

*A case study from*

Reducing Poverty, Sustaining Growth—What Works, What Doesn't, and Why  
A Global Exchange for Scaling Up Success

Scaling Up Poverty Reduction: A Global Learning Process and Conference  
Shanghai, May 25–27, 2004

# **Turkey: Rapid Coverage for Compulsory Education— The 1997 Basic Education Program**

Author:

Ilhan Dulger  
ilhan\_dulger@hotmail.com

Contact Information:  
Ebuzziya Tevfik Sokak 9/2  
Çankaya, Ankara, Turkey  
+(90)312 439-3841  
idulger@dpt.gov.tr

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed here are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Board of Executive Directors of the World Bank or the governments they represent. The World Bank cannot guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work.

Copyright © 2004. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / THE WORLD BANK  
All rights reserved. The material in this work is copyrighted. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or inclusion in any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the World Bank. The World Bank encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission promptly.

## **Executive Summary**

During the 1990s the Turkish government felt it needed to address the high inflation, deteriorating standard of living, worsening income distribution, and appearance of a poverty-stricken population. It sought a specific, concrete, cost-effective solution that would directly address the needs and concerns of the least advantaged. There was consensus that education should be one of the first objectives.

Since the early 1970s successive governments of Turkey have sought to extend the amount of compulsory education provided to all children to eight years from five years, and to expand coverage to 100 percent of school-age children. But they experienced difficulty covering the last segment of the target population, children ages 11–13. The breakthrough came with the passage of a law in 1997 that introduced a new eight-year compulsory education system. This law was buttressed by substantial new funding, which financed additional infrastructure and human resources to replace a system consisting of five-year primary schools and three-year lower secondary schools with one consisting of eight-year primary schools.

The government also created incentives to encourage all families to send their children to school, and it carried out a variety of other initiatives to address social, economic, and cultural factors that affect many segments of the public. While many of these efforts succeeded in persuading some parents to comply with the law, others backfired, and some succeeded for unanticipated reasons.

Total annual expenditures to date—including all investment and recurrent costs, plus private donations and loans that directly support primary education—are estimated at more than \$3 billion annually. In the first four years of the program, the government spent nearly \$2 billion more than envisioned in its development plan to accelerate the construction and rehabilitation of school buildings, provide new educational materials and equipment, and recruit additional teachers. As a result, enrollment in grades one through eight increased by over 1.1 million students, raising the net enrollment ratio from 85.63 percent in 1997 to 96.30 percent in 2002. Enrollment of girls in rural areas made particularly impressive gains, increasing by 160 percent in the first year of the program alone in the nine provinces (out of 81) with the greatest gender disparity.

The government's strategy focused heavily on construction. Almost 104,000 new primary classrooms were built, creating additional capacity for more than three million basic education students. Over 70,000 new primary school teachers have been recruited since 1997. In order to improve access for children in rural areas, a variety of special schemes, including bussing, the establishments of boarding schools, consolidation or closure of some village schools, were implemented. Students from low-income families receive free textbooks and school meals.

In order to provide a strong incentive for students to continue their education into sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, the government abolished the traditional diploma that had been awarded at the end of the fifth grade, replacing it with a diploma for successful completion of the

eighth grade. This was a significant move since many students and their families view gaining primary education diplomas as critical to joining the workforce. With the adoption of a uniform eight-year primary education program, the government canceled all vocational and religious electives, a move which upset many religious and poor families. Changing the apprenticeship age from 12 to 15 years not only postponed the child's ability to earn money but also removed other benefits, including legal and insurance security, that had been provided under the student-apprentice program.

The Rapid Coverage for Compulsory Education Program, with its special provisions for poor children, was Turkey's largest poverty alleviation program. The program was designed and implemented during a period of severe economic crises and short-lived coalition governments. Given the economic and political instability, the government chose to take a "big bang" approach to education reform, believing that reform could be overturned or its financing cut if it tried to take the time to build coalitions, develop quality-enhancing components of the program, or undertake complementary steps designed to assuage different interest groups and populations. The rapid approach brought fast action. Moreover, the intensity of the government's effort awakened a spirit of contribution from large segments of the public. The program unexpectedly generated substantial donations from the private sector. Rising enrollment and the construction of long-awaited facilities helped push Turkish education to higher standards. And since education is one of the main instruments of social mobility in Turkish society, it produced important social benefits. Children living in poorer urban suburbs and rural areas, especially girls in rural areas, gained the most, as increased educational opportunities opened the doors to better jobs, higher incomes, and enhanced welfare. In the long run, the positive effect of longer years of education on individual and socioeconomic development and on poverty alleviation will be seen more and more.

In taking a "big bang" approach, however, the government missed opportunities to make incremental changes that could have supported reform. More careful planning for utilization of the additional funds and existing infrastructure could have saved the reform effort from becoming too unidimensional, and could have directed some attention and resources towards addressing qualitative and organizational issues, such as the need for incentives and support for teacher development, reorganization of the central ministry structure and its related general directorates, empowerment of the local authorities and school administrations, curricula revision, and higher quality standards. Today, the new one-party government (elected at the end of 2003), which unlike many other administrations has a broad popular basis, has a tremendous opportunity to transform the Rapid Coverage for Compulsory Education Program into a more democratic, and more comprehensive package of reforms. For the first time, education spending will exceed the defense budget; the Ministry of National Education's budget represent 3.07 percent of GNP.

The lesson from Turkey, in short, is that equity-oriented policy reforms in the education sector can be successfully launched using a bold "big bang" model, but that efforts to achieve social inclusion and involve stakeholders are needed to assure the institutional, social, and economic sustainability of the effort.

## Program Description<sup>1</sup>

The main goal of Turkey's 1997 8-Year Basic Education Program was fundamentally to expand opportunities for all children to attend school in grades 1 through 8, attract children to the schools, and to encourage them to stay in school to complete at least the eighth grade. In particular, the Program had the objective of enrolling the remaining 35 percent of the hardest to reach students. In order to avoid frightening more reluctant students away, the Program did not impose sanctions on the families of children who were unable to attend with regular frequency.

The Program was conceived in the broader context of government strategies to improve conditions of the poor. Government supported the Program as a way of enhancing social cohesion through reduction of economic disparities and social inequalities. Largely due to economic reasons, some school age children in rural areas as well as in urban slums (gecekondü) did not attend school and girls enrollments were much lower than boys. In particular, Government policy analyses (DPT 1995 VIIth Plan) concluded that rural children were among the most disadvantaged of demographic groups, with rural girl children suffering the most. There are a number of reasons why it has been difficult to increase enrollment of girls in Turkey. In some closed villages and in some localities where tribal relations still prevail, suppressed female roles persist. For perceived safety or morality issues, girls are denied the right to education. Nonetheless, over time, populations in rural villages had become accustomed to five-year compulsory primary schooling. Unfortunately, the age at which girls would attend lower-secondary school coincides with the age of puberty, especially for those who enrolled late in primary school or who repeated one or more grades. In locations where the beginning of reproductive age is coupled with the expectation by the family that their girls would marry, schooling is seen as a danger.

The Basic Education Law required that, as of 1998, all children who completed the fifth grade would continue through the eighth grade. More generally, the law required that all of the 6.9 million children who were currently enrolled in grades 1 through 5, and all children who started school in the future would remain in school through completion of the eighth grade. The Law did not require that children of basic-education age who had already left school return to school, but it was expected that many who had left would do so. The Government introduced an open basic education program, using distance learning methods, to provide core basic education skills to young people over 15 years old who had dropped out of basic education.

Extending the duration of compulsory education from five to eight years and reducing crowding in existing schools would require a major expansion of school capacity -- particularly for grades 6 through 8. Ministry of National Education estimated that 14.2 percent of the basic-school-age population -- a total of 1.5 million children -- was not attending school. In most urban

---

<sup>1</sup> See annex 1 for the definitions of common education administration terms used in Turkey and, consequently, in this case study, including for basic education, primary education, compulsory education, formal education, non-formal education, lower-secondary education, and upper-secondary education.

areas, school attendance was constrained primarily by inadequate classroom capacity, and inadequate numbers of teachers. In rural areas, primary schools (grades 1 through 5) were generally available, but a beneficiary assessment done in the Eastern and Southeastern provinces found that school attendance in those regions was constrained by household poverty, public perceptions that educational quality in village schools was low, and parents' unwillingness to send their children-particularly, their daughters-to schools outside the village. Some rural classes also lacked teachers, and almost all rural schools suffered from frequent teacher turnover because of the isolation and difficult teaching and living conditions in remote, rural schools. Some schools in the East and Southeast had been closed because of security risks, but many of these schools were being reopened as secure conditions were restored. In rural areas, there was a widespread shortage of capacity in the upper grades of basic education (grades 6 through 8), and parents often could not afford to send their children away to school.

To address the classroom constraint, the Ministry proposed to construct nearly 3,900 new basic education schools, and to add 15,300 classrooms to existing schools. Schools would also be designed to accommodate handicapped children.

To address the teacher constraint, the Ministry planned to recruit an additional 150,000 teachers and inspectors for basic education schools, and to improve the attractiveness of rural schools by upgrading teacher housing, and providing better financial incentives for teachers in hardship areas. It also planned to experiment with teacher recruitment and assignment policies-which were currently administered centrally-to identify more effective and efficient ways to deploy teachers in basic education schools.

The Program aimed to address these demand constraints to basic education by visibly raising the quality of basic education, providing material incentives to children from poor households the form of free school meals, student uniforms, and textbooks, and improving the incentives for teaching couples to teach in rural schools.

The extensive improvements to rural teacher housing which were planned under the Program were expected to make an important contribution to attracting and retaining qualified teachers in village schools. Beyond this, improved cash incentives were being provided for teachers who serve in the most remote and poorly equipped provinces. Under the information technology activities in the Program, the Ministry also intended to develop an interactive system of professional support for teachers, which was expected to reduce the sense of professional isolation which affects many teachers in village schools. To help overcome the handicap of low household income, the Ministry provided special assistance, including free uniforms and textbooks, to children in schools in low-income areas, and developed a strategy which would address their special educational needs.

## **Rationale and Objectives of the Program**

Shortly after the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the government instituted the first education law -- "Law for Consolidation of Instruction. This law nationalized the four pathways for schooling; public, religious, private, and foreign schools were all nationalized and

brought under the Ministry of National Education (MONE), and a national curriculum was introduced. Until today, all schooling continues to be managed and controlled by MONE.

Five-year primary education was compulsory from the very beginning of the Turkish Republic. The subsequent three-year schooling period, previously referred to as lower secondary education, was accepted to be compulsory in 1961. In 1972-1973, the enrollment rate in five-year primary schools was 89.6 percent, and that of three-year middle schools was 34.3 percent (MEB 2001,P.24). In 1973, the Basic Law for National Education (Law: 1739) redefined basic education as comprising 8 years, and declared that this would be compulsory. Unfortunately, the government proved unable to enforce the mandate for compulsory education for different reasons, including lack of facilities and teachers. The 1973 Law was amended in 1983 to require compulsory enrollment wherever the physical infrastructure was in place.

In time, the universalization of compulsory education gained a certain momentum. By 1996, the first five-year primary enrollment reached 96.68 percent coverage, while the enrollment rate for lower-secondary schooling climbed slowly but steadily to 64.73 percent. It was against this background that the government introduced the 1997 Basic Education Plan and Law.

### **Objectives of the Basic Education Project**

The Rapid Coverage for Basic Education Project had as its main objective to provide all children with continuous 8-year schooling. Continuing schooling has been shown to be closely associated with family income – those earning more can afford to give their children the time and resources to pursue education. Even when there are no school fees, the poorest confront many economic barriers to maintaining their children in school,. National Planning Organization analyses indicated that those in the last 35 percent segment -- the hardest to reach – were from poor villages and from poorer suburbs of the metropolitan areas. Also, in certain provinces gender issues posed a major problem.

The objectives of the Compulsory 8-Year Primary Education included:

- To bring the compulsory education level in Turkey to universal standards
- To develop primary education schools as social learning centers
- To enhance the physical infrastructure quality level in primary education
  - Constructing new school building with the required facilities
  - Renovating old school buildings
  - Increasing the number of classrooms in old and new buildings
  - Increasing the capacity of activity rooms and public areas in every school
  - Increasing the capacity of extension facilities in boarding school
  - Meeting the equipment and tool shortages of buildings and facilities.

The Primary Education Project was supported by the 1997 Eight-Year Compulsory Education Enforcement Law (Law no. 4306). Among the more important provisions in this law was the establishment of a temporary set of earmarked taxes targeted to finance the expansion of schooling. These new taxes raised US\$2 billion in new revenues to support the construction of new schools, the hiring of new teachers, and the provision of educational materials to new students.

In order to provide a strong incentive for students to continue their education into 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade, the Primary School Diploma was abolished for 5<sup>th</sup> grade completers. The Government now offered a Basic Education Completers Diploma. The significance of this is that the Primary School Diploma is the key to any future in Turkey, and thus is viewed by students and their families as critical to joining the workforce.

## **Implementation Challenges**

### **Program Design Issues**

#### **The Controversy Over the New Law**

One of the main implementation issues was the controversy that surrounded the Law. First, the Law was difficult for the public to comprehend since it is not exactly a clearly specified set of articles and provisions as in a typical piece of legislation. In fact, the new law was a series of amendments and modifications to previous laws, making interpretation and analysis by the lay public complex to say the least. Second, in a manner not uncommon in Turkey, the legislation was prepared by a small group of ministry administrators with no public consultation or debate. In fact, it has been argued in the press that some members of Parliament were playing a double game with the legislation to further their agendas under the umbrella of the law. Once the Law was approved, the Ministry of National Education administration did not make an effort to promulgate it. Consequently, there was a strong degree of questioning and even opposition to the Law; the Minister and the Prime Minister were caught off guard by these reactions. These problems created a negative attitude with respect to the Law. The Ministry of Education, usually gaining a high score for trustworthiness in public opinion polls, met with looks of contempt.

Previous to the enactment of the Law, lower secondary (6-8 grades) exhibited some degree of differentiation, including the presence of religiously oriented elective formal education programs offered to 5-year primary graduates (about 38,000 students were enrolled in these of programs). The controversy was that some bureaucrats took advantage of the new legislation to abolish together with the elective formal programs of the Ministry the non-formal courses run by the Religious Affairs Center, with the approval of the Ministry of National Education, for children who had completed the five-year primary cycle by requiring all of these students to attend also formal school for an additional three years as part of their 8-year compulsory education programs. Many religious parents did not like this change because they realized that this meant their children would not be given religious instruction outside of their home until after 14 years of age, for in Turkey no private or religious foundation schools are permitted by the

Ministry, where families can send their children to receive a desired level of religious instruction. Many parents complained about their children could only be given religious education through illegally run (non-MONE approved) courses.

The controversy surrounding the new law naturally provoked a big debate. The religious education issue stimulated the largest debates, even among secular-oriented groups. The Government reacted to quell the outpouring of criticism by trying to prove that the Law was not just targeting religious electives, but closed down all vocational skills courses at the lower secondary level (that is, in the last three years of the new 8-year Primary Education cycle) and the student- apprenticeship scheme. This converted the old middle schools' program to a uniform, standard instruction form, which eliminates all individual, regional and industry needs. But this upset poor families because they wanted their children to enter work immediately after compulsory education.

The Law also changed the student-apprenticeship age from 12 to 15 years. The education-industry collaboration for dual training, which could happily be organized after years of preparation (MEB 1986) collapsed. This caused a negative reaction from small and medium-sized enterprises, which have a tradition of on-the-job apprenticeship training for the continuation of their businesses. Their argument was that the second phase of 8-year primary education is not being functional thus leading students to seek upper secondary education. This new implementation will dry out the supply of apprentices. Plus, every industry deals with a different level of technology; it is the legal duty of education to create appropriate solutions for basic skills and vocational training and for passages to life for further training in industry, and the Ministry was accused of blocking the way of SMEs.

These polemics may have done harm to the Law and the Program, and made government unpopular contributing to the loss of November 2002 elections for all the political parties of the coalition government.

### **The Quality of the Educational Content**

The curriculum base for the new, comprehensive primary education program was the 1968 national curriculum (the last comprehensive curriculum upgrade), although with some minor adjustments were made. In other words, the primary education curriculum was joined with the existing lower-secondary general education curriculum, started foreign language teaching at the 4<sup>th</sup> grade (without sufficient number of language teachers), cancelled all vocational and religion course electives thus making it a standard package for all and called it the 8-Year Primary Education School Curriculum. It can be concluded that there was inattention to the quality of the educational content and to the democratic method. The reason for this was that Ministry wished to implement the finance and administrative dimensions of the Program as quickly as possible while a supportive coalition government was in power, so did not want to wait for the relatively slow Board of Education procedures to review and upgrade the national curriculum for constructing a program appropriate for the needs of all Turkish children from the first through the eighth grades.



On the other hand, a new implementation philosophy was adopted for compulsory education. The traditional selective-eliminative assessment method of formal education was interpreted as leading to an unhealthy competition among students and to a lot of students to be labeled as failures. Furthermore, the situation worked against children from low socio-economic levels (MEB-Baskent Univ. 2002, p. 8). The school's function is defined as a medium for helping the children to gain the necessary basics according to their abilities. Disciplinary punishment was eliminated and personal counseling is adopted. Class failures were almost eliminated. This positive approach requires a thorough review of the curriculum, teaching methods and in-service training for teachers. To reach healthy results will take some time. For the time being, there is strong criticism from the teachers about declining effectiveness of education and the loss of teacher's value.

### **The Eight-Year Primary Education School (PES)**

After the passing of the 8-Year Compulsory Education law in 1997, the Ministry took the rejected idea of uniting the two levels of education in the same buildings. The State Planning Organization warned that there would not be enough available funds for this kind of approach and asked to go back to the proposal of putting the two levels of education under one administration which would facilitate the use of all available school buildings in a certain district. With the spirit of the day, the Ministry chose to rely on the earmarked taxes of Law 4603 and initiated a new school construction campaign.

In 1996-1997, there were 1,1 million children, including 780,000 age group girls, that needed to be enrolled in middle schools. The total number of schools in the two levels was 56,143. For unification purposes, by the year 2000, of the village schools 20,078 were closed down, decreasing the total number of school buildings by % 35. In the meantime, by way of accepting students who have passed the age of school on time, the number of students had increased by % 10, and the 345,141 teachers had increased by % 17 (MEB 2001 p. 16-18).

**Preschool Class:** The one-year preschool class in the primary schools was being tested for a long time since 1973 and it is scaled-up to cover age 5 group. Its aim is to help developmental needs of the children and to pave the way to easier primary schooling. "The importance of preschool education is realized in Turkey (MEB-Baskent Univ. 2002 b. p.160). However, its coverage could reach only % 17, due to needs of building separate classrooms and assigning special teachers. The plan to expand its coverage starting from disadvantaged villages, settlements and regions need to be speeded up (MEB-DPT 1996 a,b,d.)

**Double-Shift Education:** In 2000-2001 school year % 22 of the 36,064 primary education schools were applying double-shift education. In the provinces, this ratio was % 45 while it was % 13 in the villages, (MEB 2001 p.17). The Education Master Plan 1996-2010 aims to eliminate this practice by half until 2003, and totally by 2010. (MEB-DPT b, p.23). By its Primary Education Project, the Ministry is planning to create 121,500 extra classes in order to reduce double-shift education and the class-section size average in cities from 38,4 in 1996-1997 to 30 by 2003-2004. However, due to the unforeseen new policy of unification of village schools with primary education schools double-shift education has increased from its % 16 to % 22, and

the emphasis on new construction has limited renovation funds for the existing schools. The bussing education contributes to the growing of class sizes. In 2003 these are 8,532 schools practicing double shift; 4410 in urban areas and 4,122 in large villages.

### **Developing Strategies for Physical Environment Needs**

One of the challenges that the Government intended to meet with the Eight-Year Compulsory Education Program was to encourage those segments of the population most difficult to serve with schooling opportunities due to different needs and expectations, especially education beyond the primary level (fifth grade). As Program Implementation got underway, Government established variants of the regular eight-year primary education school. To serve children in rural areas faced by different types of conditions, special schemes had to be undertaken.

### **Bussing Students**

First, the bussing scheme was widened. In locations where the population was small and scattered, children were bussed to nearby villages for schooling. Between 1997 and 2003, over 640,000 children were bussed annually to their schools.

The launching of bussing education at a large scale in 1997-98 school-year has caused a major institutional change in education. The Regulation of Bussing Education (MEB 2000), which standardized the practice was issued quite late. At present, 640,000 students are being transported daily from their homes, at least 2,5 km away, to and from the primary education schools. % 43 of normal PES and % 17 of P10's have bussing students. The provincial and subprovincial governors are responsible for the tenders and supervision of bussing. School administrators and teachers are net delegated supervisory authority over the solution of administrative problems of school bussing. There are crucial problems of on site management.

Among the educators and administrators, bussing education has both its supporters and opponents. Those who support it think that despite the obstacles bussing education can help giving more opportunities and funds to primary education schools to become modern social learning centers. On the other hand, those opposing the organization have reservations about its pedagogical basics and argue that basic education and primary schooling needs to be organized as a community affair in order to increase externalities and returns to society.

In villages where primary schools have been closed down due to bussing implementation views such as these are voiced: "there are not any educational and multiactivity cultural institutions left in the village; no more educational-cultural programs oriented to village children, adolescents and adults; the teacher being a preeminent figure in a village has disappeared from the scene; the parents are isolated from the schools of their children and parent-school relationship has deteriorated; the closed-down school buildings are not being maintained; it will cost a lot to fix them (MEB-Baskent Univ. 2002 b. p. 158).

Many of the village headmen became bus drivers or bus company owners; the provinces had to give credit to this in order to gain the trust of the parents towards bussing education.

Turkey has accumulated experience and solutions in multi grade education. Its being pushed away has provoked discussion on its better utilization for less costly solutions. Also, “Some teachers are in the view that, although a costly investment is being made in bussing, contrary to the expectations, it has dropped the quality in education. A better quality education could be given in village schools from 1<sup>st</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> grades with the same expenditure,” (MEB-Baskent Univ. 2000 b. p. 158).

Parents feel uneasy about their daughters getting on shuttles unchaperoned. Unfortunately, in year 2001-2002 when bussing education reached its peak, the ratio of bussing girls fell. In that year, the ratio of female students was % 39 as compared to % 61 male students. In the following year although the number of students increased by % 60, proportion of female students has dropped to % 36 against % 64 males. Although not more than overage % 4-5, the female drop outs occur at the beginning of 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades, meaning that having learned how to read and write is enough and getting closer to the age of puberty is an alarm to keep girls at home.

### **Boarding Schools**

If the distances are too great, children are boarded at regional free boarding primary education schools (YIBO), which are designed to board only their own students. Preference was given to poor children who would further benefit from the meals offered and the care given them. Also, Primary Education Schools with Pension Housing (PIO), which are designed to accommodate students of different schools, are available in relatively larger settlements. Each type of school with accommodation serves over 140,000 students per year (MEB 2003a). This strategy was given support and the total number 153 YIBOs and PIOS in 1997 is increased to 561 by 2003.

### **Attention to Construction Needs**

During the implementation phase, specific information on classroom and school construction needs were disseminated to province and sub-province governors. The Master Plan indicated how many new classrooms would be needed on basis of census and enrollment information. All the provincial governors became very enthusiastic about the Program, and gave a tremendous amount of contribution and collaboration. Location planning for the schools were already indicated in physical city plans. For rural areas, governors were encouraged to develop boarding school and bussing plans. These decisions were taken with interactive planning processes with municipal governments. Local governments and provincial governments made proposals for where and how. Central government put into framework what is affordable. The investment programming was strictly followed. This aspect of the implementation proceeded smoothly.

### **Teacher requirements**

Recruitment, which was managed by the Ministry of National Education, was based on expected student numbers. 70,000 new teachers are recruited. In 2003 there are 264,953 teachers in urban settlements, 125,322 teachers in rural areas. All teachers are university graduates, plus they acquire pedagogical formation through theoretical and practical courses. However, because the program started up immediately without a scale-up phase, many university graduate teacher candidates could receive only a very short teacher education and training program. Teachers with

little pedagogical preparation were sent out to schools. Many of these new teachers were given temporary licenses and were expected to complete training in summertime. Universities launched massive summertime courses in order to keep up with the necessities of the situation. Teacher follow-up on training needs further elaboration.

### **Finance requirements**

The Ministry of National Education budget was expanded to meet the payroll needs. Earmarked taxes financed the investments, other current expenditure like materials etc other than payroll and transfer expenditures like bussing, boarding. Additional funding from another earmarked extra budgetary program, the Social Solidarity Fund, financed meals for children bussed to schools in accordance with an agreement between MONE and the Fund.

Once the law passed in 1997, and the Program was officially underway, the Ministry of National Education was responsible for its implementation, wished to accelerate the Program, and sought a US\$3 billion loan from World Bank to achieve the objectives of the Program in a shorter time frame and adopted a Three-Year 2000 Reach Project, which was a speeded up version of the first six years of the Education Master Plan. In addition, the Ministry of National Education expected that revenues from the earmarked tax levies would address medium-term financing needs. In fact, revenues from these taxes for education increased substantially for first couple of years until an economic crisis hit.

### **Political Climate and Political Context**

#### **Preparation for Educational Reform.**

The goal of all governments in Turkey has been to eliminate illiteracy and increase the number of students receiving a basic education diploma. In the mid-90s, the concern surrounded which mechanisms to use in order to include the unserved population in compulsory education.

Policy reform in Turkey is governed by legislation, as discussed above. In order to support the development and adoption of more effective legislation, the Ministry of Education (MONE) and the State Planning Organization (SPO) undertook the preparation of a 15-year Education Master Plan that would comprehensively account for all factors needed to assure that this objective for primary education would be met in coherence with the education sector goals and objectives as a whole. It is worthwhile to note here that the consistency of the vision of the SPO accounts for the longevity of this program across changes in government.

The Master Plan calculated all the qualitative and quantitative necessities in a mathematical model, including enrollment expectations for all grade levels, based on a series of 3 five-year plan segments. This technical plan became the backbone for the new legislation, defined the qualitative, policy, human resources, fiscal and quantitative requirements needed to assure universal eight-year coverage, and gave the lawmakers in Parliament confidence that the objectives of the forthcoming Law could be achieved.

**The Political Climate around the Program.**

The situation in the country, in the region and in the world influenced the decision to adopt this program. Turkey was going through a series of sharp business cycles, where incomes were lost to unproductive expenditures while new crises were expected both in the country and the global economy. The Far East Money Market Crisis had begun and was expected to shake the Russian economy.

The high inflation of the 1990's, deteriorating standard of living, worsening income distribution and the appearance of a poverty-stricken population in the 6-7 years preceding the program were risks the government felt it needed to address. There were rising complaints that the government was not protecting the rights of the poor, especially since resources were being siphoned off by corrupted officials. The government had introduced some minor poverty alleviation measures, but these were generally thought to be uncoordinated and a waste of public resources. In addition, education sector studies had shown that there were serious lags in the implementation of the compulsory education policies.

In addition, there was externally-supported terrorism in the Southeastern and Eastern parts of the country which had deprived many children of education for the last ten-twelve years. As the government brought this terrorism under control, it recognized that it must undertake accelerated education programs to address these education losses.

At the same time, there was growing unrest in the Middle East, which was attributed to political Islam by the international community. The government was anxious that the terrorist groups that were starting to diminish in Turkey would start to identify with the objectives of those in the Middle East (from whence it could also gain new funding), thus reigniting Turkey's problem. Implementing measures to stop the spread of terrorism, then, was another goal of the government.

Finally, 1996 is the date when Turkey entered the European Union (EU) customs union. One of the government's major concerns became that the country should not enter negotiations for full membership in the EU with only five years of compulsory education. The education master planning exercise had taken EU country practices into consideration.

Against this backdrop, the government sought a specific, concrete, least costly solution that would directly address the needs and concerns of the least advantaged. The consensus was that its first objective should be to attack unemployment, then education. To help facilitate this approach, the government felt that the IMF should not place already low education and health expenditures under strict fiscal policy measures, when negotiating stabilization policies.

**Governmental Instability.**

For the ten years preceding this reform, Turkey was governed by unstable, short-lived coalition governments. The passing and enactment of the legislation for this reform took place during three coalition governments, one covert coup d'état and one national election. This was a time when authoritarian views clashed against democratic views. The bureaucrats found ample time during this phase to shape the Law and its implementation according to the changing political conjuncture and their own will.

### **Consistency of the objectives of the Compulsory Education Program with any ongoing country poverty reduction strategies**

The Eight-Year Compulsory Education Program was conceived in the broader context of government strategies to improve conditions of the poor. The government supported the Program as a way of enhancing social cohesion through reduction of economic disparities and social inequities. Other initiatives included the Social Solidarity Fund, organized at the sub-province level with demanded programs by the local people. Most of the help ended in handing out money. In addition, the government designed the Health Green Card program to pay the health expenses of the poor who were not under the social insurance umbrella. The Social Solidarity Fund financed the Health Green Card program as it does the noon meals of primary school children in depressed areas now. The student-apprentice program of MONE provided educational supervision as well as legal and insurance security, but this was abolished by the eight-year compulsory education program.

### **Changes in scale**

A number of pilots and experiments were underway at the time the new Program was introduced. The Government had been experimenting with school-improvement grants, total quality management for school quality improvement, elective courses to be decided by the school, school-developed curricular revision, one-year pre-school classes in primary schools, teacher empowerment and flexibility for multiple intelligence approaches in education, more democratic modeling for school climate, open-doors policy at schools, empowerment of school administrations, decentralization of central ministry tasks, alternative primary school and school building organization styles, social area and physical education space variation, differentiating school construction type projects according to regions, workshop rooms and skills practice school networking and computer-aided instruction. There were laboratory schools, where the projects to be scaled up were tested. Only computer-aided instruction, Pre-school classes and physical facilities improvement received any significant inclusion in the scaling up of the Eight-Year Compulsory Education School as is reflected in the Three-Year Catch 2000 Project of MONE, MEB 1997 B. These innovations were mostly limited to construction or to purchase and installation of equipment rather than any substantial innovations in the way in which education was organized.

Because of its highly centralized and bureaucratic structure, the Government applied the big bang approach to introducing the reform. The State Planning Organization (SOP) had seen the reform to be critical to address many of the emerging national problems, and wanted to implement it as widely and rapidly as possible, rather than step by step which ran the risk of derailing the Program.

### **Institutions Involved**

As discussed above, the SOP prepared the Master Plan that illustrated the viability of achieving universal eight-year education. This plan provoked the interest of academic circles, including

tens of thousands of teachers, and stimulated the Ministry of National Education to promote the initiative. The Minister of National Education had a strong background in finance. This background, along with his close association with the Prime Minister (he was slated to become the next Prime Minister) gave the plan considerable credibility. Later, the Prime Minister took it up as a project of his own and obtained support from his entire Cabinet.

A serious shortcoming of the Program was that teachers, administrators, students and their families, and local communities were not consulted on the reorganization and improvement in their schools.

### **Other Actors Involved**

A variety of other actors and organizations were involved, either invited by the Government or on their own. For example, *local administrations* played a large part in supporting the program. Provincial and sub-provincial administrations made efforts to include village heads to induce families to send children to schools. Local governments, in consultation with mayors or village heads, also were involved in school location planning. The Ministry of National Education carried out orientation and coordination seminars to encourage greater participation of local administrators, including the public announcement of the names of provinces and sub-provinces that were advancing more rapidly than others. *Television and radio networks* also became involved voluntarily. They gave free airtime to promote discussions about the importance of universal 8-year education. Moreover, given the importance of the new Law, and the lively public discussion associated with the provisions of that Law, the media took advantage of the dynamic to air debates in which important national or local figures debated these issues and simple people found a chance to be heard. *NGOs* also became very interested, and new NGOs were established to start education initiatives and promote ideas of substantial reform for the education sector.

In addition, *the private sector* wanted to contribute to the effort by building free schools. Specifically, the Istanbul Stock Exchange responded to the call to action, and threw considerable support to the initiative, including hundreds of millions of US dollars that were contributed without tax incentives initially. Besides supporting the Basic Education Program, these efforts gave positive publicity to the stock exchange and showed them to be formidable social partners.

The *World Bank* played a supportive and advisory role during the lending discussions, from which the Ministry benefited. Finally, the *IMF* indicated its acceptance of the Program and did not restrict expenditures on education and health.

### **Impact Analysis**

The Program comprised a broad range of actions, financed largely by the Government, but also by major private contributions. The Government-financed portion of the Program involves expenditures of over US\$2 billion per year, including both actions financed under the investment budget (such as construction of new schools, refurbishment of existing schools, and provision of

improved educational equipment and materials), and actions financed under the recurrent budget (largely comprised of payment of salaries of teachers and other educational staff, and recruitment and training of additional teachers and educational staff to expand school capacity). Total annual expenditures for the Basic Education Program to date -- including all investment and recurrent costs which directly support basic education - are estimated at over US\$3 billion annually.

The Program had as its primary goal to enroll the last and the hardest 35 percent of the 11-14-age population into the education system after 1998. This was to be effected by building new schools and classrooms in order to create the necessary capacity. However, it is likely that the abolition of the Primary School Diploma after the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and creation of a Basic School Completers Diploma for those completing eight years of education, had the greatest impact on increasing enrollments.

The results were impressive: although total eight-year education enrollments had actually declined during the six years prior to 1997, enrollments increased by 1.5 million since the Program began, raising net enrollment for the eight-year primary education program from 75.8 percent to 95 percent. Girls' enrollments in rural areas made the most rapid progress. Girls' enrollments in grade six in rural areas increased by 162 percent in the first year of the Program, and have continued to make sharp gains since. There are few cases in the history of any national education system which can compare with these initial achievements of the Basic Education Program.

Other actions implemented to date under the Basic Education Program include the following:

#### **School Construction and Rehabilitation**

Through a combination of Government resources and private contributions (the unexpected major contribution of the private sector to this effort is an important point to be noted), the Ministry of National Education (MONE) constructed 103,983 new basic education classrooms during the five years 1997 - 2001, bringing the total stock to 264,776 basic education classrooms. These actions created additional capacity for more than 3 million basic education students. Enhanced allocation of funds for capital investment, particularly from the private sector, in combination with new contracting procedures made this vastly scaled-up school building program possible.

In addition, the Program has supported the renovation of 300 large rural and central village schools, 1,300 small rural schools, 13 regional boarding and pension schools, and is funding the rehabilitation and extension of 44 schools in low-income areas around large cities (gecekondü areas).

#### **Support to Students from low-income families**

The Program has provided a complete set of free textbooks to 796,000 needy basic education students in 36 provinces. Free school meals are being provided to 635,000 basic education students in the school bussing program, to over 80,000 basic education students in boarding schools, and to 100,000 students in the Marmara earthquake area. In addition, the Program is supporting daily bussing for 600,000 students from villages without a school offering grades 6 to 8 to larger population centers which have such a school.



### **Teacher Recruitment and Training**

Over 50,000 additional basic education teachers have been recruited. In addition, four annual cycles of in-service training have been provided to basic education teachers, principals, inspectors, and provincial education staff.

### **Introducing Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)**

The Ministry introduced computers in secondary schooling under the earlier Bank-financed National Education Development Project (Loan 3192-TU). The Basic Education Program is extending this initiative to basic education, starting with grade four. In addition to developing teacher and student computer literacy, it is integrating ICT into other subjects in basic education, starting with grade four.

In the long-run, the positive outcomes of longer years of education to the individual and to socio-economic development and to poverty alleviation will be seen more and more. In the short and medium term, positive outcomes of the project have not yet been reflected in employment and Household Income and Expenditure Surveys.

### **Minor adjustments and fundamental changes to original plans**

As indicated above, the Program was intended to bring into the system those who had been left out, from poor villages and from poorer suburbs of the metropolitan areas, as well as girls. In contrast to the enrollment rates, school attendance rates in these areas were not at expected levels. When incomes are low, the returns to education in the eyes of the community are suspect and gender differences are more pronounced.

The figures of absenteeism are preliminary, but varies between one and ten percent through the provinces. The number of absentee female students is around 10 percent higher than male students. Absenteeism of female students shows a slight increase in first through third grades, but a more rapid increase is observed in the fifth and sixth grades. Once girls make it to the sixth grade, absenteeism drops, indicating that they are committed to earning the diploma. The focus group study carried out by Başkent University on the parents report that “parents tend not to send their sons to school after the fifth grade, and now take their daughters from school before the fourth and fifth grades since there is no longer a diploma is received after the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, and some parents find eight-year primary education too long, (MEB-Başkent Univ. 2002, p. 37). Though no changes have been introduced as of yet, how to address absenteeism is now being reviewed.

Government officials have also begun to discuss whether bussing is advantageous, or that perhaps extending boarding opportunities might be more acceptable to students and their families.

The Ministry sought to bring all children in primary and lower secondary into a single school building. Confusion in schools was rampant because of the mandate to implement this change without preparing the school administrators, public or the local administrators. For example, principals tried to implement the mandate, but not all had schools with the appropriate physical conditions. Due to closed down village schools and bussing the classrooms became even more crowded. As a result, the reopening of some village schools came to the agenda.

Even though it is called so, the Law 3406 is not a law reforming primary or basic education, but it is a Law for enforcing enrollment.. With a preconception about how primary education should be enforced, this Law brings amendments to certain existing Laws. These amendments affect or cripple other parts of the system intentionally or unintentionally, which close off alternative educational and training options for poor children. By and large, the Turkish society has historically had a positive attitude to educating their children. However, the Basic Education Program does not allow for the But the standardization of lower secondary education effectively closed down all vocational skills courses at the lower secondary level (that is, in the last three years of the new 8-year Primary Education cycle) and the student- apprenticeship scheme that train students for low paid, but numerous job opportunities.

The Ministry chose to implement the reform by authoritarian measures of inclusion. Though a number of problems arose during implementation, the 2003 Budget essentially proposed to continue implementing the project as it had been originally conceived. Among the small changes that have been introduced include: *all* primary school children are now provided with a free set of textbooks, the “Hundred-Percent Support for Education” campaign was started, among the measures of which are the tax-deductible donations to education bill (Law No.4842), which helped to increase donations to education five fold.

## **Driving Factors**

### **Commitment and Political Economy for Change**

The new single-party government of Justice and Development Party (AKP), which took power after the November 2002 elections, committed itself to the Basic Education Program by calling for a vote of confidence in the Parliament. Having gained this, the implementation of the Program is continuing as it was planned.

The 2004 Budget of the government puts special emphasis on education. For the first time, *the education budget will exceed the defense budget*. Excluding education budgets of other public institutions and higher education, the proportion of MONE budget to GNP will be 3.06 percent The government’s current commitment to the program is illustrated in its budget proposal to the Planning and Budgeting Commission of the Parliament, (MEB 2003b, p.30-31):

- The schooling of the whole age group will be provided, by putting more emphasis on quality of education and on elevating student achievement,
- Increased quality of education in schools of small settlements, bussing centers, YIBOs and PIOs will get priority,
- YIBO and PIO service area coverage will be increased,
- Double-shift education will be eliminated in the shortest time possible,
- Multi-grade education in village schools will be reduced to an acceptable level,

- Open Primary School Project will be launched for those who have passed the age of compulsory schooling,
- Guidance and counseling services will be upgraded to serve children to discover their talents and develop physically and psychologically,
- At least, one foreign language learning opportunity will be offered to all students; second foreign language learning will be encouraged,
- In all primary education schools workshops will be set up,
- To reduce average classroom size to 30 will be followed strictly.

In 2002, the government engaged UNIC as an active partner in implementing a program to attract girls in the poor provinces in eastern Anatolia to school. Initiated as a pilot project in 2002, it has been expanded to other provinces and being jointly monitored by the government and UNICEF. Other NGOs, and even more importantly private sector initiatives have begun to take off as well with new programs to improve quality of education. Although this effort is still small, the government can learn from their experience, and may be able to use these lessons in the improvement of their program.

### **Institutional Innovation**

There were surprisingly few institutional innovations to support the introduction of this massive change. No new formal accountability mechanisms were introduced: the education system remained centrally managed and operated. The Ministry of National Education maintained its existing structure with minor modifications. The one organizational change the Ministry of Education undertook was with the information and communications technology (ICT) directorate. This general directorate was strengthened and elevated in importance within the structure of the Ministry. Local instances of MONE, that is, education directors from provinces and sub-provinces, picked up some additional responsibilities, but experienced little change in terms of organization and management. Also, departments and units within MONE headquarters in Ankara were integrated electronically, and connected to many of the units in the provinces and sub-provinces by means of a new Management Information System (the ILSIS). The Ministry did begin to provide some additional information to the public in response to the controversy sparked by the inadequately consulted Law and Program. Although some reengineering was proposed for such areas as reorganization, change of MONE Institutional Law, curriculum development, institutionalizing in-service training, assignment and transfer procedures, these are being evaded because of central bureaucracy's resistance to change. The proposal to integrate small primary schools with lower-secondary schools into a virtual education administration was never realized for the same reason.

Finally, the MONE currently has some pilot activities to introduce a modern inspection and quality supervision system. It is expected that these programs will be implemented by the end of 2004.

## **Learning and Experimentation**

Several lessons have been integrated into the program during implementation:

- The closing of village schools had a negative impact both educationally and socially. During the 2003-2004 school year 1,200 of the village schools are being reopened.
- The lack of revised curricula programs that effectively integrated 1<sup>st</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> grade programs with 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade programs resulted in substantially reduced quality outcomes. Thus, in 2004, the primary education curriculum is being taken up for review and upgrading.
- The bussing education experiment has highlighted the real educational needs of the communities and of the different age groups and reminded the educators to revisit the fundamentals. This produced a consensus on taking up primary education restructuring in dispersed settlements together with community needs. It is hoped that this will ensure community participation in decision-making.
- The level of donations from the public convinced the government in 2003 to authorize tax deductions for their donations for education.
- Construction activity carried out through the central Ministry offices caused many implementation problems. The school construction and services are now being decentralized from the MONE and turned over to the provinces again.

## **External Catalysts**

Turkey's interest in being accepted by the European community and being fully integrated into the European Union was a major, if not the primary stimulus for the development of this program. The IMF support to protect the education budget, and in fact guarantee a minimum 4.25 percent of GDP for education in turn strengthened the government's interest in moving forward with this undertaking.

Another external factor that played a significant role in developing this program was the need to reduce the social instability, and the associated risk of terrorism among populations that perceived themselves to be excluded, both within the country and without.

## **Lessons Learned**

### **Positive Lessons Learned by the Ministry of Education**

- The public has a strong interest in education and is willing to contribute its own resources
- The willingness of the private sector to contribute to improving education even without financial incentives was one of the reasons for the success of the program..
- Stakeholders and beneficiaries are capable of quickly expressing their needs.

## CASE STUDIES IN SCALING UP POVERTY REDUCTION

- The “Big Bang” approach to implementing reform can be effective even without consultation and consensus building, but sustainable improvement in implementation and outcomes requires subsequent efforts to engage the public.
- The initial and rapid success of the program helped market the reform to the public
- Government commitment was the primary instrument for success in this program.

### **Negative Lessons Learned as a Society and by MONE**

- Lack of clear information and lack of time for enough public debate interfered with improvement and sustainable expansion of the program.
- Reorganization was necessary at all levels of the system. Quantity attainment strategy and success do not produce quality results.
- Starting right away without scaling-up means higher costs, mistakes, loss of confidence, increased expenses associated with trail and error implementation.
- Less democratic, more authoritarian education systems lead to fewer pathways to successful careers.

## References

- BÜYÜKBOYACI, \_ (1998); Ta\_ımalı \_lkö\_retim ve Sorunları: Çanakkale Örne\_i; (Bussing Education and Its Problems: Çanakkale Example), Çanakkale: Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi.
- BÜYÜKKARAGÖZ, S.S.; \_AH\_N, H.; SULAK, H.(1994); Ta\_ımalı \_lkö\_retim: Konya \_li \_çin Ara\_tırma, (Bussing Education: Research on Konya Province), Konya Selçuk Üniversitesi Ara\_tırma Fonu.
- D\_E; (Various Years), Educational Statistics: 1960/2002; Ankara D\_E.
- DPT (1996); Seventh Five-Year Development Plan; Ankara: Ba\_bakanlık
- DPT (2001); Eighth Five-Year Development Plan; Ankara: Ba\_bakanlık DPT.
- DÜLGER, \_lhan (2002); “E\_itim Ana Plan: 1996-2011 Bütünle\_tirilmi\_ bir Reform Stratejisini Uygulamaya Aktarma Düzeni,” “The Education Master Plan: 1996-2011, An Implementation Strategy for Integrated Reform) Planlama Dergisi /Journal of Planning), Eylül(September) 172-212.
- KAPLAN, I. (2000); Sekiz Yıllık \_lkö\_retim Okullarına Geçi\_in Getirdi\_i Sorunlara ili\_kin Yönetici Çözümleri ve Önerileri (School Administrators’ Solutions and Proposals for Problems of Transition to Eight-Year Primary Education Schools) Masters Thesis, Ankara; Hacettepe University.
- KARAKÜTÜK, Meliha (1996); Ta\_ımalı \_lkö\_retim Uygulaması ve Sorunları (The Bussing Education Policy and its Problems) Masters Thesis, Ankara: University.
- Martı, M.M. (1997); Planlı Dönemde Ulusal E\_itimimizin Temel Hedefleri ve Finansman Kaynakları: 1963-1992) (Main Targets and Financial Resources of Our National Education During the Planned Period. 1963-1992) PhD. Thesis; Ankara: Ankara University.
- MEB (MONE) – DPT (SPO) (1996); E\_itim Ana Planı: 1996-2020; (Education Master Plan: 1996-2010) (Restricted Distribution) Ankara: MEB Ara\_tırma; Planlama ve Koordinasyon Kurulu.
- MEB (MONE) – DPT (SPO) (1996); E\_itim Ana Planı: 1996-2010 Özeti (Summary, Education Master Plan: 1996-2010), Ankara: MEB, DPT.
- MEB (1997); “Ça\_ı Yakalama 2000 Projesi” (Three-Year Catch 2000 Project); Ankara: MEB Ara\_tırma, Planlama ve Koordinasyon Kurulu.
- MEB (MONE) (1997) \_lkö\_retim Kurumları Yönetmeli\_i (Regulation for Primary Education Institutions) \_stanbul: MEB Basımevi.
- MEB (MONE) – World Bank (1998); Basic Education Project (Ln-4355-TU), Ankara: Official Paper,

- MEB (MONE) (2000); Ta\_ımalı E\_itim Yönetmeli\_i (Regulation for Bussing Education); Ankara: MEB Basımevi.
- MEB (MONE) (2001); Milli E\_itim Sayısal Veriler 2001 (Quantitative Data on National Education 2001); Ankara: MEB Ara\_tırma, Planlama ve Koordinasyon Kurulu Ba\_kanlı\_ı.
- MEB-Ankara Üniversitesi (2002); \_lkö\_retim Okullarının Sosyal Etkilerinin De\_erlendirilmesi Ara\_tırması (Social Impact Assessment of Primary Education Schools), Ankara: MEB Projeler Koordinasyon Merkezi Ba\_kanlı\_ı.
- MEB-Baskent University (2002); The Institutional Evaluation Research on Primary Education Schools; Ankara: MEB, Projeler Koordinasyon Merkezi Ba\_kanlı\_ı.
- MEB-Ba\_kent University (2002); The Cost Analysis Research on Primary Education Schools; Ankara: MEB, Projeler Koordinasyon Merkezi Ba\_kanlı\_ı.
- MEB (2003a); Milli E\_itim Sayısal Veriler 2002-2003 (Quantitative Data on National Education 2002-2003); Ankara: MEB, Ara\_tırma, Planlama ve Koordinasyon Kurulu Ba\_kanlı\_ı.
- MEB (2003b); 2004 Mali Yılı Bütçe Tasarısına \_li\_kin Rapor (Government Proposal for the 2004 Fiscal Year Education Budget) Ankara: MEB, APK
- Resmi Gazete (Official Paper) (1986); Law Number 3308: on Vocational Training and Apprenticeship.
- Resmi Gazete (Official Paper) (1997); Law Number 4603: Changing Various Laws to Enforce Compulsory Education.
- TBMM; Milli E\_itim Bakanlığı Kesin Hesap Raporları 1973-2001, (Final Budget Realization Reports on MONE Budgets, 1973-2001) Ankara: (parliament), Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonu.
- WCEFA (1990); World Declaration on Education For All and Framework to Meet Basic Learning Needs, 5-9 March. Jontien Thailand.
- World Bank (2001); Turkey: Public Expenditure and Institutional Review; 22530-TU, Washington DC; World Bank Document.
- Yetim, R. (2001); Yatılı Bölge Okullarının Mevcut Durumu ve Ö\_renci Hizmetleri Yönetimi (The Existing Situation in Boarding Regional Schools and the Management of Student Services) Masters Thesis; Ankara Hacettepe University.
- Yılmaz, Z. (1998); Ta\_ımalı \_lkö\_retim Uygulaması: Kır\_ehir\_li Örne\_i (Bussing Education Implementation in Kırsehir Province) Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

## Appendix 1. Definitions

**Basic Education:** Every subject has a common-base knowledge aspect to it, without which a further step forward is hard to take. Basic education is something more than this: It is the common-base knowledge every citizen should have in order to be affluent in a society. For purposes of securing equality of opportunity for fair access to the means of the society, every state must provide a common-base of knowledge for all of its citizens. Basic education is the core education that every citizen should be able to get free at any age, preferably at the beginning of schooling. In a democratic country, it should cover at least literacy training, official language skills, basic arithmetic, citizenship rights, duties, procedures utilized for it and the paths for benefiting from individual's rights and freedoms. According to its needs, each country can define the core knowledge necessary for its members. This core may exist in upper levels of education in a shorter but strengthened way, adjusted to the mental capacities of the relevant age group.

In the minds of the public, usually, basic education is expected to cover morality education and/or basic religion education according to the conviction of the guardian of the child. Due to the fact that religion cannot be standardized for all citizens, in secular or laicist states, this service is referred to the religious authorities in the country according to the families' choice.

In Turkey, basic education is designed for students and for adults according to this definition; literacy training, as the official language Turkish language skills, arithmetic, citizenship and human rights education. Being a laic state, the Ministry officials take that religion education should not be a part of basic education programs, but can be given as "morality and religion culture knowledge" under the concept of general education. Due to the fact that in Turkey all kinds of education are under the control of the Ministry of Education, there are no alternative legal institutions families can apply to get religion education and training for their children. Consequently, there is a debate going on in the country. For some, it is a laicism-antilaicism debate; for others it is a human rights- authoritarianism debate.

**Basic Adult Education:** Widespread non-formal courses of basic education designed for the level of illiterate adults leading to a certificate.

**Functional Education:** Education contents designed to fit the life-style needs of the recipients. This concept is usually associated with the needs of the adult students who get non-formal basic education courses or demand for programs offering more than general education that lead to pathways to life.

**Informal Education:** Unprogrammed and unstructured education usually carried out at home, in associations or in foundations whose course contents have not been approved by the Ministry of Education and who do not have the right to issue legal certificates.

**Non-Formal Education or Training:** Ministry approved flexible courses or programs that are designed according to the needs of its demanders with no age limitation for attendance after the age of compulsory education and that lead to certificate.



**Formal Education:** Full-time in-school education designed for the needs of certain age-group levels that lead to diplomas that open the way for upper levels of education

**Compulsory Education:** Educational attainment level that the society believes is necessary for each of its members allows certain age and is enforced by law. In Turkey, 5-years of education was compulsory. After 1977, a strict attempt is being made to cover the last portion of the age population by 8-year compulsory education.

**Pre-School Education:** Developmental educational environment prepared for the needs of 3 to 6 year old children, voluntary preparing for school experience and that does not lead to any certification. In Turkey two or three year pre-school institutions exist. Also, there is beginner's class in the primary schools called the "mommy class" where children of 5 years of age are accepted to get used to school environment.

**Primary Education:** First level of education designed for the needs of 6 to 12 year old children, covering a basic education component and knowledge instruction, education and skill development necessary for this age level. Countries have 5,6,8 or 9 years of primary education according to the structure of their education system. Turkey used to have 5-year primary education leading to a primary school diploma. Now, Turkey is trying to turn it into an 8-year primary education by connecting together the primary education and lower-secondary education.

## Appendix 2. Tables

**Table 1: Turkey - Number of Students, and Schooling Rate**

FIVE-YEAR PRIMARY SCHOOL		
Years	Students	Schooling (%)
1973-1974	5.326.000	92.30
1974-1975	5.380.000	91.50
1975-1976	5.467.000	91.20
1976-1977	5.503.000	90.00
1977-1978	5.458.000	87.40
1978-1979	5.575.000	88.10
1979-1980	5.622.407	88.50
1980-1981	5.694.860	87.30
1981-1982	5.864.161	87.60
1982-1983	6.042.486	88.30
1983-1984	6.500.539	88.70
1984-1985	6.527.036	90.50
1985-1986	6.635.821	91.50
1986-1987	6.703.895	92.50
1987-1988	6.880.304	92.80
1988-1989	6.766.829	93.10
1989-1990	6.848.083	93.40
1990-1991	6.861.722	94.10
1991-1992	6.878.923	95.20
1992-1993	6.707.725	96.10
1993-1994	6.526.296	96.80
1994-1995	6.466.648	97.02
1995-1996	6.403.300	96.47
1996-1997	6.389.060	96.68

**Table 2. Turkey - Number of Students Schooling Rate**

<b>Three-Year Middle School</b>				
<b>Years</b>	<b>Total Number of Students</b>	<b>General Middle Sc. Students</b>	<b>Vocational Training Students</b>	<b>Schooling %</b>
1973-1974	965.835	927.000	38.835	36.50
1974-1975	999.133	946.000	53.133	37.00
1975-1976	1.122.955	1.039.000	83.955	41.00
1976-1977	1.192.211	1.074.000	118.211	42.70
1977-1978	1.247.378	1.107.000	140.378	43.80
1978-1979	1.255.164	1.110.000	145.164	43.90
1979-1980	1.339.508	1.180.233	159.275	44.10
1980-1981	1.312.837	1.147.512	165.325	43.50
1981-1982	1.419.105	1.239.809	179.378	46.90
1982-1983	1.515.811	1.312.809	183.002	49.90
1983-1984	1.633.011	1.450.624	182.387	51.90
1984-1985	1.761.456	1.586.581	174.875	52.20
1985-1986	1.855.390	1.673.723	181.667	54.60
1986-1987	1.962.942	1.761.794	201.148	57.40
1987-1988	2.091.790	1.870.515	221.275	60.80
1988-1989	2.261.972	2.019.980	241.971	58.00
1989-1990	2.291.972	2.038.537	253.435	57.40
1990-1991	2.381.510	2.108.579	272.931	58.40
1991-1992	2.405.335	2.116.625	288.710	58.70
1992-1993	2.556.339	2.242.875	313.464	63.70
1993-1994	2.636.558	2.303.418	333.140	65.01
1994-1995	2.674.986	2.318.915	356.071	65.85
1995-1996	2.645.440	2.296.386	349.071	65.14
1996-1997	2.622.594	2.269.620	352.974	64.73

**Table 3: TURKEY - Eight-Year Compulsory Education & Number of Students, Classrooms and Schooling rate**

PROMARY EDUCATION SCHOOL			
Years	Students	Classrooms	Schooling %
1997-1998	9.084.635	210.905	85.63
1998-1999	9.609.050	213.243	88.49
1999-2000	10.028.979	244.958	94.30
2000-2001	10.480.721	253.892	96.18
2001-2002	10.562.426	265.602	98.00
2002-2003	10.331.619	280.257	96.30

Source: DİE 1967-1975 .....1988-1989 Milli Eğitim İstatistikleri. DİE'nin 1990-1991-1993-1994-1995-2002 Türkiye İstatistik Yıllıkları. M.E.B. APK Kurul Başkanlığının 1992-1993..... 2002-2003 yılları arası Milli Eğitim Sayısal Veriler kitapçıkları.

**Table 4: Share of Ministry of Education Budget in National Accounts (1990 – 2004)**

Years	Share of Gov. Consolidated Budget to GNP	Public Sector Capital Investment to GNP	Share of MONE Budget in GNP	Share of MONE in Gov. Consolidated Budget	Share of MONE in Total Public Capital Investments
1990	16,92	8,6	2,14	13,21	8,95
1991	20,53	7,6	2,36	14,10	8,50
1992	20,08	6,8	2,75	14,56	9,09
1993	24,29	7,3	2,88	14,35	8,20
1994	23,08	3,6	2,42	11,36	9,09
1995	21,78	3,8	1,78	10,41	16,12
1996	26,31	5,3	1,77	9,71	15,20
1997	27,19	6,5	1,78	9,01	14,66
1998	29,15	6,8	2,41	10,90	37,33
1999	35,89	6,6	2,80	11,58	28,96
2000	37,40	6,9	2,78	10,43	28,35
2001	44,49	5,6	2,39	8,17	22,28
2002	52,90	6,3	2,86	7,90	22,34
2003	46,60	4,5	2,87	6,91	16,44
2004	(Prog) 42,90	4,7	2,93	8,43	16,89

Source : SPO National Accounts

Note: 1) In the first column the increase in the share of government budget to GNP is related to economic stabilization program.

## CASE STUDIES IN SCALING UP POVERTY REDUCTION

2) The MONE figures do not include educational activity budgets of other public institutions and the higher education sector. Approximately % 60 of the Ministry budget is used for 8-Year Compulsory, primary and lower secondary level education.

3) Note the increase in MONE capital investments (in the last column) while the public sector capital investments are kept stable.

## Appendix III: Box

**Incremental Change from the Bottom Up:** Teachers and administrators have extremely limited recourse to funds, but many have wanted to participate in making the Compulsory Education Program a success. A large urban school in Anatolia decided to share their facilities with a disadvantaged area school from another province. Forty visiting students and their teachers came together with the host school for a month of the school year. The visiting students and teachers were encouraged to find out what kinds of new solutions they themselves could take back to their school to implement on their own.

**Learning by Living:** The outskirts of the Istanbul suburbs can be more depressing than poor villages because of loneliness and alienation. The mayors from these areas created a school-municipality collaboration initiative to give teenagers from 12-14 the opportunity to actually visit the city. Teachers in school identify the students who have not been anywhere in Istanbul except their home and the school (and the TV screen!). The municipality organizes weekend bus trips that combine entertainment, and some information and learning opportunities that teach students how to reach the facilities of the city. This has helped to open the minds of students to think more a future outside their own small cities.

**Initiative for Convincing Women to Go to School:** City officials were unable to determine why the suicide rate among young women in a Southeastern Province was growing. Psychological and sociological research has been ongoing, but it is generally known that the problem is related to gender discrimination as applied by the tradition of the tribe. The provincial governor and sub provincial governors introduced a special initiative to invite girls and women to attend school. Due to media and public attention about the suicides, men in the province chose to allow this, and enrollments and attendance rose. The girls are cheerful and happy and the thing they most wish to express to the reporters runs something like this: “When women are ignorant, they give birth to many babies. The family does not have means and time to earn more money, all children keep eating. My family got poor like this. When our families are like this, they cannot educate their children. For better education, my family needs a better budget. I want to continue school till I learn a vocation. I am decided to continue this struggle. I want my teachers to show me the way. In the future, I will work, have my own income, have a higher family income and have less number of children whom I will help to educate more than myself”. Indeed, currently, the major watch over schools, their children’s homework and teacher contact are more effective by families from poorer economic backgrounds.

**Expanding Student’s Experiences; Spreading the Word:** A retired teacher living in an Eastern province used his pension bonus to take a group of 12-14 age children to travel around Turkey, to see how their peers were learning. Through one of the teachers’ associations, accommodations in different places were arranged in lower-middle or middle-income homes with children of the same age. The visiting children experienced how school and a school day was lived in such homes. On the weekends they toured the points of attraction in their host cities. When they returned home, these students were accorded a special status by their friends, and their stories helped to increase interest in attending 6-8 grade.

Following this example, women’s associations, institutions like public and private companies, foundations, the army, and local governments with a proper PR budget started to allocate some of their funds for similar programs. Some examples include one for girl students from the Southeastern region, and another for disabled children. Initiatives such as these have helped to spread the information regarding expanding education from five to eight years to closed communities. Another program offers trips for eighth graders to visit the schools they would like to attend after primary school graduation, and for city children who wish to know the education facilities of their own cities.