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In the recent Eastern enlargement, the EU has put particular minority conditions for the accession of the candidate countries. It has used membership incentive to promote minority norms and principles in the candidate countries. The state in question recorded important legislative changes which promote the level of minority protection without the EU’s conditionality would not have been possible. All candidate countries have engaged in a large scale process of transformation and approximated their human rights to European practices.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROBLEM DEFINITION

In the recent Eastern enlargement, the EU has set specific democratic conditions for the accession of the candidate countries and developed a new human rights policy, featured as an increased level of conditionality and fulfillment of certain requirements. It has used membership card as an incentive to implement human rights norms and principles in the countries striving to access to the EU. All candidate countries have engaged in a large-scale process of transformation and approximated their human rights standards to European practices. In this context, promotion of minority and cultural rights has appeared to be an important aspect of the pre-accession strategy. Even though minority rights are not closely related with the traditional competence of the EU, the positive influence of the EU on the candidate countries has strongly been noticed. The states in question have recorded important legislative changes which promote the level of minority protection, without which the EU’s conditionality would not have been possible.

Turkey has increasingly become the target of the minority conditionality of the EU, since Turkey was given candidate status at the Helsinki Summit in 1999. Despite the fact that the EU had influenced minority reforms in Turkey in the course of the 1990s through the use of Association Agreement and Custom Union, the EU had failed to offer a combination of explicit minority conditions and incentives that promote paradigmatic transformation in Turkey. For the first time, at the Helsinki European Council, the EU has provided Turkey with strong membership incentive and imposed clear conditions. Since then, the EU has exerted considerable pressure on Turkey to observe “respect for and protection of minorities” and thereby linked Turkey’s eventual membership to the minority reforms that Turkey would record in the course of the accession process.

Reform process in the field of minority rights has gained important momentum and dynamism since the Helsinki Summit onwards. The membership prospect has drastically changed political structure in Turkey, introducing new opportunities for different ethnic, religious, and political groups, including Islamists, Kurds, Alevis, and Armenians. The EU process provided that groups with important incentives, motivation and a space of mobilization for their identity claims. In response to the

---

perspective of membership and as a result of favorable domestic factors, Turkey has brought its legislations in line with the EU standards. Several taboo issues, including the use of Kurdish language in public and private, property rights of the non-Muslim minorities, and elimination of discrimination against Alevi have been addressed. In brief, the EU has appeared to be the main catalyst in accelerating Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey. It has evidently launched a process of change – though its claims led to harsh reaction in that they pose important challenge to nation-state understanding, the conception of homogenized Turkish national identity and citizenship.

Despite the fact that the steps taken so far are far-reaching in terms bringing minority related legislations and policies in line with European standards and conditions, the reform process has suffered from an important problem of endurance. Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey is not smooth and steady. The compliance pattern has been varied over time. Important ups and downs and halt and restarts occurred in the reform process. Given the degree and pace of the Europeanization of minority norms, three distinct periods can be observed since Justice and Development Party (AKP) come to the power in 2002.

The first period started with general elections in 2002 when the AKP come into power and ended up with the launch of official accession negotiations in October 2005. In this period (2002-2005), the pace and intensity of the minority reforms increased. Being firm supporter of Turkey’s EU membership bid, the Justice and Development Party (AKP) acted single-mindedly to liberalize minority protection regime of Turkey. The government gave considerable energy in passing several harmonization packages, which include regulations concerning minority reforms.

The second phase started with 2005 and ended up with parliamentary election in 2007. In this period, no important steps were taken with regards to minority rights protection. Ironically, the reform impetus appeared to decrease in the aftermath of 3 October 2005 at which the European Council acclaimed the reforms taken, concluded that Turkey complied with the Copenhagen criteria and launched officially accession negotiations. Instead of addressing minority issues, the government turned back to nationalist discourses and acted together with pro-status quo groups opposing minority reforms.

The third phase started with the presidential election in 2007 and ended up with general elections in 2011. In this period, the reform process has regained a momentum, albeit with a lower level and a lower speed compare with the period of 2002-2005. The AKP launched Democratic Opening Initiative which addresses the problems of ethnic and sectarian groups. The government publicly recognized the existence of different groups and opened a debate on the ways of accommodating ethnic diversity of the population. The discourses and policies of the government were path breaking in the sense that for the first time the claims of the identity
groups were addressed systematically and openly at the state level. Important steps were taken that bring Turkey’s policy and norms in line with the European standards. However, the AKP again lost its motivation for further reform since the parliamentary election in 2011.

Overall, it is not possible to talk about constant process of Europeanization of minority norms. This irregularity in the Europeanization process begs the question of how different dynamism in terms of the degree and pace of minority reforms in different time periods can be explained in Turkey. In this respect, the objective of this dissertation is to analyze internal and external factors that explain variation in the reform process concerning minority rights protection over time. Having centered on the EU’s norm and conditionality as the main variables, the objective is to explain the deceleration and acceleration of the reform process in Turkey on basis of theoretical strands concerning Europeanization of member and candidate countries.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTION

In this regard, the main research question of this dissertation is that: What accounts for the variation and sustainability in the Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey? The study intends to identify whether conditionality or normatively induced factors explain fluctuations and continuity in domestic change concerning minority rights protection over time.

1.3 RELEVANCE

There are several reasons of analyzing Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey. Firstly, the question of minority rights in Turkey has particular policy significance for the EU. Since the end of the Cold War, ethno-cultural conflicts have risen around the world.\(^2\) Ethnically and religiously oriented conflicts have appeared to overtake class conflicts.\(^3\) Considering the threats that these clashes pose on European security and stability and their destructive impact on European states, the EU has referred to minority protection as an important conflict resolving mechanism. Given that Turkey has a high number of ethnic minorities and has been going through ethnic conflict having spillover effect to the European countries, the

---


containment of ethnic conflict in Turkey through promotion of minority rights has strong implication for European security and stability. Hence, understanding the dynamics of domestic change in the field of minority rights has strong policy relevance for preserving security in Europe.

Secondly, the case of Turkey is also empirically relevant in understanding Europeanization of minority norms in other candidate and third countries. Turkey is the hardest case in terms of internal and external factors. Given Turkish national identity, popular attitudes towards minorities and mixed signals for membership prospect, Turkey is the least likely case that norm adoption would take place. Despite negative domestic and international constellations, minority norm adoption has been continuing in Turkey. This situation renders Turkey empirically interesting case for understanding other candidate countries which are considered to be unlikely incidences of norm adoption.

Thirdly, Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey is also theoretically relevant with the explanatory models concerning Europeanization of candidate and member countries. It lends itself to the analysis because of the good variation in the independent variable. The credibility of the EU conditionality is considered as constant for the Central and Eastern European countries in the pre-accession process. Membership prospect is not taken into account systematically in the analysis of the reform process in these countries, as the EU has sent clear signals to the CEECs concerning their integration to the EU. In Turkey’s case, however, the institutional ties and credibility of the membership perspective have always been varied. This situation renders Turkey theoretically interesting case in understanding how the credibility of membership can have the potential of weakening the influence of the EU itself.

1.4 Timeframes

The timeframe covered in this study starts from 2002 in which Justice and Development Party (AKP) come into power and ends up with 2011 in which general election took place. Thus, in depth analysis is carried out only for the term of the AKP. The previous term of the coalition government of Motherland Party, Democratic Left Party and Nationalist Movement Party (ANAP-DSP-MHP) is left outside the scope of in depth analysis, as minority reforms recorded in this epoch is weak.

The term of the AKP (2002-2011) is subdivided into three different periods in parallel with the compliance degree. The first phase is the period of 2002-2005 in which Turkey recorded important reforms and the second one is the period of 2005-2007 in which reforms halt and third one is in between 2007-2011 in which reforms restart. Such periodization is justified on three grounds. Firstly, the term of the AKP provides important observations concerning variation in domestic change over time. As it is said above, compliance trend under the AKP ruling is not steady and smooth. There are ups and downs, even though the AKP government has displayed to a very basic level of commitment to the reform process. This situation makes the period of AKP government interesting case. Secondly, the existence of pro-minority or liberal government is considered as a necessary condition for norm adoption in the field of minority rights. The focus on the term of the AKP, which is accepted as conservative liberal, would enable me to eliminate the existence of pro-minority government as a variable, but to concentrate on other variables that might be responsible for the variation in domestic change. Thirdly, the term of the AKP government provides alternative explanations apart from the EU conditionality. It is possible to trace normatively induced and identity related factors, since the AKP has challenged, overtly national identity of Turkey constructed by the Kemalist elite on the premises of “one nation, one state and one language” for the first time at the state level.

1.5 STATE OF ART

Academic researches which focus on the process of Europeanization in Turkey have proliferated since 1999. The adoption of harmonization reform packages after the Helsinki Summit has located the EU at the center of the researches as an “external source” of change. The studies particularly address the changes that took place in a wide range of policy domains associated with the European integration. They specially focus on domestic impact of European integration on 1) political and legal structures in Turkey, 2) political actors and identities, 3) particular policies.

The first group of studies addresses Europeanization as a political process and evaluates the impact of the European integration on the macro-political and legal

transformations in Turkey. Specific emphasis was given to the reforms undertaken in the field of democratization and human rights. For example, Hale (2003) analyses the developments in freedom of expression, treatment of ethnic minorities, abolition of the death penalty and security sector in the course of the accession process. Without referring the term of Europeanization, Özbudun (2004 and 2009) presents very elaborate analysis of the harmonization packages and constitutional amendments in line with the EU conditions. He mainly focuses on how the EU reforms have contributed to the elimination of “semi-authoritarianism” inherited from militaristic regime established in the post military takeover in 1980. Kurban (2003) and Tokdas (2009) have given particular importance to the minority issue in the EU-Turkey relations. Having examined the substance and implementation of the political reforms concerning minority protection, Kurban basically concludes that minority reforms in the EU accession process are positive, but they are far from providing constitutional protection to minority groups. There are also several comparative studies contrasting Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey with different candidate and member state countries. For example, Grigordis (2008) compares Europeanization of minority norms in Greece and Turkey and concludes that Europeanization has triggered considerable progress, but not


fulfilled its full potential both in Greece and Turkey. Atikcan (2010) also compares Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey, Latvia, Sweden and Northern Ireland. She explores that Europeanization operates within different institutional logics in different countries. According to her, while the logic of consequences drives change in the candidate countries, the logic of appropriateness is behind the Europeanization of member states. Kizilkan (2010) attempted to find out unintended consequences of the EU on minority rights protection in Turkey. She concludes that the EU process promoted the rights of the minority groups, but in the mean time, she explored that the “otherness” of the ethnic groups, such as Kurds was strongly underlined at the public level in this process.

The studies in the first group provide important insights concerning background conditions for Europeanization of legal and political structures. It is possible to subdivide these researches in three respects. The first group of studies gives particular importance to the external parameters i.e. membership prospect, to explain compliance trend in Turkey. This literature mainly argues that Europeanization in Turkey is an “externally induced, elite driven process administered through the mechanism of the EU conditionality.” In these analyses, the most vital factor that accounts for political reforms in Turkey is the application of conditionality in a credible and coherent manner. In this regard, the Helsinki Summit marks a paradigmatic shift in the EU-Turkey relations, because the EU has granted a clear perspective of membership to Turkey. In this group of studies, the EU is considered to be the main motor behind Europeanization process in Turkey. Domestic factors are viewed as a secondary importance. Turkey has adopted constitutional reforms, as a response to the decision to grant Turkey candidate status, but not because of the domestic parameters. The second group of the studies gives particular importance to the interaction between domestic and external factors as an explanation

for the patterns of convergence in Turkey. In these studies, the credible conditionality has still prominent place as an external dynamic. Yet, it is not considered as a sufficient condition for promoting change on its own. The combination of favorable-negative domestic conditions and strong-weak membership prospect are considered to explain the cycle of reforms. According to Ugur (2003), for example, the reasons of unsystematic and suboptimal convergence to the EU’s conditions is basically because of the conflict reliance nature of Turkish decision making and the incomplete nature of the contracts governing the EU-Turkey relations. In parallel, Aydin and Carkoglu (2006), conclude that the reform process in Turkey is not solely externally induced. They assert that the main reasons explaining the pace and intensity of the reforms since 1999 was the utilization of the EU as an anchor by the domestic actors for gaining credibility and legitimacy for further reforms. The last group of studies put much more emphasis on internal political dynamics. This group of analysis gives strong emphasis on the domestic mobilization of the groups in explaining domestic change with regards to democratization and human rights. Contrary to general understanding, Ulusoy (2004) argues that reform process since 2002 should be linked to the mobilization of sub-national groups at the European level. Their mobilization forms a bottom-up process, whose roots lies in the political transformation of Turkey in the post-1980 period. Rumford (2004) analyses the barriers for the introduction of human rights reforms within the context of Turkey’s accession. Even though he does not use explicitly the term “Europeanization,” and places whole Europeanization process in Turkey to the wider globalization patterns, he focuses on domestic factors limiting the influence of the EU. According to Rumford (2002), the EU accepts


22 Aydın and Keyman, "European Integration and the Transformation of Turkish Democracy." p: 80.


25 Ibid.

human rights as an integral part of its identity and conveys it a universal value on its own regardless of national contexts. That is why it does not consider addressing human rights violations as an internal issue reserved to the particular state. In contrast, Turkey considered the EU’s involvement on human rights as “veiled support for the enemies of the state” such as separatist terrorist organizations under the pretext of human rights. Hence, the EU’s support for human rights in Turkey is considered as direct interference to the internal affairs and functioning of the domestic law. According to Rumford, such a contradictory understanding led to the oscillation of a “wholehearted embrace of the EU norms on human rights and democratization and a nationalistic rejection of outside interference in domestic matters.”

The second group of literature deals with the impact of the Europeanization process on political actors, their positions and national identities in Turkey. Öniş (2003) and Türkmen (2008) analyses how the positions of the principle political parties, interest associations and public opinion are transformed in the aftermath of the Helsinki Summit. They found out two contradictory trends in Turkey. On the one hand, pro-EU coalition has emerged and committed to undertake political and economic reforms claimed by the EU. The members of the block are mainly from civil society organizations rather than political parties. On the other hand, anti-EU coalition whose members are from labor unions and political parties has become more vocal in opposing the EU reforms in particular. This camp has mainly the tendency to overemphasize endogenous and exogenous threats and has perceived political reforms as a threat to the unity of the nation. According to Öniş (2003) while pro-EU coalition would challenge orthodox security consciousness mindset in Turkey, anti EU coalition would act as a stumbling block in the reform process. Öniş and Yankaya (2008) also analyze how the policy entrepreneurs such as the AKP and the Turkish Industrialist and Business Association (TUSIAD) have responded the window of opportunity opened by the EU conditionality for policy reform. There are also studies how the position of the Turkish military and civil military relations has transformed in the accession process.

28 Ibid.
The third group of studies examines the impact of the EU on particular policies in Turkey. For example, Kirişci (2003) analyzes the impact of the EU on the asylum and migration policies of Turkey. Having focused on the reforms that have been taken in this regard, Kirişci (2003) focuses on the limitations and challenges in this issue area. These challenges are high cost of meeting the EU requirements and the imposition on Turkey a policy of authoritarian border controls. Aydin and Acıkcèsme (2009) also focus on the transformations that took place in Turkish foreign policy as a result of European conditionality. They mainly introduce mechanism of conditionality for foreign policy change in Turkey with particular references to institutional issues, sensitive foreign policy problems and the neighboring region of Middle East.

1.6 CONTRIBUTION

Overall, the literature examining Turkey’s Europeanization process agrees with the idea that the EU has been the main trigger in domestic change in a wide range of issue areas. However, these studies have some shortcomings. Firstly, studies addressing Europeanization particularly rely upon rationalist arguments or conditionality in explaining “ebbs and flows” in reform process. They have the tendency to conceptualize Europeanization as a response of the states to the opportunity structure opened by the EU conditionality and power distribution among actors. Accordingly, variation in domestic change in Turkey over time is explained by the cost-benefit calculations of the actors. They do not refer to constructivist assumptions premised on learning and internalization of the actors and do not address changing values, identities and norms in their conceptual frameworks. The situation results in important restrictions with regards to theoretical openness. It also leads to the shortcomings in explaining the instances of Europeanization which cannot be accounted in terms of economic strategic benefits or the existence of conditionality. In order to fill the gap in the literature, this study brought norms and identities into the analysis in addition to the conditionality. Rather than assuming norms have played limited role in the issue area of minority rights protection, this study looks to what extent the government in power refers to norms, values and identities in the justification of domestic change.


34 See the role of the EU in evolving Turkish foreign policy in: Ziya Onis and Yılmaz Sahnaz, "Between Europeanization and Euro-Asianism: Foreign Policy Activism in Turkey During the AKP," Turkish Studies 10, no. 1 (2009).
Secondly, the literature on Europeanization of Turkey overemphasizes the role of the EU conditionality or norms in explaining domestic reform process in Turkey. Even though the EU conditionality and partly norms explain important part of the puzzle, sources of change originating from globalization or other international organizations such as the Council of Europe (CoE) and Organization for Security and Cooperation (OSCE) are ignored. This shortcoming is particularly relevant for minority protection, as both the OSCE and the CoE have also jurisdiction over minority protection. The EU has referred the norms established by these organizations. This study takes into account alternative sources of influence. Accordingly, it clearly distinguishes “the EU-ization which is a formal alignment with the EU’s institutions, policies and legal structure from Europeanization which is a wider context.”

In this distinction, this study makes reference not only to the EU, but also other European organizations having jurisdiction over minority protection as additional “exogenous sources” of change.

Thirdly, minority reforms in Turkey is mainly affected by internal developments, including the existence of ethnic conflict, domestic mobilization, public opinion on specific reforms, popular attitudes, minority representation in the parliament, and enforcement mechanisms. These domestic dynamics have not been covered by the analyses focusing on Europeanization of Turkey, until these parameters become explicit obstruction to the reform process. Accordingly, domestic source of change are generally understudied. This analysis takes into account domestic conditions through including hypothesis which are not directly related with conditionality and norms. It proposes that Europeanization took place without the existence of material and normative pressure of the EU. It can take place as the decision makers are not pleased with the existence policies or status quo or when there is a strong domestic pressure from bottom to up for change.

Fourthly, the research on Europeanization of minority rights in Turkey particularly focuses on formal legislative changes which bring domestic legislative corpus in line with the legislation of the EU. Particularly those dealing with human and minority rights did not take into account implementation and do not address reasons of shortcomings in implementation. This dissertation could not eliminate this shortcoming totally, as it is not possible to measure systematically implementation. That is why the study did not focus on implementation, but just formal legislative changes. But it envisages a partial solution. It analyses the implementation as far as an implementing regulation exists.

35 Kaliber Alper, "Reassessing Europeanization as a Quest for a New Paradigm of Modernity: The Arduous Case of Turkey," in ISA’s 49th Annual Convention, Bridging Multiple Divides (San Francisco, 2008): p. 3.

1.7 DEFINITIONS

The term “minority” suffers from an important ambiguity. There is no universally adopted and legally binding definition of the concept of “minority” at international and European level.\(^{37}\) Generally speaking, international organizations have identified the content of minority rights but not specify who the holders of such rights are.\(^{38}\) As such, it is necessary to give the definition used in the study.

Despite the fact that there is no “official” definition of minorities, “operational” minorities are defined as the groups “numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state, which are in a non-dominant position, whose members – being nationals of the State– possess ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language.”\(^{39}\) In this definition there are certain objective and subjective dimensions. Objective dimensions are numerically inferiority, non-dominant position, and ethnic, religious and linguistic differences from the majority. Subjective characteristic is possessing collective sense of community.

Inspired from this definition and in parallel with Lerner (1993), in this study, the term “minority” is used interchangeably with the “groups” to the extent that the groups have subjective and objective features.\(^{40}\) This choice is justified on the grounds that the term minority refers to a narrow category of groups in Turkey. It denotes only officially recognized groups, including Jews, Armenians and Greeks as minorities. However, the focus of this study is broader than officially acknowledged minorities. The study attempts to understand domestic reforms related with ethnic, religious and linguistic groups which are not recognized as minorities in Turkey. Accordingly, the groups covered are not only limited to the officially recognized minorities by Turkey such as Jews, Greeks and Armenians. The groups holding subjective and objective elements of being minority are included. As such this study is in favour of using the term “groups” which are “preceded or not by the qualifying notions racial or ethnic, religious and cultural or linguistic.” But of


\(^{38}\) No definition exists in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities and European Framework Convention for the Protection of Minorities (FCNM). The EU law does not contain any definition; despite minority rights are incorporated into the primary legislation of the EU by Lisbon Treaty.


course, not every sum of persons is considered as “group” in the sense of the meaning using in this study. The existence of certain components, including “spontaneity, permanency, a feeling of belonging and the conviction of sharing a common past and destiny” \textsuperscript{41} are taken into account.

The notion “minority rights policy” does not denote to a particular and standard policy program in this study. It refers “a wide range of policies which have in common that they all in one way or another recognize and accommodate the demands of communities distinguishing themselves from majority populations by religious, linguistic, cultural and other characteristics that are considered ethnic.” \textsuperscript{42}

**1.8 STRUCTURE**

In order to find out an answer to the main research question, the dissertation is structured as follows.

Chapter 2 presents theoretical framework which offers different mechanisms and explanations for understanding external sources of domestic changes. The chapter consists of three parts. In the first part, theoretical strands relevant to externally induced domestic policy making is presented. In the second part, the concepts employed in this dissertation are clarified by focusing on definitions and conceptualizations stipulated in the Europeanization and conditionality literature. In the third part, having reviewed relevant strands of theoretical frameworks, the explanatory models employed in this study is presented. This part also introduces theoretical hypotheses that are going to be tested in the light of empirical data.

Chapter 3 presents research method which is used to operationalize and test the validity of theoretical model and propositions. This chapter consists of three parts. In the first part, research strategy of the dissertation is provided. Methodological and empirical difficulties in Europeanization research are discussed in this regard. Then, in order to overcome the challenges in question, retrospective research design are proposed as a research strategy. In the second part, main explanatory, intervening and outcome variables are presented. In the last part, the methodology for data gathering and data analysis is presented.

Chapter 4 intended to identify minority norms which are institutionalized at the EU level and EU minority conditionality imposed on the candidate countries in the course of the accession process. On this basis, the chapter consists of three main parts. In the first part, minority norms consolidated at the European level are ana-

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.

lyzed, with a special focus on “contested” feature of minority protection in terms of the definition and content in the international law. In the second part, pre-accession instruments identifying the benchmarks and requirements concerning minority protection are analyzed. The focus is here mainly on external minority policy of the EU within the context of the conditionality. In the last part, some conclusions are drawn concerning the EU norms and conditionality with regards to minority protection.

Chapter 5 identifies status quo concerning minority protection regime in Turkey. The status quo is analyzed at the levels of policy and legislation. Firstly, general policies and corresponding legal frameworks adopted by the states in order to accommodate ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity are discussed. These policies and corresponding legal frameworks are 1) denial through exclusion/assimilation, 2) integration through non discrimination, and 3) recognition through individual-collective minority rights. Secondly, which of these policies has been adopted by Turkey is determined through the analyses of the legislations, constitutional provisions and the rulings of higher courts with respect to minority rights. The objective is to find out status quo concerning minority protection in Turkey. Thirdly, particular problems of Muslim and non Muslim minorities are analyzed.

Chapter 6 is concerned with Turkey-EU relations in terms of minority protection. The objective is to determine minority conditionality specific to Turkey. The aim is to determine ad hoc minority conditions or benchmarks on which the degree of Europeanization in Turkey is measured. In this respect, Chapter 6 consists of two parts. In the first part, the approach of the EU towards Turkey concerning minority rights protection is discussed. In this framework, the groups recognized as minority by the EU, the degree and content of minority protection claimed and the types of measures that the EU imposes on Turkey are analyzed. In the second part, the concrete conditions that Turkey need to fulfill before the accession process are explored. The objective is to draw a catalogue of minority conditions on which the degree of Europeanization in Turkey is measured.

Chapter 7, 8 and 9 analyze Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey. Applying conceptual and theoretical instruments that have been discussed in the previous chapters, first, the degree of Europeanization for the period of 2002-2011 is analyzed. Then, the time period in question is subdivided into three parts in line with the degree of domestic change: These periods are 2002-2005, 2005-2007 and 2007-2011. The objective of these chapters is to understand why domestic change in minority protection has varied over time in Turkey. It intended to test research propositions and hence the explanatory relevance of the internal and external variables in the light of gathered empirical evidence for different periods in question. The analysis gives a particular importance to the actors, institutions and discourses
and the interplay between internal variables and the EU conditionality in determining the pattern of Europeanization in Turkey.

Chapter 10 provides main empirical and theoretical results of the study. It discusses the contribution of this dissertation to the current body of knowledge for advancing theoretical understanding. It also provides alternative explanations for the phenomena of Europeanization of minority norms in Turkey.
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