

## THE VIEW OF SIVAS CITY RESIDENTS ABOUT TURKEY'S FULL MEMBERSHIP TO EUROPEAN UNION<sup>a</sup>

Osman DEMİR\* ve Hatice ERKEKOĞLU\*\*

### Abstract

Turkey has been trying to be a full membership to European Union (EU) since 1959. It is important to learn public view about Turkey's full membership, which is sure to affect daily life deeply. For this purpose, a survey was conducted with 1934 residents living in Sivas. Majority of the participants have supported Turkey's full membership to EU. But they have less believed EU will allow Turkey into the EU. High rate of unemployment, lack of democracy, mismanagement and underdevelopment were regarded as the main obstacles before Turkey's full membership to EU.

**Keywords:** European Union, Turkey, Sivas, public survey, full membership.

### Sivas İl Merkezinde Oturanların Türkiye'nin Avrupa Birliği'ne Tam Üyeliğine Bakışı

### Özet

Türkiye 1959'dan beri AB'ye tam üye olmak için çaba harcamaktadır. Günlük yaşamı derinden etkilemesi kaçınılmaz olan böyle bir konuda halkın görüşünün alınması son derece önemlidir. Bu amaçla Sivas il merkezinde oturan 1934 kişiyle yüz yüze görüşerek anket yapılmıştır. Katılımcıların büyük çoğunluğu AB'ye tam üye olmayı desteklemiş, ancak AB'nin Türkiye'yi tam üye yapacağına çok azı inanmıştır. Yüksek işsizlik oranı, demokrasi eksikliği, kötü yönetim ve geri kalmışlık tam üyeliğin önündeki temel sorunlar olarak görülmüştür.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Avrupa Birliği, Türkiye, Sivas, Anket, Tam Üyelik.

---

<sup>a</sup> This study is based on research project "İKT-051" supported by the Presidency of the Commission for Scientific Research Projects in Cumhuriyet University.

\* Prof. Dr., Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fak., Tokat

\*\* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Erciyes Üniversitesi, MYO, Kayseri

## 1. Introduction

Westernization in Turkey has always been the main target since the foundation of Republic (1923). Turkey was the founder member to United Nations in 1945 and member to NATO in 1952. She applied to EU for a partnership in 1959 as to maintain economic cooperation with the west in addition to her cooperation in political and military fields. With Ankara Agreement (September 12<sup>th</sup>, 1963) Turkey's application for full membership was in the process of preparatory, transitional and final stages. Preparatory stage started in 1964 and transitional in 1973. It was hoped that with the end of transitional period envisaged to last for 22 years. Turkey applied for a full membership to EU on April 1987 and was a member to Customs Unity on January 1996.

As demanded from other candidate countries, Turkey is expected to comply with the political and economic criteria accepted at Copenhagen, Madrid and Helsinki summits so as to be a full member to EU (Landaburu, 2000). Within the context of political criteria, Turkey is demanded to conform to EU standards in such fields as freedoms, democracy, trial, capital punishment, education and publication in parent language, environment and visa regulation, prevention of illegal immigration, government reform and inspection. Within the context of economic criteria, Turkey is demanded to conform to EU standards in such fields as market economy, inflation, public deficits, agriculture, privatization, social security, economic stability, productivity, social and regional imbalances, total competition, finance, documentation, observation of market and law of corporation (DTM, 2000a; DTM, 2000b).

In *National Program* drawn up in 2001, Turkey promised to conform to some criteria demanded for full membership in short term and some in medium term (DPT, 2001). In this framework an important step was taken with the law numbered 4771. Capital punishment was abolished, freedom of thought was expanded, and regulations preventing torture, facilitating to found society and foundations and increasing their authorities were put into practice. Education and publication in parent language is allowed on the condition that they are not against national unity (Resmi Gazete, 2002).

Turkey's full membership to EU has always been on the governments' initiative. It is extremely important for the democratic system to get the public view about such a subject, which is sure to affect the daily life deeply. The member countries, achieved this after getting the approval of their people or parliaments. For example, Norway gave up becoming a member to EU when public voted against the full membership to EU in referendum firstly held on September 25<sup>th</sup>, 1972 (Tekeli and Ilkin, 1993: 72), and later on November 28<sup>th</sup>, 1994 (DTM, 1999: 308). 75,3% of Polish who participated in referendum held on June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2003 voted for full membership to EU.

The purpose of the research was to find out the answers of aged 18 and over living in Sivas<sup>1</sup> city center for the following questions: How they defined EU? How much they consider EU successful in which fields? How much they wish Turkey's full member to EU? How much they believe EU will allow Turkey into the EU? Which obstacles are there before the Turkey's full membership? How was full membership affected by customs unity? How will corruption be affected by full membership in Turkey? How much they want potential alternative unifications for Turkey? The contribution of this study is that finding obtained from the study will help policy makers to know public opinion about EU to make more healthy decision before having final EU related policies.

In the study, firstly some information will be given about scope and method of the research and qualities of the sample group. Later, the results of study will present and compare with the results of other researches. Afterwards, a discriminate analysis will be done in order to determine the property differences between the participants who say, *Turkey must be full member to EU* and *Turkey must not be full member to EU*.

## **2. Survey Procedures and Qualities of Sample Group**

### **2.1. Survey Procedures**

The survey was conducted in 60 wards in Sivas city center through random access method interviewing directly between the dates of July 17 and 22 in 2001. The results of the survey were collected daily from the pollsters. Pollsters were chosen from among the students of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences in Cumhuriyet University. They were informed in advance about the questions in the survey and potential problems that might be encountered during the conductance of the survey. In the context of the survey 2007 people were conducted with, but 1934 forms were considered valid.

According to 2000 census, the population of Sivas central town is 251776 persons (DİE, 2002b). 55% of this population (roughly 138477 person) is 18 years old and above. A survey of 1934 people shows that the required minimum number for such a study was largely exceeded. Because at the significance level of 5% it is enough for sampling size to be 398 when total population is 100000 and 400 when the size of total mass is directed towards the infinite (Yamane, 2001: 498). Questions asked in the survey mostly consisted of the graded questions in Likert Scale.

### **2.2. Qualities of Sample Group**

---

<sup>1</sup> Sivas is 2<sup>th</sup> ranks in terms of area and 28<sup>th</sup> ranks in terms of population among 81 cities in Turkey (DİE, 2002a: 50-51, 54). It has been located in the center of the country at east-west and north-south linkages. It is one of the cities, which has the highest rate of emigration and it has a university with about 17000 students.

32,5% of the participants in the survey was 18-24 age group and it were followed by 25-30 and 31-40 age groups. 69,9% of them was male and 29,5% was female. 34,5% of the participants graduated from high school, 18,9% primary school, 14,3% undergraduate school and 17,8% was university students. Monthly income of 17,5% of the participants had below minimum wage (about 108 million Turkish Lira). The rate of those with a monthly income of 500 million Turkish Lira and below was 69%. 38,7% considered their knowledge about EU moderately adequate, 29,5% inadequate and 18,9% adequate. 48,4% has been living in Sivas for over 20 years and 19,4% for 11 to 20 years. 88,7% has spent most of their time in the city. 20,8% was student, 18,1% civil servant, 14,8% shopkeeper and 10,9% housewife. 82,9% has never been a European country (Table 1).

**Table 1: Qualities of Sample Group (n=1934)**

<b>Age Groups</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Period of residence in Sivas</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
18-24	629	32,5	Less than 5 years	316	16,3
25-30	444	23,0	5 to 10 years	263	13,6
31-40	452	23,4	11-20 years	375	19,4
41-50	255	13,2	Longer than 20 years	937	48,4
51+	145	7,5	No answer	43	2,2
No answer	9	0,5	<b>Spent most of his/her life in</b>		
<b>Sex</b>			City	1716	88,7
Male	1346	69,6	Town	90	4,7
Female	571	29,5	Village	79	4,1
No answer	17	0,9	Abroad	23	1,2
<b>Level of Education</b>			No answer	26	1,3
Primary school	365	18,9	<b>Work Groups</b>		
High school	667	34,5	Worker	171	8,8
University student	345	17,8	Civil servant	351	18,1
Vocational training school	138	7,1	Farmer	61	3,2
Undergraduate school	276	14,3	Tradesman	38	2,0
Graduate school	119	6,2	Shopkeeper	287	14,8
No answer	24	1,2	Industrialist	31	1,6
<b>Income levels (TL)</b>			Housewife	211	10,9
108.000.000 and below	339	17,5	Retired	92	4,8
109-209 million	471	24,4	Student	403	20,8
251-500 million	524	27,1	Other	242	12,5
501-750 million	128	6,6	No answer	47	2,4
751-999 million	36	1,9	<b>Time they spent in Europe</b>		
1 billion & above	39	2,0	Never	1604	82,9
No answer	397	20,5	1week	37	1,9

Level of knowledge on EU			1 month	70	3,6
Completely adequate	106	5,5	6 months	43	2,2
Adequate	366	18,9	1 year	20	1,0
Moderately adequate	748	38,7	Longer than 1 year	102	5,3
Inadequate	570	29,5	No answer	58	3,0
Completely inadequate	134	6,9			
No answer	10	0,5			

The number of female participants remained low since housewives did not generally want to participate in the survey. The fact that there was a large number of formal and non-formal higher education graduates and students among the public and that they were willing to participate in the survey caused the number of participants with a university degree to increase. Although Turkey's membership process has taken too longer than for any other country, the participants had not to have adequate information on EU. This problem is also confirmed by the findings of other researchers. For example in a survey (European Commission, 2001: 9)<sup>2</sup>, the rate of Turkish participants who said they were very well-informed on Turkey's membership to EU and the expansion of EU was 17% (last order among the candidate countries) and the rate of those who said they were well-informed was 20% (second order from the last). In a survey (Türkiye-Avrupa Vakfı, 2002)<sup>3</sup>, 22% of the participants stated they knew nothing about the Turkey's membership to EU and 61% said they knew little about it.

### 3. Results of the Survey

#### 3.1. Description of EU

Participants were asked to state how well the terms of economic unity, Europeanism, opposition to Turks, Christian unity, military unity, opposition to Islam, political unity, contemporariness and colonialism, define EU by marking one of the following choices: *never define, no define, less define, define, well define*. When the rates of votes for less define, define, well define were added up the choices which got the highest votes in descending order were; economic unity, contemporariness, political unity, Europeanism, colonialism, Christian unity, opposition to Islam, opposition to Turks and military unity (Table 2).

It is quite natural for the choice economic unity to get the highest number of votes considering that the foundations of modern EU consist of the European Coal

<sup>2</sup> A survey was conducted with 1000 participants in the 15+ age group from each of 11 candidate countries (Turkey, Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Letonia, Slovenia, Estonia) and with 500 participants from Malta and Greek Cyprot.

<sup>3</sup> Survey was conducted interviewing with 1886 people directly in a total of 17 provinces in 7 regions between December 26<sup>th</sup> and January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2002.

and Steel Community (ECSC), European Economic Community and European Atom Energy Community (EAEC). That contemporariness got the second highest number of votes as it is one of the reasons why Turkey wants to be a full member to EU. That the name of the EU translates as European Community and European Union and it has got organized political parties in member countries and a parliament shows that EU is getting more political unity.

The fact that the process for Turkey's full membership to EU took quite a long time and that it is uncertain how longer it will take might have been affective for high number of votes for the description of EU as Europeanism and opposition to Turks. In a survey (European Communities, 2001: 11, 38), 4% of the participants described themselves as European, 45% by their national identity and Turkey was chosen as the least wanted country by 30% of votes. These results may also show that there is not a common idealism for Europeanism among EU citizens.

Some EU authorities like J. Delors, president of European Commission, who said that Christianity lies in the root of Europeanism might have been affective for the high number of voters for the description of EU as Christian unity and opposition to Islam. In a survey (Çarkoğlu et al, 2002: 29) 49% of the participants described EU as Christian club. In a survey (European Communities, 2001: 12, 39), 38% of the participants stated that *there is a common culture shared by all Europeans* while 49% said that, there is no common culture. 64% regarded the expansion of EU as cultural richness. All these things must indicate that religious difference is not an insurmountable obstacle before the unification. Turkey's full membership will be an important proof that EU is not a union consisting of only Christian countries. According to G. Verheugen who is the member responsible for the expansion of European Commission (2001), political leaders have an important role in telling the public why expansion and Turkey's membership are important and that EU is not a Christian unity but a union founded on common democratic values.

The fact that the description of EU as colonialism got high number of votes must be significant considering the fact that according to a thesis known as Prebisch-Singer thesis in literature foreign trade will develop in favor of the developed countries exporting industrial products and against under developed countries exporting agricultural products in the long term (Appleyard and Field, 1992: 781), and developed countries are generally those giving loans and developing ones are those generally getting credits. That the description of EU as military unity got low number of votes might have stemmed from the fact that the EU failed in stopping the bloody wars during the disintegration of Yugoslavia.

**Table 2: Types of Describing EU** (% , n = 1934)

Describing Types	Never define	Not define	Less define	Define	Well define	No answer
Economic Unity	4,7	3,7	15,6	33,7	38,7	3,7
Europeanism	12,6	10,9	21,1	25,8	21,9	7,7
Opposition to Turks	25,9	17,0	19,1	11,2	19,1	7,8
Christian Unity	24,2	10,6	15,8	15,8	26,6	7,0
Military Unity	24,9	18,3	23,8	15,3	9,4	8,4
Opposition to Islam	22,6	14,6	18,1	13,7	23,6	7,4
Political Unity	10,5	9,4	22,9	25,3	24,9	6,9
Contemporariness	11,0	8,2	20,3	27,4	26,5	6,6
Colonialism	21,4	12,7	16,4	13,1	29,0	7,4

### 3.2. EU's Success Level in Different Fields

When the rates of votes of those who found EU *less successful*, *successful* and *very successful* were added up, the order of the fields in which EU was considered successful was economic, political, law, social, human rights and military fields. The rate of those who found EU very successful in economic, human rights and social fields was quite high (Table 3).

**Table 3: Success Rate of EU According to Different Fields** (% , n=1934)

Fields	Completely unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Less successful	Successful	Very successful	No answer
Economic	3,8	2,3	11,4	33,7	45,2	3,6
Social	5,5	6,6	19,2	30,6	32,1	6,0
Political	5,7	7,6	22,8	31,3	25,7	6,8
Law	5,7	5,8	18,4	34,1	29,7	6,3
Military	13,3	16,0	28,6	20,7	13,8	7,5
Human Rights	9,3	6,8	14,0	25,6	39,9	4,3

### 3.3. Turkey's Full Membership to EU

#### Must Turkey be a full member to EU?

65% of the participants wanted Turkey to be a full member to EU (Table 4). This rate is nearly same in another surveys, for example 68,7% (Elekdağ, 2000)<sup>4</sup>, 64% (Çarkoğlu et al, 2002: 38)<sup>5</sup> 68% (European Commission, 2001: 5) and 68%

<sup>4</sup> Survey was conducted by interviewing directly with a total of 2027 individuals 18 years and above in 17 cities (Adana, Antalya, Bursa, Diyarbakır, Manisa, Erzurum, Gaziantep, İstanbul, İzmir, Kayseri, Kırklareli, Konya, İçel, Samsun, Zonguldak, Aydın).

<sup>5</sup> Survey was conducted by random access method interviewing directly with 3060 individuals 18 years and above in 17 provinces (Adana ,Ankara, Balıkesir, Burdur, Bursa, Denizli, Diyarbakır, Erzurum, Gaziantep, İstanbul, İzmir, Kars, Konya, Malatya, Samsun, Sinop, Şanlıurfa) and in 25 towns which administratively belong to these provinces.

(Türkiye-Avrupa Vakfı, 2002). In a survey (European Commission, 2001: 19) Turkish respondents chose the 7<sup>th</sup> option at the rate of 52% in a scale ranging from 1 to 7 (1 means no need for progress, 7 means fast possible need for progress) which shows the preferences for the speed of realization of Turkey's full membership to EU.

**Table 4: Must Turkey Be a Full Member to EU?**

Options	Number	Percentage
Yes	1266	65,5
No	472	24,4
No idea	177	9,2
No answer	19	1,0
Total	1934	100

#### **Which obstacles are there before Turkey's full membership?**

When the rates of votes of those who chose *less prevent*, *prevent* and *much prevent* options for potential obstacles before Turkey's membership to EU were added up the order of obstacles before Turkey's full membership were, in descending order, high rate of unemployment, lack of democracy, mismanagement, developmental difference, Cyprus problem, Greece factor, terror events, religious difference and nationalistic difference (Table 5).

**Table 5: Obstacles Before Turkey's Full Membership to EU, (% n=1934)**

Potential obstacles	Never prevent	Not prevent	Less prevent	Prevent	Much prevent	No answer
Nationalistic difference	14,2	11,3	20,1	23,3	25,5	5,6
Religious difference	11,9	9,8	15,4	20,9	37,6	4,4
Developmental difference	5,6	4,6	12,4	22,1	50,1	5,1
High rate of unemployment	3,5	3,3	9,1	23,1	57,3	3,7
Greece factor	8,0	10,9	23,1	23,9	28,1	6,0
Lack of democracy	4,3	4,9	11,3	26,0	48,5	5,0
Cyprus problem	6,2	7,9	19,4	24,1	37,5	5,4
Mismanagement	4,4	5,7	11,8	22,1	51,3	4,6
Terror events	11,0	9,3	17,1	20,4	37,5	4,8

#### **How long time took for Turkey's full membership process?**

62,2% and 18% of the participants found that time spent for Turkey full membership is very long and long respectively. Total rate of votes for these options was 80,2%. 10% of the participants did not state any idea in this subject (Table 6).



**Table 6: Time Spent For Turkey's Full Membership**

Ideas	Number	%
Very long	1202	62,2
Long	348	18,0
Normal	136	7,0
Short	42	2,2
No idea	193	10,0
No answer	13	0,7
Total	1934	100

**Which group how much prefer Turkey's full membership?**

When the rates of votes of those who chose *less want*, *want* and *much want* options were added up, the order of those who wanted Turkey to be a full member was youth, academician, media employee, unemployed, industrialist and merchant, civil bureaucrat, civil servant, military bureaucrat, former and elderly. The much want option took the highest percent of votes (64,1%) about Turkey's full member to EU by the unemployed (Table 7).

**Table 7: The Preferences For Turkey's Full Membership (% , n=1934)**

Groups	Never want	No want	Less want	Want	Much want	No answer
Industrialist and merchant	7,2	5,5	12,4	24,9	45,2	4,8
Worker	8,4	10,7	21,9	24,9	27,1	7,0
Civil servant	8,3	8,1	19,6	29,9	27,2	6,8
Former	21,4	17,5	20,0	14,9	18,4	7,7
Academician	2,7	3,1	10,4	31,6	44,9	7,2
Civil bureaucrat	5,9	6,2	18,8	30,5	30,8	7,8
Military bureaucrat	13,2	12,2	21,0	22,5	23,6	7,5
Media employee	5,1	2,7	8,9	19,5	57,2	6,6
Youth	3,7	2,9	11,5	21,0	55,6	5,3
Elderly	26,6	21,4	25,4	11,0	7,9	7,8
Unemployed	6,3	2,5	5,4	15,9	64,1	5,8

**How much improve some fields by full membership in Turkey?**

When the rates of votes of those who chose *less improve*, *improve* and *much improve* options for different fields were added up, the order of fields for which improvements were expected were economy, education, law, social, political, security, democracy and human rights. The fact that *no answer* option for democracy and human rights got 42,4% of votes must be the indicator of the indecisiveness of the respondents in this topic (Table 8).

**Table 8: Improvement Fields When Turkey Full Member to EU (% , n=1934)**

Fields	Never improve	Not improve	Less improve	Improve	Much Improve	No answer
Economic	5,7	4,0	17,3	33,8	36,3	2,9
Social	7,9	8,3	19,5	30,2	29,5	4,7
Political	9,6	11,1	25,2	27,2	21,7	5,1
Law	6,6	6,9	18,5	32,2	30,3	5,5
Education	5,5	5,0	18,1	32,2	35,2	4,0
Security	14,0	13,3	25,1	22,8	19,3	5,5
Democracy and human rights	2,7	2,1	10,0	16,2	26,6	42,4

### How did customs unity affect to full membership?

25% of the participants stated that customs unity facilitated Turkey's full membership, 22% made it more difficult, 28,5% no affect, 22,8% had no idea. These results have stated there was not a strong correlation between customs unity and full membership (Table 9).

**Table 9: How Did Affect the Customs Unity to Full Membership?**

	Number	%
Facilitated	483	25,0
Made it more difficult	426	22,0
Not affected	551	28,5
No idea	440	22,8
No answer	34	1,8
Total	1934	100

### How would the full membership affect corruption?

7,5% of the participants stated that full membership would prevent the corruption thoroughly, 43,6% would reduce, 12,6% would increase and 26,1% would not affect it at all (Table 10).

**Table 10: How Would the Full Membership Affect Corruption?**

	Number	%
Prevent	145	7,5
Reduce	844	43,6
Increase	244	12,6
Not affect	505	26,1
No idea	173	8,9
No answer	23	1,2
Total	1934	100

### How much do people believe eu will admit Turkey for full membership?

20,7% of all participants stated that they believe and 71,5% did not believe EU would allow Turkey into full membership (Table 11). The low number of those who believed in being admitted into EU membership might have stemmed from exceptionally long process of full membership and from the pessimistic atmosphere caused by the economic crisis experienced intensively in 2001. In a survey (European Commission, 2001: 8) 53% of Turkish participants stated that they trusted and 34% did not trust EU.

**Table 11: Public Belief in Being Admitted into Full Membership By EU**

	Number	%
Believe	401	20,7
Not believe	1383	71,5
No idea	137	7,1
No answer	13	0,7
Total	1934	100

### 3.2. Turkey's Conditional Full Membership into EU

In this part, questions asked to the participants are on conditions demanded from Turkey for full membership and Turkey promised to realize them in the short and middle term in *National Program*<sup>6</sup>. These topics were included in *Progress Reports* dated November 4<sup>th</sup>, 1998; October 13<sup>th</sup>, 1999; November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2000 drawn up by the Commission of EU and in the Document for Accession Partnership with Turkey dated November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2000 (DPT, 2001; DTM, 2000a).

Those conditions are abolition of capital punishment, speeding privatization, annulling the principle that Turkish is the national language in Turkey in Constitution, withdrawal of Turkish Army from Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), strengthening local governments, converting National Security Council (NSC) into an advisory committee and abolition of martial law. Some conditions, as are acceptance of increasing human rights and freedoms, strengthening local governments, speeding of privatization, abolition of martial law and converting of NSC into an advisory committee got votes of over 50%. Annulling the principle that Turkish is the national language in Turkey and withdrawal of Turkish Army from TRNC were severely opposed (Table 12).

In a survey (Çarkoğlu et al, 2002: 14, 25), the rate of those who wanted the abolition of capital punishment after putting the life imprisonment into force was 62%. The rate of those who wanted the abolition of the laws hindering the citizens

<sup>6</sup> Of these, the condition that Turkish Army should withdraw from the TRNC was not included in official records. In official records, it was demanded that UN Secretary of Generals initiatives on Cyprus be supported.

from training and educating in their own language was 42%. The rate of those who wanted the abolition of the laws preventing the broadcast in their own language was 41%. The disagreement between these results and our findings might be resulted from the fact that they were not presented as a condition for membership in other survey and from the difference in time and simple group between the two surveys. The fact that terrorist leader of PKK Abdullah Öcalan, who had been a trouble for Turkey for 15 years and who cost the lives of around 30000 people, was given capital punishment must have played an important role in the opposition to the abolition of capital punishment.

The severe opposition to the abolition of the principle *Turkish is the national language of the Turkish State* in the Constitution resulted from the worry that broadcast and education in different languages might harm Turkey's national unity. Turkey stated in the *national program*, the fact that official and educational language is Turkish will not prevent citizens from using different languages, dialects in their daily lives (DPT, 2001). Having a Turkish identity card was considered identical with being Turkish citizen.

In a survey (European Communities, 2001: 39, 44), the rate of the choices that enlargement of EU will bring cultural richness, more peace and security was 64%. 84% of participants demanded that EU institutions should undertake more active role in the struggle with racism. In a survey (Elekdağ, 2000), the condition that Turkey must eliminate her deficiencies in democracy, raise human rights to universal standards and conduct state affairs according to the principle of the superiority of law got 69,3%, the condition that precautions which ensure respect to the freedom of opinion got 70,4%, and the condition that citizens from different groups have equal identity and cultural rights before the law got 62% of the votes. In a survey (Çarkoğlu et all, 2002: 14), the rate of those who wanted Turkey to satisfy the required conditions in the field of freedom of opinion so as to be a full member to EU was 82% and the rate of those who wanted Turkey to satisfy the required conditions in the area of freedom of religion and conscience was 77%. In a survey (European Communities, 2001: 33), the rate of those who demanded that individual rights be guaranteed and democratic principles be respected was 80%.

In the *national program*, Turkey promised to make every effort to improve the conditions in the area of human rights particularly those on arresting and trial and in prison; train police officers and judges at EU standards; take the indemnities from the public employees who caused the juridical mismanagements carried to the Court of Europe Human Rights; reduce regional imbalances; increase social and cultural facilities; work to ensure that everybody benefits from the basic rights and freedoms equally without observing the difference in language, race, color, sex, religion, political and philosophical view (DPT, 2001).

Cyprus problem is probably the biggest obstacle before Turkey's full membership. Although EU's economic, commercial and strategic interests in

Turkey are more important compared to an island with a population of 700 000, combined Greek votes may be affective in EU organs and change EU's view to Turkey and Cyprus in time Southern Cyprus's admission into EU. Greeks on the Island may lobby for the Northern Cyprus to be regarded as an area in EU borders occupied by illegal occupiers and Turks in the north as rioters supporting the occupiers. Greeks may resort any means to exclude Turkey and Cyprus Turks and may persuade EU to use its power against Turkey. However, recognition of the independence of both sides would be a realistic and sensitive attitude. Preventing the candidacy of Turkey by the Greeks will not be for the benefit of EU (Barchard, 2002).

In a survey (Çarkoğlu et al., 2002: 14), the rate of those who accepted the condition that Turkey should be a full member on condition that army's effect on Turkish policy reduced was 50%. Turkey stated in *national program* that NSC would be converted into an advisory organ interested in national security (DPT, 2001). The number of civilian members was increased with 4709 number law by including vice president and minister of justice into the NCS consisting of president, prime minister, president of general staff, ministers of national defense, internal affairs and foreign affairs, commanders of air, land and naval forces and general commander of gendarmerie. The statement, that NSC decisions firstly considered by the cabinet has changed as evaluated by the cabinet (Resmi Gazete, 2001).

Acceptance of the condition for the termination of martial law got votes at a rate of 54,6%. Turkey stated in her *national program* that martial law would completely be terminated (DPT, 2001), and martial law was completely terminated in Tunceli and Hakkari on July 30, 2002, in Diyarbakır and Şırnak on November 30, 2002.

**Table 12: Conditional Full Membership for Turkey's to EU (% , n=1934)**

Conditions	Must be accepted	Must be rejected	No idea	No answer
Abolition of capital punishment	43,5	51,7	3,4	1,4
Speeding privatization	71,1	23,1	4,0	1,9
Increasing human rights and freedoms	86,3	9,3	1,9	2,5
Withdrawal of Turkish Army from TRNC	12,2	81,2	4,0	2,5
Strengthening of local governments	82,3	10,2	4,8	2,7
Conversion of NSC into advisory committee	50,5	30,2	16,1	3,2
Abolition of martial law regime	54,6	35,1	7,9	2,5
Abolition of the principle that "Turkish State Language is Turkish" in Constitution	12,3	83,0	2,3	2,5

### 3.5. Potential Unities for Turkey

When the rates of those who chose *less good*, *good* and *very good* options for alternative unities were added, the order of alternative unifications demanded for Turkey was unification with Turkish States, EU, Islamic Countries, neighbor countries and USA. Staying out of all unifications has got very little votes (Table 13).

The fact that while Turkey's full membership into EU has got votes at a rate of 65,5% (Table 10), the rate of votes went up to 75,2% must have stemmed from the concentration of those who objected other unifications in this choice. Although USA is affective in the formation of Turkey's internal and external policy, unification with the USA might have been preferred less possibly because the geographical distance between Turkey and USA. In spite of high rates of votes for the unifications with Turkish States, Islamic Countries and neighboring countries a strong union like EU doesn't exist among these states as yet, and Turkey is not strong enough to be an engine for such a union, and unifications based on religion and race may have other risks. In addition, Turkey admitted into EU as a full member can have healthier relations with Islamic Countries, Turkish States and neighboring countries.

**Table 13: Potential Alternative Unities For Turkey (%) (n=1934)**

Unit with	Never good	No good	Less good	Good	Very good	No answer
EU	13,0	6,7	11,5	26,7	37,0	5,1
USA	22,1	12,8	20,9	21,1	14,8	8,3
Islamic countries	13,9	10,3	20,2	21,0	27,8	6,7
Turkish states	7,7	6,9	12,9	23,2	42,3	7,1
Neighbor countries	15,1	10,4	21,9	25,2	19,6	7,7
Staying out of all unities	60,5	10,3	6,3	3,8	8,9	10,1

### 4. Discriminate Analysis

In this section, a discriminate analysis has performed in order to determine the property differences between the participants who say, *Turkey must be a full member to EU* and *Turkey must not be a full member to EU*. Those who choose the same answer for the same questions were comprised a group. The properties of groups, which bring them closer to each other or draw them apart from others, are determined by discriminate analysis that is a continuation of MANOVA, a variance analysis with one factor and many variables.  $H_0$  hypothesis means there is no difference and  $H_1$  hypothesis there is difference between the groups. When the  $H_1$  hypothesis accepted, the reasons for the difference between the groups were investigated. Discriminate variables, which determine the difference between the groups may be with a least error, are revealed by the discriminate functions (Tatlıdil, 1996: 256-257).

#### 4.1. Data Set

51 years age group was taken as a constant value, other groups as independent variable, no answer group as missing value. Women were taken as constant value, men as independent value, no answer as missing value. Males were coded as (1) and females as (0).

Graduate students were taken as constant value, other education levels as independent variable, and no answer as missing value. Other occupation group was taken as a constant value, occupation groups outside this as an independent variable, no answer group as missing value.

Those who spent most of their lives in town and village were taken as constant value, those who lived mostly in cities and abroad as an independent variable and no answer as missing value. Those who spent most of their lives in city and abroad were coded as (1); and those who spent most of their lives in village and town as (0). Those with a monthly income of 1 billion Turkish Lira and above were taken as a constant value, other income groups as independent variable and no answer group as missing value.

Those who had never been in any European Country were taken as a constant value and those who had been as independent variable no answer group as missing value. Those who went to a European country were coded as (1) and those who did not as (0).

Those who considered their level of information on EU completely inadequate were taken as a constant value, those who considered it inadequate, moderately adequate and completely adequate as independent variable. Those who did not answer were taken as missing value. 653 of a total of data (33,8%) were excluded from the analysis as missing value and 1281 (66,2%) were considered valid (Table 14).

**Table 14: Analysis Case Processing Summary**

Unweighted Cases	N	%
Valid	1281	66,2
Excluded	653	33,8
-Missing or out-of-range group codes	137 person	%7,1
-At least one missing discriminating variable	457 person	%23,6
-Both missing or out-of-range group codes and at least one missing discriminating variable	59 person	%3,1
Total	1934	100,0

**Table 15: Discriminate Variables And Coefficients**

Independent variables	1, Turkey must be full member to EU 0, Turkey must not be a full member to EU	Coefficients of canonical discriminate functions	
First age group	Between 18-24 years old 1, others 0	0,445	
Second age group	Between 25-30 years old 1, others 0	0,455	
Third age group	Between 31-40 years old 1, others 0	-0,510	
Fourth age group	Between 41-50 years old 1, others 0	-0,658	
Sex	Male 1, female 0	0,591	
Education level-1	Primary school 1, others 0	0,048	
Education level-2	High school 1, others 0	0,039	
Education level-3	University student 1, others 0	0,278	
Education level-4	Vocational training school stu. 1, others 0	-0,459	
Education level-5	Undergraduate student 1, others 0	-0,046	
Occupation-1	Worker 1, others 0	0,182	
Occupation-2	Civil servant, 1, others 0	-0,082	
Occupation-3	Farmer 1, others 0	1,377	
Occupation-4	Trader 1, others 0	0,551	
Occupation-5	Shopkeeper 1, others 0	0,216	
Occupation-6	Industrialist 1, others 0	0,774	
Occupation-7	Housewife 1, others 0	-0,519	
Occupation-8	Retired 1, others 0	1,036	
Occupation-9	Student 1, others 0	-0,546	
Life style	Those who spent most of their time in cities and abroad 1, others 0	0,435	
Income level-1	108 million TL and below 1, others 0	1,473	
Income level-2	109-250 million TL 1, others 0	0,716	
Income level-3	251-500 million TL 1, others 0	0,655	
Income level-4	501-750 million TL 1, others 0	0,158	
Income level-5	751-999 million TL 1, others 0	-0,330	
Haven been to a European country	Those who had never been to a European country 1, those who had 0	0,300	
Information about EU	Level-1	Those who consider their knowledge on EU is completely sufficient 1, others 0	0,477
	Level-2	Those who consider their knowledge on EU sufficient 1, others 0	-0,468
	Level-3	Those who consider their knowledge on EU is insufficient 1, others 0	-1,049
	Level-4	Those who consider their knowledge on EU is completely sufficient 1, others 0	-0,704
Constant value		-1,159	

Chi-Square: 65,693

Df: 30

P: 0,000

Wilks' lambda: 0,949

Canonical Correlation Coefficient: 0,225

Means of Group: -0,412 for 1, 0,376 for 0



#### 4.2. Discriminate Functions

Participants were divided into 2 groups as said that *Turkey must be a full member to EU* and *Turkey must not be a full member to EU*. First group was coded as (1) and the second group as (0). Discriminate function separating the groups from each other was obtained. That high chi square value obtained (65,693) shows the reliability of the function (Table 15).

#### 4.3. Results of Discriminate Analysis

The properties of groups, which separate each other, which say, *Turkey must be a full member to EU* and *Turkey must not be full member to EU* are information level about EU, age, sex, level of education, income, occupation, the place of the life spent mostly, length of stay in any European country (if they went) and knowledge of a foreign language.

Wilk's lambda, F values and significance grades of those who said, *Turkey must be a full member to EU* and those who said, *Turkey must not be a full member to EU* are listed in Table 16. Significance grades of 11 characteristics are below 5%. The fact that significance grade was 0% for education at vocational training school and undergraduate levels and for monthly income of 108 million TL and below shows that they are reliable as distinctive property. Group averages those who are vocational school, undergraduate, university students, high school graduates, civil servants, in 31 to 40 years old age group; have a monthly income of 501 to 750 million TL, consider their information on EU at a moderately sufficient level and those who state *Turkey must be a full member to EU* are much higher.

Group average of those who said that, *Turkey must not be a full member to EU* was higher among those with a monthly income of 108 million TL and below, who were 18 to 24 years old, and in males (Table 16).

In Table 17a, standardized coefficients for canonic differential function are listed. According to this function the variable whose coefficient is the highest is the one, which most strongly differentiates two groups from each other. The variable with the lowest coefficient is the one, which most slightly discriminates the groups from each other. Top 3 variables are respectively, education level-4, income level-1 and information level-3. Other variables listed in order of importance.

In addition to showing the variable, which discriminates between two groups and the rate it discriminates them, this function has two important tasks, too. The first one is that it allows the reassignment of present observations to the groups using the data for their independent variables. The second one is that substituting the data for an observation taken from outside in the equation, it determines the groups they belong to. Yet, the data for independent variables of this observation

must be between the minimum and maximum values of observations in the sample (Hair, 1995: 111).

In this study the variables, which discriminate two groups, most strongly were education level-4, education level-5, income level-1, education level-2, education level-3, occupation-2, age-3, and income level-4, respectively. As correlation coefficients of other variables were below 30%, they had a weak power to discriminate (Table 17b). When we look at MANOVA test of these 8 variables whose discriminate power was high, we see that the means of those who said “Turkey must be a full member to EU” was higher among vocational training school and undergraduate students, high school graduates, university students, civil servants, those between 31-40 years age range and those with an income of 501 to 750 million TL. The means of those who said that, “Turkey must not be a full member to EU” was higher among those where income was below minimum wage (Table 16).

**Table 16: Equality Tests For Group Averages**

Variables	Means for 1	Means for 0	Total	Wilks' Lambda	F	Df1	Df2	Significance
Age – 1	0,2433	0,3070**	0,2609	0,996	5,480	1	1279	0,019*
Age – 2	0,2310	0,2719	0,2423	0,998	2,972	1	1279	0,085
Age – 3	0,2946**	0,2135	0,2722	0,993	8,912	1	1279	0,003*
Age – 4	0,1540	0,1140	0,1430	0,997	3,635	1	1279	0,057
Sex	0,7779	0,8333**	0,7932	0,996	5,472	1	1279	0,019*
Education level –1	0,1429	0,1667	0,1494	1,000	0,342	1	1279	0,559
Education level –2	0,9632**	0,6111	0,8659	0,991	11,594	1	1279	0,001*
Education level –3	0,7444**	0,3977	0,6486	0,991	11,200	1	1279	0,001*
Education level –4	0,6897**	0,3041	0,5832	0,989	14,056	1	1279	0,000*
Education level –5	0,7701**	0,3947	0,6664	0,990	12,995	1	1279	0,000*
Occupation –1	0,09821	0,1082	0,1010	1,000	0,088	1	1279	0,767
Occupation –2	0,2667**	0,1871	0,2447	0,993	9,215	1	1279	0,002*
Occupation –3	0,03013	0,04971	0,03554	0,998	2,894	1	1279	0,089
Occupation –4	0,02344	0,02924	0,02504	1,000	0,244	1	1279	0,621
Occupation –5	0,1708	0,1813	0,1737	0,999	0,732	1	1279	0,392
Occupation –6	0,01786	0,02632	0,02019	1,000	0,487	1	1279	0,485
Occupation –7	0,05022	0,02924	0,04443	0,998	2,916	1	1279	0,088
Occupation –8	0,04464	0,06725	0,05089	0,998	2,056	1	1279	0,152
Occupation –9	0,1641	0,1842	0,1696	0,999	0,852	1	1279	0,356
Lifestyle	0,9230	0,9211	0,9225	1,000	0,003	1	1279	0,959
Income level –1	0,1830	0,2778**	0,2092	0,990	12,511	1	1279	0,000*
Income level –2	0,2835	0,3129	0,2916	0,999	0,889	1	1279	0,346
Income level –3	0,3705	0,3216	0,3570	0,998	2,229	1	1279	0,136
Income level –4	0,1004**	0,05263	0,08724	0,994	7,676	1	1279	0,006*
Income level –5	0,03237	0,01462	0,02746	0,998	2,831	1	1279	0,093
Having been in a	0,8170	0,8480	0,8255	0,999	1,792	1	1279	0,181

European Country								
Information About European Union	0,05915	0,08772	0,06704	0,997	3,770	1	1279	0,052
	0,2333	0,2368	0,2342	1,000	0,046	1	1279	0,830
	0,4342**	0,3626	0,4144	0,995	5,784	1	1279	0,016*
	0,2366	0,2544	0,2415	1,000	0,230	1	1279	0,631

\* Those with a significance level below 5%, and \*\* those with a high group average.

As there were a large number of variables in the study, we benefited from matrix structure in order to determine discriminate grades of variables and the limit up to which variables were significant in discrimination.

As for their discriminate loads, the sequence of the correlations of the variables in the function is given in terms of their absolute values in this known matrix. Matrix orders the variables from the strong to the weak ones in terms of their power to discriminate variables. Correlation shows the relationship between discriminate variables and standardized canonical discriminate function. Variables whose discriminate power is above 30% are considered valid and those whose discriminate power is below 30% are invalid (Hair 1995: 111).

Table 17a: Standardized Canonical Discriminate Function Coefficients		Table 17b: Structure Matrix	
	1		1
Education level-4	-0,752	Education level-4	-0,454
Income level-1	0,596	Education level-5	-0,436
Information on EU (level-3)	-0,515	Income level-1	0,428
Education level-3	0,455	Education level-2	-0,412
Income level-2	0,327	Education level-3	-0,405
Income level-3	0,313	Occupation-2	-0,367
Information on EU (level-4)	-0,305	Age-3	-0,361
Occupation-3	0,251	Income level-4	-0,335
Occupation-8	0,239	Information on EU (level-3)	-0,291
Sex-1	0,238	Age-1	0,283
Age-4	-0,233	Sex-1	0,283
Income-9	-0,202	Information on EU (level-1)	0,235
Age-3	-0,228	Age-4	-0,231
Information on EU (level-2)	-0,197	Age-2	0,209
Age-1	0,193	Occupation-7	-0,207
Age-2	0,193	Occupation-3	0,206
Information on EU (level-1)	0,119	Income level-5	-0,204
Life Style-1	0,118	Income level-5	-0,181
Having been in a European Country-1	0,114	Occupation-8	0,174
Occupation-6	0,111	Having been in a European Country-1	0,162
Occupation-7	-0,107	Income level-2	0,114
Occupation-4	0,086	Occupation-9	0,112
Occupation-5	0,082	Occupation-5	0,104

Education level-5	-0,075	Occupation-6	0,085
Education level-2	0,063	Education level-1	0,071
Occupation-1	0,056	Occupation-4	0,060
Income level-5	-0,053	Information on EU (level-4)	0,058
Income level-4	0,044	Occupation-1	0,036
Occupation-2	-0,035	Information on EU (level-2)	0,026
Education level-1	0,018	Life style-1	0,006

72,9% of the sample group was classified correctly according to discriminate function. 14 out of 351 who said that, *Turkey must not be a full member to EU* were classified correctly and 337 incorrectly. That is, 337 individuals in Group 0 fell into Group 1 in the estimated group. In the other words, they have the properties of individuals in Group 1. 920 out of 930 in Group 1, 98,9%, comprised of those who said that, *Turkey must be a full member to EU* were classified correctly and 10 incorrectly. That's to say, 10 individuals in Group 1 have the properties of those in Group 0. 930 of 1281 participants wanted and 351 did not want Turkey to be a full member to EU (Table 18).

**Table 18: The Results Of The Classification**

	Number			Percentage		
	Group, 0	Group, 1	Total	Group, 0	Group, 1	Total
Group, 0	14	337	351	4,0	96,0	100,0
Group, 1	10	920	930	1,1	98,9	100,0
That couldn't be grouped	3	134	137	2,2	97,8	100,0

(72,9% of original grouped cases correctly classified)

## 5. Summary and Conclusions

Turkey has been making efforts to be a full member to EU and these efforts have largely been spend on the governments' own initiative. On such an important topic, which is sure to affect daily life deeply surveying for public opinion is quite important for democratic administration. In a survey conducted by interviewing directly with 1934 resident in Sivas city center, EU was described as economic unity, contemporariness, political unity, Europeanism, colonialism, Christian unity, opposition to Islam, opposition to Turks and military unity, respectively. The descriptions excluding opposition to Turks and military unity got votes of above 50%. EU was found successful in economics, politics, law, social, human rights and military fields, respectively.

The results showed that potential obstacles before Turkey's full membership were ordered high rate of unemployment, mismanagement, developmental difference, Cyprus problem, Greece factor, terror events, religious difference and nationalistic difference. That religious and nationalistic differences were in the last row is promising for the full membership. In spite of strong support given for full membership there was a weak belief in EU's support for full membership.

When the votes of those who chose *less good*, *good* and *very good* options were added up, the order of unifications preferred for Turkey was unification with Turkish States, EU, Islamic Countries, neighboring countries and USA. The option of staying out of all unifications got few votes.

A discriminate analysis was performed to determine the properties separating those who said *Turkey must be a full member to EU* from those who said *Turkey must not be a full member to EU*. The means of those who said *Turkey must be a full member to EU* was higher among vocational training school and undergraduate students, high school graduates, university students, civil servants, 31-40 age group, those with an income of 501 to 750 million TL and those who find their knowledge on EU at moderately sufficient level. The means of those who said, *Turkey must not be a full member to EU* was higher among 18-24 age group, males and those with an income of 108 million TL and below.

According to standardized canonic discriminate function coefficients, the variables discriminating the two groups from each other most strongly were education level-4, income level-1 and information level-3 on EU, respectively. According to matrix structure, variables which separated the two groups most strongly were education level-1, education level-5, income level-1, education level-2, education level-3, occupation 2, age group 3 and income level-4, respectively. It is obvious from the results that education and income levels were the most important elements, which separated the group from each other. 72,9% of the sample group was classified correctly in discriminate function.

Finally, the findings obtained from this paper have implications for government policies related to EU. Having the public opinion about the topic related the EU and Turkey's long lasting relations will help Turkish policy makers be better prepared for future policy proposals.

## References

- Appleyard, Dennis R. And Alfred J. Field, (1992), *International Economics*, (USA: Richard D. Irvin, Inc.).
- Barchard, David, (2002), *Güçlü Bir Ortaklığa Doğru: Türkiye ve Avrupa Birliği*, www.tesev.org.tr/projeler/proje\_ab.php, 23.05.2002. (Çev: Murat Cemil Yalçıntaş ve Orhan Bilgin)
- Çarkoglu, Ali vd., (2002), *Türk Halkının Avrupa Birliği Üyeliğine Bakışı*, www.tesev.org.tr, 30.06.2002.
- DİE, (2002a), *Türkiye İstatistik Yıllığı 2001*, Ankara.
- DİE, (2002b), www.die.gov.tr/nufus\_sayimi/2000tablo4.xls, 12/09/2002.
- DPT, (1995), *Türkiye ve Avrupa Entegrasyonu*, (Ankara: Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu).

- DPT, (2001), Ulusal Program, [www.dpt.gov.tr](http://www.dpt.gov.tr), Ekim 2001.
- DTM, (1999), Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye, (Ankara: 4. Baskı).
- DTM, (2000a), “2000 Yılı İlerleme Raporu Hakkında Not”, [www.foreigntrade.gov.tr](http://www.foreigntrade.gov.tr), 9 Kasım 2000.
- DTM, (2000b), “Türkiye İçin AB Komisyonu Tarafından Hazırlanan Katılım Ortaklığı Belgesi'nin Gayri Resmî Tercümesi”, [www.foreigntrade.gov.tr](http://www.foreigntrade.gov.tr), 8 Kasım 2000.
- Elekdağ, Şükrü, (2000), “Aklımız Avrupa'da”, Milliyet, 21 Eylül 2000, [www.milliyet.com.tr/2000/09/21/haber/hab04.html](http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2000/09/21/haber/hab04.html), 31.05.2002.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, (2001), Public Opinion in the Countries Applying for EU Membership, [www.eureptr.org.tr/english/eurobarometersummary.pdf](http://www.eureptr.org.tr/english/eurobarometersummary.pdf), 23.05.2002.
- EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES, (2001), How Europeans See Themselves? Looking Through the Mirror with Public Opinion Surveys, <http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/publications/brochures/docu/europeans/en.pdf>, 23.05.2002.
- Hair, J. F., R. E. Anderson, R. L. Tatham and W. C. Black, (1995), Multivariate Data Analysis With Readings, (4<sup>th</sup> ed., Prentice Hall).
- Landaburu, Eneko, (2000), “Genişleme, Türkiye ve Sivil Toplum”, Avrupa Komisyonu Genişleme Genel Müdürünün 1 Aralık 2000'de Bilgi Üniversitesi'nde yaptığı konuşma.
- RESMİ GAZETE, (9 Ağustos 2002), Sayı 24841.
- RESMİ GAZETE, (17 Ekim 2001), Sayı 24556 Mükerrer.
- Tatlidil, Hüseyin, (1996), Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistiksel Analiz, (Ankara: Akademi Matbaası).
- Tekeli, İlhan ve Selim İlkin, (1993), Türkiye ve Avrupa Topluluğu – I, (Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık).
- TÜRKİYE-AVRUPA VAKFI, (2002), Türkiye'nin AB Üyeliği Anketi, [www.ozgurpolitika.org/2002/02/21/hab04.html](http://www.ozgurpolitika.org/2002/02/21/hab04.html), 05.06.2002.
- Verheugen, Günter, (2001), “Ortak Hedefimiz” <http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/makale-verheugen.html>, 18 Şubat 2001, Milliyet Gazetesi.
- Yamane, Taro, (2001), *Temel Örnekleme Yöntemleri*, (İstanbul: Literatür Yayınları: 53), (Çev: Alptekin Esin vd.).