

RESEARCH REVIEW

the impact of the eu on turkey: toward streamlining europeanisation as a research programme

h. tolga bolukbasi^{a,}, ebru ertugal^b and saime ozcur-umez^a*

^aDepartment of Political Science, Bilkent University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey
E-mails: bolukbasi@bilkent.edu.tr; saime@bilkent.edu.tr

^bDepartment of International Relations and the EU, Izmir University of Economics, Sakarya Cad. No. 156, 35330, Balçova, Izmir, Turkey
E-mail: ebru.ertugal@ieu.edu.tr

*Corresponding author.

doi:10.1057/eps.2010.79

Abstract

This article provides a reassessment of the literature on the transformative impact of the EU on Turkey through the lens of the 'Europeanisation research programme'. It relies on systematic examination of a sample of the literature based on substantive findings, research design and methods. It suggests that this sample displays limitations characteristic of the Europeanisation research programme and proposes to remedy these limitations by applying the research design and methods used therein for generating empirically based comparative research on Turkey.

Keywords Europeanisation; Turkey; research design; research method

This article aims to provide a reassessment of the literature on the transformative impact of the European Union (EU) on Turkey through the lens of what has come to be referred to as the 'Europeanisation research programme'. This research programme has perhaps been the most vibrant strand in research on European integration during the past decade. Whether it remains a 'faddish' concept (Featherstone, 2003) or

is no more than 'concept stretching' (Radaelli, 2003), it has undoubtedly 'blown fresh air into the older debates on European integration, policy-making and European governance' (Lenschow, 2005: 56). In doing so, in terms of its substantive scope, the research programme has focused on the impact of the EU on the domestic level in terms of policies (paradigms, goals, instruments, styles, standards, resources,

organisational structures, actor coalitions, networks), politics (partisan politics, electoral politics, interest formation, aggregation, representation and intermediation, patterns of contestation, public opinion) and polity (state-society relations, state traditions, executive-legislature relations, administrative structures, judicial structures, intergovernmental relations). As a growth industry during the past decade, the research programme shows signs of maturity in its analytical rigour when specifying causal mechanisms of domestic change and accumulation of a wealth of empirical data from the current member states of the EU.

Studies (in the form of research projects and scholarly outputs) on the EU's domestic impact in Turkey have proliferated especially since the decision of the Helsinki European Council in December 1999 to admit Turkey as a candidate country to join the EU. Inspired, in part, by research conducted in member states and the newly acceding countries in the early 2000s, these studies have, in principle, aimed to identify the EU's role in processes of domestic change. There are at least two factors that may explain the proliferation of studies of Europeanisation focusing on Turkey. First, Europeanisation as a research programme has the potential of capturing the imagination of social scientists working on Turkey mainly in the fields of international relations, political science, public administration, European studies, urban and regional studies, political economy as they saw it as a vibrant and fashionable research programme addressing the nature and scope of the changes at the domestic level. Thus they used it as a springboard to pitch their views on domestic compliance (in terms of adoption and implementation of EU models or rules) and institutional inertia, credibility of EU commitments and firmness of the EU as a potential anchor, and questions of EU conditionality as they apply to the case of Turkey. Second, such

a research programme also potentially allows for studying the differentiated impact of the EU on domestic change in (groups of) cases whose relationship with the EU differs according to their actual or potential timing of accession ('old' member states versus 'new' member states) and non members ('pre-accession' or 'candidate' countries and 'potential candidates'). The body of literature, in time, gave way to analytical extensions of the theoretical models to the study of transformative impact of the EU even when EU membership was not on the immediate horizon – which would fit the case of Turkey.

Through the proliferation of such studies as such we have amassed a critical mass of research on Turkey which calls for a systematic review. Thus, this article aims to contribute to the ongoing debate on the transformative role of the EU in domestic change by reviewing studies focusing on the Europeanisation of domestic policies, politics and polity in Turkey. At the same time, a survey conducted in the early 2000s on European integration studies in Turkey concluded that political science in general and European studies in particular are relatively new fields of study in Turkey and that research in these fields has a tendency to be normative and legalistic rather than empirical (Müftüler-Bac, 2003). This article also aims to test the proposition that research in an emerging sub-field of Europeanisation of Turkey can be the launch pad of less normative and more empirical and comparative case-study research on Turkey. In terms of the focus of our review, while there may exist alternative ways of conducting such exercise, we propose to concentrate on the substantive coverage, conceptualisation of Europeanisation with attendant mechanisms, type of research design, dominant research method, existence of causal inference, and generalisability of research findings. In addition to

commenting on the substantive scope and mechanisms of Europeanisation therein, therefore, the main focus of this article can be summarised by the following questions: does the research on the Europeanisation of Turkey provide evidence of awareness of debates on research design and methodology, and if so what are the design and methodological choices of scholars working in this area? Is there any contribution that research on the Europeanisation of Turkey can make to the wider Turkish political science research?

Up until now there has not been a survey of research on Europeanisation in Turkey with the exception of Müftüler-Bac's (2003) review of European integration studies as anchored within the discipline of political science. Overall, there has not been a systematic examination of a sample of the literature based on a discussion of not only substantive findings but of research design and methods. This is what this article intends to accomplish. In order to do so, the first section presents the procedure we have followed in constructing a sample of the literature we have analysed. The second section presents a brief discussion of a set of benchmarks and criteria employed in evaluating social science research. The third section presents our findings of our evaluation of the sample of the literature with respect to the benchmarks and criteria discussed in the second section. The fourth section concludes with a proposal to advance causal and comparative research based on analyses of empirical data in addition to the existing studies.

CONSTRUCTING A SAMPLE FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Our aim was to review that part of the literature on Europeanisation of Turkey which was addressing an international audience and which appeared in

'Is there any contribution that research on the Europeanisation of Turkey can make to the wider Turkish political science research?'

peer-reviewed and influential journals. We relied on the *Social Sciences Citation Index* (SSCI) which compiles 2,474 'of the world's leading social sciences journals across 50 disciplines' (publisher's website) as the sampling frame. We are aware that a sampling frame as such is somewhat limited and the entire population of studies on Europeanisation and Turkey is much more varied. However, we suspect that even if we had the chance of reviewing a larger sample (or perhaps even the entire population) of studies our conclusions would not be different. The sample we have selected is rather representative of the entire population of studies on Europeanisation and Turkey with respect to the benchmarks and criteria we propose below for systematic reviewing. Eventually, it will be desirable to confirm this representativeness with further sampling from beyond the universe of SSCHI-indexed journals. However, we believe this is a good place to start as it constitutes an examination of published work on Turkey and Europeanisation meeting internationally accepted standards of good research.

In the SSCI, we conducted a keyword ('topic') search in October 2009 by entering the keywords 'Europeanisation AND Turkey', which yielded a total of 16 articles. Of these, five items were disregarded. One of these articles was written in German concerning interlingual adaptation of lexicon into aspects of Europeanisation of Turkey in the Turkish vocabulary and the other four which were written in Norwegian in the early 1990s

were part of a symposium on Turkish foreign policy. Therefore the size of the sample to be systematically reviewed was limited to eleven (see Table 1).

A cursory analysis of Table 1 shows that, with the exception of one, all of the articles were published very recently starting from 2008. In terms of the substantive focus, Table 1 shows the diversity of substantive domains studied by the sample of the literature analysed. Masked by this diversity is the clustered convergence of domains around policy (Unalan, 2009; Onis and Yilmaz, 2009; Grigoriadis, 2008; Oguzlu, 2008; Ulusoy, 2008), politics (Unalan and Cowell, 2009; Eralp, 2009; Samur, 2009; Tocci, 2008) and polity (Celenk, 2009; Dulupcu, 2005). The majority of units in the sample literature, therefore, focus on policy as the domain of Europeanisation followed by politics. Whereas foreign policy is the most studied policy domain (Onis and Yilmaz, 2009; Oguzlu, 2008; Ulusoy, 2008), democracy and the human rights regime is the most studied politics domain (Eralp, 2009; Samur, 2009; Tocci, 2008) in the sample literature.¹

However, as will be elaborated below, it has to be noted that a majority of these units do not apply the Europeanisation research programme to the Turkish case as these research pieces are using the term 'Europeanisation' as a concept or reference point without specifying which EU laws, instruments or actions as (potentially) prompting domestic change. Those units in the sample literature that do follow the Europeanisation research programme identify (in some cases implicitly) a diverse set of factors which are considered to play a role in Europeanisation mediating the EU impact that leads to differential domestic outcomes. Factors explicitly identified as playing a role in Europeanisation in the units of the sample include domestic factors and the nature of the contractual relationship with the EU, in particular its value,

credibility and political management (Tocci, 2008). Domestic factors, in turn, include interactions between actors and institutions (Unalan, 2009), preferences, discourses and discursive justifications of actions (Unalan, 2009; Celenk, 2009), historical and political context, centralised nature of the bureaucracy, its politicised nature (Celenk, 2009; Unalan and Cowell, 2009), and limited capacity of civil society and political dominance of economic development objectives (Unalan and Cowell, 2009). Factors that are implicitly assumed to play a role in Europeanisation in the sample literature include democratisation (Samur, 2009; Ulusoy, 2008), increased security (Samur, 2009) and pre-existing domestic structures (Grigoriadis, 2008). Among those units which do not apply the Europeanisation research programme, two of them nevertheless specify explanatory factors – temporality (Eralp, 2009) and global restructuring, EU accession, populism, statism and centralism (Dulupcu, 2005) – for their particular outcome of interest, that is, Turkey-EU relations (Eralp, 2009) and regional development (Dulupcu, 2005).

BENCHMARKS AND CRITERIA FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS OF A SCHOLARLY LITERATURE

We have conducted a systematic review of a sample of the literature which is carried out on the basis of certain benchmarks and criteria for evaluation we are proposing below. The main benchmarks and criteria identified fall into five categories, which are derived both from debates concerning the wider Europeanisation research programme (Exadaktylos and Radaelli, 2009) and from causal comparative (case-study) analysis (Gerring, 2007; George and Bennett, 2005). These include substantive issues

Table 1: Articles on Europeanisation and Turkey in SSCI

Author	Journal	Year	Substantive focus	Main factors for Europeanisation
Unalan, D.	<i>Policy and Politics</i>	2009	Environmental policy	Interactions between actors and institutions, discourses and discursive justifications of actions
Unalan, D. and Cowell, R.	<i>Environmental Impact Assessment Review</i>	2009	Environmental governance	Centralised nature of the bureaucracy, its politicised nature, limited capacity of civil society and environmental organisations and political dominance of economic development objectives
Eralp, A.	<i>New Perspectives on Turkey</i>	2009	Political reforms	Temporality
Celenk, A.	<i>Mediterranean Politics</i>	2009	Administrative reform	Historical and political context, actor preferences, discourse
Onis , Z. and Yilmaz, S.	<i>Turkish Studies</i>	2009	Foreign policy	n.a.
Samur, H.	<i>Turkish Studies</i>	2009	Return migration	Democratisation and increased security (implicit)
Tocci, N.	<i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i>	2008	Conflict resolution	Value, credibility and political management of contractual relationship with the EU
Grigoriadis, I.N.	<i>Mediterranean Politics</i>	2008	Minority rights	Pre-existing domestic structures (implicit)
Oguzlu, T.	<i>Turkish Studies</i>	2008	Foreign policy	n.a.
Ulusoy, K.	<i>Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans</i>	2008	Foreign policy (Cyprus issue)	Democratisation (implicit)
Dulupcu, M. A.	<i>European Urban and Regional Studies</i>	2005	Regionalisation	Global restructuring, EU accession, populism, statism and centralism

(factors and mechanisms that play a role in processes of Europeanisation), the main goal of research (whether they aim at testing or generating hypotheses), broader research design issues (whether studies adopt a top-down or a bottom-up approach and whether they are designed to allow for extrapolating to other cases) and research methods issues (whether the articles rely on analytical or empirical methods; if the latter is adopted, whether they use qualitative or quantitative data). Let us turn to a discussion of these categories.

TOP-DOWN VERSUS BOTTOM-UP RESEARCH DESIGN

Early Europeanisation research followed a top-down approach to research design, which treated EU policy/politics as the independent variable and tracked down its impact at the domestic level of member states and candidate countries, that is, searched for 'effects of causes' (Exadaktylos and Radaelli, 2009: 512). Based on the 'adaptational pressure' and 'goodness of fit' arguments, in this analysis pressure emanating from EU policy/politics is mediated by intervening/mediating variables in the form of domestic factors and leads to domestic change or lack of it (Cowles *et al*, 2001; Börzel and Risse, 2003; Lippert *et al*, 2001). Research bias associated with top-down research designs, which tend to find the EU as the cause of domestic change, led to new studies adopting a bottom-up research design whereby analysis starts at the domestic level of outcomes and investigates the possible causes of observed domestic change, that is, search for 'causes of effects' (Exadaktylos and Radaelli, 2009: 512). Top-down research designs, therefore, reflect a preference for discussing outcomes, that is, whether the country analysed has been Europeanised or not in a particular domain of interest. As such, top-down research

designs tend to attribute observed outcomes to the effect of the EU and tend not to engage in a systematic search for identifying cause(s) of domestic change, which may or may not involve the EU or other international factors such as globalisation or international organisations.

MECHANISMS

After having explored a systematic, observed relationship between a cause and a particular outcome, social scientists investigate the nature of the process linking the 'cause' to the 'effect'. Therefore they aim to identify the underlying causal mechanism which would help unpack the relationship between the 'independent' and 'dependent' variables. The mechanisms are 'unobserved analytical constructs which, through invoking causal agents, make a relationship intelligible by accentuating some aspects of a process and omitting others' (Heritier, 2008: 70). The ways in which the EU plays a (causal) role in domestic change (i.e. how the EU relates to the observed outcome in the domestic context) have not been fully developed in Europeanisation research. The most cited Europeanisation mechanisms were developed by Knill and Lehmkuhl in the form of positive, negative and framing integration, which befit a top-down research design (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 1999, 2002). Knill and Lehmkuhl's mechanisms are based on the new-institutionalist theory and involve: (1) institutional compliance by force (through legal force of EU policy/politics), (2) changing opportunity structures and instrumental rationality on the part of actors, and (3) socialisation or social learning. Börzel and Risse (2009) have expanded on these vertical mechanisms assuming a hierarchical relationship with the EU by introducing horizontal mechanisms of diffusion of ideas emanating from the EU involving (4) persuasion (communicative rationality),

and (5) emulation in the form of lesson-drawing based on instrumental rationality or mimicry based on normative rationality. The presence of the latter two mechanisms can be detected only if a bottom-up research design is adopted.

HYPOTHESIS GENERATING VERSUS TESTING

Among the goals of social research, two are especially essentially relevant for a systematic review each of which is associated with the two ways of logical reasoning – deduction and induction (Ragin, 1994). Among these, first, studies aiming at hypothesis testing (which rely on deductive thinking) can take two forms: a study relying on *explicit hypothesis testing* would contain a thorough review of the theoretical literature from which clear, testable expectations on the possible relationship between two or more variables (i.e. hypotheses) are derived. These hypotheses are then subjected to systematic empirical testing. Other studies relying on *implicit hypothesis testing* (or proposition evaluation) may engage with the literature in a less comprehensive way and conduct a loose test of the theoretical expectations suggested in the form of propositions that posit a relationship between concepts (Franchino, 2005). Second, studies aiming at hypothesis generation (as conceived through induction) can also take two forms: a study relying on *explicit hypothesis generation* would work from systematic, detailed, in-depth examination of a case and theorises general principles based on the empirical observations collected. It would thus, on the basis of new evidence, develop a new theoretical concept or new relationship or advances understanding beyond the existing ones. Other studies relying on *implicit hypothesis (proposition) generation* may make use of propositions inductively suggesting potential relationships.

'Among these two dominant research methods, analytical research takes descriptive research one step further by seeking to explain the reasons (and sometimes the mechanisms) behind a particular occurrence through identifying causal relationships'.

DOMINANT RESEARCH METHOD AND REASONING

In the social science literature, there exists a (allegedly synthetic) distinction between analytical and empirical research. While empirical studies rely on observations, analytical studies emphasise ideas and concepts each of which makes contributions to research in their own way in any scholarly field. In general, analytical studies develop concepts and ideas in order to build theories whereas empirical studies collect and analyse evidence for testing existing theories. Among these two dominant research methods, analytical research takes descriptive research one step further by seeking to explain the reasons (and sometimes the mechanisms) behind a particular occurrence through identifying causal relationships. The goal is to offer an analytical account based on careful examination of detailed components of the object of study by relying on secondary sources (often in the form of existing research) as evidence rather than empirical data collected from primary sources. Empirical research, however, is based on objective observation of social phenomena. There remain two traditional

approaches to empirical research: qualitative and quantitative. While 'quantitative methods seek to show differences in number between certain objects of analysis', 'qualitative methods seek to show differences in kind'. In terms of data collection, qualitative methods rely on a range of techniques including in-depth individual and focus group interviews, qualitative field research (participant observation), and comparative-historical research. Qualitative data analysis involves indentifying and understanding 'the attributes, characteristics and traits of the objects of inquiry'. Quantitative methods rely on data obtained through surveys (at the individual level) and existing statistics (generally at the aggregate level). Data analysis focuses on distributions these data exhibit and the relationships that can be established between numeric variables using simple and advanced statistical methods' (Landman, 2008).

CONCERN FOR EXTERNAL VALIDITY

Knowledge of general patterns is generally preferred to that of specific cases as 'understanding a single situation thoroughly might prove pointless if it does not offer generalizable knowledge' (Ragin, 1994: 34). Knowledge of general patterns is best achieved through examining many comparable cases with the hope that 'if a broad pattern holds across many cases, then it may reflect the operation of an underlying cause which can be inferred from the broad pattern' (Ragin, 1994: 35). Thus external validity presupposes that the relationships used in a given piece of research 'apply not only to the cases under review but to all similar cases that satisfy the conditions set out in the research question and related research design' (Pennings *et al*, 2006: 7). Europeanisation research on Turkey, as well as the Turkish political studies

literature, almost invariably adopts individual case analysis. If research on the Europeanisation of Turkey does not lend itself readily to 'strict comparison or to orderly cumulation', then it means that while such research may be instructive for its own sake, it is weak with respect to external validity and hence cannot lead to theory development (George and Bennett, 2005: 68). Concern for external validity requires that the researcher (1) identifies at the outset general research questions derived from Europeanisation literature, (2) establishes which aspects of the Turkish case is to be focused for analysis, and (3) establishes what those aspects of the Turkish case are an instance of, so that a basis for systematic comparison exists.

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON EUROPEANISATION AND TURKEY

This section presents the findings of the systematic review of the literature on Europeanisation and Turkey with respect to the benchmarks and criteria we have proposed for analysing the literature in the preceding section (see Table 2). It should be noted that our review is not intended to evaluate the overall quality (e.g. with respect the internal validity aspects) of the sample units nor does it attempt to pass judgment on their scientific rigour.

TOP-DOWN VERSUS BOTTOM-UP RESEARCH DESIGN

In terms of the research design adopted, the sample of the literature analysed may be classified into two categories: those that have adopted a top-down research design approach and those for which such a classification is not applicable. In the latter category are those which do not

Table 2: Articles classified according to benchmarks and criteria for systematic review

	Top-down versus bottom-up	Mechanisms	Hypothesis/proposition generating versus testing	Dominant method		Concern for external validity
				Analytical		
				Empirical	Quant.	
Unalan (2009)	Top-down	Obligation-based policy transfer	Implicit testing	✓	—	Medium
Unalan and Cowell (2009)	Top-down	Obligatory compliance with EU conditions, policy-learning cultivated by the EU and Turkish government	Implicit testing	✓	—	High
Eralp (2009)	n.a.	n.a.	Implicit generating	—	—	High
Celenk (2009)	Top-down	Social learning	Implicit testing	✓	—	Medium
Onis and Yilmaz (2009)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	—	✓	Low
Samur (2009)	Top-down	Compliance with EU conditionality	Implicit testing	✓	—	Low
Tocci (2008)	Top-down	Conditionality, social learning, passive enforcement or experimental learning	Explicit hypothesis generating	✓	—	High
Grigoriadis (2008)	Top-down	Rationalist and constructivist reasoning	Implicit testing	✓	—	High
Oguzlu (2008)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	—	✓	Low
Ulusoy (2008)	Top-down	Compliance with EU conditionality (implicit)	n.a.	—	✓	Low
Dulupcu (2005)	n.a.	n.a.	Explicit testing	—	✓	High

apply the Europeanisation research programme. The latter category uses the term Europeanisation as a reference point without specifying the EU laws, instruments or actions prompting domestic change. None of the units in the sample literature, however, employ a bottom-up research design, reflecting a dominant preference for the search for 'effects of causes' rather than a search for 'causes of effects' – a tendency reflective of the Europeanisation research in general (Exadaktylos and Radaelli, 2009). Even though most of the units in the sample literature do not explicitly discuss research designs, those that have adopted a top-down approach start their analysis, some implicitly, at the level of EU conditionality, 'adaptational pressure' or 'goodness of fit', and then track down its impact at the domestic level. Some of the units in the sample literature examine specific aspects of EU conditionality, that is, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (Unalan, 2009; Unalan and Cowell, 2009), administrative reform (Celenk, 2009) and minority rights (Grigoriadis, 2008), which are expected to exert impact at the level of domestic policy, politics or polity. Other units in the sample, however, do not explicitly specify which aspect of EU conditionality in particular they expect to exert impact at the domestic level, preferring instead to make a general reference to EU accession criteria in the political field implying democracy and human rights (Samur, 2009; Ulusoy, 2008). Different from other units in the sample literature employing a top-down approach, Tocci (2008) problematises the nature of the EU accession process, that is, the contractual relationship with the EU, assessing the effectiveness of built-in (dis)incentives in the process through structured focused comparison. Units in the sample literature that do not apply the Europeanisation research programme use the term 'Europeanisation' as explicitly synonymous

with change in the conduct of Turkey's foreign policy (Onis and Yilmaz, 2009; Oguzlu, 2008), with state restructuring in Turkey (Dulupcu, 2005), and implicitly synonymous with Turkey's democratisation (Eralp, 2009).

MECHANISMS

Reflecting the less than fully developed state of Europeanisation mechanisms in Europeanisation research, most of the units in the sample literature that follow the Europeanisation research programme employ one or more of the mechanisms identified by Knill and Lehmkuhl (1999, 2002). Thus, Unalan (2009) and Unalan and Cowell (2009) explicitly identify the mechanisms of obligation-based policy transfer and obligatory compliance with EU conditions respectively, which correspond to the mechanism of 'institutional compliance' (Unalan, 2009; Unalan and Cowell, 2009). Even though they do not specify explicitly, Samur (2009) and Ulusoy (2008) assume, rather than demonstrate, the mechanism of compliance with EU conditionality. As such the authors do not provide a causal account of how the EU leads to domestic change. Celenk (2009) and Grigoriadis (2008) both employ the mechanism of 'social learning'. While Celenk (2009) attributes the lack of domestic change in administrative reform to the absence of the social learning mechanism, for Grigoriadis (2008) it is constructivist reasoning or socialisation that explains domestic change in minority rights in Turkey, the extent of which the author finds to be limited due to the limited diffusion of EU norms. Tocci (2008), on the other hand, identifies potential mechanisms at the outset in the form of conditionality, social learning, passive enforcement or experimental learning and applies them to the two cases to see under which conditions these mechanisms are effective in inducing domestic change. The author finds limited

domestic change in both of her cases, Turkey and Georgia, due to shaky credibility of conditionality and limits of social learning often caused by 'political' management of contractual relations by the EU. The remaining units in the sample literature do not apply the Europeanisation programme and hence do not specify any Europeanisation mechanisms. Instead, they take Europeanisation (assumed as domestic change) as a given outcome and treat it as a factor that plays a role in understanding other outcomes such as the trajectory of the relationship between Turkey and the EU (Eralp, 2009), a shift in Turkey's foreign policy to a soft Euro-Asianism (Onis and Yilmaz, 2009), Middle Easternisation of Turkey's foreign policy (Oguzlu, 2008) and limited hollowing-out of the state and economic development in Turkey (Dulupcu, 2005). Reflecting the fact that all units in the sample literature that do apply the Europeanisation research programme adopt a top-down research design, no unit in the sample employs horizontal Europeanisation mechanisms as possible explanations of the ways in which the EU may or may not lead to domestic change – mechanisms which could have been captured by a bottom-up research design.

HYPOTHESIS GENERATING VERSUS TESTING

Among the sample under review, it is interesting to observe that all of the units appear to rely on relationships that are formulated as propositions (constituted of concepts) rather than explicit hypotheses (composed of operationalisable variables). There is one exception to this rule (Tocci, 2008). Therefore the discussion below conceives these works in terms of their engagement in formulating and evaluating propositions rather than hypotheses. There remain four categories of units with respect to whether, and if so, how they entertain (causal) relationships:

'... no unit in the sample employs horizontal Europeanisation mechanisms as possible explanations of the ways in which the EU may or may not lead to domestic change – mechanisms which could have been captured by a bottom-up research design'.

units implicitly evaluating propositions, units implicitly generating propositions, units explicitly generating hypotheses, and others that do not engage with hypotheses/propositions in either an implicit or explicit manner. Among these three categories, a majority of units engage in implicit testing of propositions by assessing the validity of (causal) relationships relying on qualitative data (Unalan, 2009; Unalan and Cowell, 2009; Celenk, 2009; Samur, 2009; Grigoriadis, 2008). While some of these units apply a theory to the case at hand, others assess the validity of a given proposition on a relationship. A second category of units generate propositions by signalling the centrality of a set of variables (i.e. temporality and interaction) in explaining the trajectory of the relationship between EU and Turkey in a more exploratory way which can be tested in later research (Eralp, 2009). A third category of units engage in explicit hypothesis generation: Tocci (2008) posits a relationship between explicitly stated variables. Although not formally specified in her article, the hypothesis takes the form of 'the nature of the contractual relationship (in terms of value, credibility and political management) of a country with the EU is likely to determine EU's effectiveness in conflict resolution'. A fourth category of units

which predominantly rely on analytical research engage in neither testing nor generation of hypotheses (Onis and Yilmaz, 2009; Oguzlu, 2008; Ulusoy, 2008). These units may, however, be used as exploratory studies in a subsequent wave of research, be it on Europeanisation or on other areas. Units that rely on weaker tests may be improved for them to engage with the literature in a more systematic way, deriving from the literature testable hypotheses and use the case of Turkey to test the empirical validity of theoretical expectations and analytical claims. One reason why units in the sample on Europeanisation of Turkey do not frequently engage in strong hypothesis testing may be the relative weakness of the existing research on cases which countries like Turkey may be examples of (e.g. candidate countries, potential candidates, etc.) in terms of accumulated data and mature theories of Europeanisation as it applies to these cases.

DOMINANT RESEARCH METHOD AND REASONING

The selected sample is rather diverse in terms of the methods that its constitutive units employ in building an argument and reaching respective conclusions. There remain two types of research – those based on empirical data and others relying on analytical mechanisms. First, in the category that is largely empirical, based mainly on making observations and then presenting them in an orderly pattern consistent with an argument, in terms of the methods employed, the sample predominantly consists of studies relying on qualitative data. Most frequent qualitative techniques used include semi-structured, in-depth, qualitative interviews with EU institutions, officials working with international public institutions (e.g. OSCE), government officials, policy practitioners, policy-makers, experts,

advisors, lawyers, civil society actors, and ordinary subjects (such as 'returning migrants') (Unalan, 2009; Unalan and Cowell, 2009; Celenk, 2009; Samur, 2009; Tocci, 2008), and analysis of primary and secondary data such as government official documents (such as development plans), pieces of legislation (including draft bills), EU documents (such as reports, decisions, directives, progress reports, accession partnership documents), documents published by other international public organisations (such as OECD and UN), and print media which are traditional sources of data in comparative-historical analyses (Unalan and Cowell, 2009; Unalan, 2009; Celenk, 2009; Tocci, 2008; Grigoriadis, 2008; Dulupcu, 2005; Onis and Yilmaz, 2009; Samur, 2009). With respect to the qualitative interviews, while the level of reliance on these data collection methods vary from one study to another in the sample, it is striking that most of the units do not seem to exploit the full potential of data that may be produced by these methods. Rich and variegated data produced from in-depth interviews should, in principle, be helping authors substantiate their arguments most effectively. The sub-optimal use of this otherwise very effective method, however, may be understandable given space constraints in short articles which seem to be limited to 6,000–8,000 words. In terms of other types of empirical studies relying on quantitative methods, interestingly, to date, the sample does not include studies on Europeanisation and Turkey relying on quantitative data such as those obtained from individual-level surveys or existing aggregate-level statistics. There is one exception to this which relies on descriptive statistics based on survey data (Samur, 2009). Such general absence may be a direct consequence of the nature of the field as variables that may be identified in processes of Europeanisation may not be easily amenable

to quantification and such pattern may be generic to Europeanisation research in general. In the second category, units are based mostly on analytical research relying on ideas and concepts that see Europeanisation strictly as a concept or a reference point as discussed above rather than a research programme. These descriptive/analytical or exploratory works aims to enhance our substantive knowledge about what types of change take place in Turkey. Studies as such are in this way valuable in and of themselves, as Franchino (2005) also suggests in relation to non-empirical studies. At the same time, in the debates on research methods and reasoning in a given discipline, there exists a common view that as a body of literature matures, analytical studies aiming at theory building would subsequently give their way to empirical research geared towards theory testing.

CONCERN FOR EXTERNAL VALIDITY

In terms of degrees of concern for external validity, the sample of the literature analysed may be classified into three categories along a scale of high, medium and low concern for external validity. With respect to the Europeanisation research programme, three units display a *high* concern for external validity though for different reasons (Unalan and Cowell, 2009; Tocci, 2008; Grigoriadis, 2008). Of these three, two units (Tocci, 2008; Grigoriadis, 2008) use a comparative approach by means of which they compare the case of Turkey with other cases, and draw conclusions on how the comparison may have implications for other countries either directly (Tocci, 2008) or indirectly (Grigoriadis, 2008). Tocci's research on the comparison of the EU's role between Turkey's Kurdish question and Georgia's conflict with Abkhazia and South Ossetia points to the EU's role in other conflicts depending on the nature of

their contractual relationship (in terms of value, credibility and political management) with the EU (Tocci, 2008). Grigoriadis (2008) compares domestic change in Greece and Turkey in the field of minority rights to show the differentiated role of membership and candidate status on domestic reform processes, from which implications can be drawn for other member states and candidate countries. Unalan and Cowell's (2009) case-study of Turkey displays a *high* concern for external validity, albeit indirectly, by identifying the conditions which constrain and facilitate the adoption and implementation of the EU's Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive in Turkey, which in turn has implications for the conditions under which it can be adopted in other countries. With respect to the Europeanisation research programme, two units (Unalan, 2009; Celenk, 2009) in the sample exhibit a *medium* degree of concern for external validity. These two units are more concerned with showing that the theoretical framework they have developed actually explains the outcome of their interest. Thus, the process of obligation-based policy transfer in the EU context involving discourses and discursive justifications of actions explains the limited degree of domestic change in terms of adopting the SEA (Unalan, 2009) and the absence of social learning due to historical and political context, actor preferences, and discourse explains the absence of domestic change in terms of administrative reform (Celenk, 2009). With respect to the Europeanisation research programme, two units (Samur, 2009; Ulusoy, 2008) in the sample exhibit a *low* degree of concern for external validity. These two units are less concerned with identification of case selection criteria, which would have pointed to other cases to which their conclusions could be generalisable. Instead, these two units are more concerned with demonstrating substantive

knowledge of their cases – reasons for return migration (Samur, 2009) and the Cyprus issue (Ulusoy, 2008). With respect to the units in the sample that do not apply the Europeanisation research programme, two of them (Eralp, 2009; Dulupcu, 2005) display a *high* degree of concern for external validity. Eralp's (2009) analysis of the relationship between temporality and interaction can be applied to other candidate or non-candidate countries to explain the trajectory of the relationship between the country of interest and the EU. Dulupcu's (2005) analysis of a developing country, that is, Turkey, to criticise the 'new regionalism', a theoretical framework based on the observance of developed countries, can be easily generalised to other developing countries. Two other units in the sample that do not apply the Europeanisation research programme display a *low* degree of concern for external validity to the extent that they are more concerned with substantive knowledge of their subject of inquiry, that is, shift to a soft Euro-Asianism in Turkey's foreign policy (Onis and Yilmaz, 2009) and Middle Easternisation of Turkey's foreign policy (Oguzlu, 2008), rather than using a theoretical framework and specifying which aspects of theory their subject of inquiry is a case of.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we have examined a sample of the literature on the transformative impact of the EU on Turkey through the lens of what has come to be referred to as the 'Europeanisation research programme'. Our aim was to test the proposition of whether research in this emerging sub-field of Europeanisation can be the launch pad for a less normative and more empirical and comparative case-study research on Turkey. In doing so we sought to address two

issues: does the research on the Europeanisation of Turkey provide evidence of awareness of debates on research design and methodology, and if so what are the design and methodological choices of scholars working in this area? Is there any contribution that research on the Europeanisation of Turkey can make to the wider Turkish political science research?

Our evaluation based on a systematic examination of a sample of the literature with respect to the benchmarks and criteria employed points to the following conclusions: first, all of the units in the sample that follow the Europeanisation research programme adopt a top-down research design approach, although they do not explicitly discuss this choice leaving the reader to infer such choice. There may be two reasons for the adoption of the top-down approach: first, accession process involves asymmetry of power whereby the candidate country has to unilaterally adopt the EU *acquis communautaire* without negotiating the substance of the latter. The nature of this process leads to the expectation that any domestic change observed is attributable to the EU. Additionally, in wider Europeanisation research top-down research design is still the most dominant approach (see Exadaktylos and Radaelli, 2009) despite calls for a bottom-up research design, which reflects a preference for the search for 'causes of effects'. The second conclusion is that in parallel with the prevalence of top-down research design approaches, all of the mechanisms employed in the units of the sample (that adopt the Europeanisation research programme) examining the process of Europeanisation assume a hierarchical or vertical relationship with the EU and thus the choice set of these mechanisms are too limited for understanding domestic change. However, for most of the units, following the Europeanisation research programme appears to facilitate

a mechanisms-oriented analysis. Third, all of the units seem to rely on relationships presented in the form of propositions rather than explicit hypotheses. Therefore scholars have been more successful at conceptualisation than operationalisation turning the concepts involved into measurable variables. Such methodological choices, in our view, would not contribute to the maturation of the literature on Europeanisation of Turkey. Fourth, with respect to the dominant research method employed, the foregoing discussion suggests that following the Europeanisation research programme has the potential of spawning more empirically based research. This would contribute to the 'normalisation' of the literature on EU's transformative effect on Turkey. Finally, there is a mixed picture in terms of whether following the Europeanisation research programme results in higher degrees of externally valid studies. Although there is no clear pattern in this respect, a majority of the studies following this research programme display high or medium degrees of external validity and thus producing findings potentially allowing for making comparisons. Our findings point to the conclusion

'... in wider Europeanisation research top-down research design is still the most dominant approach (...) despite calls for a bottom-up research design, which reflects a preference for the search for "causes of effects"'.

that these studies would contribute to a more empirically based comparative research to the extent that they are successfully applying the research design and methods used in the Europeanisation research programme.

Acknowledgements

The authors would also like to thank Ian Bache and Natalie Tocci for their insightful comments on an earlier version of this article.

Note

1 Eralp (2009) does not explicitly use the terms of democracy and human rights. Instead, the author prefers to use the term political reform without specifying its content. Therefore, we take the author's usage of political reform as alluding to democracy and human rights, an interpretation in line with Copenhagen criteria and progress reports prepared by the European Commission.

References

- Börzel, T. and Risse, T. (2003) 'Conceptualising the Domestic Impact of Europe', in K. Featherstone and C.M. Radaelli (eds.) *The Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 57–80.
- Börzel, T. and Risse, T. (2009) 'The transformative power of Europe: The European Union and the diffusion of ideas', *Working Paper KFG The Transformative Power of Europe*, Nr. 1. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.
- Celenk, A.A. (2009) 'Europeanisation and administrative reform: the case of Turkey', *Mediterranean Politics* 14(1): 41–60.
- Cowles, M.G., Caporaso, J. and Risse, T. (eds.) (2001) *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dulupcu, M.A. (2005) 'Regionalization for Turkey. An illusion or a cure?' *European Urban and Regional Studies* 12(2): 99–115.

- Eralp, A. (2009) 'The role of temporality and interaction in the Turkey-EU relationship', *New Perspectives on Turkey* 40: 149–170.
- Exadaktylos, T. and Radaelli, C.M. (2009) 'Research design in European studies: the case of Europeanisation', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 47(3): 507–530.
- Featherstone, K. (2003) 'Introduction: In the Name of "Europe"', in K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli (eds.) *Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–26.
- Franchino, F. (2005) 'The study of EU public policy: results of a survey', *European Union Politics* 6(2): 243–252.
- George, L.A. and Bennett, A. (2005) *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gerring, J. (2007) *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grigoriadis, I.N. (2008) 'On the Europeanisation of minority rights protection: comparing the cases of Greece and Turkey', *Mediterranean Politics* 13(1): 23–41.
- Heritier, A. (2008) 'Causal Explanation, in Approaches in the Social Sciences', in D. Della Porta and M. Keating (eds.) *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 61–79.
- Knill, C. and Lehmkuhl, D. (1999) 'How Europe matters: different mechanisms of Europeanisation', *European Integration Online Papers (EIoP)* 3(7): 1–19.
- Knill, C. and Lehmkuhl, D. (2002) 'The national impact of European Union regulatory policy: three Europeanisation mechanisms', *European Journal of Political Research* 41(2): 255–280.
- Landman, T. (2008) *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics*, New York: Routledge.
- Lenschow, A. (2005) 'Europeanisation', in J. Richardson (ed.) *European Union: Power and Policy-making*, 3rd edn, London, UK: Routledge, pp. 55–71.
- Lippert, B., Umbach, G. and Wessels, W. (2001) 'Europeanisation of CEE executives: EU membership negotiations as a shaping power', *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(6): 980–1012.
- Müftüler-Bac, M. (2003) 'Turkish political science and European integration', *Journal of European Public Policy* 10(4): 662–673.
- Oguzlu, T. (2008) 'Middle Easternization of Turkey's foreign policy: does Turkey dissociate from the West?', *Turkish Studies* 9(1): 3–20.
- Onis, Z. and Yilmaz, S. (2009) 'Between Europeanisation and Euro-Asianism: foreign policy activism in Turkey during the AKP era', *Turkish Studies* 10(1): 7–24.
- Pennings, P., Keman, H. and Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2006) *Doing Research in Political Science: An Introduction to Comparative Methods and Statistics*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Radaelli, C. (2003) 'The Europeanisation of Public Policy', in K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli (eds.) *Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 27–56.
- Ragin, C. (1994) *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Samur, H. (2009) 'Turkey's Europeanisation process and the return of the Syrians', *Turkish Studies* 10(3): 327–340.
- Tocci, N. (2008) 'The EU and conflict resolution in Turkey and Georgia: hindering EU potential through the political management of contractual relations', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46(4): 875–897.
- Ulusoy, K. (2008) 'The Europeanisation of Turkey and its impact on the Cyprus problem', *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 10(3): 309–329.
- Unalan, D. (2009) 'An analytical framework for policy transfer in the EU context', *Policy and Politics* 37(3): 439–452.
- Unalan, D. and Cowell, R. (2009) 'Adoption of the EU SEA directive in Turkey', *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 29: 243–251.

About the Authors

H. Tolga Bolukbasi is Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science, Bilkent University, Turkey. His research interests include Europeanisation of economic governance, labour markets and welfare states. Recent publications include *Euros and European Welfare States*, Toronto University Press (forthcoming) and 'On consensus, constraint and choice: economic and monetary integration and Europe's welfare states', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2009.

Ebru Ertugal is Assistant Professor in the Department of International Relations and the EU, Izmir University of Economics, Turkey. Her research interests include Europeanisation of regional policy and transformation of regional governance. Recent publications include 'Europeanization and multi-level governance in Turkey', *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 2010 (forthcoming).

Saima Ozcurumez is Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science, Bilkent University, Turkey. Her research interests include politics of immigration and asylum, gender and migration, health and diversity. Recent publications include 'Immigrant associations in Canada: included, accommodates or excluded?', *Turkish Studies*, 2009 and *Of States, Rights and Social Closure: Governing Migration and Citizenship* (co-edited with Oliver Schmidtke), Palgrave, 2008.