Youth Work and Policies[1] in Turkey

Nurhan Yentürk, Yörük Kurtaran, Gülesin Nemutlu

Istanbul Bilgi University, Youth Studies Unit

---

[1] The articles in this paper are direct translations of the research book of Youth Work and Policies in Turkey that was published in May 2008 by Istanbul Bilgi University publications The original book, in Turkish, is consisted of 21 articles by 17 reserachers. For more info please contact: yoruk@bilgi.edu.tr

Gençlik Çalışmaları

CONTENT

PREFACE

Youth Studies Unit (http://genclik.bilgi.edu.tr) was founded in November 2005 as a joint initiative of Istanbul Bilgi University (www.bilgi.edu.tr) and the Community Volunteers Foundation (www.tog.org.tr). The Unit's primary objective is to develop youth policy proposals. Endorsing the understanding that policy proposals are only meaningful when they are formulated with the active participation of stakeholders, the Unit also aims to contribute to the development of non-governmental youth organisations which will be active in the youth field. Another objective of the Unit is to provide opportunities for dialogue within and between public institutions and non-governmental organisations that are active in the youth field. One of its main activities is conducting research and modelling studies in order to advocate for youth policy proposals on the basis knowledge and experience.

Since its founding in 2005, the Unit has acquainted itself with the stakeholders in the field, studied youth policy models from different countries, and collected data on youth services and youth work practices undertaken by public institutions and non-governmental organisations. Another initial task carried out by the Unit was the analysis of past and ongoing rights-advocacy activities in Turkey in order to develop a strategy for itself.

Since 2006, the Unit has been applying and further advancing, by means of several projects, the strategy that was formulated at the end of the first year. The first of these projects was GePGeNç FeSTiVaL (www.gepgencfestival.net), an effort to enable stakeholders active in the youth field to meet and learn from each other, and to promote a culture of participatory action. Held annually since 2006, the festival is programmed and run by the GePGeNç Organisation Committee which brings together several organisations on the basis of voluntary participation.

Furthermore, in partnership with the Department of Youth Services, the Youth Studies Unit undertook the Turkish coordination of the "All Different – All Equal" European Youth Campaign, launched in 2006-2007 by the Council of Europe, European Commission and the European Youth Forum. The Unit has facilitated the process whereby campaign activities on the themes of diversity, human rights and participation were coordinated by a National Campaign Comittee which also involved non-governmental organisations. This was an important and instructive experience for the Unit, and valuable knowledge was gained with regard to cooperation between youth NGOs and public institutions. The Unit shared its findings, as well as the results of the campaign, with the rest of the youth field. In addition to the task of coordinating the campaign, the Unit made additional contributions to the campaign, such as the weekly radio program "All Different – All Equal" broadcast on Açık Radio, the "Living Library" project (http://yasayankutuphane.blogspot.com), and other publicity and outreach activities.

"Short Wave Youth Centre" is another project of the Youth Studies Unit, in operation since 2006 and expected to continue in the future. The Centre was established in order to conduct modelling studies in the field of youth work, and to build civilian capacity in youth policy and youth work. In its first year, the Centre designed and implemented "The Owl Youth Training" programme, and published training pamphlets in order to make these training modules widely available. Focusing on the subjects of "Youth Work", "Non-formal Learning in Youth Work", "Internet Technologies in Youth Work", "Foreign Language Use in Youth Work", and "Youth Inititatives", these training modules were further advanced in implementation, with the participation of representatives of youth NGOs. In this sense, "The Owl Youth Traning" sessions which took place at the Short Wave Youth Centre were "modelling" studies, like other activites at the Centre. After finalising the training modules and pamphlets, the Unit contacted the National Agency and discussed the inclusion of these modules in the National Agency's training programme. The Owl Youth Training sessions will be implemented in 2008 as part of the National Agency's training programme, with the support of the Unit.

Last but not least, the Unit edited a book entitled *Youth Work and Policy in Turkey* in an effort to contribute to the discussions on youth work and youth policy, and to assemble policy proposals that emerged during the process described above.[2] The book aims to contribute to the process of producing youth policies regarding young people who live *today* and *in this country*. We believe that the book may be of use to those working to ensure the participation of young people in existing social movements, in an effort to advance pluralist democracy. The first article in this report provides an overview of the book, and a summary of youth policy proposals advanced therein. This report also includes the English translations of four articles published in that book. We thank Istanbul Bilgi University and Open Society Institute for their contributions to the publication of *Youth Work and Policy in Turkey*.

Youth Studies Unit

---

[2] Yentürk, N.; Kurtaran, Y. and Nemutlu, G. (2008) *Türkiye'de Gençlik Çalışması ve Politikaları* (Youth Work and Policy in Turkey), Istanbul Bilgi University Publishing House, Istanbul.

ABOUT, FOR, AND TOGETHER WITH YOUTH-
A SUMMARY OF "*YOUTH WORK AND POLICY IN TURKEY*"[3]
Yörük Kurtaran, Gülesin Nemutlu and Nurhan Yentürk

Introduction[4]

Although there are some services provided by public institutions for youth in Turkey, it could be said that they are quite inadequate. We could also add that there are almost no support systems in place for sustaining youth organisations. Moreover, there is no coordination between public institutions that provide services for the youth: people who develop youth policies do not familiarise themselves with either the experiences of those working in the youth field, or the expertise of those who do academic studies on youth. These observations could bring us to the simple conclusion that there is no youth policy in Turkey. Yet to come to this conclusion would be to undermine the sheer gravity of the situation. We believe that the absence of youth policies in Turkey is the very youth policy of this country. The actual existence of youth policies would require the decision makers and policy developers to acknowledge the rights that young people may want to exercise, including their right to have say over their lives. And yet, such an acknowledgment would bring with it the "risk" of losing their "power" over youth.

As an effort to contribute to the process of developing youth policies, we edited a book entitled *Youth Work and Policy in Turkey*. As we are discussing in the book and below in the report, we argue for an approach that prioritises the ability of young people to experience the process of becoming autonomous individuals in their youth, and to take part in social life as young people. Youth policies that we have developed in light of this approach value the ability of young people to determine their own needs above and beyond what adults imagine and design for them, their ability to defend their rights pertaining to these needs, and their capacity to organise to extend the current sphere of rights available to them.

The primary target audience for the book is comprised of individuals and institutions that work with youth in either a public or non-governmental setting, and those who participate or will participate in processes of developing policies about youth and related areas. In addition,

---

the book aims to provide a means by which policy developers, youth workers and academics involved in youth studies can hear one another.

There are different approaches to the content and the development process of youth policies. These differences stem from the debate on how to conceptualise youth. Most commonly, youth is defined as a period in human life, as the transition from childhood to adulthood, and is reduced to a specific age group (United Nations, 1993; United Nations 2003; World Bank, 2007).

However, this conceptualisation of youth as a fixed and biological identity has come under many criticisms.[5] The main criticism is that defining youth on the basis of an age group does not take into account the variables of time and place. For example, the processes of urbanisation, industrialisation, and the increase in schooling in the 20th century have resulted in the lengthening of the period of youth. Whereas many international organisations used to define youth as persons aged 15-25, due to the prolongation of schooling, these same organisations now define youth as persons aged 15-29 (United Nations, 1993; United Nations, 2005; Council of Europe, 2003; World Bank, 2007).

When defined solely in terms of an age group, it is as if youth is deemed a biological given with a fixed nature, exempt from the effects of historical and social events. Such a definition paves the way for the ascription of either exclusively positive properties to youth, such as dynamic, progressive, and strong; or exclusively negative properties such as troublemaking, unruly, and dangerous (Lüküslü, 2005).

Another common approach that often follows the said tendency is conceptualising youth on the basis of *instrumentalization*. In this approach youth is seen as the "most dynamic" and "widest" section of society, an object to invest in as the "guarantee of our future" and for "sustainable economic growth". That is, youth is taken into account only in relation to something that is deemed "greater and more important".[6]

---

[5] For historical exposés of these criticisms, see Wyn and White, 1997; Mitterauer, 1992.
[6] For a study on the profile of "the proper citizen" in schoolbooks from 1908 onwards, and the "duties" that this profiling ascribes to youth, see Üstel, 2004. For a study of youth as the object of modernisation in the period between the foundation of the Turkish republic and the 1980s, see Neyzi, 2001.

Similarly, when youth is defined as the "period of transition into adulthood", it is perceived as the path to becoming an adult, and adulthood is seen as the final destination. Therefore youth is defined as not-yet-adult, a position of "deficiency". And since youth is a position of "deficiency", it is in need of guidance and expertise from adults who have already been there. And since each and every adult has lived through a period of youth, they must be experts on the subject! Hence youth is understood as a period, the deficiencies of which must be supplemented with help from adults in order for successful passage into adulthood. Youth is seen as a preparation for a future "real life" (for "adulthood"). This approach also presumes that young people have to wait for becoming adults in order to begin to participate in social life and obtain equal rights (McGrath, 2002). Likewise, when youth is defined as an age group, young people also experience youth as a period that needs to be lived through and done with promptly in preparation for adulthood. Since this period of transition is understood as a period of preparation for becoming what is deemed a "good adult", the notion of good youth (youth) is defined through the notion of good adult (adult) (Bessant, 2005).

However, understanding youth requires an examination of power relations in society. In other words, youth should not be conceptualised solely on the basis of attributes of an age group. It should be analysed both in relation to the conditions of its social construction and in relation to adulthood.[7] The states of being young and being adult are constructed in a context of power relations where the adult has the upper hand. Classification on the basis of age facilitates the restrictions that adults impose on the possibilities that young people have for leading autonomous lives (Bourdieu, 1986 and 1995). The opportunities young people will have, the rights they will win and the autonomies they will experience are all determined as a result of a social struggle between adults and young people. However, the power that adults hold over young people is not only reproduced by the adults, but also by young people. When young people themselves conceive of youth as a period of transition, and invest in the promise of becoming an adult in the near future, they end up not only reconciling themselves to the power of the adult, but also reproducing it.

---

[7] A parallel could be drawn between defining and assessing youth on the basis of an age group on the one hand, and explaining femininity and masculinity on the basis of biological attributes and difference on the other. When sexual difference is considered in terms of biological features, the socially constructed gender roles and the power relations between the two genders are neglected. However a gender-based approach argues that an analysis of power relations and of relations between women and men (women and women) is key to understanding femininity and masculinity (Wyn and White, 1997). Just as femininity is constructed through various definitions of femininity and masculinity, and for example, women are said to be naturally emotional, youth is also constructed, and for example, deemed to have "biological" properties, such as dynamism, etc. (Aktan, 2005)

Young people are impacted by the socioeconomic and cultural conditions of the era they live in, as well as by all kinds of changes in production and distribution policies (Levi and Schmitt, 1997). To give an example from the recent history of Turkey, in the 1970s young people were amongst the most dynamic political actors in the country. Following the 1980 coup d'état, they learned to stay away from institutional political structures such as political parties, labour unions and associations. During the neo-liberal globalisation processes of the 1990s, they learned to trust only in the "market forces". They learned that the projects they would build their life around would have meaning only if they carried market value. They learned to relate to one another and the world using communication technology, internet and satellite systems. They were immensely affected by the increasing inequality, poverty, discrimination and exclusion.

However even with the changes that effect whole generations, it is not possible to speak of a unitary youth independent of social status. Young people from different social strata experience important social changes in different ways. And yet, it could be argued that in societies which undergo rapid changes, historical and social processes have a great effect on the lives of youth. For example, the aforementioned social transformations in Turkey from the 1980s onward allow us to discuss generational commonalities between young people from different social classes, just as it allows us to speak of differences between different generations of youth.[8] In other words "each young generation differs from a previous generation, and yet these differences develop in tandem with social and socioeconomic categories" (Kentel, 2005; Dubet, 1987). Hence just as an unemployed and uneducated young person who lives in a shanty town with unemployed parents will differ significantly from a young university student who lives in a gated community with wealthy parents, there will also be crucial differences between them and their parents due to the different historical and social conditions their generations have been subject to.

The framework discussed above suggests that young people who come from different socioeconomic backgrounds have different needs and demands. However, the different experiences of youth that result from socioeconomic differences are all subject to the power relations that exist between adults and youth. Experienced by all kinds of different youths in

---

[8] For a seminal work on generational consciousness that may be developed by those who live in the same historical and social era, see Mannheim, 1952.

different ways, these power relations hinder every young person's individual process of becoming autonomous.

The two methods that we argue for in lieu of conceptualising youth as an age group (namely, defining youth in its relationality to different forms of power, most importantly to adulthood; and taking into consideration that each generation differs from a previous generation and yet these differences evolve in tandem with social, socioeconomic categories) have significant bearing on the perspective of youth policies that are to be developed. The approach we endorse argues that the focus of youth policies should not be limited to "effects" such as disobedience, crime, drug-addiction, and suicide; that youth policies should not instrumentalize youth for an ostensibly "greater/more important" project; and that youth should not be conceived as a period of preparation for a future "real life". In terms of youth policy development, this perspective, as detailed in the following pages, prioritises a young person's ability to participate in social life as youth, and to experience the process of becoming an autonomous individual in his/her youth. Youth policies developed with this perspective will not consist of what adults devise and design for young people. In this perspective, young people can determine their own needs, defend the rights that pertain to these needs, and organise to expand the sphere of rights available to them.

Youth Policies: How?

Following our attempt to discuss a general approach to youth policies, here we will discuss what we deem to be the fundamental principles of youth policy[9]:

The importance of youth participation in youth policy development

One of the most important elements of any political process is the participation of the subject in the process of determining the content and framework of an issue that is directly or indirectly related to the subject. Hence the participation of young people in such a process

---

[9] European youth work and youth policy debates have contributed to the formulation of these principles. Here our references are the debates led by the Council of Europe Directorate of Youth and Sport (of which Turkey is a member) since the 1970s on issues such as non-formal learning, intercultural education, human rights, pluralist democracy and cultural diversity; as well as the discussions at European Youth Forum which is an umbrella organisation for youth NGOs in Europe. Additionally, and perhaps most of all, our discussion is enhanced by the practical experiences of rights advocacy organisations that have been active in Turkey over the past 15 years, focusing on women's rights, human rights and environmental issues. We should also note that the requirements of further democratisation in society and government already encompass the majority of these principles. Last but not least, the experiences of those who work in the youth field in direct contact with young people have also been an important reference for us in listing these principles.

would transform the content of the policy in line with young people's own needs. Thereby youth policy could be defined as the process of developing and enforcing a policy that secures the equal and sustained participation of young people.

Focus on the different needs of different youths

Young people need support and targeted policies in order to overcome their dependency (especially on their parents) and gain their autonomy. These policies should adopt a "need-based" approach rather than a "problem-based" one, so that young people are not perceived as a danger, as "the future" or solely in terms of labour force, but can exist in the social realm as autonomous, independent and active citizens.

Not instrumentalizing youth

The opportunities provided to youth are often in the name of transforming a greater reality that youth is seen as only a part of. As a result, youth is taken into account only in terms of another policy area, for example, as an aspect in employment policy. However, a policy suggestion should only be considered a youth policy if it is formed on the basis of valuing youth as a whole, and solely on account of their being youth.

Not objectifying youth

Having more control over their own lives is a condition for the ability of young people to make decisions as equal citizens. It is very common for young people to organise their lives around their parents' and other adults' ambitions and desires. On the other hand, the official education policy dictates that the ideals of youth be congruous with that of the nation-state. A crucial principle for developing youth policies is allowing youth freedom with respect to their own choices.

Not conceptualising youth as a period of transition

Rather than focusing on the "transition" of youth into labour market, adulthood or starting a family, the target for youth policies must be empowering young people to experience life as "individuals" in their youth. Youth policies are not policies that prepare youth for adulthood. On the contrary, they are policies that engender the ability of young people to become autonomous citizens with equal rights *in their youth*.

Not limiting the criteria of evaluation to market value

Young people's creativity, interest and participation in social life should not be evaluated solely based on the criterion of "having market value", but rather be seen as spheres of liberty which young people are free to construct as they wish.

Prioritising the voluntary participation of youth

Volunteering is a means for youth to participate as active citizens in social life, of their own free will. It is an imperative that proposals advanced in the framework of youth policies be put into practice as a result of young people's own will.

Empowering youth

Empowering and increasing the capabilities[10] of youth to live their differences as autonomous and equal individuals and to participate in social life as young people must form the basis of youth policies.

Emphasising the importance of participating in collective action

Organising, namely assembling around a common area of interest or for creating social change, is one of the defining elements of participation in social life. The contribution of the individual to collective or organisational processes, and consequently the influence that these processes have on the individual are educational and instructive, in the sense that they facilitate the development of a culture of democracy and reinforce the mutual understanding that forms the basis of co-existence. Moreover, they may yield additional benefits such as the extension of voluntary participation. Prioritising the knowledge and skills that individuals develop within a youth group, instead of prioritising the capability of different youth groups to work together, may hinder the collective empowerment of the target group. This is why youth policy proposals must place emphasis on the importance of organising. Here "organising" should not necessarily be understood in its traditional sense. In other words, the usage here does not necessarily refer to officialized bodies. The participation of youth in organisations that have minimal prerequisites and conditions of participation, such as networks and platforms, will be an important aspect of a new kind of youth policy.

---

[10] This concept emphasised in Amartya Sen's works could be defined as having the basic rights necessary to lead a dignified and meaningful life, being aware of these rights, having access to them and being capable of demanding them (İnsel, 2000).

Mainstreaming youth

The practical target of policies that are devised to encourage youth's autonomous and sustainable participation in social life could be defined as mainstreaming youth. This approach, as articulated in the "White Paper on Youth"[11] is premised on the idea that it is better for youth to be "everywhere" than "nowhere", and suggests that mainstreaming youth requires both specific means and general mechanisms (European Union, 2001). For example, one of the implications of this would be the cooperation and representation of youth in all areas that concern it, including education, sports, health, culture, justice, human rights, security, social security, urban planning, etc.

Emphasis on gender

The discrepancy between male and female visibility in social life often means that youth policies are developed with a bias towards young men. Youth policy proposals must be developed with an aim to address in equality and fairness the full spectrum of similarities and differences between what young men need and what young women need. One of the fundamental principles of youth policies must be the willingness to provide services to young women and young men separately, in accordance with their differential needs; as well as to ensure the existence and visibility of young women in cases of common interest.

Special emphasis on young people with fewer opportunities[12]

The general fertility rate across Turkey is on the decline while longevity is on the incline, therefore the proportion of youth in the entire population is on the decline. And yet, taking population growth into account, it can be said that in the next 25 years, the actual population of youth will be constant. However, fertility and longevity rates in underdeveloped parts of the country are changing much more slowly than in other parts of the country. This means that in the next 25 years there will be an increase in the proportion of young people with fewer opportunities within the general youth population. Turkey-specific youth policies must be coined and enforced with an awareness of this development. In other words, social inclusion must be a major aspect of these policies.

---

[11] See http://ec.europa.eu/youth/archive/whitepaper/index_en.html.
[12] For this concept of "young people with fewer opportunities," see www.salto-youth.net/inclusiondefinition.

Emphasis on differences not as threat but as diversity

In Turkey, there are not many environments where youth are provided the opportunity to socialise and experience the coexistence of different identities and cultures, and develop new future-oriented projects. The lack of such environments produces many negative consequences, including political and physical violence in the face of ethnic, religious, cultural and sexual differences, as well as increased intolerance and fanaticism. Hence a fundamental principle of youth policy must be providing opportunities for young people to socialise with others in their differences.

Complementary Approach and Thorough Empowerment

Youth policies must be pursued with a complementary approach, in the sense that young people should be supported not only in a single area, but in every aspect of life that they need support for. In the complementary approach, just as it is important to provide educational opportunities and equip youth with a social safety net; it is also important to establish support mechanisms that enable young people's participation in social life as active and autonomous individuals.

The Scope of the Book

As the selection of issues and articles hereunder will demonstrate, the book, *Youth Work and Policy in Turkey*, attempts to bridge two areas together. One is the area of youth work in which youth workers are engaged and which draws on the national and international experience in the field. The other one is the area of academic studies concerning research and accumulation of knowledge on youth. In bridging these two areas, the book aims to provide youth workers and other stakeholders in the youth field with a record of the experiences in the field, and to promote their interest in academic studies on the subject. On the other hand, it aims to draw the attention of academics to the developments in the field of youth work.

The first chapter of the book consists of youth policy proposals coined within the framework of the principles mentioned above. We begin with proposals that are based on youth work, an area we consider to be of central significance in youth policy development. The first article by Nemutlu and Kurtaran, "Youth Work-based Policy Proposals[13]", propose policies that are

---

[13] The english translation of the paper can be seen in this report.

based on fieldwork experience in local and international youth work, non-formal learning[14] and youth participation. These policy proposals are also based on the articles in the second chapter of the book which are provide comprehensive analyses of official documents as well as fieldwork experience.

The first chapter also includes "Youth Policy Proposals in Areas Surrounding the Lives of Young People[15]". These policies are on issues such as youth unemployment, youth and education, youth and political participation, youth and social exclusion, and youth poverty. Studies and policy proposals on these matters generally tend to address youth as a subcategory. However, the policy proposals in the book are formulated from a perspective that prioritises the ability of youth to exist in society as "youth", that is, a perspective that sees youth as the subject and agent of these policies. The proposals are primarily drawn from the academic works included in the last chapter of the book.

The second chapter includes articles addressing issues around "youth work". We think that youth work will play a significant role in ensuring the ability of youth to exist as "youth" in society. By presenting these articles we wish to initiate a debate on youth work, which we believe should be pivotal in youth policy development. Based on the insight that youth work is not uniform, Nemutlu's article "'Subject-Oriented' Classification Model for Youth Work" proposes a new kind of classification in an attempt to enrich the debate on youth work. The model she proposes analyses youth work not on the basis of where it takes place but on bases of who conducts it, for which target group, and on which subject. This model intends to facilitate discussions on policy proposals in the youth field.

Certel and Kurtaran's article titled "Youth Policies Across Europe" focuses on the youth policies of the Council of Europe and European Commission, two bodies that support the development of youth work in Europe. The article also discusses structures and programmes that bring these policies into practice. Nemutlu's article in the same chapter, "Historical Development of Youth Work within Civil Society Organizations in Turkey" charts the impact on Turkey of European youth enterprises, which some Turkish institutions have occasionally taken part in or benefited from. The developments in this area which gained momentum

---

[14] For a definition of "non-formal learning", see Taylor's article in the book.
[15] The english translation of the paper can be seen in this report.

especially after 1955, are discussed from the point of view of youth workers who have participated in the process. Kurtaran's article "The Role of the State in Youth-Related Activities in Turkey [16]" outlines the current standing and services of public institutions that assist young people and youth organisations. The article provides grounds for discussing youth policies in the framework of youth work.

Kristensen's article "'Mobility' in Europe" discusses the concept of mobility, a key element in national and international youth work. Kristensen emphasises the individual benefits of mobility for educational as opposed to touristic purposes, and draws attention to points of concern in such mobility projects. We believe that this article is an important contribution to youth mobility projects across Europe, in which young people from Turkey increasingly take part.

In "Youth Work and Local Governments in Istanbul", Kurtaran examine how Revised European Charter's articles on youth work are applied in Turkey. Investigating the state of youth policies in Turkey from a new angle, the article contributes to the task of analysing young people's participation in decision making in terms of participation in society, rather than the narrower framework of participation in government.

Non-formal education, which is widely used in youth work and essential in designing a learning environment, is conceptualized here by Taylor's article "Getting Interested in Non-formal Education and Learning in Youth Work". The article also discusses the relationship between youth work and non-formal education, and provides a thorough bibliography on non-formal learning. Another article on the subject of non-formal learning included in the book is Nemutlu's "Youth Work and Youth Trainers". This article profiles youth trainers in Turkey by examining the results of a survey which polled 43 out of a total of 70 youth trainers who are employed by National Agency's "Youth in Action" Programme.

In the third chapter of the book, we present a selection of articles on the different aspects of the role of young people in society. These articles are actually on issues that we are very much accustomed to hearing or reading about in relation to youth, such as youth unemployment, youth and education, and youth and political participation. However, the

---

[16] The english translation of the paper can be seen in this report.

difference that is common to all these articles is their perspective that prioritises the ability of youth to exist as "youth" in society as opposed to conceiving of them as "adults-to-be".

Amongst the texts in this chapter, Pultar's "Who Are We? Young People in KONDA Social Structure Research" is based on results of the research conducted by KONDA Research and Consultancy firm. The data was gathered from a sample of 47,958 people living in Turkey, 6621 out of which were young people aged 18-28. The conclusions of the article provide insight into issues such as the geographical distribution of young people's ethnic and religious affiliations, their levels of education, household income and poverty, population mobility among youth, and loyalty to identity. The article by Yentürk, et al., "Istanbul Youth: Does NGO Membership Make a Difference?" is based on a survey of 1014 young people aged 15-24, who had studied or were studying in Istanbul. The authors compare the responses of young people who are members of NGOs (13.8%) with the responses of those who are not (74,5%), to questions of socioeconomic status and consumption patterns, lifestyle, media consumption, values, emotional attitude, and interest in issues such as the EU, religion and politics. The article presents clues as to advancing active democratic participation via increased NGO membership of youth.

In "Contemporary Youth in Turkey", Lüküslü draws on the in-depth interviews she conducted with 80 young people aged 18-25 in Istanbul, and suggests that this generation is not apathetic, indifferent, and "selfish" as is generally claimed, but rather they consider the sphere of politics to be inadequate for solving their problems, unchangeable and comprised of authoritarian structures that will not accommodate young people's characteristics. Caymaz's article, "Youth Groups of Political Parties" is concerned with young people in today's Turkey who participate in politics via political parties. The author considers the place and position of these young people within the party structure, and suggests that they do not assume a distinct stance or style by virtue of their youth, but rather take part in political parties without questioning the authoritarian structure of existing power relations.

In "Youth Unemployment in Turkey: Contributing Factors and Policy Proposals[17]", Yentürk and Başlevent argue that youth population in Turkey is faced with crucial problems and that these problems cannot be overcome simply by securing employment opportunities. They

---

[17] The english translation of the summary of the paper can be seen in this report.

explain that the extent of youth unemployment is an important factor in aggravating these problems, and yet it is not the decisive factor in solving them. In "Social Exclusion and Youth" Yurttagüler provides a survey of the literature on social exclusion, and draws attention to the relationship between social exclusion and youth. The article also gives an outline of policies developed by the Council of Europe and European Commission to promote social inclusion of young people, and discusses the opportunities that can be provided to young people in the struggle against social exclusion and poverty in specifically Turkey. Uyan's article in the book, "From Childhood to Adulthood: The Non-Youth", discusses the status of young people in society by drawing on the literature on youth poverty. Uyan suggests that poverty, opportunity discrepancy, and gender, regional and ethnic discrimination are the main causes that lead to the inability of young people to live their youth, their loss of hope for the future, and their hurried passage into adulthood.

İdemen's article "Social Origin, Habitus and Education" is on the socially conservative structure of the education system and its inability to operate in favour of the disadvantaged, of those who cannot break through social exclusion. Utilising Bourdieu's critical approach, the author argues that primary education that children and young people receive in their family plays an important role in reproducing the existing power relations in society, that primary family education is systematically linked to social origin, and that the existing system of education uncritically teaches the dominant culture and reproduces social inequality.

In "School, Young People and 'the Others'", Üstel assesses the role of school (as an institution of socialisation) and schoolbooks in shaping Turkey's young generations' mentality towards discrimination and xenophobia. Üstel's findings show that xenophobia, prejudice on national heroism, praise of war, extolment and sanctification of the authority of the state, legitimisation of ethnic, religious and gender discrimination, biased opinions on the dangers and threats from inner and outer enemies all prevail in schoolbooks that young people read as part of their education. Correspondingly, what prevails amongst youth is an antagonistic political culture, suspicion of one another, and a spirit of intolerance, xenophobia and "othering".

In "Rap Pedagogy as a Critical Method of Education", Kaya suggests that both rap and graffiti embody the possibility of turning young people into active subjects by liberating them from the restrictions of traditional, official methods of education that are programmed to blunt

that which is "other and different". According to Kaya, this culture flourishing outside school points to a training programme that is more critical than modern education, and allows youth to express their criticisms of dominant culture in society, as well as to build subcultures, discourses, styles, cultural forms and identities of their own.

Bibliography

Aktan, H. (2005) "Olmaya 'Gençlik' Cihanda" (No Country for "Youth"), *Birikim*, no. 196, Istanbul.

Bessant, J. (2005) "Principles of Developing Youth Policy", *Policy Studies*, vol. 26, no 1.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) *Distinctions: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, Routledge, London.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Pratical Reason*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge. Council of Europe (2003), Experts on Youth Policy Indicators, "Final Report", 26-27 March 2003, European Youth Center, Strasbourg.

Dubet, F. (1987*) La Galère: Jeunes en Survie* (The Galley: Youth Trying to Survive), Fayard, Paris.

European Union (2001), "White Paper on Youth", http://ec.europa.eu/youth/archive/whitepaper/index_en.html

Hall, T. Coffrey, A. and Williamson, H. (1999) "Self, Space and Place: Youth Identities and Citizenship", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 20, no 4.

İnsel, A. (2000) "Özgürlük Etiği Karşısında İktisat Kuramı: Amartya Sen'in Etik İktisat Önerisi" (Economic Theory in the face of Ethics of Freedom: Amartya Sen's Proposal for Ethical Economics), *Toplum Bilim*, no 86.

Kentel, F. (2005) "Türkiye'de Genç Olmak: Konformizm ya da Siyasetin Yeniden İnşaası" (Being Young in Turkey: Conformism or the Reconstruction of Politics), *Birikim*, no. 196, İstanbul.

Lagre, J.C. and Loncle, P. (2001) "Jeunes et Citoyennete" (Youth and Citizenship), *Problem Politiques et Sociaux*, no. 862, La documentaiton Française, Paris.

Levi, G. and Schmitt, J.C. (1997) *A History of Young People in the West*, Harvard University Press.

Lüküslü, D. (2005) "La Jeunesse Turque Actuelle : La Fin du 'Mythe' de la Jeunesse" (Turkish Youth Today: The End of the "Myth" of Youth), PhD Thesis submitted to Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), CADIS, Paris.

Mannheim, K. (1952) "Problem of Generations", *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, Routledge, London.

McGrath, B. (2002) "Towards the Enablement of Unqualified Rural Youth: A Structurationist Perspective on Socially Inclusive Policy Interventions", *Journal of Youth Studies*, vol. 5, no 3.

Mitterauer, M. (1992) *A History of Youth*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Neyzi, L. (2001) "Object or Subject: The Paradox of 'Youth' in Turkey", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 33.

Özbay F. (2007) "Demografik Geçiş Sürecinde Gençlik ve Türkiye" (Youth and Turkey in the Process of Demographic Transition), Üniversite Gençliği ve Sosyal Haklar Sempozyumu, Toplum Gönüllüleri Vakfı (Community Volunteers Foundation), 2-4 November 2007, Ankara.

United Nations (1993) "The Global Situation of Youth in 1990s: Trends and Prospects", New York.

United Nations (2005) "World Youth Report 2005" www.un.org/esa/socdev/unyin/wyr05.htm

Üstel, F. (2004) *Makbul Vatandaş'ın Peşinde: II. Meşrutiyetten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi* (In Search of the Ideal Citizen: Citizenship Training since the Second Constitutional Monarchy), İletişim, İstanbul.

World Bank (2007) "Development and the Next Generation", *World Development Report*, Washington DC.

Wyn, J. and White, R. (1997) *Rethinking Youth*, Sage, London.

YOUTH WORK-BASED POLICY PROPOSALS [18]

Gülesin Nemutlu and Yörük Kurtaran

Youth policy proposals that we offer in this article are all derived from youth work and formulated in order to contribute to improving youth work. As emphasised in the Introduction, the fundamental principles of our proposals are: securing the participation of young people as autonomous individuals in devising and developing youth policies, and promoting need-based policies that take into account the different needs of different kinds of youth. Hence the policies proposed here are not centred on sports, as they conventionally are, but rather on youth work.

Another important point to take into account when developing youth policy proposals is the structural difference of the "youth field" in comparison to civil society organising in other fields. Youth organisations and groups tend to have a high turnover of participants[19]. When this phenomenon is observed as a neutral fact rather than as a problem, it becomes clear that the policies in question need to be developed as long-term policies.

The policy proposals below can be analysed in three categories. The first set of proposals pertain to legal regulations that are deemed necessary for a more effective youth policy. The second set of proposals concern the framework of youth work, one of the main areas where youth policy is brought into practice. Finally, a third set of proposals are coined to promote and support the viability and progress of youth policies.

a) Legal regulations:

Youth legislation– Proposal for a general legislation regulating services provided to youth:

In Turkey there are three types of legal regulations concerning the rights of youth. First, there are laws that are directly about young people, such as Article 59 of the Constitution.[20] The second type consists of laws that do not target youth directly but nevertheless concern sections of society that are predominantly young. A good example to this kind of regulation is the Disciplinary Code of the Higher Education Credit and Dormitories Institution (Yurt-Kur).

---

[18] Translated from the Turkish by Başak Ertür.

[19] In the sense that for various different reasons, young people who participate in youth organisations tend to stay in one organisation only for a short period of time.

[20] For a detailed examination of laws and codes regarding youth, see Kurtaran (2008a) and his paper in this report titled "The Role of the State in Youth-related Activities in Turkey".

The code concerns students, but since the overwhelming majority of university students in Turkey are young people, the main addressee of the law is actually youth. The third type consists of legal regulations that target youth as part of a separate issue, such as employment. Taking the needs of youth in Turkey as the point of departure, the regulations that fall under these three categories need to be revised, improved in content, and in some cases annulled or fully rewritten. Otherwise the gap between increasingly differentiating needs and available services will continue to widen.

A regulation that may bridge this gap between young people's needs and the capacities of different institutions that provide services to youth could be a general youth legislation designed as the point of reference for all other laws and regulations that include provisions on youth. Specifying the fundamental duties and responsibilities of the state towards youth in this manner will not only define the rights of youth clearly, but also bring about the extension of these rights into all areas of social life to the benefit of young people. Such a fundamental law could potentially act as a model for future legal regulations developed in favour of other sections of society with different needs.[21]

The development of these new regulations should take place simultaneously with structural reforms in public institutions serving youth, as Kurtaran argues in his article (Kurtaran, 2008a). As also expressed in State Planning Organisation's 2007 annual programme, public institutions providing services to youth should reform their operations in order to achieve the following aims: advancing the participation of young people in decision making; promoting respect for differences, tolerance, consensus and solidarity in society; gradually transferring youth services to local governments; increasing the number of young people, especially the number of disadvantaged youth who avail themselves of these services; and following the good examples of the European Union and others on the coordination of services provided to youth.

Proposal for an open method of coordination in devising youth policies in Turkey:
Open Method of Coordination is a relatively new but widely used method designed for developing concrete policy initiatives for European Union's (EU) policy areas. The main strength of the method is that it requires the participation of all stakeholders in the process of

---

[21] For an example of the kind of general law we propose here, see Germany's Youth Protection Law.

formulating policy guidelines by consensus. Hence stakeholders who are directly or indirectly influenced by the policy area are involved in the development of the policy. This grants the policy the highest possible level of social legitimacy and encourages large sections of society to embrace it.

The Open Method of Coordination is a policy-making method that can be used not only as a transnational method for Europe but also a national one. When deciding on the process of the Open Method of Coordination, emphasis must be placed on taking into account the conditions that are specific to Turkey in order to guarantee the participation of disadvantaged sections of youth in the process.

As a precondition for preparing the appropriate environment for the effective implementation of the Open Method of Coordination, the central government and local governments must create mechanisms aimed at increasing the participation of youth. In order to effectively disseminate information and empower young people to avail themselves of opportunities that are offered (such as voluntary activities that increase social participation in terms of active citizenship, exchange programmes, youth assemblies designed to increase participation in local governments, and so on) central and local governments have the responsibility to make alliances with young people and youth organisations, based on a mutually agreed-upon framework of duties and rights.

A policy document for youth – the "White Paper" proposal:
An important preliminary step in the process of formulating and implementing laws is to create groundwork documents using a variety of methods to expound on the current situation of the policy area in question and the strategic openings that are available. As the basis for developing effective policies, this will help define the short-term, mid-term and long-term needs of the policy area, and identify ways of addressing these needs. United Kingdom's "Every Child Matters" document (http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/) and the European Union's "White Paper on Youth" (http://ec.europa.eu/youth/archive/whitepaper/index_en.html) are policy documents that were produced with similar methods, the former being national, and the latter being an international one.

Produced with different objectives, both of these documents were preceded by a Green Paper published by the UK government, and the European Commission, respectively. These Green

Papers were prepared with limited contributions by experts in the area, and opened for contributions from stakeholders for a defined period of time. Hence their content was enhanced by contributions from young people and youth workers. These are perhaps the most important contributions in terms of ensuring that the policy document is based on needs. Moreover, the collaboration of the concerned organisations on a common document, as equal participants within a framework of dialogue between civil society and government, has in turn motivated both of these types of organisations to bring their efforts in line with this policy document.[22]

In Turkey, stakeholders who are active in the youth field could produce a similar policy document on youth, in a process of collaboration based on equal participation. This document would define the current state of affairs on the basis of needs, and propose solutions by identifying which institutions or bodies could provide for these needs. Formulating these proposals together in a dialogic process would also lay the groundwork for collaboration on future youth-related undertakings and activities. Hence the atmosphere of cooperation that this document will occasion would help articulate common goals and legitimise the necessity for further cooperation.

Monitoring and evaluating youth policies – Developing indicators for youth policies:
The advancement of youth policies depend on systems that are in place for evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation process. The system of evaluation must be based on the conditions and facts specific to the country in question, and must be composed of measurable indicators. The utilisation of such indicators in the youth field would assist the public institutions in self-monitoring and self-evaluation, and provide non-governmental youth organisations with the necessary foundations for developing concrete policy proposals.

Council of Europe's indicators for youth policies[23] provide an important model for evaluating public youth policies and for mapping the state of the youth field in a given country.

---

[22] An example to this kind of process is the preparation of the Accession Partnership Document, which commenced with a general meeting held on 3 December 2004 in Ankara, attended by delegates of the European Commission and representatives from all concerned public institutions, social partners, non-governmental organisations and universities.
[23] http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unyin/documents/CoE_indicators.pdf

Similarly, the indicator for "Youth Information Systems" (ERYICA[24], 2004) is a good reference for analysing information systems for youth services. These indicators provide a general framework for youth policies, however, they have aspects that ought to be improved particularly on the basis of youth work.

These examples are predominantly suitable for monitoring the extent of available services, hence they must be further developed for evaluating the content and quality of the services provided.

Clearly, the different structures of youth services in each country will necessitate different national indicators. However, in order to facilitate the evaluation of youth-related activities across Europe on common grounds, there must be efforts to adjust the different indicators developed for different countries.

Perhaps the most important step in ensuring the adoption and implementation of national youth policy indicators by all non-governmental and governmental stakeholders in the youth field is to guarantee that the indicators are coined in a process of cooperation between civil society organisations and the government. If this process of dialogue initiated by such an exercise becomes a "success story", it may pave the way for similar dialogues flourishing and strengthening in other policy areas.

Youth Council of Turkey – A proposed structure for young people's participation in decisions concerning themselves:
Youth councils are amongst the most widespread mechanisms for enabling organised youth to participate in decision making on local, regional and national levels in a given country. The structure of youth councils and their practice differ from country to country. Whereas youth councils in some countries function as a kind of advisory board which is consulted on issues directly concerning youth, in other countries they play a greater role as part of the legal decision making process. A youth council's structure and form of organisation also differs according to conditions specific to each country. Although differing from one another in a variety of ways, the common element in all youth council models is that they contribute to the

---

[24] ERYICA: European Youth Information and Counselling Agency, http://www.eryica.org/european-youth-information-charter

formation of a rights-based relationship between the state and youth by enabling youth to participate in decision making , on matters that concern themselves. This should be understood as a process that contributes to the balance of power between the state and citizens.

European Youth Forum is an umbrella organisation recognised by EU as a partner in policy-making. Currently, National Youth Councils of 32 countries are members of the European Youth Forum. Turkey is not represented in the forum, the fundamental reason being its lack of a National Youth Council.[25] However, one of the most effective means of influencing youth policy in the EU even as a non-EU country[26] is by way of membership to the European Youth Forum.[27] Turkish Parliament's National Education, Culture, Youth and Sport Committee, Department of Youth Services (DYS) and National Agency (NA) must play an active role in expediting the official foundation of a national Youth Council in Turkey. All stakeholders in the youth field should have equal participation in the process of establishing this Youth Council.

b) The framework of youth work[28]

Space for more widespread youth work – Proposals regarding youth centres:

In Turkey, there are a limited number of institutions where young people can socialise, prepare for a social life outside of family life, and find space for sharing experiences. Certel and Kurtaran (2008) suggests that there are several important options in this area, including European Youth Centres where alternative techniques of non-formal education and participation are utilised towards increasing the social inclusion, participation and empowerment of young people. Kurtaran (2008a) emphasises the need for improving services provided by youth centres that are operated by Department of Youth Services (DYS). This would mean increasing the number of youth centres, augmenting their budgets and widening their scopes. A quick calculation shows that currently the number of young people for each DYS youth centre is approximately 146,000. Furthermore, as the article by Yentürk, et al. (2008) illustrates, within a wider range of spaces where young people get together, the proportion of venues such as youth centres is close to nil.

---

[25] For further details on the efforts to found a National Youth Council in Turkey, see Nemutlu (2008a).

[26] For example, Armenia is not a member of the EU, but is represented at the European Youth Forum via its National Youth Council.

[27] The European Union includes the European Youth Forum in the processes of developing its youth policies.

[28] For a study on the development of the notion of youth work in Turkey, Nemutlu (2008a)

According to Municipal Law no. 5393, it is a municipality's duty to provide services for youth.[29] However, limited progress has been made in this area. The knowledge and experience of municipalities on the subject is also quite limited. Municipalities must reinforce their capacities for youth work in order to successfully establish youth centres and operate these centres on the basis of participation. Similarly, municipalities must provide more resources and renewed efforts for women's shelters, where young women who are victims of violence can get assistance.

When we consider non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in this context, as potential spaces for young people to socialise outside school, existing resources are, again, very limited. Aside from youth organisations, most NGOs have difficulties developing volunteer/member participation programmes that take into account the special needs of young members and volunteers. Furthermore, in some cases, youth voluntarism and membership is dismissed as an added burden or cost. All these factors contribute to the scarcity of venues where young people can self-actualise.

In her article, Yurttagüler (2008) states that youth centres where young people can express themselves and partake in the "public sphere" are perhaps foremost amongst opportunities that can be provided so as to enable young people to participate in society as active citizens. Discussions on youth, social exclusion and poverty emphasise young people's relationship to their peers as a key factor. Community centres or youth centres are considered pivotal in ensuring the social participation of young people, supporting their autonomy and struggling against social exclusion. It is possible to increase the social visibility of young people by means of youth centres and youth workers. Moreover, enabling young people to make decisions about themselves and the society they live in will contribute to the ability of young people to express their own needs more clearly. Correspondingly, clearly defined needs will facilitate the formulation of solutions from a youth perspective and ensure a more reliable and "inclusive" relationship between young people and the society they live in.

In order to overcome the obstacles to young people's social participation, it is possible to create environments that are suitable for young people's self-expression, and to provide

---

[29] For a more detailed discussion of youth work in local governments, see Kurtaran (2008b)

services such as counselling, information and guidance. Mobile youth workers,[30] and youth centres established in areas where disadvantaged youth reside will be especially pertinent in enabling young people to exist as active individuals in society and to form relationships with their social environment.

Proposals regarding the recognition of youth work:

The most general definition of youth work is "working to create a learning environment designed to address the needs of young people in their quest for self-actualisation".[31]

Since it is outside the boundaries of formal education, there is no certification system which assesses learning that takes place during youth work. At the same time, youth work is generally framed towards assisting young people in gaining life skills.

It can be observed that many countries in Europe have a certain system of certification for people who work with youth either voluntarily or professionally (and in many countries people who work in this area professionally are referred to as "youth workers"). A good example is "European Portfolio for Youth Leaders and Youth Workers" (http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/Source/Resources/Portfolio/Portfolio_en.pdf), which is discussed in detail in Certel and Kurtaran (2008). Designed to aid youth workers in marking and observing their personal progress, the Portfolio very much resembles an artist's portfolio in that it makes visible achievements that otherwise may not find their way into a conventional CV. Methods of this kind positively contribute to the employment opportunities of youth workers, and more importantly they enable youth workers to assess themselves on the basis of common standards.

Furthermore, new certification schemes are developed for verifying and recognizing the participation of young people in youth work activities. *Youthpass*, a compulsory component of Youth in Action, which in turn is European Commission's new youth policy programme for 2007-2013, is likely to become the most visible and widespread amongst such schemes of recognition.

---

[30] Shortwave Youth Centre, established with the support of Youth Studies Unit at Istanbul Bilgi University, is currently (2008) carrying out a modeling on mobile youth workers in Eyüp, Istanbul.
[31] In this definition, "self-actualisation" means the ability of young people to experience the process of becoming autonomous individuals in their youth, and to exist as youth in social life.

One could predict with good reason that schemes such as Youthpass and Youth Portfolio will become pivotal components in establishing standards for youth work, as they are increasingly taken up and used by youth workers who are employed by governments. Hence, in rendering youth work in Turkey compatible with European standards, it is very important to adapt Youthpass itself or a similar standard to the local conditions in Turkey, rather than directly translating it into Turkish, and using it as it is.

However, all certification systems have problems that are inherent to their very structure. For example, when participation in youth activities shifts from "voluntary work on the basis of active citizenship" to "volunteering for sake of a certificate", this shift will necessarily, that is, due to the nature of civil society, change the content of the activity. In light of all these discussions, we propose that certain standards be developed for young people and youth workers who take part in youth activities in Turkey, while keeping it optional for stakeholders in the youth field to utilise such standards.

Proposals regarding youth workers:

As also mentioned under the section on the recognition of youth work, developing certain standards for youth workers will lead to the recognition of youth work in general and the recognition of youth workers in particular. In countries where youth work is widespread, there are different kinds of arrangements for this line of work. For example in the United Kingdom, a higher education degree is a precondition for working with youth.[32] Even though there are differences in how youth work is regulated, it is significant that in such countries youth work as a professional category is differentiated from other occupations that are also directed at meeting the needs of youth.

Even though some people in Turkey who work with young people have recently begun to identify themselves as youth workers –especially in the last three years, owing to the new terminology introduced by partnership with European counterparts in the context of European Commission's Youth in Action programme–, there is no such officially recognised occupation. And even though departments of social work in higher education institutions treat youth as a subcategory of the discipline, the kind of youth work that we define and discuss here is not taught at university level. (http://www.shy.hacettepe.edu.tr/turkce/html/

---

[32] http://www.nya.org.uk/

anaframe.htm). What is taught in its stead are merely products of conceiving of youth as a problem, covering it under subjects such as youth and drug addiction, or youth and violence. Hence the graduates of social work departments go on to work with youth only within this limited framework.

In Turkey, youth work experience is increasingly accumulated especially in sphere of organised civil society. Taking this and the structural characteristics of youth work (youth in focus, peer-to-peer approach, voluntary-based, emphasis on the interaction between youth worker and young people, etc.) into account, we propose that youth workers recruited by the state to work in public institutions be appointed on the basis of their experience of working with young people and participating in youth activities.

Supporting non-formal education:

As Taylor (2008) suggests, non-formal learning is one of the most fundamental educational dynamics of youth work. The way in which youth work activities differ from leisure activities is that whatever method may be used (project management, teamwork, intercultural learning or sports), a youth work activity will always have predetermined learning aims, and the learning during a youth work activity will be shaped by the participants themselves, of their own free will. Policies designed to promote youth work should include initiatives directed at supporting and promoting non-formal learning environments in general, and non-formal education in particular. Building the capacity of youth workers (paid or voluntary) to design non-formal learning environments,[33] and increasing the field-wide proficiency in designing non-formal education for youth will contribute to the participatory implementation of youth policies.

Proposal to support youth mobility:

Mobility can be an important instrument for learning, autonomy and personal development. As Kristensen (2008) discusses in detail, human beings have been travelling to different places and cultures since time immemorial, albeit for different reasons (commerce, education, etc.), and as a result, they have been improving their skills of coexistence. Learning mobility programmes for youth usually and specifically involve young people who are students. However, mobility is an important learning opportunity for every young person, even if

---

[33] For a discussion on designing non-formal education environments, see Nemutlu(2008b).

they're not students. Mobility programmes between regions and cities, or between different countries (two different examples of which can be found in European Commission's Youth in Action Programme and Lifelong Learning Programme) potentially provide an important opportunity for young people to flourish. Mobility activities that are part of the partnership between Turkey's Department of Youth Services and the German Government, as well as the mobility component of National Agency's Youth in Action Programme, are very good examples of learning mobility. Such schemes should increase in number and continue.

c) Possibilities and proposals regarding implementation and improvement

Cooperation in the youth field – Proposals regarding coordination between public institutions:

National Agency (NA), Department of Youth Services (DYS), Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SSCPA) and the Ministry of National Education (MNE) directly provide a variety of services to youth as part of their of duty. By virtue of their broad range of resources and their direct and face to face relation to a massive section of the youth population of a certain age group, both MNE and SSCPA have the potential to open up new areas of venture for the opportunities provided by the state. Informing more youth via MNE about opportunities provided by various youth work schemes will increase the demand for such services. The demand for improving, differentiating and expanding the services provided by the state to youth may eventually result in a positive pressure group working towards favourable developments in this area. In addition, informing disadvantaged youth via SSCPA about youth activities will similarly widen the target group of existing activities.

In addition to providing information, the physical resources of these institutions, such as meeting rooms, workshop venues and conference halls, can be utilised by youth organisations for a range of activities, including those organised by DYS and NA. This will not only solve the lack of activity space for non-governmental organisations but also make use of public buildings that are unutilized during certain hours of the day, weekends and long public holidays.

The first condition for achieving these improvements is enabling the said institutions to collaborate on the basis of schemes of cooperation that are clearly defined by various protocols. As Kurtaran (2008a) discusses, important steps in building coordination between these institutions include the establishment of a "higher board of coordination" and the

formation of a separate committee on children and youth within the Turkish Parliament, as also proposed in the 2007 report of State Planning Organisation's Special Commission on Children and Youth.

Proposals regarding transparency in forming and sustaining services:

As long as the procedure and implementation of services provided by public institutions are transparent, civil society stakeholders will be able to keep track of policies and services that concern themselves. Transparency in developing and sustaining public services for youth will facilitate their participation in and awareness of these services. There are two important questions concerning transparency in existing services: first, the criteria and procedure by which Department of Youth Services and National Agency award funds to young people and youth organisations, and second, the criteria and procedure by which these same institutions select young people who are to participate in their educational activities. As long as there is a lack of transparency in these processes and information is not provided on a general basis, there will be uncertainty as to why these services are provided, in order to meet what needs, and for which young people.

Proposals for a higher budget for opportunities provided to youth:

The quality and quantity of services that the state is obliged to provide to youth must be determined by an approach that conceives of opportunities provided to youth in terms of rights, and the aim of providing for the different needs of different sections of the youth population. In a right-based relationship between stakeholders, the size of the population does not have a bearing on the state's duty to diversify the scope of service structures according to a certain standard and with a view to all differences. On account of this right, the state and/or municipalities are obliged to thoroughly provide for the demands of those who wish to take advantage of such services.

One of the most significant restrictions on young people's ability to take advantage of services mentioned in this report is the inadequacy of the share allocated to youth in the national budget, especially when considering the population structure and the necessity to address the differing needs within the population. One of the most pertinent indicators of this inadequacy is the current average public expenditure per young person, as discussed in Kurtaran (2008a). For 2006, Department of Youth Services' average expenditure on youth

activities was 0,11 YTL[34] per young person. For the National Agency, this figure was 0,9 YTL per capita. Hence the total amount spent on youth work services for the duration of a year was approximately 1 YTL per young person.

In addressing this problem, transfer of necessary resources must be adopted as one of the fundamental aspects of the scheme for widening the scope of youth services. Revising and increasing the funds provided to youth clubs will enable more youth organisations to develop their capacities. Furthermore, every contribution towards youth centres and training of staff at youth centres will have a multiplier effect and serve as a means to directly providing opportunities for youth. In addition to increasing the budgets of institutions serving youth, utilizing a variety of public resources in support of these services, such as making it easier to take advantage of facilities at community centres, will contribute to widening the scope of these services.

Both kinds of support will contribute positively to widening the scope of services. However, in case the content of services provided is not improved on a par with their scope, it is the duty of related public institutions to ensure –by means of changes in legislation and regular inspections– that services are provided within a framework of certain values, against all forms of discrimination and with a view to all differences. As long as the duty to monitor the public implementation of these arrangements is undertaken by stakeholders from civil as a matter of course, it will be possible to secure an equilibrium between the scope and content of services provided to youth.

Another noteworthy consideration here is the financial support provided by the private sector to the civil society as part of corporate social responsibility projects. As is known, youth are seen as the largest consumer group, and as a result, efforts to sell products (advertisements, campaigns, etc.) often target youth. When we look at social responsibility projects that are funded/operated by corporations, we see that most of the projects are directed at children or education, which are considered to have a high "public relations value". Hence, another proposal we would like to put forward here concerns increasing the support given to youth projects as part of corporate social responsibility projects sponsored by the private sector.

---

[34] Exchange rate in 2006 by the end of the year was 1 YTL = 0.541 Euros

Individually reviewing each funding source available for the youth field and youth organisations will also contribute to policy proposals that will be designed to increase the funding sources for youth policies and youth.

In Turkey, there are two public funds that youth organisations can directly benefit from. One of them is National Agency's Youth in Action Programme. Youth in Action Programme provides funding chiefly for international mobility projects that enable young people across Europe to volunteer to make common cause in devising and actualizing various activities. By means of this fund, youth organisations can bring their various projects to fruition, volunteer in another country for a short period of time (6-12 months), carry out exchange programmes with young people from different countries, organise different kinds of training sessions across Europe in collaboration with other youth organisations, and take part in such trainings.

The second available public funding source is financial sponsorship provided to youth organisations that are registered with the Department of Youth Services. Only registered organisations can take advantage of this resource. One important distinction of this fund is that it also sponsors administrative needs (rent, etc.) which are crucial for the sustainability of youth organisations.

In addition to public funds there are other resources that youth organisations can apply to, including Pepsi's fund for Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) Administration's youth projects; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Coca Cola sponsored Life Plus; United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) for projects that UNFPA collaborates with NGOs on; and various funding opportunities provided by foreign embassies. Unfortunately, however, institutions providing such funds are only a handful, the amount of funding they provide is often insufficient and there are problems regarding funding continuity. These are obstacles to fully supplying for the demand in the youth field.

The funding sources mentioned above allow significant openings in the youth field. However, despite their many positive aspects, these funds may lead to a variety of problems on account of their structure. For example, Youth in Action Programme does not have a flexible structure and leads young people to develop projects that are not diverse and creative, but rather constricted by planning proposed by the programme itself. Hence the approach to the process of developing non-governmental projects becomes activity-based, rather than need-based.

This is one of the most important obstacles to youth organisations' capacity development. As a result, organisational awareness gradually becomes based on "work" rather than need, and this leads to a gap between the raison d'être of the organisation and its state of affairs. Furthermore, the activity-based nature of such projects acts as an impediment to fundraising from local/community stakeholders. Consequently, youth organisations become institutions that survive on various "funds", and when these "funds" cease to exist, the organisations cease to exist as well.

In this sense, it is necessary to support youth organisations in their processes of need-based capacity development. This kind of support could be provided by universities, non-governmental organisations and state institutions involved in the youth field. One point that perhaps must be clearly emphasised here is that this support must not be solely based on transfer of knowledge. In this context, it is very important to consider non-formal methods and the model of peer education as an approach. Furthermore, as Kurtaran discusses in his article "Youth Work and Local Governments in Istanbul" (Kurtaran, 2008b), the share of youth organisations in municipal budgets is close to nil. Increasing the share of youth organisations in both local and national budgets will significantly boost their progress.

Proposals regarding governmental recognition and promotion of models developed by NGOs:

As demonstrated by Nemutlu (2008b) youth policies and youth work in Turkey have been advanced primarily by civil society. In the last 10 years both knowledge provided for the field of youth in Turkey by the European Commission and Council of Europe, and the locally conducted studies by non-governmental youth initiatives on youth and issues that effect the lives of young people constitute a significant accumulation of knowledge in the field. The majority of projects developed and implemented within the civil society are projects that focus on providing services for the youth. As long as they are provided by the civil society, the target audience of these services will be *arbitrary*. In order to turn these into rights-based services provided by the state, non-governmental organisations must model their projects, and public institutions must examine these models, learn from them, and act to promote the good ones.

Proposal regarding the issuance of a National Youth Policy Review for Turkey upon Council of Europe's incentive:

Upon invitation from the country in question, Council of Europe's Directorate of Youth and Sport[35] convenes an international research team to draft a report on the national youth policies as they currently stand in that country. Researchers are selected amongst independent experts on youth, as well as experts from other disciplines. The research team also includes local experts. Youth organisations and related public institutions provide this international team of researchers with the resources they need to objectively and scientifically evaluate factual conditions on the ground with an international perspective.

A variety of methods are used in drafting these reports including desk study, interviews conducted during study visits, and field visits. So far, national youth policy reviews on 13 countries for the period of 2000-2007 have been presented to the attention of the countries in question and stakeholders across Europe. The ensuing report not only provides an evaluation of the national youth policies of the country in question, but also informs about the opportunities provided for youth and helps the institutions that provide these opportunities to analyse and assess their own activities.

In Turkey, the body that has direct contact to and collaborates with the Council of Europe's Directorate of Youth on common projects within a certain protocol of cooperation is the Department of Youth Services (DYS), under the General Directorate for Youth and Sports. Hence, for the researchers to conduct a national youth policy review on Turkey via the Council of Europe, DYS would need to initiate the process by submitting an official request.

Proposal regarding promoting research on youth:
Youth policies and services provided within the framework of these policies must be regularly updated to suit the changing needs of young people. Youth research is an important instrument for understanding youth and their changing needs, and for developing youth policies based on knowledge. Most social researches attend to young people not as the subject of research but rather as a sample group. On the other hand, youth workers concentrate on the services they provide to youth, and tend not to keep themselves up to date on the long-term measures that need to be taken and changes that need to be made regarding these services. It is very important to encourage social scientists and youth workers to collaborate on youth

---

[35] http://www.coe.int/youth

research, which centres on young people and draws experience and academic knowledge together.

Proposal regarding developing Youth Information Systems:

When the state or a municipality provides an opportunity for its citizens, one of its most important duties is to inform the citizens of the existence of such an opportunity, and of how they could access that opportunity. Otherwise, citizens will not be able to take advantage of that opportunity.

Similarly, providing systemised information for young people and youth organisations on any issue that may concern young people directly or indirectly –and not solely limited to youth work– will enable young people to claim their rights. Using new information technologies such as the internet and mobile phone and making these information systems easily intelligible will not only reduce the cost but also enable more youth to easily access information. An important consideration here is that in order to make them accessible to disadvantaged youth, information systems that are based on new information technologies must be backed by support systems (i.e. free internet points) developed under separate policy areas. Otherwise the structure of these policies will prevent a certain section of the youth population from taking full advantage of these opportunities.

Bibliography

Banks, S. (2004) *Ethical Issues in Youth Work*, Routledge, London.

Certel, E. and Kurtaran, Y. "Youth Policies Across Europe" in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Chisholm, L,. Hoskins, H. and Glahn, C. (2005) *Trading Up - Potential and Performance in Non-formal Learning*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg

Cohen, P. (1993) *Rethinking the Youth Question: Education, Labour, and Cultural Studies*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Corney, T. (2004) "Values Versus Competencies: Implications for the Future of Professional Youth Work Education", *Journal of Youth Studies*, vol. 7, no 4.

Council of Europe (2003) Experts on Youth Policy Indicators, Final Report, 26-27 March 2003, European Youth Centre, Strasbourg.

Delgado, M. (2000) *New Arenas for Community Social Work Practice with Urban Youth: Use of the Arts, Humanities, and Sports*, Columbia University Press.

Erdem-Artan, İ. (2005) "Üniversite Gençliği Değerleri: Korkular ve Umutlar" (The Values of University Youth: Fears and Hopes), TESEV, İstanbul.

European Union (2001) White Paper on Youth, http://ec.europa.eu/youth/archive/whitepaper/index_en.html.

European Youth Information and Counselling Agency (ERYICA), (2004) European Youth Information Charter Adopted by the 15th General Assembly, 19 November 2004, Bratislava, http://www.eryica.org/european-youth-information-charter.

Hazekamp, J.L. and Popple, K. (eds.) (1997) *Racism in Europe: a Challenge for Youth Policy and Youth Work*, UCL Press, New York.

History Foundation of Turkey (Tarih Vakfı, 2002) "Sivil Toplum Kuruluşlarında Gönüllülük ve Gençlik" (Voluntarism and Youth in Non-Governmental Organizations), Türkiye'de Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları Sempozyumu, 9th-10th 2001, Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, Istanbul.

IARD (2001) Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe, Mimeo, Milan.

Youth in Statistics, (2007) İstatistiklerle Türkiye'de Gençlik (Turkey's Youth in Statistics), 2007, Youth Studies Unit, http://genclik.bilgi.edu.tr/Default.asp?pageID=5

Kristensen, S. (2008) "'Mobility' in Europe", in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Krueger, M. (1998) *Interactive Youth Work Practice*, CWLA Press, Washington, DC.

Kurtaran, Y. (2007a) "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Barınma Hakkı Çerçevesinde Yurt-Kur Mevzuatı" (Legislation of Higher Education Credit and Dormitories Institution from the Perspective of University Students' Right to Accommodation), *Üniversite Gençliği ve Sosyal Haklar Raporu* (Report on University Youth and Social Rights), November 2007, TOG, Istanbul.

Kurtaran, Y. (2007b) "Bir Sosyal Politika Önerisi: Nasıl Bir Gençlik Çalışması?" (A Social Policy Proposal: What Kind of Youth Work?"), *Üniversite Gençliği ve Sosyal Haklar Raporu*, (Report on University Youth and Social Rights), November 2007, TOG, Istanbul.

Kurtaran, Y. (2008b) "Youth Work and Local Governments in Istanbul", in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Nemutlu, G. (2008a) "Historical Development of Youth Work Within Civil Society Organizations in Turkey" in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Nemutlu, G. (2008b) "Youth Work and Youth Trainers", in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Ohana, Y. (2005) *How Big is Your World? - Europe, Youth and Globalisation - An anthology*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Ramberg, I. (2008) "Committed to Making a Difference: Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance and Their Impact on Young People in Europe", Symposium report, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Reuven, K. (1997) *The Origins of Postmodern Youth: Informal Youth Movements in a Comparative Perspective*, Walter de Gruyter, New York.

Siurala, L. (2002) *Can Youth Make a Difference? Youth Policy Facing Diversity and Change*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

State Panning Organization (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 2006) Çocuk ve Gençlik Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu (Report by Special Commission on Children and Youth), IX. Kalkınma Planı, Ankara

Taylor, M. (2008) "Getting Interested in Non-formal Education and Learning in Youth Work", in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Tekeli, İ. (1988) *Tarih Bilinci ve Gençlik: Karşılaştırmalı Avrupa ve Türkiye Araştırması* (Historical Consciousness and Youth: A Comparative Research on Europe and Turkey), Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, Istanbul.

United Nations (2005) *World Youth Report 2005*, (www.un.org/esa/socdev/unyin/wyr05.htm), United Nations.

Williamson, H. (2002) *Supporting Young People in Europe: Principles, Policy and Practice*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Williamson, H., Hoskins. B. and Boetzelen, P. (2006) *Charting the Landscape of European Youth Voluntary Activities*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Yentürk, et al., (2008) "Istanbul Youth: Does NGO Membership Make a Difference?" in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008) Türkiye'de Gençlik Çalışması ve Politikaları, (*Youth Work and Youth Policy in Turkey)*, Istanbul Bilgi University Publishing House, Istanbul.

Youth Minister Conference (2002) The 6th Youth Minister Conference in Thessaloniki 2002, Final Declaration.

Youth Policy in Cyprus (2007) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Estonia (2001) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Finland (1999) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Luxembourg (2002) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Lithuania (2003) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Malta (2005) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Netherlands (2000) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Norway (2005) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Romania (2001) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Slovakia (2007) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Spain (2000) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Youth Policy in Sweden (2000) Council of Europe Publications, Strasbourg.

Yurttagüler, l. (2008) "Social Exclusion and Youth" in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

YOUTH POLICY PROPOSALS IN AREAS SURRUNDING THE LIVES OF YOUNG PEOPLE [36]

Nurhan Yentürk

In this paper, I attempt to formulate youth policies on a variety of issues including social exclusion, unemployment, education, and participation in political and social life. Two approaches guide this discussion and the proposals advanced here: First, youth policy proposals must be coined in ways that promote young people's ability to exist in society as "youth". Hence, for example, policy proposals regarding employment are not formulated here with an approach that treats employment as the one and only solution to problems such as youth social participation and youth poverty. Second, the issues in question are not examined in terms of what is usually prioritised by "reform and restructuring efforts". For example, education is not discussed in terms of length of education and curriculum, but rather in terms of the effect of education on social exclusion of youth and intolerance.

Youth unemployment:

Youth population in Turkey is faced with problems that are too immense to be solved simply by increasing employment opportunities. Therefore we cannot claim that curbing youth unemployment is the sole critical factor in solving these problems, and yet, it would be reasonable to suggest that the scale of youth unemployment plays an important role in aggravating these problems. In 2006, Turkey committed to participating in schemes by "Youth Employment Network", a joint initiative of the United Nations (UN), the World Bank (WB) and the International Labour Organisation (ILO), in order to create employment opportunities for youth and to develop a national strategy on youth employment (ILO, 2006a). However Turkey still has not developed and opened to discussion with stakeholders a youth employment strategy.

As shown in Yentürk and Başlevent (2008), unemployment rate in Turkey for youth aged 15-24 is 20%; while non-agricultural unemployment rate for ages 15-19 is 22.5% and for ages 20-24 is 23.8%. The highest rate of unemployment in Turkey applies to non-agricultural young women (28%). The rate of youth unemployment has been at least twice as high as adult unemployment for many years in Turkey, indicating that adequate policies have not been

---

[36] Translated from the Turkish by Başak Ertür.

undertaken to reduce youth unemployment. Taking into account that no significant demographic changes are expected in the medium- to long-term future, it would be appropriate to devise specific policies to reduce youth unemployment, and especially unemployment among young women. The rate of youth unemployment is so high that the fight against it requires jointly developed economic and social policies. Turkey needs a youth employment strategy that is negotiated with all stakeholders.

In Turkey, the rates of young women's participation in education and in the labour force is significantly below their counterparts in the EU countries: 85% of women aged 15-19 in non-agricultural activities do not participate in the labour force, this figure is 75% for women aged 20-29. In other words, only 25% of non-agricultural young women aged 20-29 participate in the labour force in Turkey. However, there has been an increase in the labour force participation of young people outside education, especially in the non-agricultural activities, and it is expected that this increase will continue. Increase in labour force participation is an important factor in achieving high economic growth. But it must go hand in hand with increase in training, skill and productivity. Increased labour force participation on its own may easily lead to further unemployment, poverty and social insecurity.

In Turkey, the level of education of the young labour force has become significantly higher than the level of education of the adult labour force. This development may provide the infrastructure for a general tendency towards sectors which require an educated/skilled labour force. Failure to create more employment in these sectors may increase unemployment amongst the educated/skilled labour force. Education has the long-term effect of reducing the risk of unemployment. However, it can be observed that employment opportunities for recent high school and higher education graduates are limited: 18.5% of unemployed youth aged 20-24 are university graduates. Hence, educated young people who are recent graduates have difficulty finding jobs. This has two indications: that there is a need for institutions and policies that will facilitate the transition from education to employment, and that skills gained in formal education are not relevant to the needs of the labour market.

Furthermore, it is necessary to provide youth-oriented institutionalisation in Turkey's labour market in order to effectively fight youth unemployment, which will increase due to skill shortages of the labour force, migration and new participation. Institutions providing training, advice and job matching services specifically designed for youth are very common in

developed countries. In Turkey, establishing such institutions exclusively serving youth will increase the number of job applications filed by young people, and provide encouragement to migrant, discouraged and disadvantaged youth.

The operation costs of such institutions could be partially funded by international social funds, or covered by municipal budgets. They could also be financed by the unemployment fund. Another financial contribution can come from a small reduction in the primary surplus. Universities, trade associations, NGOs and the private sector could provide financial and in-kind support, especially in the form of human resources and expertise. Youth unemployment in Turkey is too high and too persistent to be combated simply by creating new employment. The same problem exists all around the world. Youth unemployment and exclusion must be addressed by increasing the number and scope of social protection institutions, and financing them by social aid budgets.

If we take into account the rise in youth population and the potential rise in young people's labour force participation, an important challenge will be to create new jobs for which young people could be employed. Hence, as the level of education among youth increases, it is crucial to increase skilled employment opportunities at industry and service sectors that use skilled labour. It might be useful to consider creating new part-time work opportunities for youth at service sectors, which are generally deemed employment-friendly. Another option is to design policies targeting young people's participation in sectors where youth employment is lower than adult employment, such as social services, and sectors that use high technology, including transportation, communication and software. Young people are gradually withdrawing from the agricultural sector. However, youth employment creation strategies directed at rural areas (especially for non-agricultural activities), infrastructure investments and productivity growth must continue to be prioritised. Public and private institutions, which assist young people in starting their own business, and increasing their entrepreneurial and creative abilities by offering training, counselling and capital, must become more widespread.

Yentürk and Başlevent (2008) states that economic growth has different effects on adult employment and youth employment. Hence, growth policies that are employment-friendly for youth must be devised separately. Employment tax is very high in Turkey, negatively effecting employment. Reducing employment taxes for employing a young person, especially

a young woman for their first time, or implementing tax exemptions for a certain period of time would help reduce youth unemployment.

In urban areas, the proportion of young people working without having been registered at a social security institution is significantly higher than that of adults. The fight against unregistered employment will predictably cause a certain decrease in employment. It is likely that the conversion of unregistered employment to registered employment will result in loss of employment more for youth than for adults. Hence in the fight against unregistered employment, it is important to use methods which take into account the additional costs of registered employment for small businesses.

Youth and Social Insecurity:

The form that the social security system will take in the future is a very important matter for youth. In many countries, the collective (shared) form of social security management which stemmed from the stable employment conditions of the business world prior to the 1970s was replaced by a largely individualised form of social security management in the 1990s. In other words, today the general social security system for those who are employed either covers fewer risks or lowers the threshold of responsibility, and consequently, complementary individual insurance is gaining prevalence. Additionally, there is no social security for people who try to make a living by one of the new kinds of occupations that have emerged in the contemporary conjuncture. Included in this category are, for example, young people who work temporary and/or seasonal jobs, young women who work as daytime house cleaners or do other domestic jobs.

As Pultar states in his article "Who Are We? Young People in KONDA Social Structure Research", the proportion of young people who have a green card is much lower than that of adults. In that sense, the clause in the new Social Security and General Health Insurance law granting all youth under 18 years of age inclusion in the general health insurance scheme irrespective of whether their parents pay contributions, is an important regulation. However, young people and adults over 18 years of age whose premiums are not paid by the state, who are not students, and do not pay premiums are not included in the general health insurance scheme. The plan is to finance this new system by fully paid premiums, marking a significant divergence from the common European scheme of a tax revenue-financed health system. This aspect of the new system has been subject to criticism (Keyder, et al., 2007). Similarly,

changes planned as part of the new social security system are criticised particularly for doing away with preventive medicine, and transforming the doctor-patient relationship into a doctor-client relationship by introducing a fee per visit to the family doctor (Sütlaş, 2007; Keyder, et al., 2007). Furthermore, individual complementary private insurance, which will become more widespread due to fewer risk coverage and curtailed threshold of responsibility in the general social security scheme, may prove to be inaccessible for the young generation who will have difficulty paying regular premiums. It is very important to establish and develop centres which provide free drug rehabilitation services for youth, advise on reproductive health and sexually transmitted diseases, as well as other preventive medicine services. However the new Social Security and General Health Insurance law does not cover these issues in sufficient detail.

As discussed by Yentürk and Başlevent (2008), working without social security and without expectations of full and permanent employment is quite common amongst young people in Turkey. In urban areas, the proportion of young people of all ages who work without registration at a social security institution is significantly higher than that of adults. The proportion of young women aged 15-19 working in an urban area without registration is much higher than that of adult women doing unregistered work in urban areas. In Turkey, especially the uneducated urban young women who work as daytime house cleaners or in other domestic jobs have no social security at all. If we consider young women who will be migrating from the agricultural sector into urban areas, the number of young women who reside in urban areas and work without registration or in the informal sector is likely to greatly increase in the near future.

Criticisms directed at the new social security reforms are mostly concerned with protecting existing rights pertaining to full employment and the formal sector. However, if we take into account the increase in the number of people who work for sectors and jobs that are not covered by these categories, it becomes crucial to discuss new opportunities and proposals. The new social security reforms undertaken by the Social Security Institution must tend to matters such as basic health, social retirement and unemployment insurance independently of full and permanent employment, specifically directed at young people who work part-time, seasonal, temporary jobs. As migration from the agricultural sector, and women's labour force participation in urban areas is gradually increasing, it is necessary to devise policies concerning social rights of young women who work as daily house cleaners or do other

domestic jobs (young housewives could also be included in this category). Similarly, measures must be taken for facilitating the inclusion of part-time work as well as job training and internship activities under social security schemes, as a step towards officially registering young people who currently work in the informal sector.

As I will argue under the sections on youth poverty and social exclusion, policies for fighting social exclusion and poverty, such as need-based social aid, and citizen's income as a basic right, must be discussed simultaneously with the new Social Security and General Health Insurance law. As Yurttagüler suggests in her article, while in education or while they are trying to get into the labour market, young people are protected by alternative means of security, rather than a generalised social security system that seeks to preserve equality amongst all citizens. Existing social security mechanisms for youth are generally provided by their families or by non-governmental organisations. Since social security provided by families or by non-governmental organisations is not based on an irrevocable right, such support is not only liable to be subject to behavioural conditions, but also likely to have detrimental effects on young people's autonomy. For example, it is often the case that NGOs and/or families set certain conditions which young people have to fulfil in order to be entitled to social security: complying with the rules of the family, pursuing a career chosen by the family, or conforming to criteria of success determined by the NGO.

On the other hand, in Turkey, agricultural employment is so high that it is unmatched by any other country which has similar conditions. The agricultural reform of the recent years has been so grave that it is likely to lead to acute disintegration in the agricultural sector. According to Yentürk and Başlevent (2008) 86% of young women living in rural areas are unpaid family workers. Considering that young women who are unpaid family workers in rural areas have no form of social security whatsoever, it is important to emphasise that these young women have no chance of participating in the society as autonomous individuals, and that they comprise the most dependent section of society. For women, unpaid family work and work without social security are conditions that persist in further age-groups. Young men who live in rural areas are also predominantly employed as unpaid family workers and without any social security, but the proportion of men who work for themselves and with social security rapidly increase in further age groups. This astonishing situation must be addressed by a social security network designed specifically for young women who live in rural areas and who are bound to work as unpaid family workers for the rest of their lives.

As Yurttagüler discusses in her article with reference to European Commission's youth policies, health insurance is considered to be a most fundamental form of support for enabling young people to stay in the education system (Yurttagüler, 2008). As part of the medicosocial system in Turkish universities, "medikos" provide free health services funded by the university budget. In many universities, medikos also provide preventive medicine services. The new General Health Insurance Law will require university students over 18 years of age to participate in their family's insurance scheme should there be one. This regulation will have a negative effect on the education life of young university students with limited means. As a service provided by universities to all of their students, university medikos must not only be preserved but also further strengthened by increasing preventive medicine services, and providing additional services such as reproductive health.

Youth and housing:

In Turkey, youth are faced with a significant housing problem. A main issue is the number of persons in households where young people reside. As related by Pultar in his article "Who Are We? Young People in KONDA Social Structure Research," in the North East Anatolia region, 39% of households where young people reside contain 6 or more persons, this figure is 44% in the Middle East Anatolia region, and 45% in the South East Anatolia region. In Istanbul, 16% of households where young people reside contain 6 or more people, 8% in West Marmara region, and 10% in the Aegean region (Pultar, 2008).

Young people's school and home environments do not offer them private space. This is especially the case in North East, Middle East and South East Anatolian regions where crowded families are common. Lack of private space has two important consequences. First, there is a direct correlation between unfavourable living conditions at home and discontinuing education. Second, lack of private space can have negative effects on the personal and psychological development of a young person (Hall, et al., 1999). On the other hand, because they are unable to create a space for self-expression at home, young people end up being confined to streets/coffeehouses (and in extreme cases, to drugs/violence) for such spaces. Youth centres would fill an important gap, especially in the regions mentioned above. Specified in Kurtaran's article as one of the public services that must be provided to youth, youth centres should not only help young people in their self-expression and self-development, but also assist them in continuing their education by providing reading/study

rooms for those who have limited space at home (Kurtaran, 2008). Youth centres must be flexible so as to provide a variety of services addressing the different needs in different regions of the country.

Distance of schools and the problem of transportation have a negative effect on a poor family's decision to send their youth and children to school (Adaman and Keyder, 2006). Considering the ability of high school students to continue education in terms of the housing problem, it would be beneficial to increase the quality of regional boarding schools, and to provide more dormitories for young women students.

In 2004, of the young people who passed university entrance exams and applied to Higher Education Credit and Dormitories Institution (Yurt-Kur) for housing, only 44% were granted accommodation. More than half of the applications were rejected (Kurtaran, 2007). Many universities and private institutions provide accommodation in return for high rents. It is quite common for students who cannot afford high rents to settle in inexpensive dormitories that are operated or influenced by various communities/ideologies. While continuing their university education, many young people have no choice but live in environments which they cannot question, where they cannot develop their individual freedoms, or make free choices on matters concerning their own lives. As indispensable measures for securing equal opportunity, there must be more accommodation options for university students, and Yurt-Kur must extend dormitory spaces in university campuses according to the size of the student body in each university.

Yurt-Kur's stated objective is to facilitate young people's higher education as well as their social and cultural development by providing credit to students in higher education, and establishing and administering dormitories (Yurt-Kur, 2006). But when we look at the figures, we see that Yurt-Kur is far from reaching this objective. There are 219 dormitories administered by Yurt-Kur, housing a total of 200,942 students. The amount of space per student in dormitories, including social areas, canteens, and passageways is 13.5m^2. The space for non-sports-related social areas amount to only a third of the space for sports-related social areas. The total number of computers in all dormitories is 1927, amounting to one computer for every 104 students (Kurtaran, 2007).

While Yurt-Kur's stated objectives include facilitating young people's social and cultural development, its disciplinary statute, far from facilitating any kind of social or cultural development, is prepared with an entirely prohibitory mentality that regards young people as potential criminals. According to Yurt-Kur's disciplinary statute, not presenting all private belongings for inspection by administration, posting any bills or posters in any part of the dormitories for any purpose, not complying with "rules of public morality", collectively or individually making oral or written statements belittling dormitory administrators or the administration, and being arrested or charged for violating the "Law on Public Meetings and Demonstrations" are all offences with punishments ranging from reprimand to expulsion from the dormitory. There are no representatives of young residents sitting on the disciplinary board. Furthermore, it is observed that young women who reside in dormitories are discriminated against in matters such as entry and exit hours, and the signature procedure during entry and exit (University Women's Forum, 2007).

The existing disciplinary statute must be amended to prevent any infringement on the privacy of the young people who reside in Yurt-Kur dormitories. Furthermore, the statute must be revised as to eliminate any regulations that prejudge young people as potential criminals. Revisions must be made to allow and promote young people's individual and organised participation in social and political life, and their exercise of all powers and rights of citizenship. The statute must be amended to enable young people's participation in improving and governing the dormitories they reside in. Regulations and practices must be changed to ensure that they do not discriminate on bases of sex, religion or ethnicity.

In Turkey, it is common for young people to live with their parents as long as they are single. However, the proportion of young people between ages 25-29, who live with their parents even though they are married is quite significant. Similarly the proportion of young people who live with their parents despite having a job and having completed their education is also noteworthy. But let us consider the case of married youth: In rural areas, 18% of married young men aged 25-29 live with their parents, while in urban areas this figure is 8% (Youth in Statistics, 2007). As Yurttagüler states in her article, there are no policies in place to support young people in setting up a home by themselves or with their partners (Yurttagüler, 2008) . An initial policy addressing young people's housing needs could be the provision of social housing in estates built by municipalities and the Housing Development Administration. In addition to policies addressing young people's general housing problems, there must be

policies devised specifically for disadvantaged youth. It is especially important, for example, to provide shelters where young people can take refuge in cases of emergency, i.e. when they face domestic violence.

Youth poverty:

Unemployment, instability and poverty caused/augmented by globalisation and technological progress (Yentürk, 2006; Buğra, 2005) are matters that concern youth as well. In addition to the right to work, the right to be a part of the social security network and the right to housing, it is very important for young people to be able to exercise their right to an income that grants dignity of human life, and their right to education, the most important factor in breaking the circle of poverty.

Young people's household income:

Youth poverty is measured in terms of the standard indicator of poverty, which is living in a household where the income is below 60% of a country's median income. In this regard, Turkey is one of the worst-off countries in Europe, especially in comparison to EU countries. In Turkey youth poverty rate is 26%, whereas the average youth poverty rate in the 25 EU countries is 19% (Youth in Statistics, 2007). According to Pultar's aforementioned article, in Turkey the household income is 700 YTL[37] or less for 56% of the overall youth population, between 700 YTL and 1200 YTL for 30%, and above 1200 YTL for 14%.

The geographical distribution of young people's household income suggests serious regional inequalities. According to Pultar's study, the household income is 700 YTL or less for 67% of the youth population in North East Anatolia, 79% in Middle East Anatolia and 83% in South East Anatolia. This same figure rises to 33% in Istanbul, 57% in the West Marmara region and 48% in the Aegean region (Pultar, 2008).

The extent of poverty in Turkey confers urgency on provision of need-based aid to poor individuals. However there is a multipartite social aid system in the struggle against poverty in Turkey. The institutions in this system include the General Directorate for Social Aid and Solidarity, Social Services and Child Protection Agency and the General Directorate of

---

[37] In 2006 (end of the year), 1 YTL = 0,541 Euros

Foundations. Some need-based social aid is distributed as well, though the amount is very much below the EU and OECD standards (Buğra and Adar, 2007).

However, need-based aid is distributed to poor people and poor youth in ways that label the recipients, render them dependent on the goodwill of others and are therefore detrimental to the autonomy of individuals. In addition to need-based social aid, a basic income that is granted to all on an individual basis, as a right of equal citizenship and irrespective of employment status, will lift all individuals in society above the poverty line, and contribute immensely to fighting poverty and social exclusion (www.basicincome.org). Such schemes are common in social policies of many countries. A basic income is especially important in the fighting hunger and alleviating the devastating effects on the poor of vulnerability to uncertainty and risk (Standing, 2006; Buğra and Keyder, 2007). The scheme must be designed so that basic income can be granted to young people under 18 years of age directly, rather than indirectly via their family.

Another manifestation of poverty is in access to capital (Adaman and Keyder, 2006). For poor youth who want to set up a business for earning a living, it is very difficult to obtain capital from immediate family, or provide the necessary guarantees to get credit from an institution. A microcredit scheme would be useful in facilitating young people's need for capital when setting up their own business. In Turkey, the first microcredit project was set up in 2003 with budget contribution from the World Bank and the Prime Minister's Office, and conducted in Diyarbakır as a joint initiative of the Turkish Foundation for Waste Reduction, Governorship of Diyarbakır and Grameen Trust. At the present time there is no law in Turkey for regulating microcredit, and the current microcredit practice is criticised for its extremely high interest rates. It would be meaningful for microcredit schemes to be extended in scope to include youth, and to be operated by partnership between microfinance institutions and non-governmental organisations. Partnerships with non-governmental organisations, instead of microfinance institutions working on their own, would mean that the beneficiaries can receive not only credit but also other kinds of assistance and information. On the other hand, in the experience of various non-governmental organisations, production and credit cooperatives that provide business development and marketing support to poor youth have proven more effective than microcredits for individual initiatives (Estivill, 2003).

Working youth and poverty:

Studies show that employment is not a sufficient factor in tackling poverty. According to International Labour Organisation's (ILO) definition, "working poor" are individuals who are employed but earn less than $1 or $2 per day (ILO, 2006b). For example if we look at the figures for 2005, the world-wide population of young people aged 15-25 was 1 billion in total, 600 million of this population participated in the labour force, and 300 million of them were categorised as working poor. In other words, at least 50% of working youth could be considered working poor (ILO, 2006b). According to the study by Adaman and Keyder (2006), unemployment is amongst the most important factors of poverty in Turkey, but another very important factor is low levels of pay in the informal sector and in unskilled jobs. As discussed above, in Turkey, most young people who work in temporary, seasonal jobs, young women who are domestic workers, daytime house cleaners or housewives, and youth who are unpaid family workers in agriculture do not have any social security. Moreover, the fees they pay in order to access health services aggravate their poverty.

It would make a big difference if there were institutions that specialised in training, job matching and advice services. Such institutions would provide a second opportunity to study and gain skills for unskilled youth, who work temporary jobs, therefore continue to be poor. Provision of unemployment benefits could be considered for young persons who have left school early, who are unskilled and unemployed. Unemployment benefits provided to such persons on the condition that they take advantage of professional training and internship opportunities, would enable them to participate in the labour market and to continue looking for work. Unskilled young persons who have had to quit schooling due to poverty can only gain professional skills and attend applied training courses if they have a minimum level of income.

Poor youth and equal opportunity in education:

Three main policies could be proposed for supporting the continued education of young people as part of the wider struggle against poverty: contribution of public funds to education, direct support provided to youth in need, in order to enable them to stay in education, and conditional aid provided to families. White Paper on Youth defines access to education as a universal right for all young persons, and puts special emphasis on the quality of education and its ability to address needs. The same document defines the aforementioned rights to

housing and health as services that must be provided by the public as a matter of basic necessity (EU, 2001).

In socially excluded families in Turkey, the main reason behind lack of access to education is economic weakness and inability to afford education costs (Adaman and Keyder, 2006). In alleviating youth poverty, funding to enable staying in education is amongst the most widely sought types of aid. There are various kinds of aid given to students in an effort to break the cycle of poverty, and institute equal opportunity and social justice. Of these, publicly-provided aid include scholarships, credits and educational grants. Municipalities are known to provide similar types of aid to students. Additionally, educational scholarships and grants provided by the General Directorate for Social Aid and Solidarity, and the World Bank-financed Conditional Cash Transfers in Education are very important schemes in supporting the participation of poor children and youth in education.

An international comparison shows that in 2002, financial support (i.e. scholarship, credit, and aid) granted to students below university level, relative to the gross national product was highest in Denmark with 0.69%. This figure is 0.21% for Hungary, 0.20% for Slovenia, 0.16% for the Czech Republic, 0.10% for Brazil, 0.08% for Poland, 0.07% for Thailand, and 0.02% for Turkey (Youth in Statistics, 2007). As can be seen, financial aid provided by the state for education below university level is very limited in Turkey. There must be an increase in the outright aid granted to poor families in order to enable the continued education of their children and youth aged 15-18. As long as continuing on to university is not an option, high school education seems to have higher costs than benefits. Since high school education cannot bestow significant advantage in the labour market, financial aid must not be in the form of credits. The sole "returns" for such aid will be enabling more youth to have high school education.

For university students, the rate of successful applications to Higher Education Credits and Dormitories Institution for university tuition credits has fallen down to 39%, and successful applications for maintenance credits has fallen down to 40%. In 2004, the total number of students who were granted credits was 295,000. Tuition and maintenance credits must be provided to all young people who are admitted into university – young people could pay back when employed. Such credits are indispensable for poor youth to continue their university education.

Youth and Social Exclusion:

In Turkey, there is a need for policies that target poor and disadvantaged youth. These policies should be flexible enough to take into account the specific areas or ways in which such young persons are disadvantaged or weak, and they must designed on the basis of regional/individual needs. In order to begin discussing such policies, the issue of social exclusion must be addressed. According to Amartya Sen (2000), poverty and social exclusion is not only a matter of low income but also poor conditions of life, including lack of access to basic rights and services.

Social exclusion is the inability of an individual or a group to sustain relations with the rest of the society due to their inability to access or exercise one or more of the following sets of rights:

- economic opportunities/rights such as employment and basic income required to lead a life with human dignity;

- basic social rights such as health, education, housing and social security;

- cultural rights addressing differences in ethnicity, religion, gender and sexual orientation;

- political rights such as freedom of association and expression, political participation and the right to represent and be represented.

According to the study by Adaman and Keyder (2006) poverty is the primary cause of social exclusion in Turkey. However, not every poor person is necessarily socially excluded and there may be socially excluded individuals/groups who are not poor (Estivill, 2003). When we consider persons who are particularly under risk of social exclusion, the literature on the subject emphasises poor and uneducated persons; persons outside the dominant ethnic identity and culture, i.e. immigrants, Roma; drug addicts and persons with variant sexual orientations; the elderly, the disabled, and youth. As individuals transitioning from childhood to adulthood, young people are especially under risk of social exclusion and poverty. According to the study by Adaman and Keyder (2006) young persons who are poor feel socially excluded on account of their youth. Uyan suggest that poverty is the primary reason why young people cannot live their youth, and have to rush into adulthood (Uyan, 2008) . She also states that poor youth are aware of their disadvantaged position in society, and feel neither free, nor equal.

In Turkey, as in the rest of the world, technology usage by youth from all economic sections of society is gradually increasing. According to Yentürk, et al. (2008) communication technologies provided to and used by young people, i.e. internet and television usage, have increased significantly. As a result, young people's lives are surrounded by options that they are aware of, but cannot access due to the economic conditions and cultural structure of their families. The awareness of such inaccessible options aggravates feeling of deprivation.

In Turkey, the gaps in the regional distribution of income and education are quite severe (Youth in Statistics, 2007). Policies addressing youth poverty and social exclusion must be developed on the basis of needs and local/regional differences. Furthermore, different policies must be devised for different causes of social exclusion. For example, health, education and housing services must receive substantial additional investment, and the number of community centres targeting disadvantaged youth must be increased, especially in slum areas of high-income cities, districts inhabited by people who are destitute or socially excluded due to their sexual orientation or drug addiction, regions inhabited by "outsider" groups with cultural and identity differences, Roma neighbourhoods, and quarters where victims of forced migration reside.

Yentürk and Başlevent (2008) indicate that it is very difficult to make a quantitative estimate about the demand for centres servicing disadvantaged youth in Turkey. This is because it is difficult to calculate the number of disadvantaged youth who are at the same time poor, migrant, uneducated and of an ethnic minority, hence suffer social exclusion due to an accumulation of disadvantages. In their study, Yentürk and Başlevent analyse the survey of the 2000 National Census, and calculate the number of young persons who are aged 15-19 and 20-24, have undergone migration within the previous 5 years, are unemployed or not participating in the labour force, live in households containing 6 or more people, live in lodgings with 2 or fewer bedrooms, have toilets outside their lodgings or none at all. They suggest that 6,000 to 170,000 young persons aged 15-24 can be identified as disadvantaged on the basis of various combinations of the above indicators.

NGOs play a vital role in fighting the social exclusion of youth. According to Yentürk, et al. (2008), young persons who can keep up with globalisation and its patterns of communication and consumption owing to their family environment, quality of the schools they attend, and their economic conditions, are more likely to participate in NGOs. In this sense, being

excluded is not only a matter of exclusion from education and employment opportunities, but also from NGOs where young people get together. The same study states that although NGO membership rate for young people is quite low, half of the young people who were surveyed for the study expressed their intention to join an NGO. The type of associations for which the difference between actual membership and intended membership is lowest is student clubs and associations. And although half of the young people surveyed intend to join other types of associations/organisations, they cannot do so. This result indicates that young people are drawn to organisations that are established by people from their own generation, where they feel more comfortable and have a more direct participation in the decision-making mechanisms. The key conclusion here is that encouraging young people to associate and organise amongst themselves will contribute significantly to social inclusion.

The study also shows that the level of education of parents of young people who are not members of any organisation is significantly low, whereas the level of education of parents of young people with NGO membership is significantly high. Likewise, household income of young people with NGO membership is higher. The families of 85% of young people with NGO membership are homeowners. These young people have assets such as a bank account, a credit card, a personal computer, and internet access. Accordingly, the authors of the study put forward two separate policy proposals concerning socially excluded youth. The first is a proposal to provide encouragement and resources for self-organisation of young people who have limited and fewer opportunities in terms of economic capacity and level of education. The second is a proposal for existing NGOs (especially youth NGOs) to commit to social inclusion and make an effort to bring together young people from different identity and cultural backgrounds. Otherwise, NGOs will remain as the organisations of people of high socioeconomic status, and may eventually play a part in consolidating social exclusion.

This is why special resources must be provided to enable the self-organisation of young people who are "outsiders" in economic terms, in terms of education, culture and identity, who are migrants, or socioeconomically excluded. There must be social inclusion-oriented initiatives and organisations where young people with different economic capacities and levels of education, different identity and cultural backgrounds can get together on their own. The main responsibility for enabling such spaces belongs to NGOs and local governments. This responsibility could entail supporting youth centres and youth NGOs in areas where social exclusion is a problem, and contributing to activities that will cultivate relations

between young people from different parts of the country (such as festivals and other inter-school activities). Initiatives for increasing the mobility of young people are especially important for enabling the emergence of different types of social interactions which may in turn help overcome values and prejudices produced by various groups, and assist young people as active subjects in cultivating their own values based on their experience of different localities. The more and wider such opportunities and activities for young people who are or may be socially excluded, and the more international/mutlicultural these activities are, the more support there will be for young people's individual processes of identity-formation. Such opportunities will nurture the ability of young people to become individuals who are open to different views and "differences", who are connected to the world and their environment rather than clinging on to an identity that only prioritises itself, does not recognise differences and defines itself in opposition to "the other" (Kentel, 2005).

Youth and the formal education system:

Earlier on in this paper, under the section on youth poverty, I discussed that the state contribution for enabling young people to stay in education was extremely limited in terms of fighting poverty. Here I will discuss the scarcity of public resources directly allocated to education. According to OECD statistics, in 2002, Turkey's public expenditure on all levels of education in proportion to its GDP was below the OECD average, and below that of many developing countries. Similarly, in 2006, the share of education in public fixed-capital investments was only 11.2%. This figure has decreased since 2002 (Youth in Statistics, 2007).

According to the Ministry of Finance, in 2006, consolidated budget expenditures (the central government budget) was 175,303,995 thousand YTL[38] in total; 45,945,232 thousand YTL of this amount was paid in interest for debts. The amount allocated by the central government from the total budget for all education and social security services was 48,394,863 thousand YTL (Youth in Statistics, 2007). Compared to figures from 2004, interest payments have decreased as a result of reduced debts. However, it is still the case that the country's youth's rights to education and social services were mortgaged in the long-term, for sake of old and misused debts. Since debts are quite high, it is expected that this situation will continue for many years to come. On the other hand, interestingly, even though there has been an increase

---

[38] In 2006 (end of the year), 1 YTL = 0,541 Euros

in other expenditures during the 2004-2006 period, education expenditures have remained the same, and therefore have relatively decreased.

The central government's limited expenditure and investment in education; crowded classrooms, shortage of necessary technical equipment, and inadequate libraries create an unfavourable learning environment for young people. Increasing public spending and investment in education will contribute to increasing the quality of education. Yet certainly, increasing financial resources alone will not suffice to increase the quality of education. The need for an educational reform in Turkey is currently debated in its many aspects. The subject of these discussions range from the predominance of rote learning, and lack of support for originality to the education system's inability to create an environment where young people can cultivate their creativity; from the duration of compulsory education to the inability of vocational schools to provide adequate and up-to-date vocational education, from high school and university entrance systems to the adequacy of universities. Criticisms of the current education system and efforts at educational reform do not fall within the boundaries of policy proposals that we aim to develop in this article. However two important criticisms of formal education will be considered in this article, by virtue of their significant relevance to youth work. One is the criticism that the education system is ineffective in fighting discrimination and xenophobia, and in fact, many official schoolbooks contain elements which reinforce discrimination. The other is the criticism that the education system is socially conservative in its structure, unable to overcome social exclusion and unable to operate in favour of the disadvantaged.

According to Üstel, schoolbooks that young people use are suffused with xenophobia, preconceptions about national heroics, praise for war, glorification and sacralisation of state authority, legitimation of ethnic, religious or gender discrimination, and strong statements about threats and dangers posed by inner and outer enemies (Üstel, 2008). Similarly, various studies on youth show that amongst students, unquestioning and uncritical obedience to authority is widespread, and discriminatory/exclusionary and xenophobic tendencies have significant currency. A conflictive political culture is predominant among youth, whereby suspicion of one another is common. The spirit of intolerance, xenophobia and "othering" is increasingly widespread among youth.

Despite the legal provision stating that schoolbooks "cannot be in violation of fundamental human rights. They cannot contain discriminatory remarks based on gender, race, religion, language, skin colour, political persuasion, philosophical conviction, sect or other factors." (Official Gazette, 3 March 2007, no. 26451), Üstel (2008) demonstrates in various concrete examples that syllabi and schoolbooks used in education are still treated as an occasion for indoctrination and psychological operation. Üstel (2008) also identifies future areas of concern. It becomes evident that in Turkey "school" has to undergo a fundamental transition based on the prioritisation of the culture of peace, reconciliation and coexistence. In this context, syllabi/schoolbooks have to be radically revised so as to begin to articulate democratic values, promote domestic and international peace, and eliminate violence. Similar initiatives have been undertaken in Western countries since the 1980s.

The second criticism of formal education included in the book concerns the inability of the current education system to operate in favour of the disadvantaged sections of society and to play a part in their struggle against social inequality. In her article Idemen (2008) discusses Bourdieu's approach to education, according to which, the existing education system instructs pupils in the dominant culture and reproduces social inequality. One of the key propositions of this approach is that the knowledge and culture which are instructed must be kept open to criticism. However, the idealisation of not only the dominant culture but also the subordinate culture must be open to criticism. The argument concerning the reproduction of social inequality by the existing education system emphasises that primary education received in the family plays a major role in reproducing the power relations in society, and that primary education is systematically linked to social background. Due to their familiarity with the dominant culture and their self-confidence, children from educated families tend to have an advantage over others at school.

Although we do not have access to a local study focusing on the relationship between education and social exclusion in Turkey, Pultar's study (Pultar, 2008) demonstrates that ethnic origins and regional inequalities play a role in exclusion from education. For example, according to Pultar's study, which is based on a survey of 6,621 young people aged 18-28, the rate of illiteracy and education up to only primary school level is highest amongst young people of Arabic and Kurdish/Zaza origins. Similarly, young people of Arabic and Kurdish/Zaza origins have the lowest rate of high school and university education.

In the past 15-20 years, neo-liberal policies in Turkey have unprecedentedly increased the role that education plays in the maintenance of social stratification, by limiting high-quality education to private schools, and implementing a system whereby the high school attended by the student is factored into university admissions as a coefficient (Aktay, 2007). In Turkey, youth and children go to different schools according to their different economic and social backgrounds; similarly, neighbourhoods and public spaces are divided in the same way, resulting in boundaries that preclude encounters between youth from different socio-economic backgrounds. This is an outcome of regional differences, or patterns of settlement determined according to social strata divisions in the large cities. Children and youth of the high-income upper social stratum attend private schools for their primary-middle and high school education. This leaves no opportunity for any public encounter and shared experiences between people from different social strata throughout childhood and youth. Studies show that the initial encounter experienced in adulthood often results in delineation of boundaries and exclusion (Kentel, 2005) or the tendency to explain away differences on the basis of moral and religious values (Alemdaroğlu, 2005).

Taking the foregoing discussion as our point of departure, an initial proposal for a policy which may serve to reduce social inequality is the provision of an egalitarian education, where differences in students' social backgrounds are not ignored in the name of egalitarianism. Furthermore, in order to reduce the effects of social backgrounds, the education system must reward critical thinking, and cultivate not only the ability to learn and assimilate knowledge, but also the faculty of critical comprehension and critical interpretation of knowledge. There must be emphasis on acquiring skills, undertaking active and independent studies rather than passive intake of information, and being exposed to intercultural elements and a multidimensional conception of language. It is important to add interdisciplinary courses to programmes of study containing traditional disciplinary branches. Rather than using a single general examination for finals and school admissions, it would be a significant improvement to have an evaluation system based on frequent and regular assessments. Final examinations must measure not the amount of accumulated knowledge but rather the ability to apply this knowledge in different contexts - examinations must be revised so as to measure this ability. Increasing the opportunities for education and mobility between different educational institutions will provide more alternatives for those who are disadvantaged in terms of continuing education. Developing distance learning institutions may contribute to reducing

disadvantages based on regional differences. Life-long learning programmes provide a second chance for disadvantaged youth who have quit education early on in their lives.

In this discussion about policies that may have the effect of reducing social exclusion and inequality, we must note that one of the most important elements in promoting the coexistence of youth from different economic and social backgrounds is the provision of more scholarship and dormitory opportunities so as to enable young people to live together in dormitories, especially in higher education. Establishing more social environments outside the family where disadvantaged youth can augment their interest in and knowledge of arts and culture, creating opportunities for young people from different socio-economic backgrounds to share their cultural and artistic tastes, to create and enjoy artistic and cultural productions together, would play a significant part in reducing social inequality.

Putting these proposals into practice requires the thorough reform of not only schools but also the profession of teaching. There is a need for teachers who have undergone a more interdisciplinary education. For this, they must be versed in new instruments and methods of communication, and have access to developmental training opportunities. Another problem between teachers and students is that the rapid transformation of information technologies hinders intergenerational education and increases intergenerational conflicts in the student-teacher relationship. It is important to make use of peer-to-peer education methods in schools as well as in non-school environments for non-formal education and socialisation.

Kaya (2008) focuses on the culture in which young people learn from their peers, and adults learn from their children, as opposed to the culture in which children learn primarily from their teachers (elders). Young people who have access to resources of knowledge other than what is provided to them, establish a strong grounding which in turn can influence not only their parents but also their teachers (Mead, 1970). According to various studies, the rapid transformation of information, the fast increase and change in channels of information (i.e. internet, media, filmmaking, advertisement business, television programmes, music albums, songs, video games, electronic toys, graphic novels, etc. in addition to official education programmes and schools) means that today's young generation is much more dynamic and open to change and progress than the contemporary adult generation. In this sense, as important as it is to emphasise the quality of the dialogue and communication between students and teachers in schools, it is also crucial to point out the role that peer education can

play in prompting interaction, experience-sharing, information exchange, and ultimately, transformation.

Youth interest and participation in politics:

Yentürk, et. al. (2008) discusses the results of a survey of 1,014 youth in Istanbul, aged 15-24, who were at the time of the survey in education or intended to continue their education. More than 50% of respondents were not at all or not much interested in politics. Only 1.2% of respondents were members of a political party. An Istanbul-based field study by Yurtsever-Ateş (2006) concerning young people's interest in politics concluded that young people do not want to actively participate in politics, and that this lack of interest does not vary according to gender, education level, or income. 1,7% of research participants stated that they participate in political party activities. This figure is much lower than the result of the research conducted by Kentel (1999) on an earlier period.[39]

The current conjuncture presents two obstacles to the active participation of young generations in politics. One is the economic approach whereby the operation of the market is the sole model, and the other is the legacy of the 1980 coup d'état which negates politics. On the other hand, the transition from representational democracy to participatory democracy, a process that redefines the relationship between state and citizen, is another social transformation which has effects on young people's political participation. This process not only decreases young people's representational participation in politics but also changes the manner of participation.

In the 1990s, along with globalisation, the neo-liberal wave reduced all economic models to a single one. In this model, the exclusive authority of the market is the sole condition under which social welfare will prosper. Since, according to this approach, neo-liberalism is the only model that yields social welfare, and a well-functioning market is its only instrument, then the duty of the nation-state and politics must be to ensure a well-functioning market, that is, to serve to strengthen the market. The government is perceived as a mediator who knows the rules of the global market, and advances international competition. Being good at politics,

---

[39] Another indicator of the low level of active youth participation in politics could be the average age of the members of the parliament. As of 2007, when parliamentarians of the 23rd Period were elected into office, the average age of parliamentarians is 50.8. Average age of women parliamentarians is 43.6; average age of male parliamentarians is 51.5.

being a good political party is equated with technical skills in managing and establishing a well-functioning free market economy, and clearing all obstacles in the way of the market. When the criteria of political success is limited in this manner without any meaningful alternatives, the perception that there is nothing that political parties and the parliament can do to increase welfare or to maintain the balances in society, becomes prevalent. As parties on the left and right increasingly adopt the principle of "the market knows best" as their economic policy, politics becomes redundant by its own doing. Consequently, electoral participation has decreased all around the world. This is why young people today either stay out of political parties, or support parties that accept and obey the demands of the market (Benlisoy, 2003; İnanır, 2005; Yentürk, 2006).

It can even be said that for young people who support parties that accept the demands of the market, their active political participation in the party is in fact an investment in support of their future economic prosperity. According to Caymaz, young people who are involved in political parties do politics with an individualistic motive, which can be explained in terms of the Weberian ideal type of instrumental rationality. As Lüküslü states in her article (Lüküslü, 2008), this is a global phenomenon (UN, 2005).

In addition to the effect of globalisation on rendering politics redundant (a common phenomenon in the world-wide conjuncture), in Turkey, the 1980 coup d'état led to a process whereby politics was renounced on a mass-scale, by social consensus. Considering this process in terms of young people's participation in political parties, legal regulations issued in the wake of the coup of 12 September 1980 effectively shut down any legal venues of political activity for youth, starting with political parties. Youth branches of parties were shut down for about 17 years. On the other hand, the Student Disciplinary Statute of the Council of Higher Education (YÖK), effective since January 1985, includes many articles intended for cutting off young people from political engagement – this statute must be amended. For example, according to the statute, being involved in political activities, distributing leaflets, possessing, duplicating or distributing posters and banners, making verbal or written ideological propaganda inside the higher education institution are all offences punishable by expulsion. (http://www.yok.gov.tr/mevzuat/yonet/yonet31.html)

According to Caymaz (2008), the military regime's strategy of locking youth up in education and work, its "advice" to youth that rather than taking on utopian projects such as saving the

country, they should instead worry about saving themselves, was an attitude perpetuated by subsequent civil governments. Furthermore, families' experiences of the coup d'état factored into the socialisation of today's youth as process of apoliticisation. Military and civil administrations' efforts to keep young people away from politics prevented the organised political representation of a whole generation. Reopened in 1997 after many years, youth branches were back on the political scene, however this time with young people who accept hierarchies, do as their superiors/elders tell them, and wait for their turn to climb their way up in the party and in their political careers. Hence, as Lüküslü also states, the regime of the coup d'état did not only distance youth from politics but also trained them in an authoritarian practice of politics (Lüküslü, 2008) .

For research on young people's place and position within political parties, Caymaz (2008), conducted interviews with youth branch officials of political parties. According to his account, the young people he interviewed responded to his questions without creativity or innovation, but rather in keeping with party directives, and with a view to preserving the status quo. Caymaz (2008), also states that they were either not seeking or not able to come up with original solutions to problems. Caymaz concludes that young people had to obey rather than question the authoritarian structure of the party, and that the leaders have managed to implement amongst young members a silent endorsement of party principles.

Lüküslü's research on young people who do not participate in politics concludes that the current generation of youth is not "apathetic" and "selfish" as is often argued, but rather that they are aware of and disturbed by existing problems, even though they choose not to participate in the political sphere due to their negative view of politics (Lüküslü, 2008). In fact, they have a criticism of the political sphere: They consider it to be incompetent in solving young people's problems and see it as "rotten" system where personal gain is the order of the day. Furthermore the political sphere is perceived as one that is too difficult to change by individual intervention, one that has rules carved in stone. All political associations and parties are defined by young people as "authoritarian" structures, where they would not be able to express themselves or their individual characteristics, but could only exist as part of a group.

In summary, party politics do not provide youth an environment where they can experience and express their own characteristics/differences, and young people are unable to connect their everyday experiences/problems/practices with politics. The space given to youth by political parties do not allow them an original stance, creativity or actual participation, and young people do not trust political parties for the solution of their problems. Young people are aware that they can contribute to and have a say in social life and its problems, only if they make their way up the hierarchy as get more senior within the party (or act like the party elders). These are amongst the key reasons why young people who are interested in politics stay out of political parties. According to Lüküslü, non-participation denotes young people's lack of means for expressing themselves and their criticisms, rather than a general disinterest in politics. She also suggests that lack of youth participation in political parties effectively reduces the parties' influence on society (Lüküslü, 2008).

The process of transformation from representative democracy to participatory democracy is another factor that has contributed to reducing the influence of political parties on society and youth. Participatory democracy is, in a sense, the proliferation in society of an understanding of active and responsible citizenship (Keyman, 2004; Tekeli, 2006). This begets an environment of active and collective participation and interest in politics, where young people can directly and immediately (i.e. when still young) work to solve their own problems, rather than leaving it to adults or time to produce solutions. Although participatory democracy is not yet advanced in Turkey, young people can and do create environments where they organise in networks and use the resources of cyberspace to communicate with one another, develop consensus non-hierarchically, socialise, learn from one another, create civil platforms, express their views, turn their individual reactions and stances into political demands, and create and accomplish their own projects.

In a sense, young people can now do politics outside of political parties and structures where hierarchy prevails, leaders are appointed by representative election, and general council meetings are the exclusive site of relations with the membership. In environments/civil networks which encourage participation in leadership, horizontal communication, debate and consensus in decision making instead of majority vote, young people can work collectively for a common cause without having to compromise their individual freedoms, and contribute

to the solution of social problems around them without losing their own individual and unique style.

Increased freedoms for citizens, the prominence of the demand for equal citizenship regardless of gender and ethnic differences, and other similar changes have a transforming effect on the state-citizen relationship. Citizenship rights, the right to exist in society with one's differences, the demands of identity politics have gained currency. The site of struggle for young people is shifting from attaining employment and property ownership, to gaining recognition for their different identities, freedoms and values. Political parties are having difficulty in adjusting to these new demands of identity. Values propagated by feminism, LGBT rights, environmentalism and human rights are articulated not by political parties, but by social movements (Keyman, 2004). Today, in order to recruit young people who are engaged in social movements, political parties have to become involved in areas such as environmental politics, women's rights, human rights and animal rights.

On the other hand, we are currently witnessing the rise of NGOs as an example of participatory democracy and organised active citizenship. However, even though NGOs in Turkey have increased in number and advanced in quality in the recent years, the participation of both adults and youth in NGOs is still quite low. An important conclusion of the study by Yentürk, et al. (2008) is that although youth participation in NGOs is low, the type of NGOs that young people intend to participate in are primarily youth clubs and youth associations. Hence, they are interested in organisations where young people get together and govern themselves. One of the key reasons for low youth membership in NGOs is the fact that NGOs consider young people as an inexpensive and dynamic labour force, and are not concerned about their contribution to processes of decision making and operating NGO projects. Youth NGOs that are established exclusively for or by young people, where the main aim is for young people to participate, self-actualise and realize their projects, are crucial for young people's participation in social life and must be encouraged.

Bibliography

Adaman, F. and Keyder, Ç. (2006) "Poverty and Social Exclusion in the Slum Areas of Large Cities in Turkey",
http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/2006/study_turkey_en.pdf.

Aktay, Y. (2007) "Pierre Bourdieu ve bir Maxwell Cini olarak Okul" (Pierre Bourdieu and School as a Maxwell Demon), in eds. Çeğin, G. Göker, E. Arlı, A. and Tatlıcan, Ü. (2007) *Ocak ve Zanaat: Peirre Bourdieu Derlemesi* (Hearth and Craft: Essays on Pierre Bourdieu), İletişim, Istanbul.

Alemdaroğlu, A. (2005) "Bir İmkan Olarak Gençlik" (Youth as a Possibility), *Birikim*, no. 196.

Benlisoy, F. (2003) "Öğrenci Muhalefetinin Güncelliği" (The Relevance of Student Opposition), *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 97, Autumn 2003.

Buğra, A. (2005) "AB Müzakere Sürecinde STK'lar ve Yoksulluk" (NGOs and Poverty in the EU Accession Process) Istanbul Bilgi University, NGO Training and Research Center, Civil Society and Democracy Conference Papers, no. 12, http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/siviltoplumseminer.asp.

Buğra, A. and Adar, S. (2007). "An Analysis of Social Protection Expenditures in Turkey in a Comparative Perspective", Social Policy Watch report, Social Policy Forum, Boğaziçi University, April 2007, Istanbul.

Buğra A. and Keyder Ç. (eds.) (2007) *Bir Temel Hak Olarak Vatandaşlık Gelirine Doğru* (Towards Citizen's Income as a Basic Right), İletişim, Istanbul.

Caymaz, B. (2008) "Siyasi Partilerin Gençlik Politikaları" (Youth Policies of Political Parties), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Estivill, J. (2003) *Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social Exclusion*, ILO/STEP, Geneva.

European Union, (2001) White Paper on Youth, http://ec.europa.eu/youth/archive/whitepaper/index_en.html.

Hall, T. Coffrey, A. and Williamson, H. (1999) "Self, Space and Place: Youth Identities and Citizenship", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 20, no 4.

İdemen, B. (2008) "Sosyal Köken, Habitus ve Eğitim" (Social Background, Habitus and Education), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

ILO, (2006a) "A Resource Directory for Lead Countries of the Youth Employment Network", ILO, Geneva.

ILO, (2006b) "Global Employment Trends for Youth", ILO, Geneva.

İnanır, S. (2005) "Bildiğimiz Gençliğin Sonu" (The End of Youth As We Know It), *Birikim*, no. 196.

Kaya, A. (2008) "Rap Pedagojisi Aracılığıyla Eleştirel bir Eğitim Yöntemi" (Rap Pedagogy as a Critical Method of Education), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Kazgan, G. (ed.) (2006) *İstanbul Gençliği* (Istanbul Youth), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Istanbul.

Kentel, F. (1999) *Türk Gençliği 98: Suskun Kitle Büyüteç Altında* (Turkish Youth 98: The Silent Mass in Focus), Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Istanbul.

Kentel, F. (2005) "Türkiye'de Genç Olmak: Konformizm ya da Siyasetin Yeniden İnşaası" (Being Young in Turkey: Conformism or the Reconstruction of Politics), *Birikim*, no. 196.

Keyder, Ç. Üstündağ, N. Ağartan, T. and Yoltar, Ç. (2007) *Avrupa'da ve Türkiye'de Sağlık Politikaları* (Health Policies in Europe and Turkey), İletişim, Istanbul.

Keyman, F. (2004) "Türkiye'de ve Avrupa'da Sivil Toplum" (Civil Society in Turkey and Europe), Istanbul Bilgi University, NGO Training and Research Center, Civil Society and Democracy Conference Papers, no. 3, http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/siviltoplumseminer.asp.

Kurtaran, Y. (2007) "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Barınma Hakkı Çerçevesinde Yurt-Kur Mevzuatı" (Legislation of Higher Education Credit and Dormitories Institution from the Perspective of University Students' Right to Accommodation), *Üniversite Gençliği ve Sosyal Haklar Raporu* (Report on University Youth and Social Rights), November 2007, TOG, Istanbul.

Kurtaran, Y. (2008) "Türkiye'de Gençlik Alanında Devletin Rolü" (The Role of the State in Youth-Related Activities in Turkey), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008)

Lüküslü, D. (2005) "Farklı Kitaplardan Farklı Açılardan 'Gençlik' Analizleri" (Analyzing 'Youth' from Different Sources and Different Axes), *Birikim*, no.196.

Lüküslü, D. (2008) "Günümüzde Türkiye Gençliği" (Contemporary Youth in Turkey), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

McGrath, B. (2002) "Towards the Enablement of Unqualified Rural Youth: A Structurationist Perspective on Socially Inclusive Policy Interventions", *Journal of Youth Studies*, vol. 5, no 3.

Mead, M. (1970) *Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap*, Doubleday, New York.

Pultar, E. (2008) "Biz Kimiz? KONDA Toplumsal Yapı Araştırmasında Gençler" (Who Are We? Young People in KONDA Social Structure Research), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Sen, A. (2000) "Social Exclusion: Concept, Application and Scrutiny", Social Development Papers No. 1, Office of Environment and Social Development, Asian Development Bank, June 2007.

Standing, G. (2007) "Temel Gelir: Küreselleşen Dünyada Yoksullukla bir Mücadele Yöntemi" (Basic Income as a Method to Fight Poverty in a Globalized World), in eds. Buğra and Keyder (2007).

Sütlaş, M. (2007) "Gençlerin Sağlık Hakkı, Sağlıklı Yaşama Hakkı ve Sağlık Hizmetlerinden Yararlandıkları Sıradaki Hakları" (Young People's Health Rights, Their Right to Live

Healthily and Their Rights in Receiving Health Services", *Üniversite Gençliği ve Sosyal Haklar Raporu* (Report on University Youth and Social Rights), November 2007, TOG, Istanbul.

Tekeli, İ. (2006) "Katılımcı Demokrasi ve Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları" (Participatory Democracy and Non-Governmental Organisations), *Sosyal Demokrasi Derneği Yayınları*, no. 1, Ankara.

UN (2005) World Youth Report 2005, www.un.org/esa/socdev/unyin/wyr05.htm.

University Women's Forum (2006) "Young Women in University and Organising", University Women's Forum Declaration Leaflet), Istanbul.

Uyan-Semerci, P. (2008) "Çocuktan Yetişkine: Genç Olmayanlar" (From Childhood to Adulthood: The Non-Youth), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Üstel, F. (2008) "Okul, Gençler ve 'Öteki'ler" (School, Young People and 'the Others'), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Yentürk, N. (2006) Demokratik Kitle Örgütlerinden STK'lara: Konjonktürel bir İnceleme (From Democratic Mass Organisations to NGOs: A Conjunctural Study), Istanbul Bilgi University, NGO Training and Research Center, Civil Society and Democracy Conference no. 11, 2006. http://stk.bilgi.edu.tr/siviltoplumseminer.asp

Yentürk, C. and Başlevent, C. (2008) "Türkiye'de Genç İşsizliği: Etkileyen Faktörler ve Politika Önerileri" (Youth Unemployment in Turkey: Contributing Factors and Policy Proposals), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008) Türkiye'de Gençlik Çalışması ve Politikaları, (*Youth Work and Policy in Turkey),* Istanbul Bilgi University Publishing House, Istanbul.

Yentürk, N., Kurtaran, Y., Uran, Ş. Yurttagüler, Y., Akyüz, A. Nemutlu, G. (2008) "İstanbul Gençliği: STK Üyeliği bir Fark Yaratıyor mu?" (Istanbul Youth: Does NGO Membership Make a Difference?), in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

Youth in Statistics, (2007) İstatistiklerle Türkiye'de Gençlik (Turkey's Youth in Statistics), 2007, Youth Studies Unit, http://genclik.bilgi.edu.tr/Default.asp?pageID=5

Yurdsever-Ateş, N. (2006) "İstanbul Gençliğinin Siyasal Değerleri" (Political Values of Istanbul Youth) in ed. Kazgan (2006), pp. 85-151.

Yurt-Kur (2006) Yüksek Öğrenim Kredi ve Yurtlar Kurumu Kılavuzu (Higher Education Credit and Dormitories Institution Guide), Yurt-Kur, Ankara.

Yurttagüler, L. (2008) "Sosyal Dışlanma ve Gençlik" (Social Exclusion and Youth) in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN YOUTH-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN TURKEY[40]

Yörük Kurtaran

Conceptual framework

In the era after World War II there were two periods during which young people in Europe[41] gained increased attention. First during the end of '60s and beginning of '70s when it was predominantly young people who expressed and acted on the demands of "antisystemic movements" (Wallerstein, et al., 1989) that found resonance across different sections of society. Second during the 80s, in a context of deepening EU integration, when immigrants from non-EU countries had problems integrating into their new societies.[42] In both of these periods, efforts to formulate a concept of youth policy could be seen as part of the hegemonic[43] system's efforts to decipher a "problem", hence not a coincidence but rather an endeavour to perpetuate economic rationality.

However, conceiving of this framework in terms of an effort of "domestication" does not call for delaying the needs of young people who make up a major part of the global society, and does not require postponing structural change to a future seizure of political power. On the contrary, a need-based youth policy may be conceived as a contribution *towards* gradually establishing power today and in every area of life. Therefore, the fact that a policy focusing on youth may contribute to reducing existing social tensions does not rule out or diminish the benefits of promoting policies on a basis of rights advocacy where youth is the subject itself – hence the whole process is carried out with the direct participation and empowerment of the subject–, and even systematically integrating these policies with services provided for citizens by the state. Because if we consider "more democracy" as an integral part of progress on more freedom and more equality (and how we conceive of the balance between these two ideals of modern society reveals what kind of politics we have), then we will regard each and every youth-oriented, need-based policy developed with the participation of youth as having the potential to operate in favour of citizens in the power struggle between citizens and the state. This may in turn play a significant part in the shift from "the citizens of the state" to "a state of its citizens".

---

[40] Translated from the Turkish by Başak Ertür.

[41] In this article Europe refers to the territory of the member states of the Council of Europe.

[42] For a more detailed examination of the "attention" youth gained during these two periods, see Yurttagüler, 2007.

[43] Here the concept of hegemony is used in Gramsci's sense of the term. For further information see Gramsci, 1971.

Contents of this article

Following from the approach outlined above, this article attempts to contribute to efforts towards widening the scope of services provided to youth in Turkey, and improving their content on the basis of democratic principles. Periodically and in line with European trends, youth is conceived in laws and in common social mentality as either a problem (i.e. potential trouble-makers), or as the bearers of a social problem. This article should be considered as an effort to counter such a conception and to contribute to the normalisation of youth by means of a shift from a problem-oriented policy to a rights-based youth policy. Naturally, making a difference through these processes requires a long-term and multi-dimensional web of actions. In order to become part and parcel of society, a youth policy has to be developed through several stages. These are diagnosis and analysis of existing state of affairs, examination of international examples, need assessment, resource assessment, development of policies addressing needs, advocacy activities, legal reform, implementation, and transformation of social mentality. However, for a youth policy to earn its name, this process must be carried out with the participation of young people and monitored by them.[44]

Accordingly, this article could be situated within a body of efforts directed at contributing to what is perhaps a first step in this long-term process of transformation. Precisely for this reason, the article has all the structural problems ensuing from the incommensurability between everyday life and any written text. First of all, because life goes on, the article will be outdated as soon as it is written. Secondly, it risks falling behind on the current affairs, as laws, circulars and implementation can change any time. This risk is even higher in Turkey today, when discussions regarding constitutional changes have begun to take place as of February 2008.

In spite of all the challenges involved, this text will attempt to provide an analysis of services currently provided by the state for youth in Turkey. Here the special focus will be on youth services provided within the framework of "youth work". Where appropriate, this study will also analyse services that are directly or indirectly related to youth work, and put forth proposals for improving existing practices. In doing so, the principal objects of study will be existing legislation and activity reports of related public institutions. I would also like to mention that the observations in this article have been subjected to the mental filter of first-

---

[44] For policy proposals discussed in this article, see the article in this report by Gülesin Nemutlu and Yörük Kurtaran, "Youth Work-based Policy Proposals".

hand experience gained from working in the non-governmental youth field in Turkey. This condition may be deemed an advantage or a drawback. In any case, it plays a major role in rendering this text objective (though perhaps not impartial) in terms of a non-governmental, civilian approach. Therefore, this context should serve as a cognitive background for the reader in understanding and assessing the criticisms put forward here.

Youth in the Constitution:

The constitution of the Republic of Turkey formulates the relationship between the state and youth in Articles 58 and 59 of Section IX Youth and Sports, under Part II, Chapter 3, as follows:

A. Protection of the Youth:

ARTICLE 58. The state shall take precautions to ensure the training and development of the youth into whose keeping our state, independence, and our Republic are entrusted, in the light of contemporary science, in line with the principles and reforms of Atatürk, and in opposition to ideas aiming at the destruction of the indivisible integrity of the state with its territory and nation.

The state shall take necessary precautions to protect youth from addiction to alcohol and drugs, crime as well as gambling, and similar vices, and ignorance.

B. Development of Sports

ARTICLE 59. The state shall take precautions to develop the physical and mental health of Turkish citizens of all ages, and encourage the spread of sports among the masses. The state shall protect successful athletes.

Article 58 of the constitution very clearly expresses the way in which youth are viewed from the perspective of the state. According to this article, independence and the republic are entrusted to *youth*, as opposed to other sections of society defined within the constitution, such as women, people with disabilities, or citizens. The state's obligation is to take precautions to ensure the "training" and "development" of youth. However, the fundamental aim of this "training" and "development" is to oppose "ideas aiming at the destruction of the indivisible integrity of the state with its territory and nation". With this aim in view, the training and development is prescribed to be based on Atatürk's principles and reforms and developed in the light of positive science. Furthermore, "precautions" are to be taken for the fundamental objective of securing the continuity of the state. Hence, the main focus of this

segment of Article 58 is not youth per se, but rather the extent of legitimised state intervention in the affairs of youth in order to minimise the potential "harm" that may be brought to the state by means of youth. Therefore, these "precautions" are in favour of the state in the rights-based relationship between the state and youth, and are conceptualised in terms of the state's right of intervention, rather than the rights of youth.

Parallel to this approach, and equally significant is the paragraph on taking various precautions to protect youth from addiction to alcohol and drugs. In both paragraphs young people are deemed as passively awaiting protection, whereby the state is to "actively" intervene to protect young people from potential "trouble". Furthermore, on the basis of a social state approach, this act of protection is not conceived of as a positive intervention, but rather a "precaution".

Within this framework, it is logically consistent that the subject matter of the following article under this section would be sports. Since sports are commonly deemed a principal means to protect against addictions, it is the focus of Article 59, which immediately follows the article on youth. Although it is true that the article reflects the spirit of the particular historical era in which it was written, the fact that the wording of the article has remained exactly as it is throughout every constitutional revision since 1923 provides an important insight into the role that this spirit has played in the collective consciousness.

Article 58 is the legal basis of all services that the state provides to youth. Accordingly, as detailed by Secretariat General for EU Affairs (ABGS, 2005), Turkey's youth policies may be summarised in the following manner:

There are four main actors in the area of youth policies. These are the General Directorate for Youth and Sports (GDYS), Ministry of National Education (MNE), Turkish National Agency (NA), and Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SSCPA). Amongst these, GDYS and SSCPA operate under related ministries; NA operates under State Planning Organisation (SPO) which reports to the Office of the Prime Minister; and as its name suggests, MNE operates as a Ministry. In addition to these four institutions, other actors mentioned as partaking in the field are "other related public institutions" and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

Department of Youth Services (DYS), formed under GDYS, is the only public institution that is directly concerned with youth, hence it will be considered in detail below. National Agency will also be discussed here, primarily in terms of its contributions to youth work in Turkey, though we must note that it also plays the important role of bringing a European angle to youth work in Turkey by means of its activities in compliance with European Union's youth policies. Amongst other public institutions, Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) Administration will also be considered in this article in terms of its youth services.

Youth and public services

a. General Directorate for Youth and Sports (GDYS) / Department of Youth Services (DYS)

GDYS operates under the Office of the Prime Minister according to decree law no. 356 (GDYS, 2007a). GDYS's activities are outlined as: "…providing services for ensuring good use of youth's leisure time, organising courses to improve their level of knowledge and skills, taking necessary precautions to protect the youth from drug addiction", "Programming, operating and advancing non-school activities such as scouting and sports, and other youth activities", "..registering and supervising youth associations", "operating youth centres, hostels, camps for physical education, and other youth and sports activities, and ensuring the accessibility of these facilities for the use of citizens", "cooperating with relevant institutions in order to guarantee good use of youth's leisure time". These activities are conducted by GDYS's Department of Youth Services (DYS). Of the seven service units under GDYS, six are directly concerned with sports, whereas only one service unit, DYS is directly concerned with youth.

Since GDYS has its own budget, it operates on income generated in accordance with its code of organisation and other laws – its source of income ranges widely, from contributions from other institutions to the sale of various products. In 2006, the total amount of annual income generated from these and other kinds of sources was 349,763,995 YTL[45] (GDYS, 2006).

DYS, which operates under one of the three deputy directors reporting to the General Director, has a total of seven branches. These branches are: Support Services, Youth Centres,

---

[45] In 2006 (end of the year), 1 YTL = 0,541 Euros

Youth Camps, Cultural Activities, Non-Governmental Youth Organisations, International Relations, and Guidance, Counselling and Research.[46]

In 2006 DYS spent 2,136,669 YTL of the 2,562,750 YTL allocation it received. DYS's 2006 annual allocation amounts to 7.6% of the total GDYS budget. Accordingly, DYS's share in the total expenditure is only 7.1%. Its share in total expenditures on what is termed "main services" is 12%. The remainder of the budget is spent on sports. If we take the population of young people aged 15-29 in Turkey to be roughly19 million, then the annual state allocation per each young person is 0,11 YTL.

Some of DYS's duties involve planning and operating activities directed at guaranteeing good use of young people's leisure time (GDYS, 2007a:9). These activities range widely, from operating existing facilities to training expert staff, from developing cooperation with other countries to financially sponsoring youth activities.

International Relations Branch Directorate

On the basis of "Protocol of Cooperation on Youth Policies", signed with Germany in 1994, children and youth aged 12-26 can participate in exchange programmes and educational seminars of 5 to 30 days. Additionally, three youth leaders from Turkey participated in the German language course hosted by International Youth Exchange and Visitors' Service. In order to develop this cooperation further, a Turkish German Experts Commission was formed, DYS contributed to it by appointing some of the members of the commission. According to the protocol between Germany and Turkey, it is the duty of the signatories to supply relevant public resources for implementing the projects and activities defined by the protocol (http://www.genclikhizmetleri.gov.tr/).

It is significant that in 2006 the number of meetings and trainings where Turkey was represented by the International Relations Branch Directorate was 21, and 11 of these were with Germany. This is essentially due to the protocol between the two countries. Additionally in 2006, 22 youth exchange programmes garnered the participation of 333 experts and young people from Turkey, and 279 from Germany. Of these, 11 youth exchange programmes took place in Turkey, and 11 in Germany (DYS, 2006).

---

[46] Support Services Branch Directorate and Guidance, Counselling and Research Branch Directorate are left out of the scope of this article due to lack of access to sufficient information.

No information has been found as to which young people are to take advantage of opportunities provided by the current protocol, and according what procedure.

DYS regularly participates in the committee meetings of the European Steering Committee for Youth (CDEJ), United Council for Youth, and the annual meetings of European Network of Experts on Youth Research and Information, coordinated within the partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Commission[47] (SPO, 2006).

Under Council of Europe's assistance programme for youth work and youth policy development, which has been in effect since 2002, three training courses, two information meetings and two seminars have been organised in partnership. Calls for these activities were open calls announced on the website of Department of Youth Services. Training sessions were organised with the participation of experts from the Council of Europe and from the youth work network in Turkey.

Youth Centres Branch Directorate

Youth centres operate under Provincial Directorates for Youth and Sports. The number of youth centres in 2002 was 106, in 2006 this figure reached 130. However, regarding the number of youth centres, figures vary in two different documents published by the same institution. According to the publicity document prepared in partnership between DYS and Youth Social Development Programme,[48] there are 134 youth centres serving in 81 cities and 53 boroughs, with 139,754 youth members. Of this total number of members, 47,135 are actively participating in youth centre activities (DYS, 2007). However, according to GDYS's annual activity report, the number of youth centres in 2005 was 127, and in 2006 this figure went up to 130, with a 2.36% increase (GDYS, 2007a: 35). If we take into account that the same document's figure for "youth participating in activities" is 47,135, that is, exactly as it is in the other document, and that surely this number must have gone up during the period between the publication of the former document and that of the latter, more up-to-date document, we could reasonably conclude that there seems to be varying information at different levels of the same institution. It could be that youth centres that were built but not yet opened to the public were included in the report. Even if that is the case, however, then the

---

[47] For detailed information on these bodies, see Certel and Kurtaran, 2008.
[48] See below for further information on Youth Social Development Programme (YSDP).

problem would be that the youth centres that are not opened to the public were inappropriately reported as active youth centres. Furthermore, the majority of these youth centres, approximately 90 of them, do not have their own buildings but serve from offices within provincial directorates.

Activities offered by youth centres include painting, music, crafts, sculpture, folkloric dance, theatre, scouting, tree planting, symposiums, seminars, conferences, language courses, project training, hygiene, education on protecting nature and history, instruction in science and technology, vocational training, visits to rest homes, nature trips, and campaigns against drug addiction (GDYS, 2007a). Of these, the most preferred activity is music, followed by sports education and "other" activities (DYS, 2008).

Even though the target audience for youth centres is youth, some of these activities were designed without the participation of young people (YSDP and GDYS, 2007: 5). However, since the same document defines youth work as "all social responsibility activities designed for youth, by youth or with youth, in order to meet existing needs," it follows that some of the activities currently offered by Youth Centres *cannot be defined as* youth work by even GDYS itself. Accordingly, although this source states that youth work is offered everywhere for 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, the actual opening hours of existing Youth Centres clearly demonstrate who can attend these centres. Since young people who work during office hours can only take advantage of these centres on weekday evenings and weekends, the current opening hours of these centres from 9am to 6pm during weekdays, as with all other public institutions, impede on the ability of different youth to participate.

Young people who programme activities at Youth Centres are termed "youth workers". According to the person specification, these "youth workers", in addition to having various traits, are committed to Atatürk's principles and reforms, and have knowledge of their own culture (GDYS, 2007: 9).

As part of the "Youth Centre Exchange Project", designed for exchange between Youth Centres themselves, in 2005, 2006 and 2007, there were respectively 480, 936 and 927 young people who participated in the 5-day trips visiting other cities. Hence in the last 3 years, a total of 2343 young people have taken advantage of this exchange programme.

Additionally, since 2004 visits are organised to Çanakkale and Bilecik in order to "provide an on-site experience of history" and to "enable youth to understand the importance of historical awareness". Every week, 120 young people from three cities (40 young people from each city) participate in these tours, so far a total of 9,640 young people have participated. The tour is a two-day programme and includes information on the Çanakkale War and the city of Bilecik. In 2006 the views of young people who participated in these tours were collected in a book entitled "Çanakkale Truth and National Youth".

Cultural Activities Branch Directorate

6,533 youth participated in groups and finals of solo vocal, instrumental and choral Turkish folk music competitions and activities between 2004 and 2006. During 2005 and 2006, a total of 8,383 young people participated in Turkish folk dance activities (DYS, 2007: 8). Taking into account youth young people who participated in the local preliminaries for these competitions, we could say that the actual number of participants is higher.

During 'Youth Week' celebrations, organised 15-21 May every year, young people selected from 81 cities are received by the President, the Parliament Speaker and the Prime Minister, followed by a visit to Atatürk's Mausoleum and a reception event organised by the DYS.

According to a report, Youth Festivals are held in every city, borough and village (DYS, 2007: 11). For this purpose "Youth Festival Organisation Committees" are formed and operated by Provincial Directorates for Youth and Sports. 266,000 youth have participated in these festivals between 2004 and 2006.

Youth Camps Branch Directorate

Young people aged 13-17 *are made to take advantage of* four free sea camps located in İzmir Çeşme/Paşalimanı, Aydın Kuşadası/Davutlar, Mersin Silifke/Akkum and Çanakkale/İntepe. Criteria for participating in these camps are outlined as: academic success, success at sports, "ability to move without assistance" if disabled, having a job, being a relative of a martyr or a war veteran, being a member of a youth centre, and being a resident of an orphanage operated by Social Services and Child Protection Agency. Among other activities, young people are "*made to participate* in activities that will contribute to their social development in

preparation for life"[49] (DYS, 2007: 12). In addition, "courses on carpet-weaving and ceramics are now offered, for sake of enabling youth to acquaint themselves with handicrafts that are characteristic of Turkish culture" (DYS, 2007). Each year from 2002 to 2006, there were respectively 2709, 2789, 2471 and 2830 children/young people who took advantage of these camps (DYS, 2007).

In addition to the sea camps, nature camps are held for youth aged 18-24 since 2005, with the support of Red Crescent. These camps are in Artvin (Kafkasör Plain), Trabzon (Zigana Plain), Şanlıurfa (Atatürk Dam) and Bolu (Mengen Bürnük Pond). Unlike the sea camps, nature camps require a participation fee of 80 YTL (DYS, 2007). In addition to the activities in youth centres and other camps, these camps focus extensively on nature sports. Until 2005, nature camps were held at the facilities in provincial youth centres. Each year from 2002 to 2006, respectively 1243, 7409, 6632, 2756 and 1844 young people participated in the nature camps (DYS, 2007). As can be seen in these figures, the usage of these camps have gradually diminished each year. However, the number of camp leaders who were appointed in organising both kinds of camps between 2002 and 2006, were 190, 238, 324, 479 and 503 respectively. In other words, this figure has gradually increased, as opposed to the number of youth taking advantage of these camps. During 2006, 1061 camp leaders convened in a total of seven training and instruction sessions on operating the camps.

As stated above, the criteria for participating in the camps include academic success, a criterion only relevant to young people who attend school, and one which targets those who do better at school. Such a criterion leads to a hierarchical awarding system amongst youth of this particular age group. Furthermore, in a country where the percentage of high school graduates amongst the youth population is only 41.8% (Eurostat, 2005), this policy further aggravates the disadvantaged position of young people who are unable to continue their studies, by excluding them from an opportunity provided by the state for young people to develop their capabilities. Additionally, subjecting participation in nature camps to a fee, only advantages young people who can afford to pay it, no matter how small the fee is.

Non-Governmental Youth Organisations Branch Directorate
According to the related article of the Law on Associations:[50]

---

[49] Emphasis mine.
[50] See Law #5253: Law on Associations, *Resmi Gazete*, no. 25649, 23 November 2004.

Youth and sports clubs

ARTICLE 14- Of the associations that apply, those which are oriented towards sports activities shall be named a sports club, those which are oriented towards leisure time activities a youth club, and those which aim at both types of activities a youth and sports club. Such clubs shall be recorded in a register to be kept by the General Directorate for Youth and Sports.

The organs of clubs, the duties and powers of these organs, the inspection of clubs by the General Directorate for Youth and Sports, the terms and conditions for the extension of assistance to clubs, the principles and procedures to be observed in creating higher bodies of clubs, the qualifications of persons to conduct the activities of youth and sports, the disciplinary measures applicable to such persons, and principles concerning the registration of clubs, shall be laid down in a regulation to be issued by the Ministry in charge of the General Directorate for Youth and Sports upon a favourable opinion from the Ministry of the Interior.

In accordance with this article of the Law on Associations, DYS officially registers applicant associations that it deems appropriate. As of 2007, there were 393 youth NGOs officially registered as youth clubs. Financial support provided to these institutions between 2004 and 2007 has been as follows: a total of 304,500 YTL for 90 youth organisations in 2004; 339,592 YTL for 89 organisations in 2005; 372,000 YTL for 119 organisations in 2006; and 372,000 YTL for 122 organisations in 2007.[51] Hence the average support per organisation per year is respectively 3383, 3815, 3126, and 3049 YTL.

Here it is important to take note of the fact that the figure for 2004 includes a 40,000 YTL grant given to the Ankara-based Folk Dance Music and Youth Club for the organisation of International Ankara Music and Dance Festival; and the figure for 2005 includes both a 15,000 YTL grant given to the Ankara-based Anatolian Folk Dance Youth Club for the organisation of 9th International Ankara Folk Dance and Youth Festival, and a contribution of 118,335 YTL for Youth Week celebrations. Similarly, the figure for 2007 includes the 95,000 YTL grant given to Folk Dance Music and Youth Club for the organisation of the

---

[51] These figures are quoted from the GDYS, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 budgets respectively.

International Youth Meeting Under the Breadth of Mawlana. When we subtract these amounts from the annual budgets into which they are figured, the annual financial support per organisation is 2939 YTL for each of the 90 organisations in 2004; 2344 YTL for each of the 88 organisations in 2005; 2966 YTL for each of the 119 organisations in 2006; and 2486 YTL for each of the 121 organisations in 2007. As can be judged from these figures, there is an overall decrease in this sum in these four years, but it can be seen as part of a yearly fluctuation rather than a permanent decrease.

During the 2004-2007 period, the three cities which received the highest number of donations were Ankara (63), İzmir (27), and Istanbul (19). In terms of currency, Ankara received the highest amount in donations with 217,000 YTL. Trabzon followed with 74,500 YTL, and İzmir came third with 60,000 YTL. While it makes sense that big cities would have more youth activities, it is hard to understand why the smaller town of Trabzon received such a high amount in donations. A total of 64 cities received at least one donation, which means that youth organisations in 17 cities have not had any access to any of these donations.

As can be judged from these figures, donations given to youth clubs in Ankara are distinctly greater in number and in total. This may be because Ankara is one of the cities where youth clubs are most active. But it could also be because there is a major problem in localising the services provided by DYS, which is based in Ankara. Another reason for this discrepancy may be the small number of applications from outside Ankara. Whatever the main reason, it is important to localise youth work –and localisation in this context must be understood in terms of the transfer of youth work to local governments– and identify the areas that need improvement such as access to opportunities, capacity issues, and access to information. Additionally, the fact that there are cities which have not received any donations during this period of four years demonstrates the need for capacity building programmes for the organisations in these cities. That is, the best way of addressing this problem is not necessarily to prioritise these cities in future distribution of donations. In fact, a policy proposal targeting the distribution of donations to every city may be detrimental to organisations that need sustainability in order to build their capacity.

Youth organisations in the three cities that have received the highest amount of donations, were awarded 32% of the total amount of donations. The cities that received more than the annual average of donations in each of the four years were: Ankara, Bolu, Burdur, Çanakkale,

Çankırı, Diyarbakır, Istanbul, İzmir, Kırşehir, Tokat and Van. Youth organisations in these 11 cities, out of the 64 that received donations, have received 53.8% of the total amount of donations given over the four years. However, these cities are only 17% of the total number of cities that received donations. In this period of four years, the cities that have received the highest amount of donation per organisation are Ardahan (5000 YTL), Bolu (6500 YTL), Düzce (5000 YTL), Kastamonu (5500 YTL), Trabzon (4250 YTL) and Zonguldak (6250 YTL). These figures seem high in comparison to other grants, however they are not quite sufficient, because, as discussed below, unlike other widely available youth funds in Turkey, these donations cover budget items such as rent, furniture and fixtures. Since the distribution of available resources to NGOs is not transparent, it is not possible to comment on why youth organisations in some cities receive more support than others. Acknowledging this very fact as a problem may well serve as an important step towards change.

Compared to other civil and public funds available for youth organisations, one very important and favourable distinction of these donations is that youth organisations can use these funds for club centre expenses such as rent, fees, electricity and water (up to 80% of donations can be used for these budget items); furniture and fixtures for the office (up to 80%); trainer fees and course materials –excluding competitions– (up to 40%); and expenses for participation in national and international meetings such as seminars and conferences (up to 40%) (DYS, 2006).

Registered clubs are obliged to employ youth leaders and trainers for their youth activities. These staff must be licensed by the General Directorate for Youth and Sports. The clause that regulates these obligations suggests that "other institutions" can provide this license as well, though the circular does not specify which institutions. According to the circular, the responsibility to employ trainers and youth leaders for relevant activities belongs to provincial directorates.

Being registered as a youth club brings some responsibilities. Every club is obliged to report the resolutions of their general assembly to the provincial directorate by filling in a form. The provincial directorate sends a copy of this communication to the Department of Youth Services. If this procedure is not followed, or if no activities in declared fields are undertaken for two years, or if the club undertakes activities that are outside declared fields, its registration may be cancelled.

As discussed above, every registered club can apply to DYS for funding its youth activities. Youth clubs must submit their application to provincial directorates or the General Directorate by 1 April every year, and if their application is successful, they get financial support for their youth activities.

According to the registration agreement, the provincial directorate and the General Directorate for Youth and Sports, referred to as the "Organisation", have the right to use the materials belonging to a registered youth club. Hence, "on the condition that the Organisation compensates for any damages and provides insurance,"[52] every registered club is obliged to provide its materials for the use of the "Organisation" without prior consensus.

It is very beneficial that there is a system in place by which the state provides financial and educational support to youth organisations as a right. Furthermore, it is very important and praiseworthy that this support includes budget items that will contribute to capacity building in the sphere of youth, items such as club centre expenses, furniture and fixtures, and travel expenses that facilitate the mobility of young people. The importance of this support becomes even more apparent when we note that amongst the funds available in Turkey for youth organisations, only DYS's funding system covers these kinds of budget items. There is one aspect of this funding system that needs to be improved: a transparency process must be initiated to reveal the criteria used for deciding on which organisations are funded.

However, the framework of this funding system as it is drawn in regulations, is not based on the definition of mutual rights and obligations of the state and civil society, but rather written with an approach that protects the interests of the state. This raises a question regarding to what extent a non-governmental youth organisation can remain non-governmental and independent when it is registered.

In addition to regular services provided by branch directorates, there are several activities directly sponsored by the Department of Youth Services itself. These include "Symposium on Inter-religious and Intercultural Dialogue", 27-29 March 2007, organised in partnership with the Council of Europe as part of All Different All Equal European Youth Campaign; and the

---

[52] See Gençlik Kulüpleri Tescil Taahütnamesi (Youth Clubs Registration Agreement).

"International Youth Meeting Under the Breadth of Mawlana", held on 26 August 2007 with the participation of 600 international youth from 22 countries, and 1500 youth from 81 national youth centres (GDYS, 2007a: 15).

The open call to non-governmental youth organisations to form a Turkey National Campaign Committee for All Different All Equal European Youth Campaign, and following that, the progress of the committee were very good developments. Similarly it is important and beneficial that DYS provides funding for same campaign's voluntary education scheme and that the scheme is operated by a non-governmental and state partnership.

Youth Social Development Programme (YSDP) (www.gsgp.org.tr)

Funded by the government of Japan as part of its Japan Social Development Programme and mediated by the World Bank, "Youth Development and Social Participation" programme is operated by Youth and Sports Foundation. The programme has four main components: "empowering youth", "youth employment", "youth culture bridge" and "youth policies". Its target audience is youth aged 13-30. YSDP was launched in 2006 with a budget of 1,932,000 USD (World Bank, 2005). The framework and content of the programme was determined by the World Bank. Although the donations team operates under Youth and Sports Foundation (www.gsv.gov.tr), it reports directly to DYS. The World Bank monitors the finances and objectives of the project. The initial staff responsible for the operation of the programme was composed of experts with experience in the non-governmental youth field, and yet, they were all replaced after the first year. Nevertheless, it is a positive sign that the members of the new staff also come from the non-governmental youth field and are young, with an average age of 24,8.

The programme has been underway for the past two years. Following scoping missions for its empowering youth component, 21 pilot cities were selected to conduct various capacity building activities for youth centres in these cities. Training packs designed within this framework target volunteers and youth workers who work at youth centres and registered youth clubs. As of February 2008, seven training packs have been offered on the subjects of "Civil Society, Volunteering, and Communication", "Volunteer Management, Inclusion, Organising, and Organisational Management", "Culture, Our Culture, Institutional Culture, and Youth Centre Culture", "Activity Design and Drug Addiction", "Project and Campaign Management" and "Financial Management". A total of 3488 youth participated in these

training sessions. It is remarkable that the average age of participation in all training sessions was below 22. In every training session the participation of men was higher than that of women (YSDP, 2008).

As part of this programme, various meetings on youth employment have been held, there has been some progress on the education of provincial youth directors and youth centre directors. However, work on other aspects of the programme is yet to begin.

The efforts of the YSDP are directed at extending the scope and improving the content of services provided by DYS. It is mainly youth centres and registered youth clubs that benefit from these services. An important point to note regarding training programmes aimed at building the capacity of youth centres is that to the extent that they increase the capacity of these youth centres, they increase the state's capacity to organise youth.

However, rather than attempting to directly organise citizens, the state should provide support to citizens who are already organised or want to organise. In other words, the state's support should be structured towards facilitating the exercise of the right to organise. For example, in this case the programme should aim to transform youth centres into institutions that can provide space and resources for youth organisations.

b. City Councils / Youth Assemblies

Article 76 of the new Municipal Law outlines the support that municipal administrations are legally obliged to provide to city councils for facilitating their operation. According to the law:

> ARTICLE 76 – City councils endeavour to implement principles such as developing a city vision and responsible citizenship, preserving urban rights, sustainable development, environmental awareness, social cooperation and solidarity, transparency, accountability, participation and local self-governance.

> Municipal administrations shall provide the necessary assistance and support to enable the effective and productive functioning of city councils composed of public institutions such as chambers of trade and industry, labour unions, public notaries, universities (if any), and related non-governmental organisations, political parties, as

well as representatives of public institutions and district administrations and other interested parties.

Prepared by the Ministry of Interior's General Directorate of Local Administration for the implementation of this law, the City Council Ordinance legally protects the activities of youth assemblies that have started to function under city councils, which are not necessarily active in youth work but provide support to the field.[53] These are very important and positive developments for youth, especially when we consider that the recommendations of the city council have to be included in the agenda of the first following municipality meeting and discussed there.

Ideally, city councils should operate as a basic means to participate in the local governance of a given city, as a common platform that brings together central government, local government, public trade organisations and civil society. Voluntary structures within city councils, "especially women's and youth assemblies"[54] function as platforms that enable sections of urban society who have differentiated needs to directly participate in the local governance of the city.

It is remarkable that municipalities have undertaken efforts to form youth assemblies, especially after the related law was issued. However, the content of these activities are questionable to the extent that these efforts were primarily motivated by legal obligation. Although youth assemblies seem to be active on paper, questions remain as to their method of operation, the quality of young people's participation, their effectiveness in day-to-day life, and to what extent the issues brought up by the assemblies have a bearing on the decisions of the municipal assembly.

c. Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) Administration's Social Development Project for Youth

As part of GAP Administration's project, Youth and Culture Houses were established in nine cities including Adıyaman, Batman, Diyarbakır, Gaziantep, Kilis, Mardin, Siirt, Şanlıurfa and Şırnak. Pepsi provides the majority of the funding for the project. Youth and Culture Houses are operated on a membership basis, exclusively of youth. Elections are held among members

---

[53] See Kent Konseyi Yönetmeliği, *Resmi Gazete*, no. 26313, 8 October 2006.
[54] See Kent Konseyi Yönetmeliği, *Resmi Gazete*, no. 26313, 8 October 2006, Article 4(c).

for Youth Executive Board. In each city, one project assistant is employed who is responsible from the day-to-day operation of the process. Each city also has an "advisory board" composed of local government, civilian authorities, local non-governmental organisations and representatives of public institutions. The project was run by Youth for Habitat Association until September 2006, since then it has been operated by GAP Administration, sponsored by Pepsi, and with support from Development Foundation of Turkey. From May 2001 to December 2006, a total of 86,522 people were reached out to via a wide range of programmes including capacity development training sessions, activities for increasing employment and cultural activities (GAP, 2007: 40).

In addition to these activities, an internship programme organised in partnership with Women Entrepreneurs Association of Turkey (KAGIDER), provided 17 youth with the opportunity to intern in Istanbul, while "National Internship Programme" organised in partnership with Chambers of Commerce and Industry enabled 25 youth to intern in cities covered by the Southeastern Anatolia Project. Furthermore, four youth exchange programmes and four local youth projects were actualised with the support of the Project for Youth.

As can be seen in these examples, services provided to youth by GAP Administration are mainly centred on employment, in line with strategies directed at the "development" of the region. Even though these efforts have reached only a small number of youth, they have an important distinction from the work of other public institutions providing services to youth: These efforts are all carried out in partnership with local or national NGOs and trade organisations. By consulting existing expertise rather than developing expertise within the institution, the activities and mission of these outside institutions are supported, and the activities of Social Development Project for Youth are enriched in content. Nevertheless it would be wrong to assume that Youth and Culture Houses are exempt from the structural problems of all youth institutions. There is a very high turnover, that is, both the number of youth who get involved in the system and the number of youth who leave the system are quite high. As a result, the capacity does not remain in the organisation and the organisational memory is not transformed into knowledge, a necessary step in becoming a "learning organisation".

d. National Agency (NA) (www. ua.gov.tr)

The National Agency (NA) was founded in 2003 by Law no. 4898, as a financially and administratively autonomous institution under State Planning Organisation. The NA operates European Commission's Lifelong Learning and Youth in Action programmes. Its mission is to publicise and operate these programmes by providing the necessary infrastructure and training in cooperation with relevant institutions.

With a view to these aims, the NA organises various training and information sessions by means of which it has been able to reach out to young people and youth organisations. The trainers and counsellors who are employed by the NA to increase Youth in Action Programme's outreach have a thorough understanding of the programme and its application (NA, 2007). However, the criteria by which the NA appoints these trainers and selects people who participate in training sessions must be made transparent. Similarly, the process by which certain projects are selected also calls for increased transparency, for example, the criteria by which the Central Finance and Contracts Unit of the Undersecretariat of Treasury evaluates EU projects must be announced online to programme beneficiaries. The transparency of these processes will also help settle technical problems in the operation of the programme, such as the timely payment of grants, and will encourage local capacity building by enabling unsuccessful applicants to understand and address the shortcomings in their organisations.

Furthermore, although no such specification exists, there is a general conception that the programme's beneficiaries are mainly university students and/or youth receiving education. However, one of the four permanent priorities of the Youth in Action programme is stated as "ensuring that young people with fewer opportunities get access to the Youth in Action programme" (European Commission, 2007). And yet, progress in this area has been hindered by both the technical difficulties in outreaching young people with fewer opportunities, and the lack of sufficient attention and support by public institutions that are supposed to coordinate with the NA.

There are other impediments to the operation of such an international programme that are beyond the NA's authority, such as the acquisition of visas for international travel. There have been times when letters of confirmation from the NA and the partnering country's national agency have not been able to secure visas for participants.

Another significant issue that needs to be addressed is that there seems to be a general perception, articulated especially by young participants, that most of the project leaders recently appointed by the NA come from a teaching background.

Nonetheless, there are also many positive aspects to the programme's operation, for example, the structure of the programme is not at all bureaucratic, and the NA staff are very youth-friendly. Similarly, when a young person has the opportunity to travel abroad as part of a project that the NA mediates, the travel costs are covered by the NA – a very good method to increase the participation of relatively disadvantaged youth.

As part of the Youth in Action programme, which provides financial and educational aid with the aim of contributing a European dimension to local projects operated by youth, and promoting activities that increase the social participation of youth, an approximate total of 10.4 million Euros were granted in donations to youth groups and organisations between 2004 and 2006.

These donations helped bring to life a total of 1116 youth projects in the same period. The average amount granted to each project was 9,318 Euros. Approximately 18,605 young people benefited from the programme. Hence between 2004 and 2006, Youth in Action programme granted approximately 560 Euros per young person. When we include in this calculation the entire youth population in Turkey aged 15-29, the amount granted per capita would be 0.54 Euros. If we compare this figure to the funding opportunities provided by the DYS, it would only be fair to say that there is an enormous gap between the two schemes.

The top seven cities with the highest number of projects receiving Youth in Action grants between 2003 and 2006 were Ankara (275 projects), Istanbul (173), Antalya (70), İzmir (36), Kocaeli (32), Adana (24) and Balıkesir (24).[55] Turkey's three largest cities hosted 38% of all projects. Although the NA's website does not list the application statistics for each city, we make the following observations regarding this ranking: Although Istanbul has a larger youth population, more projects were realised in Ankara. The reason may be that the NA is located in Ankara, or it could be that the number of organised youth groups in Ankara are possibly higher than those in Istanbul. The difference between the number of projects in Ankara and

---

[55] See www.ua.gov.tr.

Istanbul on the one hand, and Izmir on the other hand is also significant, especially when the populations of these cities are taken into account. It can be observed that in comparison to other regions, the Black Sea and East Anatolia regions have benefited relatively less from this scheme. This may either be because there were very few applications from these regions, or because the applications were not adequate. Either way, there must be an initiative that will aim to increase the support provided to these regions. Table 1 analyses the ratio of successful applications in terms of sub-programmes (Actions).

Table 1: Turkey's Youth in Action Programme Application-Acceptance Figures and Percentages (2003-2006 annual)

	2003			2004			2005			2006			Total		
	No. of applications (AP)	No. of acceptances (AC)	Percentage of AC (%)	AP	AC	%	AP	AC	%	AP	AC	%	AP	AC	%
Action 1	7	2	29	75	51	68	217	78	36	306	160	52	605	291	**48**
Action 2	0	0	0	30	27	90	159	142	89	251	229	91	440	398	**90**
Action 3	4	2	50	153	83	54	390	80	21	430	158	37	977	323	**33**
Action 5	8	6	75	39	30	77	151	45	30	216	76	35	414	157	**38**
Total	**19**	**10**	**53**	**297**	**191**	**64**	**917**	**345**	**38**	**1,203**	**623**	**52**	**2,436**	**1,169**	**48**

Source: Taken from www.ua.gov.tr, statistics on the "Gençlik Programı/Neleri Başardık" (Youth in Action Programme/Our Achievements) page.

During the period it was operational in Turkey from 1 November 2003 to 1 November 2006, Youth in Action programme set out a total of 16 application dates and received a total of 2436 project applications, 1169 of which were deemed worthy of support. The general ratio of acceptance is 48%. In other words, one out of two project applications succeeded. When we remove from the statistics Action 2 (European Voluntary Service), which has the highest ratio of acceptance, the ratio of acceptance falls down to 38%. The table shows that as the programme became better known and more accessible to youth, the number of applications increased significantly. However, the same could not be said for the percentage of acceptances.

Table 2: Youth in Action Programme - Ratio of Annual Applications and Acceptances to the Total Number of Applications and Acceptances

Year	Percentage of applications within the total number of applications (2003-2006)	Percentage of acceptances within the total number of acceptances (2003-2006)
2003	1	1
2004	12	16
2005	38	30
2006	49	53

Source: Same as Table 1

As seen in Table 2, the annual increase in the number of applications is reflected by the percentage of annual applications within the total number of applications. This is also the case for acceptances. Hence it is observed that Youth in Action programme is increasingly utilised by youth groups and youth organisations. It is not possible to deduce from the limited data the specific reasons for the increase in the number of applications. However, it would not be farfetched to suggest that increased familiarity with the programme, and the staff's extended knowledge of the field must have contributed to this increase in the number of applications.

As seen in Table 3, between 2003 and 2006, 25% of all applications for Action 1 (Youth Exchanges) were applications made in the November period. This figure is 25% in February and 24% in April, however it falls down to 16% in June and 10% in September.

However, there seems to be a different trend in applications for Action 2 (European Voluntary Service). Compared to all applications for Action 2 throughout the four years, applications in September and November come across as the busiest months (24% and 20% respectively), but the ratios fall to 12% in February, 16% in April and 14% in June.

The most significant distinction in the ratios for Action 3 (Youth Initiatives) is that June has the lowest share of applications (17%), whereas November has the highest share of all applications for Action 3 (22%). Applications for this action in the other months do not exhibit significant fluctuations.

Table 3: Youth in Action Programme (2003-2006) Percentage of Acceptances (based on month and action)

Action	1 Nov 2003		1 Nov 2004		1 Nov 2005		1 Nov 2006		November Total			Percentage of the no. of applications within the total no. of applications to the Action (%)	Percentage of applications within the total no. of applications (%)
	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Acc. %		
Action1	7	2	30	19	40	24	75	50	152	95	63	25	7
Action2			11	10	37	37	39	35	87	82	94	20	4
Action3	4	2	70	40	52	21	91	64	217	127	59	22	10
Action5	8	6	13	11	20	13	100	32	141	62	44	34	6
Total	19	10	124	80	149	95	305	181	597	366	61	25	25
			1Febr.2004		1Febr.2005		1Febr. 2006		February Total				
			Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Acc. %		
Action1			8	8	70	16	73	34	151	58	38	25	7
Action2					20	19	31	28	51	47	92	12	2
Action3			6	3	101	10	100	23	207	36	17	21	9
Action5			3	3	42	10	30	13	75	26	35	18	3
Total			17	14	233	55	234	98	484	167	35	20	20
			1Apr.2004		1Apr. 2005		1Apr.2006		April Total				
			Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Acc. %		
Action1			12	5	57	16	79	34	148	55	37	24	6
Action2					20	18	49	46	69	64	93	16	3
Action3			8	5	103	15	92	16	203	36	18	21	9
Action5			5	1	45	9	23	8	73	18	25	18	3
Total			25	11	225	58	243	104	493	173	35	20	20
			1 June 2004		1 June 2005		1 June 2006		June Total				
			Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Acc. %		
Action1			13	8	34	16	48	21	95	45	47	16	4
Action2			10	8	49	46	70	65	129	119	92	14	6
Action3			12	7	83	16	69	18	164	41	25	17	7
Action5			9	6	30	6	38	11	77	23	30	19	3
Total			44	29	196	84	225	115	465	228	49	19	19
			1 Sep 2004		1 Sep 2005		1 Sep 2006		September Total				
			Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Apl.	Acc.	Acc. %		
Action1			12	11	16	6	31	21	59	38	64	10	2
Action2			9	9	33	22	62	55	104	86	83	24	4
Action3			57	28	51	18	78	37	186	83	45	19	8
Action5			9	9	14	7	25	12	48	28	58	12	2
Total			87	57	114	53	196	125	397	235	59	16	16

Source: Table 1

A similar analysis for Action 5 (Support Measures) yields a different pattern whereby September has the lowest share of applications (12%) and November has the highest share of

applications (34%). This is the largest gap between any two actions. Application percentages for the three remaining months for Action 5 are evenly matched (18%, 18%, and 19%).

When we analyse the application periods in terms of the total number of applications, we see that November has the greatest share of all applications with 25% and September has the lowest share of all applications with 16%. February, April and June respectively have 20%, 20% and 19% of all applications. Hence when we take into account all four years that the programme has been in operation, we see that November has been the period when the highest number of applications were made.

The figures for the new Youth in Action programme are not included in this analysis because the statistics for the November 2007 applications have not been published as of December 2007. However, we do know that excluding November applications, there were a total of 879,278 applications and the ratio of success has been 32%.

These figures allow us to make the following conclusions about how the Youth in Action programme is used in Turkey: Youth Exchanges (Action 1) are preferred mainly for spring and summer. Therefore November is the period with the highest number of applications for Action 1. The preference for spring and summer may be due to better weather conditions. Applicants tend to try and do European Voluntary Service (Action 2) during the winter months. Hence September and November are busy application periods for this Action. It is relatively harder to make a generalisation about Youth Initiatives (Action 3), since the percentage of applications do not fluctuate much for different application periods. However November has the highest share of applications for Action 3 within all Actions and years. Young people tend to prefer to carry out activities that fall under Action 5 in winter and spring. This is mainly because organisations that have a certain level of capacity probably do not have trouble finding international partners for carrying out these activities. When we analyse the average figures for all applications, we observe that September is the least preferred period of application whereas November is the most preferred period of application. The other three application periods have almost equal percentages, the only exception being Action 2. This may be because the NA's trainings are intensified during certain periods.

Youth in Government Programmes

The 60th government's programme of action states that in order to carry Turkey forward to its "deserved" position, its youth have to be skilled, enterprising, self-confident and committed to national and moral values. Hence the government declares to prioritise youth policies that will enable youth to be cultivated, committed to fundamental values, protected against drug addiction and optimistic about the future.[56]

Section E of the Appendix to the Council of Ministers Decree on the Application, Coordination and Monitoring of the 2007 Annual Programme, entitled "Protecting and Developing Culture and Strengthening Social Dialogue", directly analyses the current state of affairs regarding the youth population and suggests that although age of candidacy has been lowered to 25, young people's participation in decision making has not reached a desirable level (State Planning Organisation, 2007: 217). The same analysis suggests that an effort to transfer youth services to local governments is underway, but not yet accomplished. The cultural policies of the current government especially emphasise the importance of NGOs and local governments. Additionally, twelve *priorities* are determined as a means to establish respect for differences, tolerance, consensus and social solidarity, and several *measures* are listed under these priorities.

One of these twelve cultural policy priorities is directly related to youth. Priority eleven states that "Measures will be taken to improve young people's relations to their families and the society at large, develop their self-confidence, augment their sense of belonging to the society they live in, and increase their participation in decision making." (SPO, 2007: 219). For one of the four measures that are listed under this priority, the Ministry of National Education (MNE) is indicated as the responsible body, and for the remaining three measures, it is GDYS. The measure related to MNE states that efforts to prevent youth's involvement in drug addiction and crime will be carried out in collaboration with the Ministry of Interior, Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SSCPA), General Directorate of Family and Social Research (GDFSR), Radio and Television Supreme Council (RTSC), Turkish Radio and Television Corporation (TRT), local governments and NGOs. The plan is to provide information within this framework and to instruct youth and families in valuable use of leisure time. This is planned for 2007-2009.

---

[56] See R. Tayyip Erdoğan, Programme of the 60th Government, 31 August 2007, Grand National Assembly of Turkey, Ankara.

The remaining three measures listed under priority eleven include improving and diversifying efforts to increase the social participation of youth by increasing the number of youth who avail themselves of these services, and by increasing the proportion of young people with fewer opportunities amongst them. Another measure is to expedite the undertaking to define the role of the state in improving coordination in youth services. Fourth and last measure under priority eleven is to examine existing mechanisms directed at young people's participation in decision making, to learn from good examples such as those within the EU and apply the most suitable mechanism nationally. According to the decree, GDYS will collaborate with the Ministry of Interior, SSCPA, local governments, NGOs, MNE and universities in implementing these measures.

Even though various action plans are drawn up for implementing the said programme, there is a significant question as to how much progress has been made so far. An analysis of the GDYS 2007 activity report would be necessary in order to accurately answer this question (at the time of writing this report is not available), however observation shows that there is not any correspondence between what is planned and what has been done.

No information is available concerning efforts to transfer youth services to local governments, although according to the decree, this process was supposed to be expedited in 2007. The most significant development in this area has been progress achieved in forming Youth Assemblies despite various problems, as discussed under the "City Councils/Youth Assemblies" section of this article. Although the decree envisages the participation of NGOs in these processes, non-governmental involvement has been close to nil, not only because there is a small number of NGOs with expertise in these areas, but also because NGOs are not generally regarded as institutions that should be consulted. Similarly, there has not been any progress on the plan to examine successful models from the EU in order to adopt a suitable mechanism for increasing young people's participation in decision making. Accordingly, the actual participation of stakeholders and the implementations are very much lacking in comparison to what was envisaged in these plans. Once again, this reminds us that it is not possible to achieve change in the youth field without ensuring the participation of organised sections of youth.

General Observations

This last section includes observations on the opportunities provided by the state to the field of youth work in Turkey. These observations are intended to contribute to the improvement of such opportunities and rather than policy proposals as such, they should be regarded as an attempt to identify the current state of affairs. A future task following from these observations could be to reflect on how the shortcomings in this area can be addressed, with the participation and contributions of non-governmental stakeholders.

The main focus of General Directorate for Youth and Sports as an institution is not youth work, but rather sports. Both its organisational structure and its budget allocation validate this assessment.

Sports Supreme Council has been established by law, and GDYS will be functioning in its old capacity until new regulations are in operation. This is actually an important opportunity for GDYS. Managing this process of transformation with a view to provide for the needs of the civil sphere rather than the state would be a critical juncture in institutionalising a need-based support system for youth work. The primary condition for taking the needs of the civil sphere as the basis and starting point is the initiation of an equal dialogue between civil actors and GDYS. Otherwise, the diversity found in the civil sphere of youth work will not be reflected here other than the registered Youth Clubs, and the problems will remain intact.

As indicated by the geographical distribution of organisations which receive support from the NA or GDYS, youth services have not reached all parts of Turkey. Ankara, which hosts both NA and GDYS, comes across as the most advantaged in this sense. There are no support systems such as information and capacity building schemes aimed at introducing these opportunities to more young people and especially to those who reside in disadvantaged regions of the country. One of the fundamental reasons for the insufficiency of existing opportunities is the insufficiency of existing budgets. Furthermore, as strongly indicated by the geographical distribution of donations and projects, there is much to improve in terms of the transfer of existing capacity to disadvantaged cities.

Aside from the resources of the National Agency, almost all youth work in Turkey seems to lack an international dimension. Any future official undertaking for international cooperation in the youth field, such as a protocol, will not only help internationalise the institution of

youth work in Turkey, but also enable the field in Turkey to contribute to youth work in other countries. This is clearly exemplified by indicators and statistics ensuing from the protocol between Turkey and Germany.

Rights and responsibilities as they are defined in Youth Associations' registration law are biased towards protecting the interests of the state. This is one of the most important impediments to the official registration of many youth organisations. It is possible to make improvements in the registration process, but annulling the said law altogether would significantly open up the field of youth work. Furthermore, the obligation to provide services to all institutions working with youth would allow DYS to improve itself in relation to other institutions.

The criteria by which youth organisations are entitled to services are already becoming transparent by virtue of the Right to Information Act. Online publication of some statistics on youth services is a good practice, however, there does not seem to be an attempt to complete the missing data. Addressing these omissions will help improve the lack of trust between civil and public spheres.

In Turkey, the links between many programmes operated by public institutions that provide youth work services are not made clear to the youth. Keeping these programmes disconnected will only aggravate the existing constraints on young people's self-development opportunities. However, it is possible to achieve significant progress with simple protocols which are likely to have large multiplier impact.

As this discussion suggests, there are many ways in which the state can contribute to the recognition, development and proliferation of youth work which will in turn be instrumental in making Turkey a more democratic society. The provision of these opportunities by public institutions –on the basis of rights of citizens vis-à-vis the state- will lead to a succession of developments in the civil sphere. The point here is not that actors in the civil sphere should undertake that which the state will not or cannot do, but rather that the civil sphere should form pressure and advocacy groups that will urge the state to properly fulfil its duties. It will be mistaken to assume that civil society can ever have sufficient power, resources, energy and initiative for carrying out all that needs to be done. Civil society only has the power and capacity to create social change via its service and advocacy efforts.

References

ABGS: Secretariat General for EU Affairs (Avrupa Birliği Genel Sekreterliği) (2005) Analytical examination of the acquis Chapter 26 – Education and culture, Turkey Country session 16.11.2005 http://www.abgs.gov.tr/files/tarama/tarama_files/26/SC26DET_Youth.pdf

Certel, E. and Kurtaran, Y. "Youth Policies Across Europe" in Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008).

DYS: Department of Youth Services (Gençlik Hizmetleri Dairesi Başkanlığı) (2006a) *Uluslararası İlişkiler Faaliyet Kitabı* (Book of International Relations Activities), Ankara.

DYS (2006b) "2006 Mali Yılı Bütçesinden Gençlik Kulüplerine Yapılan Yardımla İlgili Genel Esaslar" (Information on Aid Granted to Youth Clubs as Part of the 2006 Annual Budget), DYS, Ankara.

DYS (2007a) "Gençlik Sosyal Gelişim Programı Tanıtım dokümanı" (Youth Social Development Programme Publicity Document), Ankara.

DYS (2007b) "2006-2007 Yılı Faaliyetleri" (2006-2007 Annual Activities), Ankara.

DYS (2007c) "Gençlik Kampları 2002-2006 Yılları Sayısal Verileri" (2002-2006 Quantitative Data for Youth Camps), Ankara.

DYS (2008) "2005-2007 Gençlik Merkezleri Verileri" (2005-2007 Data for Youth Centres), Youth Centres Branch, Ankara.

European Commission (2007) Programme Guide, European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, Youth in Action Programme 2007-2010, Brussels.

GAP: Southeastern Anatolia Project (Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi) (2007) "GAP Bölge Kalkınma İdaresi Başkanlığı 2006 Yılı Faaliyet Raporu" (GAP Regional Development Administration 2006 Annual Activity Report), Prime Ministry, Ankara.

GDYS: General Directorate for Youth and Sports (Gençlik ve Spor Genel Müdürlüğü) (2004) "Gençlik ve Spor Kulüpleri Yönetmeliği Doğrultusunda 2004 Yılı Bütçesinden Yardım Alan Gençlik Kulüpleri ve Yardım Miktarları" (Grants Given to Youth Clubs from the 2004 Budget in Accordance with the Statute on Youth and Sports Clubs), www.genclikhizmetleri.gov.tr

GDYS (2005) "Gençlik ve Spor Kulüpleri Yönetmeliği Doğrultusunda 2005 Yılı Bütçesinden Yardım Alan Gençlik Kulüpleri ve Yardım Miktarları" (Grants Given to Youth Clubs from the 2004 Budget in Accordance with the Statute on Youth and Sports Clubs), www.genclikhizmetleri.gov.tr

GDYS (2006) "Gençlik ve Spor Kulüpleri Yönetmeliği Doğrultusunda 2006 Yılı Bütçesinden Yardım Alan Gençlik Kulüpleri ve Yardım Miktarları" (Grants Given to Youth Clubs from the 2006 Budget in Accordance with the Statute on Youth and Sports Clubs), www.genclikhizmetleri.gov.tr

GDYS (2007a) "2006 Faaliyet Raporu" (2006 Activity Report), Prime Ministry, Ankara.

GDYS (2007b) "Gençlik ve Spor Kulüpleri Yönetmeliği Doğrultusunda 2007 Yılı Bütçesinden Yardım Alan Gençlik Kulüpleri ve Yardım Miktarları" (Grants Given to Youth Clubs from the 2007 Budget in Accordance with the Statute on Youth and Sports Clubs), www.genclikhizmetleri.gov.tr

Gramsci, Antonio (1971) *Selection from the Prison Notebooks*, Lawrence & Wishart, London.

NA: National Agency (2007) "Etki Değerlendirmesi Eğitmenler, Liderler ve Potansiyel Yararlanıcılar ile Toplantılar Raporu" (Impact Assessment Report on Meetings with Trainers, Leaders and Potential Beneficiaries) 25 April-6 May 2007, Ankara.

SPO: State Planning Office (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı) (2007) "2006/11105 Sayılı 16 Ekim 2006 Tarihli 2007 Yılı Programının Uygulanması, Koordinasyonu ve İzlenmesine Dair Bakanlar Kurulu kararı Eki" (Annual Programme 2007: Appendix to the Council of Ministers Decree on the Application, Coordination and Monitoring of the 2007 Annual Programme no. 2006/11105 dated 16 October 2006), *Official Gazette*, no. 26324, 19 October 2006.

SPO (2006) "IX. Kalkınma Programı Çocuk ve Gençlik İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu" (9th Development Programme Report by Special Commission on Children and Youth), Ankara.

Wallerstein, I. Arrighi, G. and Hopkins, T.K. (1989) *Antisystemic Movements*, Verso, London.

World Bank (2005) Japan Social Development Fund Grant Proposal, World Bank.

Yentürk, Kurtaran, Nemutlu (eds.) (2008) Türkiye'de Gençlik Çalışması ve Politikaları, (*Youth Work and Policy in Turkey),* Istanbul Bilgi University Publishing House, Istanbul.

YSDP: Youth Social Development Programme (Gençlik Sosyal Gelişim Programı) and DYS (2007) "Gençlik Çalışmasında İdari Yapılanma ve Gençliğin Yetkilendirilmesi ve Gençlik Merkezleri" (Administrative Structuring and Youth Empowerment in Youth Work and Youth Centres), Ankara.

YSDP (2008) "GSGP Paket Eğitimleri Değerlendirmeleri" (Assessment of YSDP Training Packages), Ankara.

Yurttagüler, L. (2007) "Young People and Youth Policies: Workfare or Welfare", mimeo, Istanbul Bilgi University

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT IN TURKEY- A Summary of Policy Proposals[Υ]

Nurhan Yentürk and Cem Başlevent

Introduction

Turkey's youth population is faced with the serious problems of the lack of education, poverty, and social exclusion. These problems not only have many dimensions that could not simply be attributed to lack of motivation and skills, but they are also ones that can not be overcome with the provision of employment opportunities alone due to the prevalency of poverty among the employed, unregistered employment, and difficult working conditions. On the other hand, young people also have to deal with social problems resulting from a wide range sources such as intolerance towards the exploration of new cultures and identities and the absence of localities such as youth centres where they can socialize, find opportunities for self-expression and self-development. With these points in mind, we still believe that the dimension of the un-employment of Turkish youth is an important factor aggravating other problems.

Problems that the youth are faced with are also high on the agendas of international organizations. The World Bank has chosen "Development and the Next Generation" as the theme of its 2007 World Development Report. Along with unemployment, the report deals with the issues of poverty, health, family formation, and becoming a citizen. Today there are over 1 billion people between the ages of 15 and 24, and about ninety percent of these people live in devepoling countries. While 657 million are labor force participants, 85 are unemployed (www.ilo.org/youth). Close to 300 million, in other words about half, of the employed young people are categorized as "employed poor" (ILO, 2006a).

Widespread problems of the employed young people such as temporary employment, employment without social insurance, as well as the low rates of labor force participation have led to the collaboration of the UN, World Bank, and ILO to form the "Youth Employment Network" (ILO, 2006b) . In 2006, Turkey has made a pledge to join the network in an effort to create employment opportunities for the youth people (www.ilo.org/yen).

[Υ] This is the summary of the paper entitled "Youth Unemployment in Turkey" by the same authors. For the full paper, references, tables and graphs please see:
http://genclik.bilgi.edu.tr/Default.asp?pageID=5)

However, so far Turkey has not a youth employment strategy wich is developed with the participation of the stakeholders.

There are only a few studies that deal with the dynamics of unemployment in Turkey. Also amoung them few studies have addressed the issue of youth unemployment to some extent. The purpose of the present study is to generate a profile of the unemployed youth, to comment on how this differs from adult unemployment, and to contribute to the development of the employment policies with an approach known as "meanstreaming youth". Mainstreaming youth, which means that all strategies and measures have to be checked for their impacts on young people, is part of the many policies discussed in "White Paper on Youth" (http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11055.htm). We consider that mainstreaming youth could be a part of the empowerment of young people for active citizenship, autonomy, active participation to the policy and decision making processes.

In the paper, we first examine youth unemployment by age groups, gender, regions, level of education to shed light on who are the young unemployed. In the second part of the paper, we make use of econometric techniques to investigate the link between the general conditions in the economy and in the labor market and youth unemployment. We also deal with labor force participation rates, reasons for staying out of the labor force, as well as the sectoral composition of youth employment to shed light on demand side factors. We do not, however, aim to address all aspects of labor demand such as youth labor costs.

a. Who are the Young Unemployed?
The extent of youth unemployment:
- As in many other countries, youth unemployment in Turkey has been persistent and youth unemployment rates have been above the rates for the economy at large. According to 2006 figures, the unemployment rate for the 15 to 24 age group is 20 percent whereas the rate for the 15+ age group is around 11 percent.

- Among the young population, the 20-24 age group has the highest unemployment rate. The reason must be that this subgroup comprises mainly of those who have just completed their education and have little or no working experience. Naturally, it takes these young people some time to find the job that matches their skills and to accept the market wage rate.

- When non-agricultural unemployment figures for 2006 are considered, we find that the adult unemployment rate is 13 percent; the rate for the 15-19 age group is 22.5 percent, and the rate for the 20-24 age group is 23.8 percent. These figures reconfirm the urgent need to pursue the economic and social policies that would mitigate the problem of youth employment.

Males vs. females:

- The gender differences are such that young females are doing much worse than their male counterparts in terms of unemployment rates. In 2006, the non-agricultural unemployment rate of young females stood around 28 percent. Furthermore, the fact that the unemployment rate figures for the youth have persistently been twice as large as those for the adults indicates that not much has been done to cure this problem. Therefore, designing policies that intend to reduce unemployment and including gender perspective to those policies are in urgent need.

The educated vs. the uneducated:

- As a result of improvments in educational attainment, the new entrants to the labor force have more years of schooling than the average worker already in the labor force. While these young people could provide the human capital to sectors that demand skilled labor, they may also find themselves among the unemployed masses if these sectors do not achieve the growth rates that would necessitate their input. In Turkey, university graduates make up nearly one-fifth of the unemployed in the 20-24 age group. Education decreases the risk of unemployment in the long run. In the short run, apparently, steps need to be taken to make it easier these people to make the transition from school to work such as making sure that there is a consistency between the skills acquied at school and the skills required at workplaces.

- One problem with the education system in Turkey is that universities continue to produce large numbers of graduates in fields that are no longer in high demand in the labor market. On the other hand, as suggested by the Board of Higher Education, there is an urgent need to improve the vocational education system and to make it better integrated with the labor market; possibly in cooperation with the proposed "National Institute for Vocational Standards".

Urban vs. rural areas:

- Employment opportunities of Turkish youth also differ by the size of area. While, as expected, employment rates do not depend on the level of education in rural areas, educated

women (20-29 age group), residing in urban locations have larger rates than less educated women. Education decrease the unemployment rate of young women work force living in the urban areas.

- Due to the transformation of the economy from agriculture to services and industry, there is substantial migration from rural to urban areas. As a result, unemployment rates are quite higher in urban areas which is true for the young population as well as for the general population. One way of reducing the flow of immigrants to urban areas could be developing employment generating strategies (not necessarily in agriculture sector) in rural areas. These would also act as poverty reduction policies targeted at young workers with no social insurance who are categorized as "unpaid family workers".

Vocational trainees & applicants to employment agencies:
- Turkey needs to carry out a reform in its educational system to increase the demand for vocational schools. Such a reform would also have to involve demand side policies that generate more jobs for those graduating from vocational schools.

- After formal education opportunites for young people provided by various public institutions and municipalities should be increased and young people could also be encouraged to take advantage of life-long training and second chance trainings for early school leavers.

-Policies aimed at improving the labor market situation of young people need to be institutionalized. Employment agencies and counselling centers those exclusively serve young people need to be established. These agencies will also help to engourage applications from discouraged and disadvantaged youth.

Disadvantaged youth:
- Turkey ranks very low with respect to the three basic indicators of disadvantaged youth, namely unemployment, early drop-out from schooling, and youth poverty. In light of available data, there are up to 170.000 disadvantaged youths in the 15-24 age group.

-"Youth centers" need to be established to contribute to the social inclusion of young people. The contribution of youth centers could be empowerment of young people in several subjects such as expressing themselves as active citizens, improving their indivudual skills social and

networking skills, self development and autonomy, increasing social political participation. The empowerment of young people should not be labor-market driven and not only consist of projiding necesseray skills for "the transition" from youth to work. But also should provide space to young people for the enhancement of their terms of self-relization and for a chance of self development and self-expression.

-These centers could be funded in part by international institutions and also by the private sector, NGO's, and universities. Main financial support could be received from municipalities and the unemployment insurance fund. Another opportunity is to decrease the budget primary surplus. Creation of employment opportunities by private and public sectors will not be enough for solving the young unemployment problem. There is a necessity to discuss youth unemployment together with the social protection and social funds.

b. Some Determinants of Youth Unemployment
Relationship Between Youth and Adult Unemployment
- Our econometric work reveals that general conditions of the labor market do a good job of predicting the outcomes for the subgroup of young labor force participants. Therefore, discussions on labor market policies also have important implications for the young people. There are different view among economists when it comes to labor market policies, Those are related to a wide range of issues such as how flexible the labor market should be, how stringent the conditions to be able to benefit from unemployment insurance should be. Although the turkish labor market could be considered as rigid in terms of regulations, in practice there are many flexibilities such as unregistered employment which usually work against young workers who do not have much bargaining power.

- If the government could make reductions on budget surplus targets agreed upon with the IMF, the additional sources could be directed at improving the conditions of young workers and future labor market participants.

- During the past decade, the phenomenon of financial liberalization has had great impact on political, economic, and cultural events worldwide. The most important adverse effect on the economies of some developing countries including Turkey has been a decline in their competitiveness in industrial production and accumulation due to the overvalued currencies.

As it is proposed by international NGOs and international institutions, global taxes from financial gains can be helpfull to combat youth unemployment and poverty.

-One of the empirical findings is that the relative cohort size of the youth population is related with the unemployment rate for this group. However, since demographic projections predict that the relative cohort size will not go down in the near future, we should not expect that the problem will eventually solve itself.

Labor Force Participation

- As a result of the improvement in educational attainment, there has been a marked decline in the participation rates for the 15-19 age group over the past decade. The trend is more clearcut in the case of women.

For the population in general, the participation rate of Turkish women is around 15 percent only if agricultural employment is disregarded. The corresponding rate for the 20-29 age group is 25 percent. On the other hand, it should be noted that, in urban areas, labor force participation rates of women is positive related to the level of education. Therefore, we expect that the participation rates of the 20-29 age group will continue to rise as they have had since the 1980's.

- If the participation rates of the youth increase in the future as expected, this change should go hand in hand with increases in educational attainment and productivity. Otherwise, higher participation rates alone would lead to more unemployment and consequently further social insecurity.

- Immigration from rural to urban areas will tend to increase labor force participation. it is important to make plans to establish institutions and training centers where young people from the agriculture sectors, can develop the skills and qualities that the labor market would require.

- As far as the urban female youth with little education is concerned, we can note that they have low rates of participation and that the participants are mainly employed in the informal sector. The number of informal sector workers and those involved in home-based economic activities could potentially rise a lot higher considering the ongoing migration from rural

areas. Therefore, it would make sense to design policies that aim to protect the social rights of these young women.

Youth's Reasons for not Working

- In urban areas, while 13 percent of adult women describe themselves as "working", 90 percent of the non-employed state that they are not working because they are housewives. This scenario applies also to the 20-29 age group while in the 15-19 age group the main reason for non-participation is being in school.

- Of the young women residing in rural areas, 86 percent are classified as unpaid family workers. The figure is similar for adult women. Rural men, on the other hand, are more likely to become self-employed and get social insurance as they get older. Taking into consideration that rural women have no social security, one could argue that these people make up the most dependent segment of the society, and they are not likely to get a chance to be a part of the society as autonomous individuals.

Sectoral Composition of Youth Employment

- Seventy percent of the urban adult employment is in services. While about 24 percent are employed in industry, the remaining 5 percent are in agriculture. When the young population is examined by age subgroups, we find that both males and females tend to move from industry to services.

- In rural areas, 30 percent of males in the 20-29 age group are employed in services and 10 percent are in industry. Since these figures are lower among the adult work force, we note that the young population is leaving agriculture at a faster rate.

- We found that young people are overrepresented in subsectors such as textiles-apparel and hotels-restaurants which do not require only high skill levels.

-To improve the employment opportunities of the young people, regulations and taxation schemes can be adopted so that part-time work is a more commonly used option by the employers. Policies that encourage the employment of young people in social services and high-tech sectors such as communications can also be implemented.

- In Turkey, there is a need for more public and private institutions which will provide training, consuling and financial assistance for young people to improve their skills, and to support the opportunites for self-empoyment and entrepreneurship. Currently, there are only a few NGO's dedicated to these purposes.

How common is unregistered employment among the youth?

- Unregistered employment (i.e. employment in the informal sector with no social security) is more common among young workers compared to adults.

- Policies need to be designed to ensure that young workers are placed under the umbrella of the social security system when they first enter the labor force as interns, trainees, or part-time workers

- Reduction in the employment level is likely to be an undesirable consequence of combatting unregistered employment especially for young workers. Therefore, policies that aim to bring more workers into the formal sector should be designed so that additional costs to employers are minimized.

- The developments in the global economic system have led to growth in sectors in which unregistered employment is prevalent. Along with the implementation of active labor force policies, social security systems should be modified so that disadvantaged groups such as those in temporary, seasonal, and home based employment will be also eligible for basic health services, retirement plans, and unemployment insurance.

The impact of economic growth on youth employment

- Our econometric analysis revealed that the impact of economic growth is different for the adults and young people. Therefore, we contend that employment-friendly growth policies will have different effects on young population than the labor force in general.

- While growth has a positive impact on employment, labor costs have the opposite effect. In Turkey, employment taxes are particularly high. To impose different tax rates across age groups should be considered as policy in order to encourage the employment of inexperienced young workers.