

The Relationship between Education and Human Development: The Comparison of Turkey and Transition Economies

Erol Karaca

Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Anadolu University,
TURKEY.

karaca69@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this research is to determine and evaluate the dimensions of educational development in Turkey in comparison with the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) countries and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries. For this purpose, in this study, Turkey is compared to the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) countries and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries with regard to the educational development and conditions. In this study, carried out through comparative relation scanning model and literature model, the sample group was established the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) countries and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries with Turkey. The research data was collected by means of data from HDI Report developed by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). On the base of data obtained from report, the study concluded that the lowest rate of adult literacy and population with at least secondary education belongs to Turkey. The rate of enrolment in primary education, however, is higher in Turkey than most of the CEE and CIS countries. This affirmative data can be attributed to the high rate of young population and/or education campaigns in Turkey since the lowest rate of secondary education and the highest level of primary school dropout rate is also seen in Turkey. In addition, performance of 15-year old students in reading, mathematics and science is generally lower in Turkey, CEE and CIS countries than in OECD countries.

Keywords: Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Education, Human Development

INTRODUCTION

As it is well known, education is a very important tool to ensure the equal opportunities and it is an indicator of development. Because of this characteristic of education, contemporary theoretical studies draw attention the importance of education for growth and development and they emphasis on creating policies that ensure equal opportunities in education. When the literature on human capital and social capital are analysed together, the importance of education in ensuring socializing becomes clear. Schooling and public spending towards education will increase the participation of students in the education system, which will in turn increase the gains from education. Education has positive effects on the macroeconomic level concepts such as growth, development and distribution of wealth and it is also a factor in increasing the quality of life on the individual level. In fact, education is a criterion for determining the development level of a country that is as effective as income per capita nowadays. Likewise, according to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), measuring countries' socio-economic development levels with just income per capita, in other words with economic growth, is not right. In addition to income per capita, the

standards for education and health must also be taken into consideration for determining socio-economic development level of countries.

A country's prosperity and happiness level depend on the situation that country's people developing their knowledge and skills by standing under lifelong education and their contribution to economic growth with the skills and knowledge's they have nurtured. Increasing a country's workforce quality and efficiency and supporting the sustainable and social economic development is the duty of education, the key to change and progress (Ereş, 2005; Nartgün- Kösterelipliğlu-Sipahioğlu, 2013). It can be said that the most important factor for driving socio-economic development and the increase in efficiency is the education level of the people and the workforce. The contribution of education on growth and development was also confirmed with international comparisons and it was noted that countries with higher incomes are the countries with higher education levels (Ünal, 1996). As a result, the importance of education for a country's development is an undeniable factor (Nartgün- Kösterelipliğlu-Sipahioğlu, 2013: 82).

The Human Development Report that has been published by UNDP since the year 1990 has developed the Human Development Index (HDI) to compare countries' socio-economic development levels and the calculation bases on three standards, "health", "education" and "prosperity" and there are four separate criterions that determine these standards. The criterion that determines the health standard is "life expectancy at birth"; the criterions which determine the education standard are "expected schooling year" and "average schooling year"; and the criterion that determines the prosperity standard is "income per capita".

Highest possible value for the calculated HDI that a country can achieve is "1" while the lowest possible is "0". It was noted that in the countries that achieved high levels of development in the aforementioned standards of prosperity, health and education and their respective criterions, the HDI value approaches the value "1"; while in the countries that have low levels of human development, the HDI value draws closer to the value of "0". In 2013 calculated HDI values are as; the countries that have values between 0,805 and 1 have very high levels of human development, countries between 0,712 and 0,796 have high levels of human development, countries between 0,536 and 0,710 have average levels of human development and countries between 0,304 and 0,534 have low levels of human development (UNDP, 2013).

Contemporary transition economies are separated into two groups, "Central and Eastern Europe Countries (CEE)" and "Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)", depending on their general income situation, geographical placement and their progress in the transition process. In addition to these two groups, China, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam are other transition economies located in Asia.

The main objective of this research is to have a comparative assessment of the effects of the improvements in education on human development in Turkey versus other transition economies, determined by the United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Index of 2013. Towards this objective, questions below were asked:

1. What effects the improvements in education on the human development in Turkey?
2. What effects the improvements in education on the human development in Transition Economies?
3. Are there any differences between Turkey and transition economies in regards to the effects of education on human development?

METHOD

This research’s objective is to compare the relation between improvements in education and the effects that education conditions have on the quality of life in Turkey and the transition economies according to Human Development Index of 2013 and the study carried out through the comparative relation scanning model. Literature scanning and document screening was also used in this research, and, UNDP’s Human Development Report for 2013, Global Competitiveness Report prepared by the World Economic Forum, OECD reports and reports prepared by the Statistical Institutions of some of the countries were subjects for examination also.

FINDINGS

Human Development Effect of Developments in Educational Turkey

Globalization, the increasing need for lifelong education and great strides in communication technologies have effected education institutions as much as they have effected other institutions. These developments surely effect education institutions in a way that they are needed to train more qualified individuals that fit into the newly emerging information society who use this information in creative ways. As a result of this effect, as with all education institutions, the institutions that train teachers also need to change their programs to ones that are more fitting and functional. The focused subject in this context is quality and researches on increasing the quality of education is an important subject that is on the agenda of Turkey and other countries (Karaca, 2008). Despite the search for quality in education, according to Global Competitiveness Report, education is among the fields that Turkey has lost grounds on (Çoban, 2013). As it can be seen on the Table 1, Turkey is ranked very low among the 144 countries that are on the ranking of education elements in the context of competitiveness levels.

Table 1. Turkey’s Education Elements in Regards to Competitiveness Levels

Education Sub-Components	144 Country Index Ranking
Secondary school enrolment rate	93
Higher education enrolment rate	56
The overall quality of the educational system	82
The quality of math and science education	100
Quality of management schools	97
Internet access to schools	68
Availability of research and training services	77
Prevalence levels of job training	65

Source: World Economic Forum, *Global Competitiveness Report*, Çoban, 2013.

Similarly, OECD’s “Education at a Glance” report offers indicators and comparisons that clearly reveal the quality problems in Turkey’s education system and in addition to the fact that increasing urbanization of the population in the last 40 years had next to no effect on the levels of education; and both of these factors profoundly expose the limitations of the general

education levels in Turkey (Çoban, 2013). Table 2 contains analysis summary data of Turkey's education quality and level according to OECD's Education at a Glance report.

Table 2. Analysis Summary Data of Turkey's Education Quality and Level

Indicator	Turkey (%)	Average of OECD (%)	Turkey's Position in the Ranking
Schooling Rates			
Age 3 (early childhood education)	4	66	33/36 country
Age 4 (early childhood education and primary education)	17	81	38/38 country
Age 5-14 (all levels)	94	96	37/39 country
Total Population Ratio of Primary Graduates and its Under Population			
Age 25-64	58	insufficient data	2/39 country
Total Population Ratio of secondary graduates and its Under Population			
Age 25-64	31	74	36/40 country
Age 25-34	42	82	35/36 country
Age 55-64	19	62	34/36 country
Total Population Ratio of Highly educated population			
Age 25-64	13	31	37/41 country
Age 25-34	17	38	35/37 country
Age 55-64	9	23	34/37 country
Higher Education Entrance Rates			
Career programs	28	17	10/33 country
Universities	40	62	31/36 country
Graduations Rates			
Projected persons rate of completion of secondary education in existing young population	54	84	26/27 country
projected persons rate of completion of higher education in existing young population	23	39	26/28 country
Total Population Ratios of Uneducated and Unemployed Population in Any Wise			
Age 15-29 (2005)	43,6	15,0	1/32 country
Age 15-29 (2010)	36,6	15,8	1/32 country

Progress gained by Turkey in education criteria, which is an important standard for measuring a country’s development levels according to UNDP’s Human Development Reports, is given out in the Table 3.

Table 3. Human Development Index and Education Element in Turkey by Years

Year	HDI		Education Index	Expected Schooling Year	Average Schooling Year
	Rank	Value			
2005	94	0.684	0.560	11.7	6.1
2006	92	0.694	0.574	12.1	6.1
2007	84	0.702	0.585	12.4	6.2
2008	84	0.704	0.588	12.3	6.3
2009	79	0.709	0.604	12.9	6.4
2010	83	0.715	0.608	12.9	6.5
2011	92	0.720	0.608	12.9	6.5
2012	90	0.722	0.608	12.9	6.5

Source: UNDP, 2013; TÜİK, 2014

In the Human Development Report of 2013, Turkey was ranked 90th with 0.722 human development index and was in the high human development countries category.

After an examination of the data in Table 3, it can be said that there are increases in every indicator. As a matter of fact, human development index in 2005 was 0.684 and it increased yearly to reach 0.722 by the year of 2012. This finding shows that Turkey is in the high human development countries group. Likewise, the education index, which was 0.560 in 2005, increased every year to reach 0.608 in 2010, but this increase has stopped since then. This is undoubtedly caused by the changes in the calculation of Human Development Index in the year of 2010, specifically by the fundamental changes in the indicators of the education index. Before 2010, “adult literacy” was used as the indicator for the education index, but since 2010 the stock variable “expected schooling year” is being used as the indicator. Because of the fact that expected schooling year does not change a lot on the short term, the upward tendency of the education index was inhibited. Moreover, before 2010, the adult literacy rate was calculated by using people 15 years and older, but after 2010, expected average schooling year rate has started to be calculated using people 25 and older, and this has also affected the index values. While Turkey has shown some improvements in the education indicators, it is impossible to change the average schooling year of the people who are 25 and older in a significant manner with a few years of improvement (DemirŞeker, 2011). Therefore, human development index is lower than the level that it should be.

Human Development Effect of Developments in Education in Transition Economics

The developments achieved by the transition economies according to education standard, which is an important standard for measuring countries’ development levels according to UNDP’s 2013 Human Development Report, was given out on the Table 4.

Table 4. Human Development Index and Indicators in the Transition Economies

Countries	Human Development Index		Average Schooling Year	Expected Schooling Year
	Rank	Value	Age 25 and older	
	2012	2012	2010	2011
CEE Countries				
Albania	70	0.749	10.4	11.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	81	0.735	8.3	13.4
Bulgaria	57	0.782	10.6	14.0
Czech Republic	28	0.873	12.3	15.3
Estonia	33	0.846	12.0	15.8
Croatia	47	0.805	9.8	14.1
Hungary	37	0.831	11.7	15.3
Macedonia	78	0.740	8.2	13.4
Latvia	44	0.814	11.5	14.8
Lithuania	41	0.818	10.9	15.7
Poland	39	0.821	10.0	15.2
Romania	56	0.786	10.4	14.5
Slovakia	35	0.840	11.6	14.7
Slovenia	21	0.892	11.7	16.9
CIS Countries				
Azerbaijan	82	0.734	11.2	11.7
Belarus	50	0.793	11.5	14.7
Armenia	87	0.729	10.8	12.2
Georgia	72	0.745	12.1	13.2
Kazakhstan	69	0.754	10.4	15.3
Kyrgyzstan	125	0.622	9.3	12.6
Moldova	113	0.660	9.7	11.8
Uzbekistan	114	0.654	10.0	11.6
Russian Federation	55	0.788	11.7	14.3
Tajikistan	125	0.622	9.8	11.5
Turkmenistan	102	0.698	9.9	12.6
Ukraine	78	0.740	11.3	14.8

Source: UNDP, 2013

According to Table 4, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Croatia is in the very high human development countries group according to HDI values calculated for 2013; Belarus, Russian Federation, Romania,

Bulgaria, Kazakhstan, Albania, Georgia, Macedonia, Ukraine, Bosnia- Herzegovina, Azerbaijan and Armenia is in the high human development countries group; Turkmenistan, Moldova, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan is in the average human development countries group (UNDP, 2013). This finding shows that CEE countries generally have higher values of human development than the CIS countries. While all of them are on the very high human development countries list, it should be noted that all of the CEE countries have high levels of human development. According to HDI values, Slovenia, Czech Republic and Estonia are the top three countries while Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia and Albania are the bottom three among the CEE countries. Despite having high human development levels, the common characteristic of the CEE countries that are behind of the CIS countries is that they are not EU members. According to HDI values, Belarus, Russian Federation and Kazakhstan are the top three among the CEE countries while Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan are among the three bottom the CEE countries.

When the HDI rankings of the countries for the years 2011 and 2012 in the Human Development Report was evaluated, it was noted that CEE country Macedonia has shown 2 points of decline; CEE countries Albania, Armenia, Bosnia- Herzegovina, Croatia and Romania and CIS countries Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan has shown 1 point of decline; CIS country Georgia has shown 3 points of growth; CEE country Lithuania has shown 2 points of growth; and CEE countries Latvia and Estonia and CIS countries Belarus, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan has shown a single point of growth.

When the data for the HDI indicator, “average schooling year” was assessed, it was noted that CEE countries, Czech Republic and Estonia, has distinguished themselves with the highest average schooling years with 12.3 and 12.0 respectively, and Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina has the lowest average schooling years with 8.2 and 8.3 respectively. For CIS countries, Georgia distinguishes itself with 12.1 years of average schooling years and Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan have ranked lowest with average schooling years with 9.3, 9.7, 9.8 and 9.9 respectively.

According to the HDI indicator “expected schooling years” criterion’s results, CEE country Slovenia shows the highest expected schooling years with 16.9 while Albania has the lowest expected schooling years with 11.4. As it can be seen on the Table 4, EU candidate countries have lower expected schooling years in comparison to EU member countries. For CIS countries, Kazakhstan has the highest expected schooling year rate with 15.3 while Tajikistan has the lowest expected schooling year rate with 11.5.

Comparison of Turkey and Transition Economics in Context of Human Development Effect of Education

Turkey’s comparison to the transition economies in the aspect of education’s effect on human development in the context of 2013 Human Development Report can be evaluated with these indicators: average schooling years, expected schooling years, access to education and schooling rates, student’s competency levels in mathematics, sciences and reading, satisfaction in the quality of education and rate of withdrawal from primary education.

Table 5 lays out the progresses achieved in the indicators such as access to education, total enrolment rates, student’s competency levels in mathematics, sciences and reading for Turkey and other transition economies according to UNDP’s Human Development Report of 2013.

Table 5 (Part-I). Education Standard Indicators of the Human Development Index in Transition Economies and Turkey

Countries	Educational Attainment		Gross Enrolment Ratio (%)			Primary school teachers trained to teach (%)	Mean score			Deviation from mean			Satisfaction with education quality (%)	Primary school dropout rate (%)
	Adult literacy rate (% age 15 and older)	Population with at least secondary education (% age 25 and older)	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary		Reading	Mat.	Science	Reading	Mat.	Science		
CEE Countries														
Albania	95.9	81.7	87.0	89.0	18.4	--	385	377	391	100	91	89	54.7	4.8
Bosnia and Herzegovina	97.9	--	88.0	90.0	35.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	67.9	26.8
Bulgaria	98.4	92.6	103.0	88.0	53.0	--	429	428	439	113	99	106	35.4	6.2
Czech Republic	--	99.8	106.0	90.0	60.7	--	478	493	500	92	93	97	71.4	0.4
Estonia	99.8	94.5	99.0	104.0	62.7	--	501	512	528	83	81	84	49.5	1.6
Croatia	98.8	64.4	93.0	95.0	49.2	--	476	460	486	88	88	85	63.7	1.0
Hungary	99.0	94.8	102.0	98.0	61.7	--	494	490	503	90	92	86	56.4	2.3
Macedonia	97.3	78.6	89.0	83.0	40.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	61.6	2.5
Latvia	99.8	98.4	101.0	95.0	60.1	--	484	482	494	80	79	78	51.0	5.4
Lithuania	99.7	90.2	97.0	98.0	77.4	--	468	477	491	86	88	85	51.1	1.6
Poland	99.5	80.0	97.0	97.0	70.5	--	500	495	508	89	88	87	60.8	2.4
Romania	97.7	86.8	96.0	95.0	63.8	--	424	427	428	90	79	79	45.3	4.9
Slovakia	--	98.8	102.0	89.0	54.2	--	477	497	490	90	96	95	58.4	2.3
Slovenia	99.7	95.6	98.0	97.0	86.9	--	483	501	512	91	95	94	72.6	0.5

Source: UNDP, 2013

Table 5 (Part-II). Education Standard Indicators of the Human Development Index in Transition Economies and Turkey

Countries	Educational Attainment		Gross Enrolment Ratio (%)			Primary school teachers trained to teach (%)	Mean score			Deviation from mean			Satisfaction with education quality (%)	Primary school dropout rate (%)
	Adult literacy rate (% age 15 and older)	Population with at least secondary education (% age 25 and older)	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary		Reading	Mat.	Science	Reading	Mat.	Science		
CIS Countries														
Azerbaijan	99.8	92.7	94.0	85.0	19.3	100	362	431	373	76	64	74	53.0	3.6
Belarus	99.6	--	100	96.0	83.0	99.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	55.4	0.3
Armenia	99.6	94.4	103.0	92.0	51.5	77.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	45.7	2.3
Georgia	99.7	91.0	109.0	86.0	28.2	94.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	65.7	3.8
Kazakhstan	99.7	99.3	111.0	100.0	40.8	--	390	405	400	91	83	87	49.9	0.2
Kyrgyzstan	99.2	81.1	100	84.0	48.8	68.4	314	331	330	99	81	91	47.7	2.4
Moldova	98.5	93.3	94.0	88.0	38.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	53.7	4.8
Uzbekistan	99.4	--	95.0	106.0	8.9	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	85.0	1.9
Russian Federation	99.6	94.7	99.0	89.0	75.9	--	459	468	478	90	85	90	38.0	3.9
Tajikistan	99.7	89.7	102.0	87.0	19.7	92.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	76.4	1.1
Turkmenistan	99.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	74.3	--
Ukraine	99.7	93.5	99.0	96.0	79.5	99.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	50.1	2.3
Turkey	90.8	34.5	102.0	78.0	45.8	--	464	445	454	82	93	81	54.3	8.2

Source: UNDP, 2013

Comparison of Average Schooling Years and Expected Schooling Years

The examination of data given out in Table 3 and Table 4 shows that Turkey (6.5) is behind of CEE and CIS countries in the context of the HDI education standard indicator called the average schooling years as well. Even the country that Turkey is closest to in the context of average schooling years, Bosnia- Herzegovina, has an average schooling years of 8.3. Similarly, Turkey also has lower values than every EU member and EU candidate CEE countries with the exception of Albania in expected schooling year indicator. As mentioned before, the changes in the education indicators have changed the result of calculations, and, countries that have been increasing schooling rates while having relatively lower current schooling rates have been negatively impacted in HDI value and rankings due to the usage of these variables. Despite this, countries with very high literacy rates have climbed to upper ranks due to the distinguishing characteristic of this variable. Previously, the literacy rate for people 15 years and older was taken for calculations, but after the 2010 year's report, schooling years for people 25 years and older have started being used as the indicator and this has negatively impacted countries that have been increasing their schooling rates in the past few years (DemirŞeker, 2011).

Comparison in Access to Education and Schooling Rates

Examination of the data in Table 5 shows that Turkey (90.8) stands behind in the literacy rate in comparison to both CEE and CIS countries. Turkey is closest to Albania in literacy rate. And even Albania has a literacy rate of 95.9. Countries with the highest literacy rates are Estonia and Latvia (99.8). The differences in HDI rankings between CEE and CIS countries do not exist in the context of literacy rates. This caused by CIS countries having high literacy rates just like CEE countries. This finding shows that CIS countries' HDI rankings are affected by other human development standards rather than education.

When Table 5, which lays out the rates of access to secondary education and higher in transition economies was evaluated, it was noted that transition economies such as the Czech Republic (99.8), Kazakhstan (99.3) and Slovakia (98.8) are ranked the highest; while transition economies such as Croatia (64.4), Macedonia (78.6) and Poland (80.0) are ranked the lowest. In Turkey, the rate of access to secondary and higher education is 34.5 percent. This finding shows that, similar to literacy rates, Turkey also stands behind of the transition economies in access to secondary and higher education.

According to Human Development Report of 2013, the exact schooling rate for primary education is 102.0%, the exact schooling rate for secondary education is 78.0% and the exact schooling rate for higher education is 45.80% in Turkey. While Turkey is higher than the transition economies' average in exact schooling rate for primary education, in secondary and higher education, Turkey is behind on the schooling rate in comparison to transition economies. Turkey also shows a high rate of dropouts from primary education in comparison to transition economies along with its high rate of primary education schooling. After Bosnia-Herzegovina, Turkey has the highest dropout rate from primary education.

Comparison of Student's Competency Levels in Mathematics, Sciences and Reading

The test called the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) run by OECD compares the mathematics, sciences and reading competency levels of students from 15 different countries and shows the results. The results for 2009 test that were released at the end of 2010 shows that Turkey has shown significant advancements starting from the year of 2003. Despite this, in the results of this test, which is graded as 1 point being the lowest and 6 points being the highest, Turkey is still graded 2 in the fields of mathematics, sciences and reading (Çoban, 2013:23). According to UNDP's Human Development Report of 2013,

Turkey is behind of every CIS country with data is available for and is behind of every CEE country with the exceptions of Albania, Bulgaria and Romania.

Despite Turkey being almost always behind of transition economies and ranking lower than the averages of the transition economies in the education indicators, there are virtually no differences in satisfaction with education quality when in comparison to transition economies, and, as a matter of fact, Turkey has ranked higher in this regard than most of these countries.

RESULT

According to Human Development Report of 2013, Turkey is ranked 90th among 187 countries and has lower HDI value than all CEE countries and all CIS countries with a few exceptions. On the HDI rankings, Turkey has been ranked higher than some of the CIS countries, namely, Turkmenistan, Moldova, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

When the CEE and CIS countries' and Turkey's human development indicators were examined, it was seen that there are significant differences between EU member and EU candidate CEE countries, CIS countries and Turkey, and these differences are not just between groups but they are in the groups as well. Additionally, CEE countries are generally doing better than CIS countries that have low income per capita, life expectancy at birth and schooling years. Turkey, ranked 90th in the HDI ranking, has higher income per capita than the EU candidate countries but it also has lower average schooling years and expected schooling years than those countries.

Turkey definitely needs to improve the education indicators aspect if it wants to reach the rankings of CEE countries. The low rates of average schooling years and expected schooling years in Turkey drop its HDI ranking despite Turkey has more gross national product than most of the transition economies. Despite this, CIS countries that are ahead of Turkey in the HDI rankings get their rankings mostly because of other human development standards rather than education.

Undoubtedly, the most important factor that effect the education index values which effect Turkey's HDI rankings negatively is Turkey reserving limited amount of its gross national product for education, especially in comparison to CEE countries. This surely reduces expenses on education per capita in Turkey and as a result of this, education index values such as schooling and literacy rates that effect Turkey's HDI rankings are lower in comparison to the countries aforementioned.

It is obvious that education, which is an important tool for ensuring opportunity equality while being a development indicator, will have an important place in the future as well. The countries with higher levels of education will have higher levels of economic and social development. In this context, Turkey needs to reserve more resources on education because of the needs in economic and social development. If Turkey wants to reach the higher steps of HDI ranking, which is an indicator of development, it needs to place more importance and make more contributions to education, especially in comparison to other transition economies.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Science, Industry and Technology Ministry General Directorate of Productivity (2013). *Productivity Strategy and Action Plan (2014-2017)*, <http://www.ydd.org.tr/uploads/files/VSEP-Komisyonlar.pdf>(Access date: May 24, 2015)
- [2]. DemirŞeker, S. (2011). *Turkey's Human Development Index and Analysis of Index Ranking*, Ankara: SPO General Directorate of Social Sectors and Coordination Publications.
- [3]. Ereş, F. (2005). Social Benefits of Education: Turkey-E Ucomparison, *The National Education Journal*, 33 (167), 33-42. http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/167/index3-eres.htm (Access date::May 24, 2014)
- [4]. Gradstein, M., & Justman, M. (2002). Education, Social Cohesion and Economic Growth, *the American Economic Review*, 92 (4), 1192-1204.
- [5]. Karaca, E. (2008). Quality Seeking In Education and Reorganization of Education Faculties, *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 21, 61-80.
- [6]. Kesici, M. R. (2008). European Union Membership and Employment in Transformation Process of Transition Economics, *Social Policy Conferences*, 363-403.
- [7]. Nartgün Ş. S., Kösterelioğlu, M. A., & Sipahioğlu, M. (2013). Comparison of European Union Member Countries and Candidate Countries in Terms of Human Development Index Indicators, *Trakya University Faculty of Education Journal*, 3 (1), 80-89, http://egitimdergi.trakya.edu.tr/arsiv/2013_Cilt3_Sayi1/article7_%C5%9Eenay%20Sezgin%20Nartg%C3%BCn%2080-89.pdf(Access date: May 25, 2014).
- [8]. TÜİK (2014). Education, Regional Statistics, <http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/SecilmisUluslararasıGostergeler/metaVeriEkle.do?durum=metaGetir&menuNo=106>(Access date: May 30, 2014)
- [9]. UNDP (2005). *Human Development Report 2005*, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/266/hdr05_complete.pdf (Access date: March 05, 2014)
- [10]. UNDP (2006). *Human Development Report 2006*, <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/267/hdr06-complete.pdf> (Access date: March 05, 2014)
- [11]. UNDP (2008). *Human Development Report 2007/2008*, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/268/hdr_20072008_en_complete.pdf (Access date: March 05, 2014)
- [12]. UNDP (2009). *Human Development Report 2009*, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/269/hdr_2009_en_complete.pdf (Access date: March 05, 2014)
- [13]. UNDP (2010). *Human Development Report 2010*, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/270/hdr_2010_en_complete_reprint.pdf (Access date: March 05, 2014)

- [14]. UNDP (2011). *Human Development Report 2011*, http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/HDR/2011%20Global%20HDR/English/HDR_2011_EN_Complete.pdf (Access date: March 05, 2014)
- [15]. UNDP (2013). *Turkey*, <http://www.tr.undp.org/content/dam/turkey/docs/Publications/hdr/Turkey.pdf> (Access date: March 05, 2014)
- [16]. UNDP (2013). *Human Development Report 2013*, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/14/hdr2013_en_complete.pdf (Access date: March 05, 2014)