programs was extended, the Comment and Erasmus programs started their second term in 1990, and the PETRA program started its second term in 1992 following the signing of the Single European Charter. At the same time, the FORCE program was prepared in the field of vocational education, and the implementation phase was started in 1990 (Funell and Müller, 1991). It was aimed to promote the circulation of labor, increase competition and create European citizenship with the revisions carried out on the programs (Özkılıç and Haspolatlı, 2008).

Some regulations were made in the field of education, and the unclear legal infrastructure in Community law was clarified in the 1970s and 1980s with the Maastricht Treaty. Vocational education and general education are clearly separated in Articles 126 and 127 of the Maastricht Treaty (Blitz, 2003).

Articles 126 and 127 are included under the titles of "Education, Vocational Education and Youth" of the Maastricht Treaty. The European Union has been limited to promoting cooperation between the Member States in general education, while it has gained more powers in vocational education in the Maastricht Treaty (Ertl, 2003).

Article 126 of the Maastricht Treaty states that the Community will support the work of the countries by respecting the language, culture, and education system differences of the Member States and contribute to the development of cooperation between the Member States. It is seen that the Community aims to implement a vocational education policy that supports the activities carried out by the Member States by taking into account the obligations of the Member States regarding the content and implementation methods of vocational education when Article 127 is examined (Karluk, 2005).

The EU is obliged to implement a vocational education policy that supports the activities of the Member States with the Maastricht Treaty, but the Member States' own laws and regulations are not obliged to directly comply with the decisions of the EU Council on the subject, and the implementation of education policies is left to the responsibility of the Member States (Tuzcu, 2006). However, it has been claimed that leaving the implementation of education policies to the responsibility of the Member States also constitutes an obstacle to the possibility of creating a European dimension in education and vocational education (Ertl, 2003).

The European Commission published the White Paper on "Growth, Competitiveness, and Employment" and the subject of education was at the heart of the Community's social, economic, and employment policies at the 1993 Brussels Summit, following the Maastricht Treaty. Meanwhile, it is clearly emphasized that general and vocational education is necessary to accelerate growth and transform it into employment (Charlier and Croche, 2005).

The European Union focused on programs such as Socrates, Leonardo Da Vinci and Youth for Europe in the post-Maastricht period (Economou, 2003). These programs included the objectives of creating collaborations between countries in the fields of education, vocational education, and youth, providing the opportunity to receive education in a different country, presenting and implementing education and training projects focusing on new approaches, and ensuring the recognition of professional qualifications between countries (Ertl, 2003). These programs also try to highlight the European dimension in education and vocational education. These programs, therefore, highlight the European dimension expressed in the Maastricht Treaty. However, the fact that the European dimension was not clearly defined in the Maastricht Treaty was seen as one of the biggest shortcomings. The concept of the European dimension has failed to affect the education systems of the Member States due to this deficiency (Ryba, 2000). The fact that education policies are seen as an important element in achieving economic objectives, in particular, has not changed with the Maastricht Treaty (Ertl, 2003).

The European Commission set two main objectives of its own working group in 1995. One of these goals is to work in accordance with the White Paper and to celebrate the European Year of Lifelong Learning, and the other is to produce ideas and work on the subject on its own initiative. It is aimed to protect employment by promoting European citizenship, competitiveness, to ensure social cohesion, to interact education and training in the information society, and to support education systems for individuals with these studies (Tuzcu, 2006).

The ministers responsible for the field of employment launched the European Employment Strategy at the Council meeting held in Luxembourg in 1997. Employment, entrepreneurship and equal opportunities were focused on with the European Employment Strategy and education were included in the employment policies of the Member States (Toprakçı, 2004).

The Bologna process was introduced in higher education with the 1998 Sorbonne Declaration and the 1999 Bologna Declaration. The Sorbonne Declaration focused on creating a common system for undergraduate and graduate students and increasing student and academic mobility (Fredriksson, 2003). Meanwhile, it was stated in the Sorbonne Declaration that universities are extremely important in the creation of the European higher education field and the cultural development of Europe, and therefore universities should act together in this regard (Tuzcu, 2006). It has also been emphasized that the creation of the European higher education field is very important in the mobility of individuals, employment and all developments. The Bologna Declaration was signed within the framework of the Sorbonne Declaration on June 19, 1999. European Education Ministers aimed to create a European higher education area by 2010 and to spread the European higher education system internationally with the Bologna Declaration (Charlier and Croche, 2005). Therefore, five main targets have been identified to be achieved by 2010. These include;

- Promoting the employment of European citizens and the global competitiveness of the European higher education system by creating an easily readable and comparable degree system with the application of the diploma supplement,
- Implementing a two-degree system that covers both undergraduate and graduate degrees and where the transition to the second degree will be possible after the successful completion of the three-year first-degree studies,
- Promoting student mobility by establishing the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS),
- Ensuring the mobility of students, teachers, researchers and also administrative personnel by eliminating obstacles to free movement,
- Encouraging the development of the European dimension in the field of higher education (Fredriksson, 2003).

Thus, it has been tried to create regional cooperation in which countries share their experiences by comparing higher education systems with other countries with the Bologna process and thus develop solutions to similar problems they have collectively experienced (Cankaya, Kutlu, and Cebeci, 2015). The most important feature of the Bologna process is that the country to be a member of the process does not have to be an EU Member State. Therefore, this feature of the Bologna process distinguishes it from other EU policies (Charlier and Croche, 2005).

The Lisbon Strategy presented to the Council of Europe aims to make the EU economy the most competitive, knowledge-oriented economy in the world with a sustainable growth capacity by 2010 at the Lisbon Summit held in March 2000. It was emphasized that there is a need for a knowledge-based society first (Köksal, Yıldırım and Özdemir, 2013), and education was seen as an integral element of economic and social policies in order to achieve these goals (Tuzcu, 2006). Therefore, the field of education has been included in the objectives set to revise EU policies with this strategy. The European Union has decided to make some transformations to become a pioneering economy in the global arena. It was aimed to place the economy on a knowledge-based basis in order to solve some problems in the economic field, to review macroeconomic policies to achieve the desired economic growth, to build a European Social Model in which people are at the center and to increase investments related to education in this context (Köksal, Yıldırım and Özdemir, 2013). Meanwhile, the Education Council was asked to determine its goals for the education system in parallel with the international competitive environment and developments in information technology (Mikl, 2003).

On March 3, 2010, the Europe 2020: A Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth report was published. The report aims to improve the quality of education and vocational education by emphasizing that initiatives in the field of education, vocational education and lifelong learning and employment opportunities of the young population should be increased within the scope of smart growth (Akbas and Apar, 2010).

In short, economic priorities have directed the EU towards education as previously stated, and education has been seen by the EU as an important tool for economic development. Thus, collaboration in the field of education has become a requirement (Tuzcu, 2006). However, the EU, which has the feature of being a supranational union, has not gone beyond showing a cooperative approach in the field of education even though it has binding regulations in many areas. The biggest reason for this is that it is very difficult for states with different education policies to bring their current education policies under a single policy with the law (Kısakürek, 2013). Therefore, the main objective of EU education policy is to promote a common understanding by providing cooperation and solidarity between the Member States and to develop a sense of Europeanness (Tuzcu, 2002).

## **Effect of Education Policy of the European Union on the Turkish Education System**

It was observed that education was not included in the treaties and protocols, which are the legal basis of EU-Turkey relations, until Turkey achieved candidate state status (10-11 December 1999 Summit of Heads of State and Government of the European Union). The process of cooperation and harmonization with the EU in the field of education gained momentum on March 19, 2001, within the scope of the calendars and priorities set out in the National Program prepared by Turkey for the achievement of the objectives set out in the Accession Partnership Document dated March 8, 2001 (Köksal, Yıldırım, and Özdemir, 2013). Therefore, education has become a very important issue in terms of the progress of Turkey's EU full membership process and

increasing its competitiveness in the global field, and Turkey's EU full membership process has been an important opportunity and a driving force for education reform (Köksal, Yıldırım, and Özdemir, 2013). Turkey made serious revisions in this field to align its education system with the European Union education policies especially after 3 October 2005, when it was decided to start full membership negotiations with Turkey (Bağcı, 2011). All studies carried out by Turkey in different fields of education such as primary, secondary, higher education and lifelong learning within the scope of compliance with EU education policy in the process of full EU membership are also evaluated in the annual progress reports prepared by the EU to determine the developments of candidate states in fields such as education, energy and environment (Fredriksson, 2003). Below, it has been tried to evaluate how much progress Turkey has made in the studies it has carried out in the field of primary, secondary, higher education and lifelong learning within the scope of compliance with the EU education policy and in its annual progress reports.

### **Turkey's Primary Education Policies**

The fact that the knowledge and skills acquired by the students in primary education constitute an infrastructure for the knowledge and skills to be acquired at other stages of the teaching process makes primary education one of the most important steps of the education process. Turkey, which is aware of this situation, carries out various studies in the field of primary education as well as in other educational processes, especially within the scope of compliance with EU education policy (Sağlam, Özüdoğru and Çıray, 2011a).

Compulsory education practice in the field of primary education, the history of which dates back many years, is an important issue that Turkey has focused on since the 1970s in many European countries. Making 8-year education compulsory in 1997 is an important step taken to close the education gap with developed countries, even though it is a very late decision, especially in Turkey, which is in the process of full EU membership (Şadioğlu, 2013; Gedikoğlu, 2005). However, it is seen that the compulsory education period extends to 9 years in these countries in EU Member States such as Greece, Denmark and France in 1998 and up to 12 years in EU countries such as Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands. Therefore, Turkey was still lagging behind the EU Member States even though it took an important step with its 8-year compulsory education decision (Gedikoğlu, 2005). The 4+4+4 system, which increases the compulsory education period from 8 years to 12 years and is a new approach for schools, entered into force in 2012 with a change made in the Turkish Education Law in the following processes, and some changes were introduced to the existing education system to include the right to choose between secondary schools, primary and vocational schools with this system, which entered into force in 2012 (European Commission, 2012). Meanwhile, the age of starting compulsory education was reduced from 84 months to 66 months with this system. However, the progress report published in 2013 revealed that the direct implementation of the system without reviewing the curriculum in this direction posed serious problems for beginners (European Commission, 2013). Therefore, the transition to this system without creating the necessary infrastructure has brought serious discussions (Şadioğlu, 2013; Gedikoğlu, 2005). In addition, it was stated in the 2013 progress report that the primary school (first four years) enrollment rate was 98.9%, and the secondary school (second four years) enrollment rate was 93.1% (European Commission, 2013). The schooling rate of primary school children increased to 99.6% and this rate to 94.5% for primary education according to the 2014 progress report (European Commission, 2014). Therefore, the transition to the 12-year compulsory education system played an important role in making progress in schooling rates.

It is seen that in the 2019 progress report, there was an improvement in the school enrollment rates of children in Turkey. The primary school enrollment rate increased from 91.2% in 2017 to 91.7% in 2018, but the secondary school enrollment rate decreased from 95.7% to 94.5% in the same period when primary school enrollment rates were examined (European Commission, 2019). It was observed in the 2020 progress report that net enrollment rates in primary education increased from 91.7% to 92.1% for girls and from 91.4% to 91.8% for boys in the 2018-2019 period compared to the 2017-2018 period. It is seen that the rate of secondary school enrollment for girls decreased from 94.7% to 93.6%, and this rate decreased from 94.3% to 92.9% for boys in the 2018-2019 education period when the rates of secondary school enrollment for girls and boys are examined compared to the 2017-2018 education period (European Commission, 2020).

In addition, Turkey has developed projects called 100% Support to Education and Hey Girls, Let's Go to School in order to mobilize the community's investment support in education and at the same time to encourage girls' participation in education during the process of full EU membership. There has been an increase in the number of schools and also in the rate of girls going to school with these projects (European Commission, 2009-2010).

Socrates Program, which aims to contribute to the development of quality in education by increasing cooperation between European countries in fields such as formal education, non-formal education, distance education and education of European languages and to strengthen the European dimension in education, has had a significant impact on primary education programs in Turkey (Duman, 2001; Kihitir, 2004). Some skills and abilities were given importance in education programs, especially in primary education programs, in order to ensure the adaptation of the new generation in Turkey to the information society (Sağlam, Özüdoğru and Çıray, 2011a). These skills, which are called verbal and mathematical skills such as basic competencies of science and technology, a different language learning, use of technology, creativity, entrepreneurship, research, critical thinking, social skills and which are included in education programs, are considered as the basic elements of the Turkish education system in this context and the system is exactly the same with EU countries (Kırkgöz, 2009).

Meanwhile, foreign language courses were given more place in education programs within the scope of EU foreign language education policies in Turkey, and it was decided to start foreign language education, which became a compulsory course in order

to realize effective foreign language learning in schools, from smaller classes (Sağlam, Özüdoğru and Çıray, 2011a). In addition, foreign language education programs in Turkey were revised in 2005, so regulations were made in terms of objectives, content, teaching, learning process and evaluation. Subject-based language learning such as geography, mathematics and music was tried to be provided, and foreign language lesson hours were increased in order to make foreign language education much more effective in the programs. A communicative approach was adopted in foreign language education, and teacher-oriented education in the old system was replaced by student-oriented education during the process of full EU membership. The role of teachers in the new system changed as a guide to the learning process, in other words, as a facilitator (Kırkgöz, 2009).

Turkey has made some initiatives to equip its schools with computer technologies in accordance with the information technology policies contained in the Lisbon Strategy, which aims to make the EU the most competitive, sustainable growth capacity in the world and knowledge-based economy by 2010. Accordingly, computer laboratories were established in primary and secondary schools in pilot provinces and teachers were trained in this regard (Bayrakçı, 2005).

### **Turkey's Secondary Education Policies**

The main purpose of secondary education is to prepare students for the profession, business life and higher education in the process in line with their interests and abilities (Gediklioğlu, 2005). Turkey has made various arrangements in the field of secondary education with the projects it has carried out within the scope of compliance with EU education policy during the process of full EU membership. Turkey focused on activities such as increasing the rate of vocational and technical education, further developing general, vocational, and technical secondary education programs, restructuring vocational and technical secondary education programs in accordance with vocational standards and raising them to the standards of EU countries, creating a secondary education system where the vocational and technical secondary education process will be predominant, restructuring the existing general, the vocational and technical secondary education system in order to completely eliminate the obstacles to the information economy, which is among the objectives of Turkey in the EU full membership process, and attaching importance to the use of technology in education especially within the scope of the Secondary Education Project in 2001. The restructuring process in the field of secondary education was initiated in 2005, especially foreign language education was emphasized, and the EU Foreign Language Level system was adopted starting from primary education until the end of secondary education in this context. Thus, curricula and hours of the courses were arranged accordingly based on an interactive approach to make the foreign language available in daily life as in the EU Member States. In addition, increasing the education and training periods of general, vocational, and technical high schools, whose education and training periods are 3 years, to 4 years, and starting to teach common skills, computer promotion and guidance courses in general, vocational and technical secondary education institutions have also been among the important activities carried out in the restructuring process in the field of secondary education (Yıldırım, 2007).

It was mentioned in the 2007 progress report that Turkey actively participated in the vocational education field Leonardo da Vinci, Socrates, and youth programs in the field of general education, which the EU implemented to increase cooperation in the field of education between its own members and also the candidate states for the European Union (European Commission, 2008). The enrollment rate of male students in secondary education increased from 67.55% to 72.35% and this rate increased from 62.21% to 66.14% for female students, especially in secondary education compared to the previous year when the 2011 progress report is examined (European Commission, 2011). It was observed in the 2012 progress report that there was a 2.5% contraction in the gender imbalance in registration rates, especially in secondary education. However, the continued efforts to increase enrollment rates at all levels, especially for female students, indicate that effective intervention strategies used to reduce school dropouts are insufficient (European Commission, 2012). The fact that Turkey ranked at the end of the PISA test results, which are considered as Student Evaluation Program and attended by children aged 15 years, indicates that there is a serious problem in education quality in the 2019 progress report, while the secondary education enrollment rate increased from 82.5% in 2017 to 83.6% in 2018 (European Commission, 2019). The resources distributed irregularly among schools and inequalities in education opportunity continue to be a problem in Turkey in the field of education even though there was an increase in the 2018 PISA test results in the 2020 progress report compared to 2015 and 15.2 students per teacher in 2018, this rate slightly exceeded the average of the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation, which was 13.1 in 2018 (European Commission, 2020).

### **Turkey's Higher Education Policies**

Higher education institutions are institutions where the necessary information emerges in the development and progression of countries and at the same time human resources are trained. Universities play an important role in determining the future of nations for this reason. Meanwhile, higher education institutions have serious obligations in discussing various social and economic development, providing new information to individuals, and protecting them (Blacburn and Lawrence, 1995). It is also an undeniable fact that higher education institutions contribute to issues such as increasing social welfare and improving living conditions (Gedikoğlu, 2005).

Turkey's efforts to integrate with the European Higher Education Area started with its involvement in the Bologna process in 2001. Turkey has made important arrangements in the field of compulsory ECTS implementation in higher education institutions, making diplomas understandable (diploma appendix), quality in higher education, mobility of students as well as academics considering the implementation of the Bologna Process. Actions were taken as of the end of the 2005-2006 academic year in the applications for the diploma appendix. Meanwhile, studies such as internal quality assessment and strategic planning were carried



out for existing higher education institutions in Turkey. Erasmus program, which provides both student and academic mobility, was started in 2004 apart from these (European Commission, 2009-2010). The mobility under the Erasmus+ program increased from 9,391 in 2017 to 10,578 in 2018, especially according to the 2019 progress report (European Commission, 2019). This figure reached 12.816 in 2019 (European Commission, 2020).

It was also stated in the 2019 progress report that there are significant differences in quality among the 206 existing universities in Turkey, but significant progress has been made in the Bologna process (European Commission, 2019). It was also stated in the 2020 progress report that there are serious differences in quality between 209 universities as stated in the 2019 progress report, but Turkey is at an advanced level in implementing the Bologna process (European Commission, 2020). Meanwhile, the Quality Board for Higher Education, which was established to deal with Turkey's quality evaluation and assurance in the 2019 progress report, and an arrangement containing the procedures and principles for quality assurance management in Turkey's higher education system, which was published in addition to the management of the Quality Council in Higher Education in November 2018, were mentioned, but it was stated that this board still did not become a member of the European Union for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (European Commission, 2019). It was emphasized in the 2020 progress report that the reorganization of the Higher Education Quality Council increased its administrative and financial independence and that the Higher Education Quality Council became a national authority with the authority to supervise higher education institutions in Turkey independently. The Quality Council for Higher Education also became a member of the European Union for Quality Assurance in Higher Education in April 2020 (European Commission, 2020).

Turkey has also made some changes regarding foreign language learning at the higher education level within the scope of compliance with EU education policies during the process of full EU membership. A system called "Teaching English to Young Students" aimed at introducing foreign language learning characteristics of young students to new teacher candidates has been included in the program of the English Teaching Department in Education Faculties (Kırkgöz, 2009).

It is also emphasized in the 2019-2020 progress reports that Turkey's Professional Qualifications Institution continues to implement the national professional qualifications system and that the Professional Qualifications Institution, which is responsible for preparing national professional standards as well as national qualifications and authorizing certification bodies, has an obligation to implement the Turkish Qualifications Framework (European Commission, 2019).

The number of occupational standards published in the Official Gazette has reached 855, and 498 qualifications have been approved as of June 2020, according to the 2020 progress report. Meanwhile, it was observed that the number of certification bodies authorized in the reporting period reached 217, and the number of professional qualification certificates of the Professional Competence Authority reached 1,047,044. On the other hand, professional documents were made mandatory for those working in heavy and dangerous jobs, and the number of these documents was recorded as 143 in October 2019. Implementation of the Turkish Qualifications Framework is ongoing under the coordination of the Professional Qualifications Authority (European Commission, 2020).

It should be ensured that the principles and procedures related to quality assurance, compliance of qualifications, credit systems, the validity of non-formal, and free learning are fully implemented by Turkey even though the Turkish Qualifications Framework has been established in accordance with the scope of European qualifications. The implementation of the modular curriculum and credit module method, not the current class transition method, poses an important problem in the implementation of the Turkish Qualifications Framework in the field of formal vocational education and training. The amendment to the Law on Special Education, approved in May 2018, shows that the holders of certificates and holders of completed training certificates issued by special education institutions are on equal terms after the examination held in an accredited vocational qualification institution. Therefore, this negatively affects efforts to establish a professional qualifications system with quality assurance in Turkey (European Commission, 2020).

### **Turkey's Lifelong Learning Policies**

It is aimed with lifelong learning to provide individuals with the opportunity to learn, to support their personal development, to strengthen their active citizenship with the aim of social integration, and to expand their fields of employment by improving their skills and capacities (Turan, 2005; Cansever, 2009). The EU has revealed smart, sustainable, inclusive growth targets based on employability and social solidarity especially considering the impact of globalization on economic and also social developments. For this reason, it has turned to lifelong learning policies covering all formal, free, and also, widespread learning styles (Urhan, 2020). Turkey has also started to attach more importance to lifelong learning and adult education issues within the scope of EU lifelong learning policies and has included practices for adult learning (Grundtvig) program, especially within the framework of Socrates (Lifelong Learning) program (Atik and Kürüm, 2007). Meanwhile, studies within the scope of lifelong learning in universities in Turkey have gained momentum, and these units with different names such as continuous education center, lifelong learning center, personal development center offer lifelong learning opportunities for employees within their own body and other people in the society (Sağlam, Çıray and Özüdoğru, 2011b).

It was emphasized considering the Articles 38, 537, 547, 555, and 657 of the Eleventh Development Plan that various, inclusive, and also qualified lifelong learning opportunities should be accessed in order to gain the skills needed due to technological developments and to further strengthen the human structure by increasing the competencies. Therefore, all of this has been an

indication that lifelong learning plays an important role in the economic, social, and individual development of individuals and is accepted by Turkey. Turkey's needs in this field and the measures to be taken are mentioned especially in the Lifelong Learning Strategy Document prepared by the Ministry of National Education. 2009-2013 Lifelong Learning Strategy and Action Plan Document aim to make access to quality learning that will strengthen the lifelong learning infrastructure easier whereas 2014-2018 Turkey Lifelong Learning Strategy includes six priorities: raising the culture of lifelong learning strategy and also awareness in society, providing access to lifelong learning opportunities, increasing lifelong learning opportunities and presentation, developing lifelong guidance and counseling service, developing the system of recognition of previous learning, and developing the lifelong learning monitoring and evaluation system (Urhan, 2020).

However, it was seen in the 2018 progress report that the participation rate of adults in lifelong learning in Turkey was 6% despite all the studies carried out by Turkey within the scope of lifelong learning and developments in this field (European Commission, 2018). Meanwhile, it is seen that the basic and intermediate level digital skills are 65% in the EU between the ages of 25 and 54, while this rate is 35% in Turkey when the basic and intermediate level digital skills data of 2017 are examined. Similarly, the digital skill rate in adults between 55-74 is 34% in the EU and 5% in Turkey. It is seen that Turkey lags behind the EU in terms of digital skills. Therefore, the concept and importance of lifelong learning are still not fully known in Turkey, and at the same time, the fact that these education and training activities are not mandatory causes the participation to be low even though emphasizing the importance of individuals' participation in learning activities throughout their lives, the gains to be achieved through non-formal and free education, the skills to be provided within the scope of vocational education and the education of adults in order to create mobility in the employment market, especially the services provided both in classrooms and digitally with e-learning resources through centers within the scope of lifelong learning institutions are gradually increasing. This shows that there is still no awareness in Turkish society that learning must continue throughout life for continuous development. Therefore, studies aimed at raising awareness on this issue should be further increased in order to establish continuous learning awareness in society. The establishment of this consciousness will cause more people to demand access to education and training activities. This will require more people to be offered much more qualified opportunities. The opportunities offered to more people, including disadvantaged people, depending on the dissemination and quality of educational activities to meet current requirements. Therefore, lifelong education activities should be successfully coordinated by covering local levels (Urhan, 2020).

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education was seen as an important tool that would contribute to the development of economic integration and vocational education was focused on in line with the economic objectives in the EU, which was initially a Union established in line with economic objectives. EU, which is a supranational union, has shown a cooperative approach in the field of education even though it has binding regulations in many areas. In other words, all of the activities related to education were conducted with the interstate cooperation method. Developments in the international field led the EU to take further steps in the field of education in the following period. In particular, the EU is trying to establish partnerships in the field of education by taking into account the national education systems and implementation methods of the Member States. Therefore, it is aimed to ensure the adoption of a Europeanness consciousness by developing cooperation between EU education policy and the Member States.

It has been seen that the EU education policy is also very effective on the education system of Turkey, which is in the process of full EU membership. Turkey has to comply with EU education policy in the field of education within the framework of the criteria set by the EU for candidate countries and to develop education policies on the basis of EU education policy in this process. Turkey has made and continues to make important arrangements, especially at different levels of education such as primary, secondary, higher education, and lifelong learning in this context. Therefore, the EU full membership process has been an important opportunity and a driving force for Turkey's education reform.

Turkey has increased the number of schools and girls' school attendance rates with various projects it has developed within the scope of compliance with EU education policy, has placed more emphasis on foreign language courses in education programs, and has ensured that schools are equipped with technological tools and equipment in accordance with information technology policies in the Lisbon Strategy. Socrates Program, which aims to strengthen the European dimension, in particular, has had a significant impact on Turkey's primary education programs, and it has been prioritized to provide students with skills such as critical thinking and entrepreneurship in primary education programs in order for the new generation in Turkey to adapt to the information society. Meanwhile, Turkey took an important step in the field of primary education by putting the 4+4+4 system, which increases the compulsory education period from 8 years to 12 years, into force in 2012, and it was seen that there was an increase in primary education enrollment rates in 2019 and 2020. However, the direct implementation of the 4+4+4 system without creating the necessary infrastructure has brought some problems and discussions.

Turkey entered into a structuring process in the field of secondary education in 2005 within the scope of compliance with EU education policy. The EU Foreign Language Level system was taken as the basis starting from primary education until the end of secondary education and the course hours were arranged accordingly in this context. In addition, the education periods of general, vocational and technical high schools have been increased from 3 to 4 years. Leonardo da Vinci program in the field of vocational education in Turkey, Socrates program in the field of general education and youth programs have also received intensive participation. However, the fact that Turkey ranked at the end of the PISA test results attended by children aged 15 years despite

all these regulations in secondary education areas indicates that there is a serious problem in education quality. In addition, resources distributed irregularly among schools in Turkey and inequalities in education opportunities continue to be the main problems in the field of education.

It is seen that Turkey has also made important arrangements in the fields of higher education and lifelong learning within the scope of compliance with EU education policy. Turkey's education system has been influenced by EU programs such as Bologna, Erasmus, Grundtvig, and important studies have been carried out to implement these programs. It was observed that Turkey made significant progress in Bologna and Erasmus fields, carried out important studies on lifelong learning and adult education, while there were still significant differences in quality between universities in Turkey and the participation rate of adults in lifelong learning was fairly low, especially in the progress reports. The concept and importance of lifelong learning are still not fully known, especially in Turkey.

Turkey has made important arrangements at different levels of education such as primary, secondary, higher education, and lifelong learning within the scope of compliance with the EU, as can be seen. However, it seems that there are deficiencies in regulations even though some progress has been made in the field of education. Turkey is partially prepared within the scope of compliance with EU education policies, even though it has made progress in the field of education, especially in the 2020 progress report. Turkey must accurately identify the root causes of its problems in the field of education in order to achieve EU standards in the field of education fully. In particular, it should solve the main problems in the field of education, such as inequality of opportunity in education and resources distributed irregularly among schools by using its economic resources correctly. In addition, research and development studies should be implemented rapidly at all levels of education in order to educate individuals who can use today's technology, and EU policies on vocational and technical education should be taken into consideration more in order to adapt to EU education policies in the field of secondary education. Vocational and technical education systems of developed EU member states may be an important guide in this regard. Elimination of quality differences between universities in the field of higher education is another important issue that needs to be solved. Meanwhile, Turkey's efforts to raise awareness in this field should be further focused on in order to develop continuous education awareness in society.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, author-ship, and/or publication of this article.

### Statements of publication ethics

I hereby declare that the study has not unethical issues and that research and publication ethics have been observed carefully.

### Researchers' contribution rate

There is only one author of this article. Asst. Prof. Omca ALTIN is responsible for all of the work done for this article.

### Ethics Committee Approval Information

The research is not an experimental study. The study is a literature review study. Therefore, ethics committee approval was not required.

### REFERENCES

- Akbas, G. ve Apar, A. (2010). *Avrupa 2020 stratejisi: Akıllı, sürdürülebilir ve kapsayıcı büyüme için Avrupa stratejisi*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/SBYPB/Sosyal%20Politika%20ve%20%C4%B0stihdam/avrupa\\_2020\\_stratejisi.pdf](https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/SBYPB/Sosyal%20Politika%20ve%20%C4%B0stihdam/avrupa_2020_stratejisi.pdf) (2020, Şubat 3).
- Atik, K., D. ve Kürüm, D. (2007). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının "yaşam boyu öğrenme" kavramına yükledikleri anlam (Anadolu Üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi örneği). 16. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri. Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Tokat.
- Avrupa Komisyonu (2008). *Türkiye 2008 ilerleme raporu*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari\\_46224.html](https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html) (2020, Şubat 3).
- Avrupa Komisyonu (2011). Komisyon tarafından Avrupa Parlamentosu'na ve Konsey'e sunulan bildirim. *2011 Yılı İlerleme Raporu*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari\\_46224.html](https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html), 3 Şubat 2020.
- Avrupa Komisyonu (2012). Komisyon tarafından Avrupa Parlamentosu'na ve Konsey'e sunulan bildirim. *2012 Yılı İlerleme Raporu*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB\\_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/IlerlemeRaporlari/2012\\_ilerleme\\_raporu\\_tr.pdf](https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/AB_Iliskileri/AdaylikSureci/IlerlemeRaporlari/2012_ilerleme_raporu_tr.pdf) (2020, Şubat 4).
- Avrupa Komisyonu (2013). Komisyon tarafından Avrupa Parlamentosu'na ve Konsey'e sunulan bildirim. *2013 Yılı İlerleme Raporu*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari\\_46224.html](https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html), 4 Şubat 2020.
- Avrupa Komisyonu (2014). *Komisyon tarafından Avrupa Parlamentosuna, Konseye, Avrupa Ekonomik ve Sosyal Komitesine ve Bölgeler Komitesine sunulan bildirim*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari\\_46224.html](https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html) (2020, Şubat 4).

- Avrupa Komisyonu (2019). Komisyon tarafından Avrupa Parlamentosuna, Konyeye, Avrupa Ekonomik ve Sosyal Komitesine ve Bölge Komitesine sunulan bilgilendirme. AB genişleme politikasına ilişkin 2019 bilgilendirmesi. *2019 Türkiye Raporu*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari\\_46224.html](https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html) (2020, Eylül 9).
- Avrupa Komisyonu (2020). Komisyon tarafından Avrupa Parlamentosuna, Konyeye, Avrupa Ekonomik ve Sosyal Komitesine ve Bölge Komitesine sunulan Komisyon bilgilendirmesi. *2020 Türkiye Raporu*. [https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari\\_46224.html](https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html) (2020, Şubat 1)
- Aygül, E. ve Güvemli, B. (2005). AB-Türkiye ilişkisinde gelinen nokta: Müzakere tarihinin verilmesi ve müzakere konuları. *Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi*, 25, 207-211.
- Bağcı, E. (2011). Avrupa Birliği'ne üyelik sürecinde Türkiye'de yaşam boyu eğitim politikaları. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30(2), 139-173.
- Bayrakçı, M. (2005). *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye eğitim politikalarında bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri ve mevcut uygulamalar*. [http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli\\_Egitim\\_Dergisi/167/index3-bayrakci.htm](http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/167/index3-bayrakci.htm) (2020, Eylül 9).
- Blackburn, R. T. ve Lawrence J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Blitz, K., B. (2003). From Monnet to Delors: Educational cooperation in the European Union. *Contemporary European History*, 197-212.
- Brine, J. (1995). Educational and vocational policy and construction of The European Union. *International Studies in the Sociology of Education*, 5(2), 145-163.
- Brock, C. and Tulasiewicz, W. (2000). *Education in a single Europe (2nd Ed.)*. London: Routledge.
- Can, H., Balkır, C., Tonus, Ö. vd. (2013). *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye ilişkileri*. Eskişehir: T.C. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Cansever, A. B. (2009). Avrupa Birliği eğitim politikaları ve Türkiye'nin bu politikalara uyum sürecinin değerlendirilmesi. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1), 222-232.
- Charlier, J., E. and Croche, S. (2005). How European integration is eroding national control ver education planning and policy. *European Education*, 37(4), 7-21.
- Cankaya, S., Kutlu, Ö. ve Cebeci, E. (2015). The educational policy of European Union. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 886-893.
- Commission of the European Communities. (1993). *Green paper on the European dimension of education*. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ca1f0e1a-7e3c-4093-ac92-b5ffd0c38082> (2020, Eylül 9).
- Çelebi, N. (2007). Avrupa Birliği eğitim politikalarının tarihçesi. *Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15(2), 59-89.
- Denac, O., Cagran, B., Denac, J. and Sicherl, Kafol, B. (2011). Arts and cultural education in Slovenian primary schools. *The New Educational Review*, 24, 121-132.
- Duman, A. (1991). Avrupa Birliği, Türkiye ve eğitim. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 26(223), 191-207.
- Duman, T. (2001). *Avrupa Birliği programları "Sokrates programı"*. [https://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli\\_Egitim\\_Dergisi/149/duman.htm](https://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/149/duman.htm) (2020, Eylül 9).
- Economou, A. (2003). Comparative study of the European dimension in education in England, Scotland and Wales. In Phillips, D. and Ertl, H., (Eds.), *Implementing European Union Education and Training Policy : A Comparative Study of Issues in Four Member States* (pp.117-126). Netherlands: Springer.
- European Commission.(2009-2010). *Türk eğitim sisteminin örgütlenmesi*. [http://www.edchreturkey-eu.coe.int/Source/Resources/ORGANISATION\\_OF\\_THE\\_EDUCATION\\_SYSTEM\\_IN\\_TURKEY\\_TU.pdf](http://www.edchreturkey-eu.coe.int/Source/Resources/ORGANISATION_OF_THE_EDUCATION_SYSTEM_IN_TURKEY_TU.pdf) (2020, Eylül 9).
- Ertl, H. (2003). The European Union and education and training: An overview of policies and initiatives. In Phillips, D. and Ertl, H., (Eds.), *Implementing European Union Education and Training Policy : A Comparative Study of Issues in Four Member States* (pp.13-39). Netherlands: Springer.
- Fredriksson, U. (2003). Changes of education policies within the European Union in the light of globalization. *European Educational Research Journal*, 2(4), 522-546.
- Funell, P. and Müller, J.,D. (1991). *Vocational education and the challenge of Europe: New developments in vocational education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Gedikoğu, T. (2005). Avrupa Birliği sürecinde Türk eğitim sistemi: Sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 66-80.
- Göksoy, S. (2013). Türkiye ve Avrupa Birliği ülkelerinde zorunlu eğitim uygulamaları. *Asya Öğretim Dergisi*, 1(1), 30-41.
- Hoggart, R. and Johnson, D. (1987). *An idea of Europe*. London: Chatto&Windus.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Karluk, R. (2005). *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and english language policy at primary education in Turkey. *English as an International Language Journal*, 5, 176-181.
- Kısakürek, M., A. (2003). Avrupa Birliği ve eğitim. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları*, 129, 9-29.
- Kihtir, A. (2004). *Avrupa Birliği'nin eğitim politikası*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Klauss, S. (2000). European Parliament in the EU external relations: The customs union with Turkey. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 5(2), 215-237.
- Köksal, O., Yıldırım, T. ve Özdemir, O. (2013). The reflection of the educational policies of the European Union to Turkish education system in terms of Turkey- European Union integration. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 18(6), 803-809.
- Mikl J. (2003). The Education Council report 2001—an evaluation based on the ATEE-RDC19 scenarios. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 26(1), 47-61.

- Özkılıç, R. ve Haspolatlı, E. (2008). Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği eğitim programlarına katılım süreci. *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, XXI(1), 151-172.
- Özyılmaz, Ö. (2013). *Türk Milli Eğitim Sisteminin Sorunları ve Çözüm Arayışları*. (4.baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Phillips, D. and Ertl, H. (2003). *Implementing European Union education and training policy: A comparative study of issues in four member states (2nd Ed.)*. Netherlands: Springer.
- Ryba, R. (1992). Toward a European dimension in education. Intention and Reality in European community policy and practice. *Comperative Education Review*, 36(1), 10-24.
- Sağlam, M., Çıray, F. ve Özudođru, F. (2011a). Avrupa Birliği eğitim politikaları ve Türk eğitim sistemine etkileri. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 87-109.
- Sağlam, M., Çıray, F. ve Özudođru, F. (2011b). Türkiye'deki üniversitelerin sundukları yaşam boyu öğrenme uygulamaları ve olanaklarının incelenmesi. 3. Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri. Dođu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Gazimağusa.
- Sevinç, D. (1996). *Avrupa Birliğinde eğitim politikaları ve eğitim politikaları açısından Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği ilişkileri*. Ankara: Eğitim Ana Planı Destek Raporu.
- Sözen S. and Shaw I. (2003). Turkey and the European Union: Modernizing a traditional state. *Social Policy and Administration*, 37(2), 108-120.
- Şadiođlu, Ç., N. (2013). Avrupa Birliği müzakere sürecinde Türk eğitim ve kültür siteminin literatür açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 37, 1-20.
- Tekeli, İ ve İlkin, S. (2000). *Türkiye ve Avrupa Birliği III*. İstanbul: Ümit Yayıncılık.
- Toprakçı, E. (2004). The European Union action programme in the area of education: A comparative analysis. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 29(131), 83-92.
- Turan, S. (2005). Öğrenen toplumlara dođru Avrupa Birliği eğitim politikalarında yaşam boyu öğrenme. *Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 5(1), 87-98.
- Tuzcu, G. (2002). *Avrupa Birliği'ne giriş sürecinde Türk eğitiminin planlanması*. [https://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli\\_Egitim\\_Dergisi/155-156/tuzcu.htm](https://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/155-156/tuzcu.htm) (2020, Eylül 9).
- Tuzcu, G. (2006). *Eğitimde vizyon 2023 ve Avrupa Birliği'ne giriş süreci*. <http://portal.ted.org.tr/yayinlar/EgitimdeVizyon2023veAvrupaBirligineGirisSureci.PDF> (2020, Eylül 9).
- Urhan, N. (2020). Hayat boyu öğrenme: Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye karşılaştırması. *Çalışma İlişkileri Dergisi*, 1, 18-45.
- Yıldırım, Y. (2007). Türk eğitim siteminin Avrupa Birliği eğitim politikalarına uyumu (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.