



Comparative Analysis of Türkiye's Covid-19 Management

Muzaffer AKDOĞAN*

Sağlık Bilimleri Üniversitesi

Ekmel GEÇER**

Sağlık Bilimleri Üniversitesi

Yasemin Necmiye TUTAR***

Sağlık Bilimleri Üniversitesi

Pınar ÜNKÜR****

Sağlık Bilimleri Üniversitesi

Abstract

The European Commission, each year, prepares reports that screen the progress made by the candidate countries of the European Union (EU). EU Türkiye reports are considered to have a positive influence on Türkiye's COVID-19 pandemic process management. Therefore, this study aims to find out whether the EU Türkiye reports have an impact on Türkiye's COVID-19 pandemic administration. Through analysing the EU Türkiye reports published in 2020 and 2021, this study also tries to establish an association between Türkiye's COVID-19 pandemic management and the reports published in previous years. In this context, the thematic distribution of the content of Covid-19 in the EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports in the light of the progress related to epidemics and infectious diseases in Türkiye and within the framework of this distribution, answers to the questions of how Türkiye's Covid-19 management is were sought. The main finding of the study is that Türkiye has improved its capacity to fight epidemics and is thus prepared for the Covid-19 pandemic process, with the influence of the guidance in previous reports.

Keywords

COVID-19, EU Türkiye Report, Infectious Diseases, EU-Türkiye Relations, Country Report

* Assoc. Prof., University of Health Sciences, Hamidiye Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Administration, muzafferakdogan@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-9999-0969

** Assoc. Prof., University of Health Sciences, Hamidiye Faculty of Life Sciences, Department of Social Psychology, ekme.gecer@sbu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3367-2236

*** Dr. University of Health Sciences, necmiye.tutar@sbu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-6820-9685

**** Graduate student, University of Health Sciences, pinarunkur@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-8335-555X

Türkiye'nin Covid-19 Yönetiminin Avrupa Birliği 2020 ve 2021 Türkiye Raporları Üzerinden Karşılaştırmalı Analizi

Özet

Avrupa Komisyonu, her yıl Avrupa Birliği (AB) aday ülkelerin üyeliğe hazırlık sürecinde kaydettiği ilerlemeyi gösteren raporlar hazırlamaktadır. Türkiye raporlarının Türkiye'nin Covid-19 pandemi sürecini yönetmede olumlu bir etkisi olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bu nedenle AB Türkiye raporlarının Türkiye'nin Covid-19 pandemi süreci yönetiminde bir etkisinin bulunup bulunmadığı araştırmanın problemi oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmada 2020 ve 2021 yıllarında yayınlanan AB Türkiye raporlarında, Türkiye'nin Covid-19 pandemi yönetiminin geçmiş raporlarla ilişkisinin kurulması amaçlanmaktadır. Bu çerçevede Türkiye'deki salgın ve bulaşıcı hastalıklara ilişkin ilerlemeler ışığında AB 2020 ve 2021 Türkiye raporlarında Covid-19 içeriğinin tematik dağılımı ve bu dağılım çerçevesinde Türkiye'nin Covid-19 yönetimi nasıldır sorularına cevap aranmıştır. Çalışmanın temel bulgusu, geçmiş raporlarda yer alan yönlendirmelerin de etkisiyle Türkiye'nin salgın hastalıklarla mücadele kapasitesini geliştirdiği ve bu sayede Covid-19 pandemi sürecine hazırlıklı olduğudur.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Covid-19, AB Türkiye Raporu, Salgın Hastalıklar, AB-Türkiye İlişkileri, Ülke Raporu

Introduction

European countries wishing to become a member of the European Union (EU) can see their progress through the country reports published every year which analyse their candidacy process. Country reports are one of the important instruments of enlargement policy. According to the statement of the European Commission (EC), the enlargement policy is valid for countries that currently want to join the EU and potential candidates. The prospect of membership is a strong incentive for democratic and economic reforms in countries wishing to become EU members (European Commission, 2022). Therefore, country reports prepared by the EC evaluate the political, institutional, and economic situation in a country (Casier, 2008: 22).

Enlargement is one of the most powerful policy tools of the EU (Emmert-Petrovic, 2014: 1349). Main documents (regulatory texts) such as strategy papers, (progress/country) reports and opinions prepared by the EC Directorate-General for Enlargement (DG for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations), are particularly important for the candidate and potential candidate countries. These documents are high-level texts called an intertextual hierarchy. The intertextual hierarchy corresponds to the real power relations between the final producer of the text (EC/EU), which has control over the decisions, and the recipient of the text (governments and citizens of the candidate and potential candidate states) (Sekulić, 2020: 74). However, in the literature, it is pointed out that the EU enlargement policy is the soft power of the EU (Rehn, 2007: 77). In this respect, country reports also may suggest

an intervention in the policy areas of the candidate country (Özdemir, 2012: 268). The asymmetry of the relationship between the two parties is clear and purposeful. One part (EU) decides on the norms and procedures of participation based on the principle of conditionality, while the other part (the candidate) is expected to provide evidence that the imposed changes, reforms, and improvements are implemented over one year (Sekulić, 2020: 78). Despite this, it is seen that the EU is generally accepted as legitimate in both member and candidate member states. Member and candidate countries, through this, seem to accept the legitimacy of the EU by complying with the decisions taken, allowing interference in their politics (Özdemir, 2012: 387).

The EC monitors and regulates the evaluation processes of EU membership applications within its authority (McCormick, 2015: 220). The EU is a supranational economic integration and the driving force of this integration and the institution that energizes is the EC (Özdemir, 2012: 225). The EC on the other hand is a supranational institution of the Union (Mathieu, 2006: 49) and has a unique position within the EU institutions. It is neither a full executive branch nor a full legislative body. Yet it is possible to find some amount of both in the EC. The EC is an important institution that has successfully fulfilled the functions of guarding the interests of the Union and being the engine of the integration process from the beginning to the present (Tezcan, 2007: 541-542). The EC evaluates the progress made by the candidate countries in the EU membership process with regular reports prepared every year. Country reports are documents which examine the candidate country in line with various predetermined criteria (Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Health, 2022). These reports, which assess the progress that the candidate countries have made within the framework of the accession criteria, include the developments made every year in comparison with the previous year. Türkiye is one of the candidate countries that is followed regularly with the EC country reports. The first report for Türkiye was published in 1998, and since then these reports allow international organizations and non-governmental organizations to evaluate Türkiye (EU Delegation, 2022). After the EC's December 2004 Türkiye progress report stated that Türkiye satisfies the Copenhagen political criteria adequately, the negotiations officially started on 3 October 2005 (Düzgit, 2011: 49).

Although "protection of health" was not included as a specific title in the 1998-1999 reports, some evaluations were made on health under the title of "employment and social affairs". In the 2000 report, they were listed one by one as "negotiation headings" under the "ability to undertake the obligations of membership" category. In the 2000-2004 reports, the 23rd of 29 negotiation titles is "protection of the consumer and health". However, although there is a stress on "protection of health" in this title, the evaluations related to health were mostly included in the title of "social policy and employment". As of 2005, when Türkiye took the negotiation calendar, this confusion was

resolved, the negotiation titles were rearranged and increased to 33, the “consumer and health protection” title was changed to the negotiation title no 28, and evaluations on the protection of health were made under this title (Akdoğan, 2020: 309).

The content on epidemics and contagious diseases has been scanned within discussion title 28. being closely monitored since 1998 as a candidate country, Türkiye’s fight against the new coronavirus (COVID-19), which has the characteristics of an infectious disease and has a global impact, can be seen in the reports published in 2020 and 2021.

Turkish Approach towards EU Reports

While the EU Türkiye reports were published as “Progress Report” until 2016, they were named “Country Report” afterwards. The country reports prepared by the EC are unilateral documents and Türkiye gives its feedback regarding these reports through press conferences. However, these feedbacks are often in the form of a backlash and include negative rhetoric about the reports. Egemen Bağış’s (Turkish Minister of EU Affairs back then) approach Regarding the 15th Progress Report dated October 10, 2012, is important within this context to see the dosage of this reaction: “We have seen that the Türkiye Progress Report was overshadowed by more subjective, biased, baseless and bigoted attitudes” (Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), 2013). The wording used by his successor, Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu, while explaining the 2013 report prepared by Türkiye for the next year (2014), is more restrained and shows a feature that attaches importance to the relations with the EU: “The Progress Report Prepared by Türkiye is not a reaction to the Report prepared by the European Commission. We aim to share with the public the reforms that our country is undertaking with determination, most comprehensively and objectively, and to emphasize that the accession process provides important gains for our country, despite the problems experienced in the negotiation process (MFA, 2014a). The first of the progress reports prepared by Türkiye was published in 2012 during Egemen Bağış’s term as the Ministry for EU Affairs (MFA, 2012a), and the second in 2013 during the term of EU Minister and Chief Negotiator Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu (MFA, 2013a). The number of these reports remained at two and no continuation came after then.

After the publication of each report, senior Turkish officials without delay stated, in written and verbal form, that the EU has exhibited a biased, unfair, and double-standard approach. Therefore, the high-level statements made concerning the 2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports, which constitute the focus of the analysis of the study, do not go beyond the rhetoric of negative discourse. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs written statement regarding the 2020 Türkiye Report said: “The 2020 Türkiye Report reflects the prejudiced, unconstructive, and double-standard approach of the EU this year as well. In this report,

the EU does not mention the responsibilities and commitments Türkiye has not fulfilled. But still criticizes our country with baseless arguments. In particular, the biased, unfair, and disproportionate criticisms of our management system, elections, fundamental rights, some judicial and administrative decisions, as well as the legitimate measures taken to combat terrorism, show how far the report is from objectivity.” (MFA, 2020).

There is no indication of COVID-19 in this report. However, the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Türkiye Report No: 351, 19 October 2021, EC 2021 said: “At a time when we are trying to establish a positive political agenda and revive our high-level dialogue with the EU, a Türkiye Report has unfortunately been published, in which the responsibilities towards the candidate country, Türkiye, are ignored and a double-standard approach is displayed in relations with our country.” (MFA, 2021). Yet, the following statements about COVID-19 in the same report are notable: “It is pleasing to see that the EU highlighted the recovery in the economy. The financial circumstances have reached pre-crisis levels and the recovery in the economy continues thanks to the measures taken within the scope of combating the COVID-19 pandemic. However, in this extraordinary period when many countries took monetary and fiscal policy measures to eliminate the negative economic effects of COVID-19 and state intervention in the economy increased, it is difficult to understand the criticism of some of the policies implemented by our country in terms of a functioning market economy.

This study aims to see how the impact of the guidance on epidemics and infectious diseases in the EU 2000-2019 Türkiye reports is reflected. In this regard, the study further aims to reveal Türkiye’s COVID-19 management through the 2020 and 2021 reports and to determine and describe how the EU assesses Türkiye concerning COVID-19. Therefore, some of the applications, measures and restrictions introduced during the pandemic period in Türkiye have been categorised under some thematic headings and analysed in comparison between the 2020 and 2021 reports.

In this study, the hypothesis “EU Türkiye reports have a positive effect on Türkiye’s management of the COVID-19 pandemic process” is tested. Therefore, the main question of the research is whether the EU Türkiye reports influence the management of Türkiye’s COVID-19 pandemic process. Based on this question, this study (a) examined the developments regarding epidemics and infectious diseases in Türkiye through the EU’s 2000-2019 Türkiye reports, (b) analysed the thematic distribution of the COVID-19 content in the EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports and answered if Türkiye’s COVID-19 management was capable enough to overcome the problems emerged through 2 years period.

Data and Methodology

In this study, the document analysis method is used for most of the data (2000-2019 reports). The data from the 2000-2019 country reports that are prepared regularly every year by the EC were examined by using the document analysis method by limiting the words to “epidemic” and “infectious disease”. For the 2020 and 2021 reports, the most appropriate method is considered to be the content analysis method. Content analysis is a technique used to characterize and compare the analysed data through coding (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2013) and its purpose is to define the contents of the analysed data in a systematic, objective and repeatable way (Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 2012). Therefore, in the EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports, the thematic content analysis method was used to determine the general trends of COVID-19. The COVID-19 keyword and equivalent words in the reports were scanned and parsed with their contexts. Then, the frequency and percentage values were found by digitizing the thematic topics and related codes again via the content analysis method. By this means, it has been ensured that Türkiye’s thematic weight and content frequency regarding COVID-19 management can be seen clearly.

After reviewing the literature on the country reports published by the EU, the secondary data of the study was created through the reports between 2000-2019 and the 2020-2021 Türkiye reports. These reports are published in association with the Commission’s Internal Working Document on the Information on EU Enlargement Policy by the EC. Unofficial translations is accessed from the official page of the Turkish Republic Ministry of Foreign Affairs Presidency for EU Affairs (MFA, 2020). The data about the content of COVID-19 obtained from both reports were meaningfully categorized. Based on these categorisations, the activities carried out by Türkiye during the epidemic period were examined under these titles: economic, foreign relations/politics, law/human rights/democracy, social, health, and education.

The data of the 2000-2019 reports were limited to the words: epidemic and infectious disease. They were scanned by the document analysis method. The results obtained are shown in the Progress of the Epidemic and Infectious Disease in the EU 2000-2019 Türkiye Reports table (Table 1). The 2020 and 2021 reports were analysed by thematic content analysis method and with descriptive statistical methods. The data from the 2020 and 2021 reports were analysed using the NVIVO program which is widely used for content analysis, and thus percentage and frequency calculations were obtained. The results of the NVIVO program were also double-checked by all authors and data was controlled accordingly. Thus, the likelihood of three different coders involved in coding, being inconsistent both with themselves and with each other was reduced, and the coding was tried to get as systematic as possible. Through the results obtained; COVID-19 Content Frequency in EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye Reports (Table 2), Distribution of COVID-19-Related Themes

in EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye Reports (Table 3), Frequency Distribution of COVID-19-Related Themes and Codes (Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) are presented in tables.

The coding of the reports was checked again by the third and fourth authors and an outside researcher. Thus, the accuracy of the coding was confirmed to ensure the reliability and consistency of the study. The reliability coefficient of the study was calculated as 0.88 based on the Reliability = Consensus / (Agreement + Disagreement) formula stated by Miles and Huberman (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As the percentage of agreement was 70% or higher among the researchers who made the examination, reliability was ensured in the data analysis. Yet, clarity and understandability of the categories are also important indicators of validity.

Findings

The Pandemic and Infectious Diseases Content in the EU 2000-2019 Türkiye Reports

While the 2000 (MFA, 2000) report did not have any content regarding the pandemic, the 2001 report stated that improvements should be made in the system regarding health monitoring, data collection, control and surveillance of epidemics (MFA, 2001). In the 2002 report, on the other hand, this warning is remarkable: “despite efforts being made, the establishment of a network in the surveillance of epidemics and control of contagious diseases, the alignment with the acquis regarding the establishment of an early warning and rapid solution system should be accelerated.” (MFA, 2002). The warning in the 2002 report was reiterated in the 2003 report too: “Alignment with the acquis and building the necessary capacity should be accelerated to establish a network for epidemiological surveillance and control of contagious diseases.” (MFA, 2003). The 2004 report covered the issue a little further: “A national plan for the surveillance and control of contagious diseases in public health should be developed. In this regard, relevant legislation regarding the surveillance and control of contagious diseases should be revised to bring them into line with Community principles and methods. There is a substantial need for capacity-building efforts to be included in the EU’s system of surveillance and control of infectious diseases.” (MFA, 2004).

Some signs of progress on the subject are visible in the 2005 report. To establish a network that will provide surveillance and control of epidemic diseases, Türkiye harmonized the list of diseases in the current surveillance system with the list of diseases in the European Commission Decision numbered 2003/534/EC. The definition of diseases has been completed after careful revision. To collect information, an Epidemic Control and Surveillance Unit was established under the Ministry of Health’s General Directorate of Primary Health Care (MFA, 2005). The 2006 report is narrower than the previous report, and the following explanations are included in the report: Türkiye has

made progress especially in the establishment of an epidemiological observation network and in the control of diseases (MFA, 2006). According to the 2007 report, Türkiye continued to strengthen its institutional structure, administrative capacity and legal regulation. However, investment in test laboratories and the diagnostic capacity of existing laboratories are below the required level (MFA, 2007). According to the 2008 report, the Ministry of Health has improved its institutional capacity to investigate and manage any likely outbreaks (MFA, 2008).

According to the 2009 report, the Early Warning and Response System (EWRS) in intestinal diseases was developed for trial and then to be extended to the rest of the country. Some progress has been made through changes in the 2009-2013 National Strategic Plan for Contagious Diseases, which regulates the principles and procedures to strengthen the follow-up and control of contagious diseases in administrative structures. However there has been no progress on the establishment of the National Institute of Public Health and the draft law has not been enacted (MFA, 2009). In the 2010 report, although the implementation of the existing legislation was not considered to be sufficient, it was noted that progress has been made in strengthening the administrative structure and establishing the National Institute of Public Health in the direction of systematic monitoring and implementation of surveillance and control measures. Also, it has been reported that the EWRS, which was established for trial purposes, has been expanded throughout the country (MFA, 2010). To complete the harmonization of the legislation on notifiable diseases and case definitions in the 2011 report, an amendment was made to the Contagious Diseases Surveillance and Control Principles Regulation in April 2011. The National Institute of Public Health has not been established yet (MFA, 2011).

According to the 2012 report, the EWRS and Field Epidemiology training unit was established within the National Public Health Institution. Efforts are continuing to ensure the consistency of the surveillance and control system established in line with the EU acquis and international health regulations (MFA, 2012b). According to the 2013 report, the national EWRS, established with EU sources, has been one of the key elements of the health safety strategy. The headquarters of EWRS was established within the body of the Public Health Institution of Türkiye. 12 out of 420 warnings sent to the centre, ended up with an epidemic. Sub-units of the EWRS are established in all 81 cities in Türkiye. Through laboratory training programs and field epidemiology, Türkiye endures its efforts to develop human resources capacity (MFA, 2013b). In the 2014 report, although Türkiye has improved its public health emergency detection and response capacity with at least one national EWRS established in all provinces (81 provinces), the system does not include all diseases reported in the EU. Continuing education programs in the area of controlling diseases have been established in the national epidemiology field

and laboratory (MFA, 2014b). In the 2015 report, it was stated that the EC and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control conducted a study jointly with Türkiye on health governance, surveillance, preparedness and response capacity in contagious diseases (MFA, 2015). According to the 2016 report, system and education problems regarding the detection, reporting and control of infectious diseases remain local (MFA, 2016). In the 2018 report, no progress has been made in the legislation regarding patient rights in transboundary health services and against serious transboundary health threats (MFA, 2018).

According to the 2019 report, it was reported that EWRS and epidemiological surveillance systems were proven to work effectively in the anthrax incidents that Türkiye faced in August 2019, in cases of contagious diseases and serious threats to transboundary health, and laboratory services were proven to support the surveillance systems to be sufficient (MFA, 2019).

Table 1. Progress regarding epidemic and infectious disease in EU 2000-2019 Türkiye report.

TOPICS	2000-04	2005-08	2009-18	2019
Outbreak control and surveillance system	no progress	Progress is visible	Progress is visible	Progress is visible
Outbreak control and surveillance system	no progress	Progress is visible	Progress is visible	Progress is visible
Establishment of an epidemiological surveillance network	no progress	Progress is visible	Progress is visible	Progress is visible
Early Warning and Response System (EWRS)	no progress	no progress	Progress is visible	Progress is visible
National Institute of Public Health	no progress	no progress	no progress	Progress is visible
Legislation against serious transnational health threats	no progress	no progress	no progress	Progress is visible
Laboratory services	no progress	no progress	Limited progress is visible	Progress is visible

The COVID-19 Content in the EU 2020-2021 Türkiye Reports

COVID-19 and related words (coronavirus, global epidemic, pandemic and health crisis) in the reports were scanned and separated with their contexts. We should note that the content of COVID-19 was used along with the global epidemic. Therefore, these two words are numerically close to each other. The two reports are in total 259 pages (2020 report 131, 2021 report 128). Content frequency values obtained from scanning these two report texts are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequency distribution of COVID-19 content in EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports.

Report Year	COVID-19	Coronavirus	Global Epidemic	Epidemic	Outbreak Crisis
2020	37	2	38	14	1
2021	84	1	70	4	..
	121	3	108	18	1

The Türkiye reports for 2020 and 2021 were separately analysed. The topics related to COVID-19 were: Foreign Relations and Foreign Policy; Economy, Law, Human Rights and Democracy; Administrative Capacity and Management, Social; Health and Education determined. The proportional distribution of these topics is shown in Table 3.

The most notable result concerning COVID-19 content is that the ratio between the 2021 report and the 2020 report is 56% higher. The relative frequency of COVID-19 content was 31% in the 2020 report, while this value was 69% in the 2021 report.

Table 3. Frequency distribution of COVID-19 content in EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports.

THEMES	2020		2021	
	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
Foreign Relations and Foreign Policy	9	19,15	13	13,68
Economy	16	34,04	32	33,68
Law, Human Rights and Democracy	10	21,28	6	6,32
Administrative Capacity and Management	6	12,77	15	15,79
Social	1	2,13	10	10,53
Health	3	6,38	12	12,63
Education	6	6,32
Other	2	4,26	1	1,05
TOTAL	47	100,00	95	100,00

Among all the themes, “economy” stands out compared to the other theme (Table 3). It can be seen that both reports have content directly related to COVID-19. In this section, the subtopics and frequency distributions of the topics related to COVID-19 are analysed separately using the EU 2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports.

Foreign Politics and Foreign Relations

The codes associated with COVID-19 under the themes of foreign politics and foreign relations are given in Table 4. These codes are created as: “Border policy”, “EU relations”, “foreign support”, “foreign relations” and “global cooperation”.

Table 4. Frequency distribution of “foreign policy and foreign relations” codes.

THEME	CODES	2020		2021	
		Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
FOREIGN POLICY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS	Border policy	3	33,33	2	15,38
	EU relations	3	33,33	7	53,85
	Foreign support	1	11,11	3	23,08
	Foreign relations	1	11,11
	Global cooperation	1	11,11	1	7,69
		9	100,00	13	100,00

Looking at the codes of this theme, the most visible content is the EU relations code. This code has a relative frequency of 53.85% with 7 frequencies, especially in the 2021 report. In this code, which includes Türkiye’s relations with the EU, issues such as the agreement between the parties, cooperation, agreement, measures, and financial aid draw attention. The border policy code, on the other hand, focuses on immigration/immigrant and asylum/refugee issues. The external support code is associated with Türkiye’s health aid during the COVID-19 global epidemic. For example, Support the Western Balkan countries in their fight against the epidemic; Donation of 30,000 coronavirus vaccines to Bosnia and Herzegovina; Donate medical aid to Albania.

Economy

The codes associated with COVID-19 under the themes of democracy are listed in Table 5. These codes are created as: “economic policy”, “tax enforcement”, “foreign trade”, “investment”, “fiscal policy”, “credit transactions”, “labor/employment” and “EU financial aid”.

Table 5. Frequency distribution of “economy” codes.

THEME	CODES	2020		2021	
		Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
ECONOMY	Economic policy	6	37,50	12	37,50
	Tax Enforcement	3	18,75	6	18,75
	Foreign trade	1	6,25	1	3,13
	Investment	1	6,25
	Fiscal policy	2	12,50
	Credit transactions	2	12,50	3	9,38
	Labour/employment	10	31,25
	EU financial aid	1	6,25
		16	100,00	32	100,00

It is clear that the code “economic policy” is above the other codes both in content and relative frequency. To combat COVID-19, the creation of financial/financial support and packages and the adoption of a series of measures for service sectors such as business, banking, accommodation and tourism to mitigate the impact of the global epidemic on the economy is the main theme that stands out in this code. The main theme in the tax application code is tax deductions. Specifically, tax deductions were given for education, housing, and the COVID-19 vaccine.

The most intense code in this theme is the work/employment code. The area where COVID-19 will most clearly show its economic impact in 2021 is labour and employment. The report, which draws attention to the profound negative labour market and poverty impacts of the global COVID-19 epidemic, focuses on issues such as labour force participation, unregistered employment, job and income loss, female employment, and migrant worker employment.

Law, Human Rights and Democracy

The codes associated with COVID-19 under the themes of law, human rights, and democracy are listed in Table 6. These codes are created: “legislative action”, “legal acts”, “illegality”, “violation of human rights” and “democratic attitude”.

Unlike other topics, this section shows a significant decrease in the number of contents in the 2021 report compared to the 2020 report. In the 2020 report, the content for COVID-19 is mainly found in the legislative activity code. In that report, the legislative package and the pocket bill were the highlights, with a focus on the state of emergency.

Table 6. Frequency distribution of “law, human rights and democracy” codes.

THEME	CODES	2020		2021	
		Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
LAW, HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY	Legislative activity	4	40,00	1	16,67
	Legal proceedings	3	30,00	1	16,67
	Illegality	2	20,00	2	33,33
	Human rights violation	1	10,00
	Democratic attitude	2	33,33
		10	100,00	6	100,00

Unlike other themes, this theme shows a significant decrease in the number of contents in the 2021 report compared to the 2020 report. In the 2020 report, the content related to COVID-19 is most visible in the legislative activity code. While the main emphasis of this content is on the issue of the state of emergency. Legislative packages and bags are prominent in the law. In both reports, the code of “illegal” was equally included in this code, attention is drawn to the unlawfulness of consumer and copyright rights. In particular, the Türkiye Wealth Fund’s use of certain legal exemptions from the crisis environment created by COVID-19 was considered illegal. In the 2020 report, the content regarding the code of “violation of human rights” took place in the form of freedom of expression. After the first COVID-19 case was reported in Türkiye, the implementation decision from Radio and Television Supreme Council (RTÜK) was evaluated as a violation of freedom of expression. In the coding of “legal proceedings” on the other hand, legal practices for the submission of hearings, investigations, prosecutions, convictions, petitions, and objections were made. The coding of “democratic attitude” coding is related to the prevention of Bar elections on the grounds of COVID-19 and joint declarations of some unions and employers’ organizations regarding the measures to be taken within the scope of COVID-19.

Administrative Capacity and Management

The codes associated with COVID-19 under the Administrative Capacity and Management theme are listed in Table 7. The codes created for this part are: “administrative action”, “planning”, “administrative capacity”, and “administrative action”.

Table 7. Frequency distribution of “administrative measures”, “planning”, “administrative capacity” and “administrative actions”.

THEME	CODES	2020		2021	
		Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY AND MANAGEMENT	Administrative measures	4	66,67	5	33,33
	Planning	1	16,67
	Administrative capacity	1	16,67	5	33,33
	Administrative actions	5	33,33
		6	100,00	15	100,00

“Administrative measures” include enacted measures of various public institutions (RTÜK, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry), asylum procedures, border crossings, civil protection, task force establishment, censorship, financial management, control and monitoring, which will not be defined until the 2021 report. In the 2020 report for this code: documentation and special audit, adjusting the number of cases to international practice. Issues such as the completion of the railroad line project, vaccine and drug development, and support for research activities were included. The administrative capacity code; e-government services and administrative simplification, improving capacity for public procurement management, strengthening administrative capacity for consumer and health protection, implementing the action plan prepared by NIPAC and NAO. The planning code is included only in the 2020 report with a single content. It refers to the adoption of the new medium-term development plan, which lost its validity due to the COVID-19 crisis.

Social

The codes associated with COVID-19 under the social theme are shown in Table 8. The codes created for this part are: “Disadvantaged groups”, “social dialogue”, “social situation”, and “social data”.

Table 8. Frequency distribution of social theme.

THEME	CODES	2020		2021	
		Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
SOCIAL	Disadvantaged groups	1	100	8	72,73
	Social dialogue	1	9,09
	Social status	1	9,09
	Social data	1	9,09
		1	100	11	100

While there is only one content for the 2020 report, 11 contents have been defined for the 2021 report. In the code distribution, the code “disadvantaged groups” was associated with COVID-19 9 times. Attention is drawn to disadvantaged refugees, displaced persons, migrant workers, gipsies and vulnerable groups. The effective use of social dialogue was examined in the social dialogue code. In the social situation code, it is mentioned that COVID-19 and high inflation are worsening the social situation despite the support measures provided by the government. In the social data code, it was noted that more accurate data on socio-demographic variables and key factors are needed to combat COVID-19.

Health

The codes associated with COVID-19 under the health theme are listed in Table 9. The codes created for this part are: “health measures”, “health system”, “hospital services”, “immunisation”, “health services”, “health statistics”, “health materials”, health capacity”, and “health risk”.

Table 9. Frequency distribution of health themes.

THEME	CODES	2020		2021	
		Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
HEALTH	Health measures	1	33,33
	Health system	1	33,33	1	8,33
	Vaccination	2	16,67
	Health service	1	33,33	3	25,00
	Health statistics	2	16,67
	Health material	1	8,33
	Health Capacity	2	16,67
	Health risk	1	8,33
			3	100,00	12

As seen in Table 9, health is one of the two themes with the widest spectrum in coding.

When it comes to health, the 2021 report has four times more content than the 2020 report, with “immunization”, “health statistics”, “health materials”, “health capacity”, and “health risk” included only in the 2021 report. The highlights of these codes are vaccination program and vaccination statistics; COVID-19 case and death statistics; human-derived substances (patient blood management); EU support to Türkiye for capacity building, training of central and provincial staff to support COVID-19 response, strengthening population-based surveillance and COVID-19 testing capacity; increased health and safety risks in some sectors.

Only the 2020 report included the health measures code. This code referred to the measures taken by the Ministry of Health to protect public health and the measures taken following the EU Communicable Diseases Directives and the International Health Regulations of the World Health Organisation (WHO). The health services code is the most comprehensive part of the health topic. It includes the provision of round-the-clock counselling services for mentally ill patients, universal access to health services for refugees, testing for all persons regardless of their social security status, and the provision of free hospital services. It is noted that the Turkish health system was able to cope with COVID-19 and managed to keep the number of new cases and deaths at the beginning of the pandemic significantly lower compared to other countries in the region.

Education

The codes associated with COVID-19 within the framework of the themes of “education” are shown in Table 10. The codes created for this part are “inclusive education”, “access to education”, “distance education”, and “special education”.

Table 10. Frequency distribution of education themes.

THEME	CODES	2020		2021	
		Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)	Content Frequency (n)	Relative Frequency (%)
EDUCATION	Inclusive education	1	16,67
	Access to education	1	16,67
	Distance learning	2	33,33
	Special education	2	33,33
		0	0,00	6	100,00

*In this theme, 6 contents are completely included in the 2021 report.
The theme of education related to COVID-19 was not included in the 2020 report.*

As seen in the table, there are four types of coding: Distance education, inclusive education, access to education and special education. Although different themes use, the main emphasis was on access to education. Schools closed due to COVID-19 have created difficulties for students at all levels. It has been emphasized that disabled, poor and Gipsy students’ access to distance education is affected negatively. The important point that drew attention to the issue of special education was the reduction of the VAT rate in special education services.

It was stated that distance education was started with the code distance education. However, it has been stated that the participation of many extremely poor households, especially gipsy students, in distance education, who do not have access to the internet and devices, is adversely affected. In the code of inclusive education, it was stated that the deficiencies regarding access to qualified inclusive education have increased. In the code of access to education, it is explained that the closure of schools due to COVID-19 negatively affects the access of children with disabilities to education. Therefore, although different coding was made, the main emphasis in the education theme was the issue of access to education. The point that draws attention to the special education code is expressed as the reduction of VAT rates for these services.

Discussion

Before the WHO declared the COVID-19 pandemic on January 10, 2020, Türkiye established the Coronavirus Scientific Advisory Board within the Ministry of Health. Türkiye responded early to the pandemic, quickly produced relevant guidance, published the Coronavirus Health Guide, and established another committee to address the social aspects of the epidemic (Genç, 2021: 1794).

The COVID-19 crisis is considered the greatest catastrophe that mankind has experienced since the Great War II. The effects of this pandemic triggered a long-term economic recession the likes of which the world had never experienced before (Kaygusuz, 2020). COVID-19 affects the capacity and overall functioning of states' healthcare systems, but Türkiye's healthcare system has proven its resilience. Moreover, Türkiye has provided free health services to all people within its borders under pandemic conditions. In COVID-19, Türkiye has shown an attitude of caring about international relations and emphasizing the importance of standing together in the fight against the epidemic.

The 2000-2019 reports indicate that Türkiye has gradually made progress in protecting public health, the health system, and health capacity in relation to epidemics and infectious diseases. This progress is clearly confirmed in the 2019 report. Türkiye's management of the COVID-19 pandemic clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of the guidance and advice provided in these reports. Türkiye's pandemic management, the strategy followed, and the measures taken against the epidemic led to successful outcomes.

The data obtained from the 2020 and 2021 reports prove that Türkiye has effectively overcome the COVID-19 process. Compared to 2020, the development of vaccine studies in 2021, the effectiveness of the policies applied to immigrants and refugees in reducing the number of illegal crossings, the taking into account the special conditions brought by the COVID-19 global epidemic and the simplification of e-government services and management, shows that Türkiye's COVID-19 pandemic measurement and application are successful.

The EU's reports on Türkiye between 2000 and 2019 were scanned over the content of "epidemic" and "communicable disease" and the progress of Türkiye on these issues was examined in the study. It has been determined that warnings have been made by the EU about epidemics since the 2001 report. In the 2005 report, it was noted that the surveillance and control of epidemic diseases and the establishment of Epidemic Control and Surveillance Units. As of 2005, it has been observed that Türkiye has started to make progress on the subject and to adapt to the EU criteria. Progress was also included in the following year's reports. For example, the 2008 report states that the Ministry of Health has improved its institutional capacity in the investigation and management of possible outbreaks; In the 2009 report, the pilot implementation for the EWRS started, and according to the 2012 report, the EWRS and the Field Epidemiology Training Unit were established within the National Public Health Institution; In the 2013 report, it was emphasized that the national EWRS, established with EU resources, is one of the key elements of the health safety strategy. In the 2019 report, it was stated that the EWRS and epidemiological surveillance systems worked effectively in the anthrax incidents Türkiye faced in August 2019 in cases of serious threats to communicable diseases and transboundary health, and laboratory services proved to support the surveillance system efficiently.

The most obvious difference between the 2020 and 2021 reports is that the COVID-19 content is more in the 2021 report. The conclusion that can be drawn from this difference is that Türkiye has been examined in more detail and intensively on the content of COVID-19 in the EC 2021 report. The reason for this difference can be explained by the reporting period of the EC candidate country reports. Country reports are released in October each year. For the 2020 report, there are evaluations related to COVID-19 over the 8 months from March 2020 to October 2020, corresponding to the pandemic declaration of COVID-19. In the 2021 report, COVID-19 content was included in the entire one-year period.

In both reports, the economy theme is 34%. This is an expected result. The EU is a supranational economic integration and therefore it is only natural that the COVID-19 ratings refer to the economy. This is not true for other issues. The two reports are relatively close on the topic of administrative capacity and management. For other topics, there are significant differences between the reports. The frequency distribution in the reports is inconsistent both in terms of the content value and the relative proportion of the topics other than the topic economy.

Within the scope of the economic theme, the evaluations of Türkiye's COVID-19 management are as follows:

- States have taken a series of measures for businesses, banking, accommodation, tourism and service sectors, such as monetary expansion,

and the creation of financial support packages, to combat the COVID-19 global epidemic and mitigate its effects on the economy.

- Türkiye has taken remarkable measures to soften the economic effects of the epidemic. Within the scope of these measures, the limits of the Credit Guarantee Fund were increased, SME loan repayments were postponed for three months, and the scope of KOSGEB support was expanded. In addition, flexibility has been granted in the repayment of some loans, debt payment terms and tax applications.
- Legal measures have been adopted to reduce the financial difficulties arising from COVID-19.
- Türkiye has implemented some practices to reduce the negative effects of COVID-19. It has developed support mechanisms for the workforce: partial layoffs, short-time working, wage subsidy, payment deferral measures, for businesses: taxes, social security premiums, electricity and water bills, and provided financial support through loan guarantees, direct lending and subsidies.

The assessments emphasizing the development of the Turkish economy and that the recovery of the economy has reached the pre-crisis level and that the recovery of the economy is continuing thanks to the measures taken in the fight against the COVID-19 epidemic were also considered encouraging by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However, in the study of Kete and Karasaç (2022), they concluded that Türkiye performed the worst in terms of unemployment and inflation criteria in 2020, which is the first year of the pandemic and countries are the most unprepared. In the same study, among Türkiye and EU member states, Ireland and Türkiye are economies that have not experienced economic contraction, but rather have grown. (Kete & Karasaç, 2022: 392).

In their study, Koç and Yardımcıoğlu (2020) reached the conclusion that Türkiye presents an ideal approach in terms of fiscal incentives and measures within the framework of fiscal policy in the Covid-19 pandemic, within the framework of its population and economic capacity (Koç & Yardımcıoğlu, 2020: 149). A similar result was obtained in this study as well.

Most COVID-19 topics occurred in the International Relations and Foreign Policy categories. Topics in this category: agreements, cooperation, measures, and grants that arose in the context of EU relations. Türkiye considered that global cooperation is essential in the fight against the epidemic. 75 million euros were allocated for this fight. Türkiye has donated 30,000 vaccines against the coronavirus to Bosnia and Herzegovina and is a major donor of humanitarian and medical aid to Albania.

Within the scope of the health theme, the evaluations of Türkiye's COVID-19 management are as follows:

- The Ministry of Health measures to prevent the collapse of the health system and protect public health.
- Türkiye has taken measures in line with EU Directives and WHO's International Health Regulations.
- During COVID-19, testing and hospital services were provided free of charge to all individuals, regardless of their social security status.
- Türkiye needs to strengthen and further expand its population-based surveillance and COVID-19 testing capacity to monitor infectious diseases.
- COVID-19 has affected the capacity of the general health system to continue to provide primary health services.
- Due to the disruption of mental health services, the Ministry of Health has set up a hotline to provide 24/7 counselling to these patients.
- During the COVID-19 Minister of Health provided general access to health services for refugees, and there was no inequality in health.
- Türkiye offered free testing and hospital services to all individuals and established a scientific committee of experts to coordinate the containment of --COVID-19 during COVID-19. COVID-19 Vaccine and drug development projects for the diagnosis and treatment of COVID-19 were supported. To implement these projects launched the COVID-19 Türkiye Platform.
- In the field of biological human material, good progress has been made despite COVID-19.

Conclusion

The last two reports assessed the performance of the Turkish health system in the COVID-19 process as positive but also identified the aspects that need to be improved. The report found the capacity of the Turkish healthcare system to be sufficient and that increasing healthcare capacity, especially during the COVID-19 process, was essential. This analysis has shown how Türkiye's current system is dealing with the global pandemic, how its current functioning has changed, and how it has kept pace with this change. The analysis shows that Türkiye has managed to address COVID-19 both economically and in terms of external relations with an effective management approach by giving importance to global cooperation.

The 2000-2019 reports indicate that Türkiye has gradually made progress in protecting public health, the health system, and the health capacity concerning epidemics and infectious diseases. This progress is confirmed in the 2019 report. Türkiye's management of the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the effectiveness of the guidance and advice provided in these reports. Türkiye's pandemic management, the strategy followed, and the measures taken against the epidemic led to successful outcomes.

The data obtained from the 2020 and 2021 reports suggest that Türkiye has effectively overcome the COVID-19 process. Compared to 2020, the development of vaccine studies in 2021, the effectiveness of the policies applied to immigrants and refugees in reducing the number of illegal crossings, and the simplification of e-government services and management are the points to be highlighted to show the success of COVID-19 pandemic.

This analysis revealed how Türkiye's current system is dealing with the global pandemic, how its current functioning has changed, and how it has kept pace with this change. Furthermore, the study shows that Türkiye has managed to address COVID-19 both economically and in terms of foreign relations by effectively considering global cooperation.

2020 and 2021 Türkiye reports prepared by the EU were examined through content analyses in this article. Both reports were associated with the reports prepared between 2005 and 2018. An original contribution to the literature is the strength of his article. However, reports of other candidate countries were not included in this analysis and this could be counted as one of the limitations of the study. Therefore, the reports of other candidate countries' comparative analyses are recommended in wider studies.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Ethical Statement

The data, information, documents, analyses and results used in the study were obtained within the framework of academic and ethical rules. Since open-access secondary data were used in the study, Ethics Committee approval was not sought.

References

- Akdoğan, M. (2020). Avrupa Birliği-Türkiye İlişkilerinde Sağlığın Korunması: İlerleme Raporlarına Bakış. *Ekonomi Politika ve Finans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 308-335. DOI: 10.30784/epfad.751871
- Casier, T. (2008). The New Neighbours of the European Union: The Compelling Logic of Enlargement? *The Boundaries of EU Enlargement: Finding a Place for Neighbours* (19-32). Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230591042
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison K. (2013). *Research Methods in Education*. 7th ed. Routledge.
- Düzgüt, S. A. (2011). Avrupa Birliği Genişlemesi ve Komşuluk Politikası. *Avrupa Birliği'ne Giriş: Tarih, Kurumlar ve Politikalar* (43-58). Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları,

- Emmert, F. & Petrovic, S. (2014). The past, present, and future of EU enlargement. *Fordham International Law Journal*, 37(5), 1349-1419. DOI: 10.13140/2.1.4508.7364
- European Commission. (2022). EU Enlargement. https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/eu-enlargement_en, [22.10.2022].
- EU Delegation to Türkiye. (2022). Progress Reports. <https://www.avrupa.info.tr/tr/ilerleme-raporlari-744>, [22.10.2022].
- Genç, K. (2021). COVID-19 in Türkiye: A Nation on Edge. *The Lancet*, 397(10287), 1794-1796. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01098-9
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Menlo Park, Addison-Wesley.
- Kaygusuz, Ö. (2020). *Covid-19 Krizi ve AB'nin Yeni Dönüşüm Dinamikleri: Gelecek Nesil AB Mümkün mü?* Boğaziçi Üniversitesi – TÜSİAD Dış Politika Forumu Araştırma Raporu, DPF 2020-AR 02. 2020.
- Kete, H. & Karasaç, F. (2022). Covid-19 Sürecinde Avrupa Birliği Ülkeleri ve Türkiye'nin Ekonomik Performanslarının COPRAS Yöntemi ile Değerlendirilmesi. *İktisat Politikası Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Economic Policy Researches*, 9(2), 373-395.
- Krippendorff, K. (2012). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. 3rd ed. Sage.
- Koç, İ. & Yardımcıoğlu, F. (2020). Covid-19 Pandemi Sürecinde Uygulamaya Konulan Mali Tedbir ve Teşviklerin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi: Türkiye ve Seçilmiş AB Ülkeleri Karşılaştırmaları. *Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi - SEYAD*, 8/2, 123-152.
- Mathieu, J. L. (2006). *Avrupa Birliği*. Dost.
- McCormick, J. (2015). *Avrupa Birliği siyaseti*. Çev. D. Özsel. Liberte.
- MFA (Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Foreign Affairs Directorate for EU Affairs). (2000). Türkiye Regular Progress Report 2000. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2001). Türkiye Regular Progress Report 2001. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2002). Türkiye Regular Progress Report 2002. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2003). Türkiye Regular Progress Report 2003. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2004). Türkiye Regular Progress Report 2004. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2005). Türkiye 2005 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2006). Türkiye 2006 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].

- MFA. (2007). Türkiye 2007 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2008). Türkiye 2008 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2009). Türkiye 2009 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2010). Türkiye 2010 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2011). Türkiye 2011 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2012a). 2012 Progress Report Prepared by Türkiye: Studies Done and Progress Made. https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/2012_ilerleme_raporu_02_01_13_foformat_version.pdf [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2012b). Türkiye 2012 progress report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2013). 2013 Progress Report Prepared by Türkiye: Studies Done and Progress Made. https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/2013TR%20IR/tthir_tr_14_01_2013.pdf [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2013a). Press Release of Mr. Bağış on Türkiye's Own Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/48405.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2013b). Türkiye 2013 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2014a). Press Release of Mr. Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu on the 2013 Progress Report Prepared by Türkiye. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/48405.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2014b). Türkiye 2013 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2015). Türkiye 2015 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2016). Türkiye 2016 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2018). Türkiye 2018 Progress Report. <https://www.ab.gov.tr/46224.html> [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2019). Türkiye 2019 Progress Report. https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2020). About the European Commission 2020 Türkiye Report. https://www.ab.gov.tr/avrupa-komisyonu-2020-turkiye-raporu-hakkinda_52150.html [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2020). 2020 Türkiye Report. https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html [28.10.2022].
- MFA. (2021). About the European Commission 2021 Türkiye report. No: 351, https://www.mfa.gov.tr/no_-251_-avrupa-komisyonu-2021-turkiye-raporu-hk.tr.mfa [28.10.2022].

- MFA. (2021). 2021 Türkiye Report. https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html [28.10.2022].
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Sage.
- Özdemir, H. (2012). *Avrupa Mantığı: Avrupa Bütünleşmesinin Teori ve Dinamikleri*. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Rehn, O. (2007). *Avrupa'nın Gelecek Sınırları: Türkiye Bir Köprü mü, Köprübaşı mı Yoksa Ergime Potası mı?* Çev. O. Şen & H. Kaya. 1001 Kitap.
- Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Health General Directorate of EU and Foreign Affairs. (2022). Progress reports. <https://disab.saglik.gov.tr/TR,3868/ilerleme-raporlari.html> [29.10.2022].
- Sekulić, T. (2020). *The European Union and the Paradox of Enlargement*. Palgrave Studies in European Political Sociology. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-42295-0
- Tezcan, E. (2007). *Avrupa Birliği Komisyonu*. USAK.