

NINE

Europeanisation of policy-making in Turkey and its limits¹

Tolga H. Bölükbaşı, Ebru Ertugal and Saime Özçürümez

Introduction

Domestic policy-making processes are exposed to external influences and/or pressures in a world of increasing globalisation. One extreme form of influence and/or pressure stems from Turkey's process of accession to the European Union (EU). As the long(est) standing candidate for EU accession for more than half a century, Turkey was declared a formal candidate for accession with the Helsinki European Council of 1999. While the impact of the EU has been a continuous feature of domestic policy-making, the EU's influence peaked especially in the early 2000s. As this collective volume shows, given the legacy of the 'heavy' state tradition characterising Southern Europe, including Turkey (Diamondourous et al, 2006, p 5), the development of systematic evidence-based policy analysis and evaluation in policy-making remains at an early stage.

In the absence of feedback mechanisms as such, policy cycles have been typically deprived of systematic policy learning, understood as 'updating beliefs about key components of policy' (Radaelli, 2009, pp 1146-7). Moreover, due, in part, to these institutional features, public policy-making has not fostered home-grown policy ideas. A characteristic of developing countries, this feature of the policy process has exposed Turkey to international influences and pressures stemming from international actors. Although it is difficult to empirically disentangle the relative roles of international organisations and the EU, this chapter aims to show the variegated role of the EU in changing Turkey's domestic policy-making and governance. While it is difficult to dissect the policy process into policy-making (constituted of processes of agenda-setting, policy formulation and decision-making) and implementation, we aim to focus on the former, delimiting our study to analysing changes in policy outputs. Since our aim is not to study implementation processes, changes in policy outcomes reflected in behavioural changes (and their impact) remain largely outside the remit of this chapter.

As widely argued in the public policy literature, policy change should be measured on the basis of policy outputs rather than policy outcomes (Bauer and Knill, 2014, p 32). This is because policy outcomes are affected by a number of intervening and extraneous factors and are, at best, only indirectly related to the causal influence of the EU. This chapter draws on empirical evidence on policy-

making processes and policy outputs in three key policy areas: macroeconomic policies, regional development policies and immigration and asylum policies.

The chapter addresses two research questions: How much change has there been in the macroeconomic, regional development and immigration policies and governance in Turkey during the 2000s? And to what extent do these changes represent instances of Europeanisation, whereby the EU constitutes the ‘prime focus of change’ (Featherstone and Kazamias, 2000, p 3) in interaction with, or as opposed to, other key international actors? In addressing the first question, this chapter traces significant changes in the principles, objectives, procedures and instruments of these key policy sectors following the ‘policy structure approach’.² It also shows that these changes resulted in stronger government policy commitment in these sectors measured through increased ‘policy intensity’ and ‘policy density’.³ All of these changes led to an ever-larger ‘policy capacity’ in the Turkish state.⁴ In addressing the second question, the chapter concludes that while it is difficult to disentangle the exclusive, net causal impact of the EU on domestic policies, the ‘transformative power’ of the EU in shaping policy structures, expanding both the density and intensity of these policies and enhancing the policy capacity, is overwhelmingly large in Turkey.⁵

Empirical evidence in each policy sector is collected through comparative historical case study methods that involve a review of programming and legislative documents, and semi-structured qualitative interviews as well as a survey of print media. The interviews, which were conducted between 2009 and 2013, included key policy-makers in the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey (CBRT), Undersecretariat of Treasury, Ministry of Development (formerly, the State Planning Organization, SPO), Ministry for EU Affairs, State Ministry for Economic Affairs, Ministry of Interior, Development Agencies in different regions, representatives of big business (TUSIAD), and officials from the EU Delegation to Turkey, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), International Monetary Fund (IMF), The World Bank, United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and International Organization for Migration (IOM).

The chapter is structured as follows. We first unpack the changes in the policy structure in macroeconomic, regional development and immigration policies by analytically dissecting the sector in terms of the dominant principles, objectives, procedures and instruments. Second, we explore the extent to which these changes can be attributed to the transformative power of the EU in each policy sector. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the main findings in all three policy sectors.

Unpacking changes in macroeconomic policies and governance

Changing macroeconomic regime from the 1990s to the 2000s

Macroeconomic policy-making and governance had already gone through changes starting with a new economic programme introduced in 1980 after the economic crises of the late 1970s. The new regime aimed at building an outward-oriented economy based on free market principles. While single-party governments implemented tighter macroeconomic policies during the 1980s, the 1990s saw populist cycles of easy macroeconomic policies with the return of coalition governments. The policy regime was still characterised by fiscal dominance. Under the Treasury's dominance, the CBRT was largely accommodating successive governments' expansionary fiscal policies (Bakır, 2007, p 26). The economic crisis hitting in 1994 led to an amendment in the CBRT's law, bringing upper limits on advances to the Treasury. The restructured Treasury emerged as the main centralised executive arm of the government, and the 1990s saw initiatives towards securing fiscal consolidation through World Bank projects. Excessive borrowing, however, continued, and by the end of the 1990s, even analysing, let alone controlling, public finances became virtually impossible. It was in this context that technocratic preparations had already started through World Bank projects. A Special Expert Commission was convened to draw up a background report as part of preparations for the 8th Development Plan. Although the Commission had completed its roadmap for overhauling fiscal institutions in 2000 before the crisis hit, no legislative reform had been passed. It was the economic crisis in 2001 that proved, in the words of key policy-makers, an 'inflection point', leading to a 'new policy regime', 'a cultural change' or 'a revolution' in macroeconomic policy and governance. The government immediately enlisted the help of Dr Kemal Dervis, then Vice President of The World Bank. Dr Dervis designed the 'Strengthening the Turkish Economy' Programme (STEP), a comprehensive package foreseeing the legal and institutional reorganisation of macroeconomic as well as microeconomic policies and governance. Items in the package were urgently passed by Parliament.

As part of STEP, in monetary policy, the CBRT became politically independent (Law no 4651 on the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey, 2001). The new law redefined CBRT's primary objective as price stability, and prohibited the Bank from granting advances and extending credits to the Treasury. In order to bring down chronic inflation, the Bank pursued an implicit inflation-targeting strategy that was then followed by an explicit inflation-targeting regime. In fiscal policy, STEP aimed at achieving fiscal consolidation through hefty primary surpluses. It introduced radical institutional changes aimed at reorganising debt management and rationalising public expenditure (Law no 4749 on Regulating Public Finance and Debt Management, LRPFD, 2002 and Public Financial Management and Control Law, PFMCL, no 5018, 2003).

Changes in the structure of macroeconomic policies

Changing principles: 'stability culture'

Interviews and documents reviewed show that a broad consensus emerged around the main principles of mainstream approaches to macroeconomic theory (new classical macroeconomics and new Keynesianism): (1) a resolute commitment to price stability as the principal objective of macroeconomic policy through an entirely de-politicised (*read*, independent) central bank; (2) installation of monetary dominance by bringing an end to fiscal dominance; and (3) stable finances allowing the CBRT to pursue its primary objective of price stability (Arestis, 2009). In the new fiscal regime, for example, the ubiquity of the concepts of 'fiscal discipline', 'fiscal control' and 'fiscal stability' in the letter of new legislations reveals their spirit. Interviews with high-ranking bureaucrats corroborate the observation that the fundamental principle guiding these reforms was 'stable public finances'. The institutionalisation of the principle of 'stability culture' and its attendant norm of 'sound money' also characterised the monetary policy regime. A review of the legislative process shows that this principle was virtually written into law in Parliament without much debate. Interviews with high-ranking bureaucrats, regular reports of the CBRT and speeches by CBRT governors repeatedly feature 'credibility of policies' and 'reputation of the monetary authority' – all of which are the hallmarks of a previously alien, newly imported 'stability culture'.

Changing objectives: 'balanced budgets' and 'price stability'

In fiscal policy, STEP aims to 'strengthen the balance of public finances in a way that will prevent deterioration in the future', (Treasury, 2001, pp 14, 30) and declares that 'discipline will be applied to public expenditures to achieve maximum savings.' In line with the new objectives as announced by STEP, the LRPFDM aims to maintain the 'confidence and stability of markets and macroeconomic balances' (Article 1). With a view to 'maintaining fiscal discipline', the PFMCL declares that fiscal policies should aim at securing 'macroeconomic stability' (Article 13a). It also states that 'it is essential to ensure revenue and expenditure balance in budgets' (Article 13h). Policy-makers interviewed unanimously expressed that the primary objective of budgetary policies should be 'balanced budgets'. The emphasis on 'balancing the budget' was also very clear in the budget speeches of the Ministers of Finance all throughout the 2000s. In fact, post-crisis governments went even further than maintaining a balance; they aimed to secure sizable primary surpluses. In monetary policy, the new CBRT law re-defined its objective as '[t]he primary objective of the Bank shall be to achieve and maintain price stability.' Minister Dervis declared time and again that with the new law, the Bank would 'pursue price stability without allowing inflation'. As interviews show, all actors 'knew' that the exclusive objective of monetary policy had now become price stability.

Changing procedures: independent Central Bank and the ‘Super Ministry’

In terms of procedures, the monetary policy regime experienced a complete reversal during the early 2000s. With the CBRT gaining independence, the institutional arrangements allowing for fiscal dominance were dismantled. There was a clear change in the fundamental powers of the CBRT: ‘[t]he Bank shall be the ultimate body authorized and responsible to implement the monetary policy’ (Article 4(b)). Additionally, in parallel to European countries where national treasuries were institutionally strengthened in the run-up to Economic and Monetary Union in the 1990s, the Turkish Treasury increasingly gained control in determining the conduct of fiscal policies. This was the case especially after the 2000–01 crises, when Minister Dervis became responsible for the Treasury. Due, in part, to Dr Dervis’ technocratic credentials and his supra-political identity (Bakır, 2009), the Treasury turned into a ‘Super Ministry’, assuming the coordination role of STEP through his ‘institutional entrepreneurship’.⁶ Crowding out the SPO and Ministry of Finance, the Treasury emerged as the centre of gravity. Such reorganisation in policy-making processes, in the words of IMF officials of the time, enhanced the reputation of institutions and the credibility of policies. STEP led to a different mode of coordination between the Treasury and the CBRT. The institutional prerogatives of fiscal dominance had been terminated, and there emerged a need for establishing the transparency and credibility of the institutions vis-à-vis each other. The CBRT’s Law emphasised the centrality of the Bank’s communication policy and envisaged a transparent monetary policy. The institutional arrangements ensuring fiscal transparency were to be put into place for the CBRT to carry out its duties for ensuring price stability. STEP had foreseen that a new public borrowing law be passed by Parliament aiming ‘to bring transparency and accountability to the state’, defining borrowing ‘limits with clarity and transparency’ (Treasury, 2001, p 21). The texts of the LRPFDM and PFMCL ubiquitously reflect the centrality of transparency in the implementation of fiscal policies.

Changing strategic instruments: fiscal rules, multi-annual programming, inflation targeting and the Monetary Policy Committee

Efforts at adopting a rule-based macroeconomic policy regime during the 1990s proved unsuccessful due to wavering political commitment. It was only with the introduction of fiscal rules as strategic instruments implemented under STEP that runaway spending was controlled. The government followed a fiscal rule regime, the ‘backbone’ of which was the IMF-imposed deficit rule alongside expenditure, revenue, debt and borrowing rules (Kaya and Yilar, 2011, p 66). These IMF conditions served as ‘de facto fiscal rules’ (Kraan et al, 2007, p 20). After a decade under IMF programming, however, the government decided not to continue with another IMF programme in 2008. There was an initiative to introduce a law on fiscal rules in 2010, but it was quickly shelved. The government

introduced multi-annual programming instruments with the implementation of the PFMCL in 2006. The Medium-Term Fiscal Plan, drawn in accordance with the Medium-Term Programme, were, thus, new strategic instruments. In the area of monetary policy, the CBRT switched to a new strategic instrument of inflation targeting in 2002 after decades of nominal targeting of monetary aggregates and the exchange rate. In the meantime, the new law had instituted the highly technical core policy-making instrument, the Monetary Policy Committee (MPC), taking the Bank's key monetary policy decisions. With the introduction of the formal inflation-targeting regime, the MPC became the key decision-maker in determining interest rates and identifying (jointly with the government) and announcing the inflation target. All of these instruments helped ensure the implementation of macroeconomic policies in line with the overarching principle of stability culture and the objectives of balanced budgets and price stability.

Transformative role of the EU

The early 2000s saw significant changes in all dimensions of the structure of macroeconomic policies. The extent of change during this period had been extensive – all policy objectives, principles, procedures and instruments saw a series of transformations. These dimensions reflect those in the EU's models, frameworks, structures, policies and instruments. However, it was primarily as a result of IMF officials working in close cooperation with qualified technocrats in the Turkish bureaucracy that these changes were engineered. In this transformation process, Turkey was 'under the double "vincoli esterni" (external constraints) of the IMF and the EU' (Bolukbasi, 2012, p 348), with both actors pointing to the identical direction and content of policy change. As the EU-anchored political reform, it delegated its supervisory role to the IMF. The role of the EU was, in this respect, more indirect. International financial markets began rewarding the government's reform efforts toward EU accession, which resulted in the lowering of borrowing costs and the extension of loan terms. Existing research also shows that rising levels of capital inflows, which were instrumental in ensuing growth in the 2000s, were also made possible by Turkey's accession prospects (Bolukbasi, 2012, p 348). While the declared principles and objectives remained largely intact, the period towards the end of the 2000s had seen some loosening up in the operation of procedures, such as the waning of the CBRT's de facto independence (Gürkaynak et al, 2015), and the shelving of the bill on fiscal rule. The timing of the changes in the policy structure correspond to an increasingly adverse international macroeconomic context and waning of the credibility of the EU anchor itself, due in large part to rising anti-Turkish accession rhetoric in leading member states (Bolukbasi and Ozcurumez, 2011).

Unpacking changes in regional development policies and governance

Regional development policy in flux: from the 1990s to the 2000s

The process that started with the official declaration of Turkey's EU candidacy in 1999 marked a turning point in Turkey's regional development policy. Previously characterised by continuity, Turkey's regional policy started to undergo noticeable changes throughout the 2000s as a response to the accession partnerships and progress reports of the EU, and especially the requirements of the EU's pre-accession financial assistance. EU conditionality and pre-accession financial assistance programmes promoted the removal of the 'exclusive right' of the central state to define the means and goals of regional development, not through formal constitutional changes, but through 'the setting of the rules and principles of the disbursement' of the pre-accession funds (Bruszt, 2008, p 614). Just how much Turkey's regional policy has changed is a matter of debate. However, analysis of change through the policy structure approach can yield fruitful insights. It could be argued that whereas regional policy existed all but in name in the pre-2000 period, it acquired a fully-fledged policy structure in the 2000s.

Changes in the structure of regional development policies

Changing objectives: regional convergence versus regional competitiveness

The officially defined aim of regional policy in Turkey, as in five-year national development plans, until the 2000s was the balancing of interregional differences or reducing regional disparities. In practice, however, this objective always remained secondary to the primary aim of national development. In the 2000s the regional economic competitiveness of every region was added as an objective and even superseded the older one in practice, according to interviews. This shift came first with the Preliminary National Development Plan (PNNDP) (SPO, 2003), formulated at the instigation of the EU, which contained both objectives. Later, the 9th and 10th Development Plans (SPO, 2006; MoD, 2013), as well as the National Strategy of Regional Development (NSRD) (MoD, 2014), emphasised regional competitiveness as the policy objective. The difference between the old and new objectives is that instead of reducing regional disparities through re-distribution by a central authority, the new objective forces regions to self-rely on endogenous potentials, and to exploit the possibilities that are perceived to exist for innovation and flexible specialisation in order to increase regional competitiveness. This reflects the EU's approach, whereby 'competitiveness' gained 'ascendancy over solidarity or equity considerations' (Begg, 2010, p 80), as evidenced in the Lisbonisation of the EU's regional policy.

Changing principles: strategic planning, programming, partnership

Even though regional policy and planning were the responsibility of the then State Planning Organization (SPO, re-named the Ministry of Development [MoD] in 2011) since 1960, neither the principles of regional planning nor the concept of ‘region’ were defined in the pre-2000 period. Instead, sectoral planning dominated the distribution of public investments in national planning, whereby spatial considerations were ignored. The national planning approach advocated that first, national economic growth should be achieved based on efficiency and only after that should resources be allocated for regional development (Tekeli, 2008, pp 267–72). Only a few regional plans were formulated in this period in a piecemeal and ad hoc fashion.

In the 2000s several principles were introduced as a result of EU conditionality and the implementation of financial assistance. One was the shift from sectoral to strategic planning including the principle of programming. This involves a focus on basic aims and objectives and prioritisation of issues as well as an holistic approach to development that builds horizontal links between policies, as illustrated by the PNDP, the 9th and 10th Development Plans and the NSRD. Programming in regional planning has led to a shift from individual project support to programme financing, with plans covering multi-annual periods. According to the interviews, programming fulfilled a void in policy formulation by facilitating the link between plans and budgetary allocations.

Another principle introduced into regional policy-making is partnership, which follows the EU’s practice of ‘close consultations between the Commission, the Member State concerned and the competent authorities designated by the latter at national, regional or local level’ (CEC, 1988, article 4), as well as economic and social partners. Turkish law establishing regional Development Agencies (DAs) stipulates that regional plans should be prepared in accordance with the principle of partnership, and requires that local stakeholders participate in the formulation of strategic regional plans (OJ, 2006). Moreover, the 9th and 10th National Plans as well as NSRD officially declare that ‘subsidiarity’ (MoD, 2013, p 135; 2014, p 2; SPO, 2006, p 91), ‘partnership’ and ‘multi-level governance’ (MoD, 2014, p 2) form the core principles of development policy. The principle of regionalisation has also been introduced with the decision of the Council of Ministers in 2002 to form 26 statistical planning regions in Turkey in accordance with the EU’s Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics classification.

Changing procedures

Two important procedural features characterised regional policy in the pre-2000 period. First, decision-making was excessively centralised so that regional policy and plans were devoid of sub-national institutional structures for implementation. Second, lack of horizontal coordination mechanisms among central institutions was endemic. In the 2000s, two key developments sought to change the procedural

features of regional policy. First is the law establishing regional DAs in 2006 (OJ, 2006) as requested by the EU in its successive progress reports in the early 2000s. Accordingly, regional plans would be formulated by DAs at regional level through participatory processes rather than the old method of deciding them at the centre. Second, a Regional Development High Board composed of ministers (such as for industry, technology, labour and social security, agriculture, transport, tourism, environment and urbanisation, and forestry) and a Regional Development Committee composed of undersecretaries was formed to coordinate sectoral policies for the purpose of regional development.

These procedural changes aim to reproduce the EU's multi-level governance in the Turkish context, and hence envisage shared decision-making, cooperation and negotiation, rather than hierarchy, across territorial levels (Marks et al, 1996; Hooghe and Marks, 2001). The interviews indicate, however, that in practice, the procedural changes are far from encouraging a bottom-up approach to regional policy design and implementation, noting, in particular, the requirement for regional plans to be approved by the Regional Development High Board as well as the continuing excessive interventions of the Ministry of Development in the work of the DAs. Hence, as confirmed by the burgeoning literature on the functioning of DAs in Turkey (Ertugal, 2017), the principles of subsidiarity, partnership and multi-level governance introduced in official national programming documents, as noted above, are not being implemented in practice.

Changing instruments

In the pre-2000 period, regional policy instruments were ambiguous, ranging from Priority Development Areas (KÖYs) to ad hoc regional projects. Even though the large-scale Southeast Anatolia Project started in 1988, this was essentially a public works project devised for the special circumstances of this region (Tekeli, 2008). In the 2000s, with the establishment of DAs in 26 NUTS II regions and their associated budgets, regional policy acquired its own permanent institutional and financial (although meagre) instruments for the first time. The grant schemes that the DAs are operating for distributing financial resources, involving calls for project proposals, have largely been copied from the practices of the EU's disbursement of financial assistance. Interviews indicate that in practice the new institutional and financial instruments have not produced their intended effect. The grant schemes have largely failed to mobilise regional partnerships among the public, private and civil society actors, while the amount of financial resources distributed are completely inadequate to address development needs.

The transformative role of the EU

EU conditionality has played two important roles in the policy-making process of regional development policy. First, the EU unleashed a process of change across all components of the policy structure throughout the 2000s. The extent of change

has been higher with respect to policy objectives and principles, which are a function of formal and legal changes through policy and programming documents and a new law. These components of change are also the ones that bureaucrats have internalised most, according to the interviews. Due to an implementation deficit, the extent of change with respect to policy procedures and instruments has been less, tempered with vested interests (of politicians and local elites) in implementation, according to the interviews.

Second, EU conditionality has left in its aftermath a place for other international organisations, in particular the OECD, to influence domestic policy. Even though accession negotiations on [Chapter 22](#) of the Acquis on regional policy and structural instruments started in 2013, the gradual waning of EU credibility, both in general and specifically in this policy field (see Ertugal, 2011), has left room for other international actors to exert influence. Given the high degree of overlap between the EU's regional policy approach and the regional development policy framework promoted by the OECD, the changes in the 2000s converged the mind-sets of Turkish bureaucrats to that of their counterparts in the OECD, where Turkey is a full member and where technical knowledge and sheer data play more important roles than the highly politicised EU process. The domestic influence of the OECD, in contrast, is much more diffuse, less intense and less dense than EU conditionality. The OECD's influence on domestic regional development policy is readily apparent in the NSRD (2014) and in the interview responses.

Unpacking changes in immigration policies and governance

Immigration policy in flux: from the 1990s to the 2000s

Set against a background of the post-Cold War period, when Turkey's experience was diversifying from one of a country of emigration to a country of destination (including circular and temporary) and transit for a variety of source countries from Newly Independent States (NIS), Moldova, Sub-Saharan Africa, Afghanistan, Iran and Iraq, there was substantial need for a change in Turkey's immigration policy. Law no 6458 on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP) in Turkey was approved in April 2013. With the promulgation of this law, Turkey has a centralised piece of legislation governing the area, with the General Directorate on Immigration and Asylum under the Ministry of Interior overseeing the whole policy area. Before this law, the policy field was governed by dispersed agencies and legislation. Passport Law no 5682 and Law no 5683 on Residence and Travel of Foreigners in Turkey, which are important in terms of immigration policy, can be traced back to the 1950s. In the post-1990 period, when Turkey experienced the Iraq crisis with mass movements and also increasing arrivals of people from the post-Soviet Republics (circular, temporary and permanent), the principle of control of these movements still dominated the legal texts and policy-maker claims. Until the 2000s, with Law no 4817 on Work Permits for Foreigners, there was no major change on legislation on foreigners. The post-2011 mass influx of Syrians

has challenged the system in different ways to introduce governance structures for international protection in the face of forced migration as a consequence of the humanitarian crisis.

Changes in the structure of immigration policies

Changing principles: control of movement, public security and human rights

Review of the policy-making process, initiatives by various ministries, EU progress reports for Turkey (with a focus on [Chapter 24](#)) and agencies as well as the legal framework itself reveals that competition among the paradigms of public safety and security vis-à-vis control is a consistent and multi-faceted one in Turkish immigration policy. Moreover, Turkey proceeded with the signing of the readmission agreement in 2013 while linking it more to the debate on visa liberalisation for Turkish citizens travelling to the EU rather than a detailed debate on the costs of a readmission agreement for Turkey. Additionally, in response to the 2011 Syrian crisis, Turkey aimed to advocate an open border policy presenting Syrian refugees as ‘guests’ (and therefore to be treated not as threats to public safety and security but to be welcomed along the lines of Turkey’s commitment to the international human rights regime, principles of no return and temporary protection), only to end up since late 2013 with a debate on whether some of these individuals are engaging in the conflict in Syria, committing petty crime in urban centres in Turkey or upsetting public order and safety as illegal urban immigrants.

Changing objectives: needs-based governance to legal framework and institutions

The laws governing the status of foreigners in Turkey had been separated into three sub-categories prior to the introduction of the new law in 2013. These categories for rules governing foreigners were ‘public law on foreigners, private law on foreigners and laws on foreigners with special status’. These included the European Convention on Human Rights, the Turkish Constitution, Passport Law no 5682, Law no 5683 on Residence and Travel of Foreigners, and Law no 4817 on Work Permits for Foreigners (added in 2003). While the law on Work Permits centralised the work permit procedure in the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, there has, as yet, been no single institution that would implement the laws on foreigners. The LFIP introduced the Directorate General for Migration Management (DGMM) to centralise procedures for foreigners. This institution is expected to coordinate all the other institutions that act as part of the governance of immigration and asylum, and to act as an ‘expert institution’ for these policy fields. It is expected to support efforts for establishing the necessary institutional and administrative infrastructure for governing migration, to coordinate efforts to harmonise Turkey’s legislation with that of the EU in the fields of immigration and asylum by comparing existing legislation with that of the EU in accordance

with the needs of both, and to follow the projects funded by the EU in the field of immigration and asylum, and inform the Ministry of Interior of efforts made.

The National Programme of 2003 includes an Action Plan for Asylum and Immigration, which envisions a common effort to harmonise Turkey's immigration and asylum legislation, infrastructure, legal and administrative capacity with that of the EU, and to implement projects to this end. The LFIP has transformed the institutional structure for governing immigration policy in Turkey toward a civilian administrative body. In the post-2003 period, various regulations, directives and laws have been introduced to combat irregular migration and the unregistered employment of foreigners. For example, Turkish Citizenship Law no 403 also aimed at preventing fake marriages by regulating citizenship acquisition by allowing foreigners to be eligible to apply for Turkish citizenship three years after the registration of the marriage. At the same time, the LFIP upholds public safety and security while combating irregular migration and organised crime, promoting the co-existence of foreigners and natives in harmony towards social cohesion. Domestic policy makers introduced changes to these laws in the context of the EU accession process in accordance with their own policy preferences.

Changing procedures in immigration and asylum policy

The most significant change in terms of the governance of migration and asylum concerns the procedures in the policy process in drafting and implementing the LFIP, which became inclusive and transparent, and this experience was unmatched and unprecedented, according to some scholars, for this particular policy field. Such a process has been characterised by some scholars as the formation of an 'epistemic community' around the immigration and asylum policy process (Ozcurumez and Turkay, 2011). There have been a series of workshops, meetings and seminars to exchange ideas and provide opportunities for communicating and input into the process, and the drafting of legislation. In all of these meetings, academics, civil society organisations (CSOs) and international organisations have discussed the shortcomings of existing practices, international and EU legislation, best practices around the world and the roles different stakeholders would aim to see themselves play once the legislation is adapted. The participants contributed to discussions on how principles of security, sovereignty and international human rights norms would be part of the new legislation. With the mass influx of Syrians, the introduction of a Temporary Protection Directive for Syrians also revised the kinds of services that would be provided to Syrians in contrast to people of other nationalities seeking international protection in Turkey. While the UNHCR and IOM played major roles in the governing of international protection and irregular migration, the Directorate General for Disaster Management and NGOs also became active in the governance of international protection and immigration, along with other line ministries.

Changing instruments

One major challenge in the introduction of new administrative structures has been the requirement to remove the gendarmerie and police forces from the borders, replacing them with civilian officers. This has been repeated since 2001 when the National Programme had been prepared, and re-examined in 2003 and 2008. In order to meet the requirements for a civilian authority, a Border Management Bureau was established in 2008, and a draft law on the Organisation and Duties of the Border Security Directorate General has been prepared, which would govern all control on land and sea borders, to ensure public order at the border gates, and to control passengers' entry and exit. There have been various projects to improve the legal, administrative and technical capacity of Turkey, and to harmonise its legislation with that of the EU on migration and asylum. Among these projects are the TR02-JH-03 Asylum-Migration Twinning Project as part of the 2002 EU Financial Cooperation, which has resulted in proposals leading to the introduction of the Task Force on Migration and Asylum Action Plan, which began its work in November and December 2004. Since the summer of 2015, the EU–Turkey Deal has placed the debates on the role of the EU in the governance of international protection in Turkey.

The transformative role of the EU

In 1999, a major shift occurred with Turkey's candidacy status being confirmed and the start of accession negotiations. [Chapter 24](#) of the accession negotiations began with a full screening of the immigration policy process. Interview data suggests that the very first project to change immigration policy had begun with a project *fiche* from 2002 originating from the Secretariat General for EU Affairs at the time. The domestic policy change does not necessarily 'mimic' the EU template as a whole, but points to 'cognitive transformation', as noted by an interviewee, and a change in 'perceptions' among the policy-makers concerning immigration policy. This 'cognitive transformation' is identified as a shift from the exclusively security-concerned paradigm to multiple ways and means through which to address the migration policy, including the human rights perspective, and through international collaboration. The objectives of the policy have shifted toward harmonisation with the EU Acquis (transition to civilian border management, readmission agreements and combating irregular migration, and a single law that governs migration policy). The procedures have also shifted toward the establishment of a new administrative structure and an inclusive policy process. The tools to be used for this purpose have also been identified as further collaboration with the EU through projects, information and expertise exchange.

Comparative conclusions

In addressing our first research question of how much change there has been in the macroeconomic, regional development and immigration policies and governance in Turkey during the 2000s, this chapter shows that there have been significant changes in the policy structures of these policies. These changes were more pronounced in the principles, objectives and instruments than in the procedures. The reason for this is that whereas the former (principles, objectives and instruments) mainly relate to the policy-making stage involving the more straightforward transposition of legislative and organisational changes, the latter (procedures) mainly relate to the implementation stage, which is partly a function of political-level capacities (see below). Implementation challenges, the exploration of which is beyond the scope of this chapter, in turn, tend to undermine the institutionalisation of changes in policy-making. Notwithstanding, the changes registered in the policy structures of the three policy areas under investigation reflect increases in the government's commitment in these policy structures measured in their policy density and intensity (Bauer and Knill, 2014).

In terms of policy density, the narratives above show that the breadth and differentiation of legislative and administrative intervention by the government had increased. Accordingly, the number of policies (that is, policy item density) has increased in all policy sectors. For example, macroeconomic policies during the 2000s aimed at sustaining price stability and balanced budgets, the regional development policy aimed to tackle both regional disparities and regional competitiveness, and the immigration policy to control cross-border movement and balance public security with human rights. At the same time, instrument density has also increased in all three policy sectors with more instruments in each policy sector: fiscal rules, multi-annual programming, inflation targeting and the MPC in macroeconomic policies; multi-annual programming, regional DAs, the grant scheme, and institutions for coordination such as the Regional Development High Board in regional development policy, and the instruction of a new administrative structure, the DGMM, with its local representatives, its own policy coordination strategies with NGOs, international organisations and line ministries working in immigration policy.

In parallel, the policy intensity of these interventions has increased. This period saw increasing numbers and degrees of changes in instrument settings (that is, substantive intensity), resulting in an expanded scope of the government's intervention. For example, targeting inflation directly (rather than following intermediate targets of monetary aggregates) and setting hard fiscal rules such as sizable primary balances are among the examples of increased intensity in macroeconomic policies. In regional development policy, examples include the distribution of financial resources through the grant scheme at regional level and the widening of the policy scope to include every region (not only underdeveloped regions). In immigration policy, many new projects on training and knowledge transfer plans for comparative development of immigration and

asylum governance, widening the recruitment of new central and local personnel for specialised governing of immigration and asylum, are examples of increased substantive intensity. The period also saw, although to a lesser extent than other dimensions of policy change, expansions in the administrative and procedural changes (that is, formal intensity) that affect the probability of implementation. In macroeconomic policies, the politically independent CBRT, with a powerful MPC and the Super Ministry under Dr Dervis, were among significant sources of formal intensity. In regional development policy, participatory processes in the formulation of regional plans were introduced in the institutional design of DAs coupled with the recruitment of new, highly-qualified personnel in the regions, and these increased the probability of the implementation of new policies. In immigration policy, again, participatory processes of policy-making and implementation constitute examples of increasing formal intensity in this sector.

All of these changes in the policy structures as well as policy outputs, as the above narratives show, point to the increased ‘policy capacities’ of the Turkish government as conceptualised by Wu, Ramesh and Howlett (2015, pp 167–8) and Howlett and Ramesh (2015, p 303). We should note that policy output dimensions (policy density and intensity) and dimensions of policy capacity are not necessarily mutually exclusive categories. First, the bureaucracy’s *analytical-level capacities*, which ensure that policy actions are ‘technically sound’ and contribute to the ‘attainment of policy goals’ after having investigated policy alternatives, increased during the early 2000s, and have remained at a relatively higher level in comparison to the 2000s thereafter. In all three policy sectors under study, the increasing ability to determine the strategic components of interventions in policy programming is a good example of increasing analytical-level capacity in the 2000s.

Second, *operational-level capacities*, which foster the ‘alignment of resources with policy actions so that they can be implemented in practice’, have also increased during the 2000s. Linking budgetary allocations to strategic priorities in the financial components of policy programming is an example of increasing operational-level capacity.

Finally, *political-level capacities* affording ‘policy-makers and managers the room to manoeuvre and the support required to develop and implement their ideas, programmes, and plans’, increased during the early 2000s. The sheer ability to introduce unwelcome innovations such as rendering the CBRT politically independent against the will of politicians, pushing through severe austerity measures targeting a hefty primary balance under crisis conditions, establishing regional DAs in a highly centralised unitary state, a completely new structure of governing migration and asylum all attest to the high political-level capacities in the 2000s. With the exception of immigration policies, whose issue salience increased with the Syrian conflict, political-level capacities in macroeconomic and regional development policies have been declining since the late 2000s. In macroeconomic policies, loosening of post-2001 crisis constraints and exiting from IMF programming in 2008, which exposed the bureaucracy to political

pressure, have led to the weakening of political-level capacities in the late 2000s. In regional development policies, the relative decrease in domestic issue salience, when it became clear that the new regional DAs would not act as managing authorities for EU funds as originally hoped by politicians and bureaucrats alike, has led to a decrease in political-level capacities in the late 2000s. The overall pattern of increase in policy capacities in the 2000s and relative stability since then is at odds with the declining prospects of Turkey's EU accession. In fact, an excessive focus on EU–Turkey diplomatic relations conceals under-the-radar, ongoing intensification and densification of public policies in Turkey in the pre-accession process.

The answer to our second research question, to what extent these changes represent instances of Europeanisation whereby the EU constitutes the 'prime focus of change', is more mixed. The narratives on the three policy areas attest to the overwhelming cumulative transformative effect of the EU and other international actors. The earlier stages of the policy cycle, starting with the agenda-setting stage and continuing with the policy formulation and policy adoption stages, all bear the imprint of the EU. The transformative impact of the EU in informing the different dimensions of the policy structures leading to increases in both the density and intensity of these policies is tremendous. Regardless of whether international actors serve as triggers or anchors, the episodes of transformation we have focused on show that the direction of domestic change remains the same. In almost all of these episodes of change, international actors categorically reinforced the EU's instruments and mechanisms of transformative impact. It is, therefore, empirically difficult to isolate the independent, exclusive, causal links by revealing the mechanisms of domestic policy change as a result of the EU. Nonetheless, just like in the Southern European countries starting with the 1980s and countries in Central and Eastern Europe and Western Balkans starting with the 1990s, the EU has indeed been the 'prime focus of change'. This is not surprising given the density and intensity embedded in the EU's models, frameworks, principles, objectives, procedures, instruments, agendas, rules and policies aiming at wholesale transformation, which we now call 'Europeanisation'.

In studying changes in policy-making in Turkey we focused on the EU's impact on policy outputs. To do so, we analysed the agenda-setting, policy formulation and decision-making stages of policy processes in three policy sectors. We thus excluded the implementation stage of policy processes from our analysis. We observe that when it comes to understanding the EU's impact in implementation and hence, outcomes, the overwhelming transformative impact fades. Existing research on other policy areas in Turkey provides limited clues as to how domestic interests shape the direction, content and magnitude of the EU's impact on policy outcomes. This research shows that domestic institutions, too, filter these effects, producing unintended outcomes (Bolukbasi and Ertugal, 2013). We therefore need further empirical research focusing on the implementation stages of policy processes in all policy sectors – only then, we believe, can we have a complete picture of the EU's impact on policy outcomes.

Notes

- ¹ This chapter presents the findings of a multi-annual collaborative research project funded by TUBITAK (Project No 109K443) on ‘Transformations in Policy and Governance in Turkey: The Case of Three Policy Areas’. We would like to thank Caner Bakır and an anonymous reviewer for their incisive comments and insightful suggestions.
- ² The ‘policy structure approach’ aims to unpack the key features of a given policy by focusing on *principles* governing the policy, *policy objectives*, *procedures* in policy-making and governance, and *instruments* at the disposal of the policy (Bolukbasi and Ertugal, 2013 based on Hall, 1993 and Graziano, 2011).
- ³ In the public policy literature, ‘policy intensity’ refers to the intensity of intervention in a given policy area measured in ‘the level and scope of governmental intervention’ (‘substantive intensity’) and ‘administrative capacities’ (including ‘financial, personnel and organisational resources’) and ‘administrative procedures’ (‘formal intensity’). ‘Policy density’ refers to the ‘extent to which a certain policy area is addressed by ‘governmental activities’ measured in ‘the number of policies’ (‘policy density’) and ‘the number of policy instruments’ that are used (‘instrument density’) (Bauer and Knill, 2014, pp 33–4).
- ⁴ The public policy literature differentiates between three levels in conceptualising ‘policy capacity’: (1) ‘analytical-level capacities’ (the extent to which policy actions are ‘technically sound’ and the degree to which they contribute to the ‘attainment of policy goals’ after having investigated policy alternatives); (2) ‘operational-level capacities’ (whether the administration fosters the ‘alignment of resources with policy actions so that they can be implemented in practice’); and (3) ‘political-level capacities’ (which afford ‘policymakers and managers the room to manoeuvre and the support required to develop and implement their [autonomous] ideas, programs, and plans’) (Howlett and Ramesh, 2015, p 303; Wu et al, 2015, pp 167–8).
- ⁵ The EU’s ‘transformative power’ is generally conceptualised as ‘successful, top-down Europeanization of member states and attempts at external governance transfer toward third countries’ impacting domestic change in policy-making, governance and policies themselves (van Huellen and Boerzel, 2013, p 5).
- ⁶ ‘Institutional entrepreneurs’, as conceptualised in the public policy literature, refers to an ‘individual who mobilizes ideas, resolves conflicts, and steers their implementation for ... institutional changes’ (Bakır, 2009, p 272). Dr Dervis emerged as an institutional entrepreneur as he has led a series of institutional changes in macroeconomic policies and governance. These changes have gone beyond changes in policy outputs (through administrative, legal and organisational change), giving way to behavioural changes of key actors. These were reflected in changes in policy outcomes with the implementation of the new policy regime.

References

- Arestis, P. (2009) *New consensus macroeconomics: A critical approach*, Working Paper, no 564, The Levy Economic Institute of Bard College (www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/wp_564.pdf).
- Bakır, C. (2007) *Merkezdeki Banka*, Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Bakır, C. (2009) ‘Policy entrepreneurship and institutional change: Multi-level governance of central banking reform’, *Governance*, vol 22, no 4, pp 571–98.
- Bauer, M. W. and Knill, C. (2014) ‘A conceptual framework for the comparative analysis of policy change: Measurement, explanation and strategies of policy dismantling’, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, vol 16, no 1, pp 28–44.
- Begg I. (2010) ‘Cohesion or confusion: a policy searching for objectives’, *Journal of European Integration*, vol 32, no 1, pp 77–96.

- Bolukbasi, H.T. (2012) 'Political economy', in M. Heper and S. Sayari (eds) *Routledge handbook of modern Turkey*, London: Routledge, pp 341-52.
- Bolukbasi, H.T. and Ertugal, E. (2013) 'Europeanisation of employment policy in Turkey: Tracing domestic change through institutions, ideas and interests', *South European Society and Politics*, vol 18, no 2, pp 237-57.
- Bolukbasi, H.T. and Ozcurumez, S. (2011) 'Of context, interaction and temporality: Historical institutionalism and Turkey's approach to the ENP and the UfM', *Comparative European Politics*, vol 9, no 4-5, pp 543-61.
- Bruszt, L. (2008) 'Multi-level governance – the eastern versions: Emerging patterns of regional developmental governance in the new member states', *Regional & Federal Studies*, vol 18, no 5, pp 607-27.
- CEC (Commission of the European Communities) (1988) Council Regulation EEC No 2052/88 of 24.03.88, in *Official Journal of the European Communities*, No L 185; 15.07.88, Brussels: CEC.
- Diamondourous, P.N., Gunther, R., Sotiropoulos, D. and Malefakis, E. (2006) 'Introduction: Democracy and the state in the new Southern Europe', in F. Gunther, P. Nikiforos and D.A. Sotiropoulos (eds) *Democracy and the state in the new Southern Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 1-41.
- Ertugal, E. (2011) 'Europeanization and institutional change: Explaining regional policy reforms in Turkey', *Policy & Politics*, vol 39, no 2, pp 257-73.
- Ertugal, E. (2017) 'Challenges for regional governance in Turkey: The role of development agencies', *METU Journal of Architecture*, vol 32, no 2, pp 203-24.
- Featherstone, K. and Kazamias, G. (2000) 'Introduction: Southern Europe and the process of "Europeanisation"', *South European Society and Politics*, vol 5, no 2, pp 1-24.
- Graziano, P. (2011) 'Europeanization and domestic employment policy change: Conceptual and methodological background', *Governance*, vol 24, no 3, pp 583-605.
- Gürkaynak, R., Kantur, Z., Tas, M. and Yildirim, S. (2015) *Monetary policy in Turkey after Central Bank independence*, London: Centre for Economic Policy Research (www.cepr.org/active/publications/discussion_papers/dp.php?dpno=10904).
- Hall, P.A. (1993) 'Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: The case of economic policymaking in Britain', *Comparative Politics*, vol 25, no 3, pp 275-96.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2001) *Multi-level governance and European integration*, New York and London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Howlett, M. and Ramesh, M. (2015) 'Achilles heel of governance: Critical capacity deficits and their role in governance failures', *Regulation and Governance*, vol 10, pp 301-13.
- Kaya, F. and Yilar, S. (2011) 'Fiscal transformation in Turkey over the last two decades', *OECD Journal of Budgeting*, no 1, pp 59-74.
- Kraan, D.J., Bergvall, D. and Hawkesworth, I. (2007) 'Budgeting in Turkey', *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, vol 7, no 2, pp 7-58.

- Marks, G., Hooghe, L. and Blank, K. (1996) 'European integration from the 1980s: State-centric v multi-level governance', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol 34, no 3, pp 341-78.
- MoD (Ministry of Development) (2013) *Onuncu kalkınma planı 2014-2018* [Tenth development plan 2014-2018], Ankara: Kalkınma Bakanlığı (www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkınma%20Planlar/Attachments/12/Onuncu%20Kalkınma%20Planı.pdf).
- MoD (2014) *Bölgesel gelişme ulusal stratejisi 2014-2023* [National strategy for regional development 2014-2023], Ankara: Kalkınma Bakanlığı (www.bgus.gov.tr/dokuman/BolgeselGelismeUlusulStratejisi(2014-2023).pdf).
- OJ (Official Journal) (2006) 'Kalkınma ajanslarının kuruluşu, koordinasyonu ve görevleri hakkında kanun' ['Law on the establishment, coordination and tasks of development agencies'], *Official Journal*, 08/02/2006, no 26074.
- Ozcurumez, S. and Turkay, S. (2011) 'Bir epistemik topluluk oluşurken: Türkiye'de iltica çalışmaları, politikası ve aktörleri' ['An epistemic community in the making: Asylum studies, policy and actors in Turkey], in Ö. Çelebi, S. Özçürümez and Ş. Türkay (eds) *İltica uluslararası göç ve vatansızlık: Kuram, kavram ve politika*, Ankara Office: UNHCR Publications, pp 28-48.
- Radaelli, C.M. (2009) 'Measuring policy learning: Regulatory impact assessment in Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol 16, pp 1145-64.
- SPO (2003) *Preliminary national development plan 2004-2006*, Ankara: Republic of Turkey (www.mod.gov.tr/Lists/OtherPublications/Attachments/8/Preliminary%20National%20Development%20Plan%20(2004-2006).pdf).
- SPO (State Planning Organization) (2006) *Dokuzuncu kalkınma planı 2007-2013* [Ninth development plan 2007-2013], Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (www.metu.edu.tr/system/files/kalkinma.pdf).
- Tekeli, İ. (2008) *Türkiye'de bölgesel eşitsizlik ve bölge planlama yazıları* [Essays on regional inequality and regional planning in Turkey], Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Treasury (2001) *Strengthening the Turkish economy: Turkey's transition program*, Ankara: Republic of Turkey Undersecretariat of Treasury (www.tcmb.gov.tr/wps/wcm/connect/9d473f48-f02c-4631-94e7-ee64593f250d/strengtheningecon.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=9d473f48-f02c-4631-94e7-ee64593f250d).
- van Huellen, V. and Boerzel, T.A. (2013) *The EU's governance transfer: From external promotion to internal protection?*, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, no 56, Berlin: Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, June.
- Wu, X., Ramesh, M. and Howlett, M. (2015) 'Policy capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding policy competences and capabilities', *Policy and Society*, vol 34, pp 165-71.