ENDERUN DERGİSİ
JOURNAL OF ENDERUN

e-ISSN: 2618-592X
YIL/YEAR: 2025 CİLT/VOL: 9 SAYI/ISSUE: 2

Çevrimiçi olarak / Available online at www.*dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/enderun*

DIGITALIZATION, INNOVATION, AND SUSTAINABILITY IN TURKIYE: A TÜSİAD-BASED DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (2000–2025)

DİJİTALLEŞME, İNOVASYON VE SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİRLİK: TÜSİAD TEMELLİ BİR SÖYLEM ANALİZİ (2000–2025)

Makalenin
Gönderim Tarihi:
12/09/2025

Makalenin
Kabul Tarihi:
25/09/2025

Assist. Prof. Dr. Sevil ZENGİN GUPTA [a]
[a]Yozgat Bozok University,
Political Science and Public Administration,
E-mail: sevil.zengin@yobu.edu.tr,
ORCID: 0000-0002-8129-8878

DOI: 10.59274/enderun.1782887

ABSTRACT

This article examines the evolving development themes in TÜSİAD reports between 2000 and 2025 through a discourse analysis approach. The study shows that the early 2000s, characterized by corporate reform and EU alignment, expanded in the 2010s to emphasize innovation, R&D, and digitalization, and further evolved in the 2020s to include the Green Deal, climate policies, and social inclusion. The analysis highlights that the persistent focus on standards compliance and external integration in TÜSİAD discourse was continuously reshaped by critical junctures, including the 2001 and 2008 crises, the 2018 financial turbulence, and the COVID-19 pandemic. Findings indicate that the Turkish business community's understanding of development increasingly positions corporate quality, digitalization, innovation, and sustainability as an integrated vision for long-term growth.

Keywords: TÜSİAD, development discourse, corporate reform, digitalization, innovation, sustainability, discourse analysis

ÖZET

Bu makale, 2000 ile 2025 yılları arasında TÜSİAD raporlarında yer alan gelişim temalarının söylem analizi yaklaşımıyla incelenmesini ele almaktadır. Çalışma, kurumsal reform ve AB uyumunun öne çıktığı 2000'li yılların, 2010'larda yenilik, Ar-Ge ve dijitalleşmeye, 2020'lerde ise Yeşil Mutabakat, iklim politikaları ve sosyal kapsayıcılığa vurgu yapacak şekilde genişlediğini ortaya koymaktadır. Analiz, TÜSİAD söyleminde standartlara uyum ve dış entegrasyona yönelik sürekli vurgunun, 2001 ve 2008 krizleri, 2018 finansal dalgalanması ve COVID-19 pandemisi gibi kritik dönemeçlerle sürekli yeniden şekillendiğini göstermektedir. Bulgular, Türk iş dünyasının kalkınmaya dair anlayışının giderek kurumsal kalite, dijitalleşme, yenilikçilik ve sürdürülebilirliği uzun vadeli büyüme için bütünleşik bir vizyon olarak konumlandırdığını ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: TÜSİAD, kalkınma söylemi, kurumsal reform, dijitalleşme, yenilik, sürdürülebilirlik, söylem analizi

1. Introduction

Over the past twenty-five years, Turkiye's economic and institutional landscape has undergone significant transformations, shaped by both domestic reforms and global developments. Business associations, and particularly TÜSİAD, have played a central role in articulating the priorities and challenges of Turkiye's development trajectory. Their reports provide a rich source for understanding how the discourse surrounding growth, institutional quality, and competitiveness has evolved over time.

The early 2000s were marked by a strong emphasis on corporate reform, European Union alignment, and institutional transparency. In this period, TÜSİAD discourse highlighted the importance of political democratization, regulatory harmonization, and the adoption of international accounting standards as foundational elements for sustainable growth. The 2010s witnessed a shift toward innovation, research and development, and digitalization, reflecting the increasing recognition that productivity and knowledge-based capabilities were critical for overcoming structural economic constraints.

Entering the 2020s, TÜSİAD's discourse further evolved to incorporate dual imperatives of digital and green transformation, alongside a focus on social inclusion and human capital development. The COVID-19 pandemic, the EU Green Deal, and emerging global supply chain dynamics accelerated these trends, underscoring the role of corporate quality, digital infrastructure, and sustainability as interlinked pillars of development strategy.

This study employs a discourse analysis approach to examine TÜSİAD reports from 2000 to 2025, identifying continuity and change in the association's development narratives. By tracing the evolution of key themes—corporate quality, digitalization, innovation, and sustainability—this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how business-led discourse has shaped and responded to Turkiye's evolving development context.

2. Literature Review

The trajectory of Turkiye's economic and institutional reforms over the last two decades has been widely analyzed in the context of globalization, EU integration, and domestic political economy dynamics. Scholars have emphasized that structural reforms, corporate governance improvements, and alignment with international standards are crucial for emerging economies seeking integration into global markets (Claessens & Yafeh, 2012; La Porta et al., 1998). In the Turkish case, reform efforts during the early 2000s are often framed as a response to systemic vulnerabilities revealed by the 2001 financial crisis, which exposed weaknesses in fiscal management, banking regulation, and institutional capacity (Öniş, 2004; Aysan et al., 2007).

Business associations, particularly TÜSİAD, have played a central role in shaping policy discourse and articulating reform priorities. Their advocacy for EU alignment and corporate governance reflects both normative and strategic considerations: aligning domestic rules with EU standards not only facilitates market access but also signals institutional credibility to international investors (Kaya, 2003; Öniş & Şenses, 2020). This perspective aligns with institutionalist theories emphasizing the interplay between domestic actors and supranational norms, where compliance is often both a political and economic strategy (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2005). Critics, however, argue that while alignment with EU norms improved formal institutional frameworks, enforcement and effectiveness remained uneven, revealing a persistent gap between de jure and de facto governance (Öniş, 2009; Aysan et al., 2007).

The post-2010 period marks a conceptual shift toward innovation-led growth, human capital development, and digitalization. Turkiye's struggle with the "middle-income trap" has been documented extensively, highlighting structural constraints such as insufficient R&D investment, skills mismatch, and weak innovation ecosystems (OECD, 2011; World Bank, 2019). TÜSİAD's discourse reflects these concerns, emphasizing the importance of productivity, digital infrastructure, and sectoral modernization. From a critical perspective, this focus on innovation underscores the tension between short-term stabilization and long-term competitiveness; scholars argue that without sustained institutional capacity and policy consistency, innovation strategies risk being fragmented or symbolic rather than transformative (Rodrik, 2013; Hausmann et al., 2008).

Recent literature on the 2015–2024 period situates Turkiye within the global dual challenge of digital and green transformation. Digitalization, platform economies, and the emergence of e-commerce have become central to maintaining competitiveness in global value chains (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; UNCTAD, 2021). Simultaneously, sustainability imperatives, including climate policy and green finance, have introduced new institutional and regulatory pressures (OECD, 2020; European Commission, 2021). TÜSİAD's reports mirror these global trends, advocating for resilient institutions, human capital development, and regulatory adaptation. Critically, scholars note that while policy rhetoric emphasizes inclusivity and sustainability, implementation gaps persist, particularly regarding the integration of environmental and social objectives into corporate governance frameworks (Dangelico & Pujari, 2010; Lozano, 2015).

Across all periods, the literature suggests that Turkiye's developmental trajectory has been shaped by the interaction of domestic institutional reform, external integration pressures, and global economic shocks (Öniş & Şenses, 2020). Business associations such as TÜSİAD function as both policy advocates and knowledge brokers, translating international standards into domestic policy agendas (Kaya, 2003; Öniş, 2009). Yet, critical perspectives emphasize that structural reforms, technological upgrades, and sustainability initiatives require not only policy alignment but also the deepening of institutional capacity, enforcement mechanisms, and inclusive stakeholder engagement (Rodrik, 2013; Hausmann et al., 2008). This literature provides a conceptual foundation for understanding the evolution of TÜSİAD's discourse from corporate reform and EU alignment to innovation-led and green-digital transformation, highlighting both achievements and persistent challenges in Turkiye's economic modernization.

3. Theoretical and Methodological Framework

Discourse analysis offers a critical approach for examining how influential actors, such as TÜSİAD, shape and communicate development priorities. Rather than treating language as a neutral vehicle, this approach conceptualizes discourse as a site where knowledge, power, and institutional authority intersect, actively producing and legitimizing particular policy agendas while constraining others (Fairclough, 2003; van Dijk, 2008). This perspective allows for a nuanced understanding of how development narratives are constructed, circulated, and normalized within social and political contexts.

In this study, TÜSİAD reports are analyzed through a three-tiered framework. The micro-level analysis focuses on annual reports, tracing immediate themes, rhetorical patterns, and the specific ways in which priorities are framed each year. The meso-level analysis synthesizes patterns across multiple years, identifying thematic consistencies, emergent issues, and discursive shifts that indicate contestation or consolidation within institutional narratives. At the macro-level, the analysis examines long-term trends and structural transformations in TÜSİAD's discourse, highlighting critical junctures where development priorities are redefined and where new paradigms emerge.

This layered framework enables a critical exploration of how development priorities are constructed and maintained over time. It illuminates both persistent narratives and shifting discursive strategies, revealing the mechanisms through which certain priorities gain legitimacy while others are marginalized. By situating TÜSİAD's discourse within broader social, political, and economic contexts, this study underscores the interplay between language, institutional power, and the strategic shaping of development agendas (Hajer, 1995; Hajer, 2006).

4. Findings

For 2000- 2004: Corporate Reform and EU Alignment as micro- level analysis (yearly summaries), the early 2000s in Turkiye were marked by a concerted effort to strengthen institutional quality and align national policies with European Union (EU) standards. In 2000, emerging vulnerabilities in the financial sector, coupled with bureaucratic inefficiencies, underscored the need for systemic corporate reforms (Kaya, 2003). The economic crisis of 2001 acted as a critical juncture, exposing the fragility of fiscal management and the banking sector while catalyzing a renewed emphasis on regulatory oversight, fiscal discipline, and measures to restore investor confidence (Öniş, 2004).

By 2002, TÜSİAD's discourse reflected a broader understanding of economic reform as inseparable from political reform. Recommendations included democratization measures, adjustments to the electoral system, and adherence to EU political criteria, alongside trade liberalization initiatives aimed at enhancing economic openness (TÜSİAD, 2002). The 2003 reports indicate a growing sophistication in financial governance, particularly the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) to increase transparency and attract foreign investment (World Bank, 2003). By 2004, the focus had expanded to competition law and sectoral compliance with EU technical regulations, signaling a move toward institutionalized market governance and long-term structural reform.

As meso-level analysis (period synthesis), the 2000–2004 period demonstrates persistent themes in TÜSİAD's discourse: EU alignment, corporate governance, and transparency. The 2001 crisis represents a critical juncture that reoriented growth priorities toward institutional quality as a precondition for sustainable development (Aysan et al., 2007). Continuities include a consistent emphasis on rule-based governance, standards compliance, and market transparency, reflecting the business community's perception that institutional strengthening is essential for both domestic stability and international credibility.

For 2005–2009: Financial Stability and External Integration as micro- level analysis, from 2005 onward, TÜSİAD reports highlight the dual challenge of aligning with EU standards while navigating global economic volatility. In 2005–2006, priorities included technical harmonization with EU regulations, improving the investment climate, and enhancing SME productivity (TÜSİAD, 2006). By 2007, attention shifted to energy security, logistics infrastructure, and diversification of external markets, reflecting an awareness of external vulnerabilities. The 2008 global financial crisis constituted a critical juncture, prompting immediate policy responses to stabilize the financial system and mitigate demand contraction (IMF, 2009). By 2009, recovery-oriented discourse emphasized exports, cost competitiveness, and productivity improvements, demonstrating an adaptive, crisis-driven policy mindset.

As meso-level analysis, this period reveals a discourse shaped by crisis management, financial stability, and competitiveness, alongside continued EU harmonization. The 2008 crisis redefined policy priorities, particularly the emphasis on macroprudential regulation and risk mitigation (Kose et al., 2010). Continuities include the persistent focus on external integration, regulatory compliance, and competitive market practices, illustrating a strategic trajectory from stabilization toward resilient market governance.

For 2010- 2014: Innovation and Digital Foundations as micro- level analysis, the post-crisis recovery period (2010–2014) marked a transition from stabilization to innovation-led growth. In 2010, policy discourse centered on productivity enhancement and structural reforms. By 2011, concerns regarding the middle-income trap prompted attention to R&D ecosystems and innovation policy (OECD, 2011). In 2012, TÜSİAD highlighted education–employment mismatches and the necessity of digital infrastructure to support competitiveness. Subsequent reports emphasized logistics efficiency, energy cost management, and value-added production, while 2014 underscored the centrality of corporate governance, investor confidence, and rule-of-law considerations.

As meso-level analysis, this period represents a structural shift from demand-driven to productivity-led growth, reflecting the integration of knowledge-based development priorities. Digital infrastructure, human capital development, and institutional reform became key discursive themes (TÜSİAD, 2014). Continuities with earlier periods include sustained EU alignment and compliance with global standards, while critical junctures highlight the emergent role of innovation and technological modernization as drivers of competitive advantage.

For 2015–2019: Digital Transformation and Resilience as micro- level analysis, between 2015 and 2019, TÜSİAD increasingly framed digital transformation as central to competitiveness. Initial reports (2015–2016) focused on industrial transformation, SME digitalization, and supply chain modernization. The discourse also addressed institutional capacity-building in response to geopolitical uncertainties (TÜSİAD, 2016). By 2017–2018, the emphasis expanded to digital policy, STEM workforce development, and financial risk management amid currency volatility. In 2019, attention turned to platform economies, e-commerce, and data governance, reflecting the growing significance of the digital economy.

As meso-level analysis, this period is characterized by accelerated digital transformation and the critical importance of human and regulatory capital. The 2018 financial turbulence represents a critical juncture, reinforcing the imperative of resilient institutions (World Bank, 2019). Continuities include EU and global standards alignment, and persistent emphasis on productivity, competitiveness, and structural modernization.

For 2020–2024: Green and Digital Dual Transformation, as micro- level analysis, the 2020–2024 period is defined by a dual emphasis on green and digital transformation. In 2020, TÜSİAD reports addressed blockchain governance, digital trade with China, agricultural reforms, tourism development, pandemic response, gendered labor impacts, and climate policy (TÜSİAD, 2020). Between 2021 and 2024, discourse extended to 5G/FRAND standards, software ecosystem development, omni-channel retail, corporate visions of "Human–Science–Institutions," TTK m.376 guidance, and educational equity initiatives, reflecting an increasingly systemic and integrative approach to economic transformation.

As meso-level analysis, key themes include digital and green transformation, inclusivity, human capital development, and institutional governance. Critical junctures, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, CBAM, and NextGenEU, accelerated both digitalization and sustainability agendas (European Commission, 2021). Continuities persist in standards compliance, external integration, and corporate quality, demonstrating an evolved policy discourse that balances economic modernization with social and environmental considerations.

For macro level synthesis which covers 2000- 2025, over the 25-year period, TÜSİAD discourse illustrates a clear evolution of development priorities:

- 2000s: Corporate reform, EU alignment, and institutional quality
- 2010s: Innovation, R&D, and digital foundations
- 2020s: Dual green and digital transformation, social inclusion, and sustainability

Persistent continuities include rule and standard compliance, external integration, and corporate governance. Transformations reflect a trajectory from institutional reform to innovation-driven and knowledge-based growth, culminating in a holistic vision integrating digitalization, sustainability, inclusivity, and corporate quality (TÜSİAD, 2024; Öniş & Şenses, 2020). This trajectory illustrates the interplay between internal institutional consolidation and external adaptation, highlighting the strategic role of business associations in shaping national development pathways.

Table 1: TÜSİAD Reports 2000–2024: Contextual Drivers, Policy Focus, and Transformative Trend

Period	Context (Turkiye & World)	Main Theme(S)	TÜSİAD Discourse / Recommendations	Sample Report Titles	Continuity	Innovation / Breakthrough
2000–2004	2001 Crisis, EU Candidacy, Copenhagen Criteria	Institutional Reform, EU Alignment, Transparency	Intra-Party Democracy, IFRS Compliance, Competition Law, Abolition Of Death Penalty	"Proposals For Amendments To The Political Parties Law" (2001); "Freedom Of Expression In Turkey" (2001); "Turkey's EU Membership And Economic Implications" (2002); "IFRS Compliance Report" (2003)	EU Standards, External Integration	Post-Crisis Emphasis On "Institutional Quality"
2005–2009	EU Negotiations, 2008 Global Crisis	Financial Stability, Competitiveness, Investment Climate	SME Productivity, Energy Security, Crisis Management	"Investment Climate And Competitiveness In Turkey" (2006); "Energy Security And Turkey" (2007); "Global Crisis And Turkey's Economy" (2008–2009)	EU Alignment Line	2008 Global Crisis Shock
2010–2014	Post-Crisis Recovery, Global Competition	Middle-Income Trap, Innovation, R&D, Digitalization	Education-Employment Alignment, Logistics/Energy Efficiency	"Turkey's Escape From The Middle-Income Trap" (2011); "Innovation And R&D Ecosystem" (2012); "Logistics	Search For Productivity	Digital Transformation Enters Discourse

				And Competitiveness In Turkey” (2013)		
2015–2019	Geopolitical Risks, Financial Fluctuation	Digital Transformation, Human Capital, Resilience	STEM Skills, SME Digitalization, Platform Economy	“Digital Transformation In Industry” (2015); “STEM Skills And Turkey’s Future” (2017); “Platform Economies In Turkey” (2019)	Standard Compliance	“Resilience” Agenda With 2018 Financial Fluctuations
2020–2024	Pandemic, EU Green Deal, 5G/Digital Economy	Dual Transformation (Green + Digital), Inclusivity	Blockchain, E-Commerce With China, Agriculture-Food, Women’s Labor, Education Equality, FRAND/SEP, Software Ecosystem	“Blockchain Technology And Business” (2020); “E-Commerce Market In China” (2020); “Women’s Labor And The Pandemic” (2020); “Green Deal And Turkey” (2021); “Future Of Retail” (2022); “Turkey’s Software Ecosystem” (2023)	External Integration, Standard Compliance	Pandemic Shock + CBAM/Climate Agenda Takes Center Stage

As shown in Table 1, TÜSİAD reports between 2000 and 2024 reflect a dynamic interplay between continuity in institutional objectives and adaptive responses to external shocks. In the 2000–2004 period, the 2001 economic crisis and Turkiye’s EU candidacy under the Copenhagen criteria framed a discourse focused on institutional reform, transparency, and EU alignment. TÜSİAD’s emphasis on intra-party democracy, IFRS compliance, competition law, and the abolition of the death penalty illustrates both a normative alignment with EU standards and a reactive post-crisis focus on “institutional quality.” However, the prescriptive nature of these recommendations indicates a limited capacity to anticipate structural economic transformations beyond immediate recovery needs.

During 2005–2009, amid ongoing EU negotiations and the 2008 global financial crisis, the organization shifted its focus toward financial stability, competitiveness, and the investment climate. Recommendations on SME productivity, energy security, and crisis management reflect a pragmatic response to macroeconomic volatility, yet the period exposes the tension between continuity-driven policy frameworks and the urgent need for systemic resilience.

The subsequent 2010–2014 period marks a transition toward addressing longer-term structural challenges, including the middle-income trap, innovation, R&D, and digitalization. TÜSİAD's reports on education-employment alignment and logistics/energy efficiency demonstrate a more sophisticated analytical approach, moving beyond immediate crisis management toward proactive economic restructuring. Digitalization emerges as a recurring theme, signaling a strategic recognition of technological imperatives for competitiveness.

From 2015 to 2019, geopolitical instability and financial fluctuations foregrounded digital transformation, human capital development, and organizational resilience. TÜSİAD's focus on STEM skills, SME digitalization, and platform economies illustrates a forward-looking stance, while the 2018 financial volatility reinforces resilience as a central organizational narrative.

Finally, the 2020–2024 period exemplifies dual transformation—green and digital—shaped by the pandemic, the EU Green Deal, and the rapid expansion of digital infrastructures such as 5G. TÜSİAD's reports expanded to cover blockchain, e-commerce with China, gendered labor participation, educational equality, and software ecosystem development. This period represents both continuity, in terms of external integration and standard compliance, and marked thematic innovation, reflecting the organization's capacity to pivot in response to systemic shocks and global policy developments.

Overall, Table 1 demonstrates that while TÜSİAD maintains a consistent emphasis on institutional quality and EU-aligned standards, each period also reveals critical junctures in which innovation, digitalization, and resilience narratives emerge. These shifts highlight TÜSİAD's dual role as both a continuity-oriented institution and an adaptive policy actor, offering insights into the organization's influence on Turkiye's economic and governance trajectories.

5. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that TÜSİAD's discourse from 2000 to 2025 has progressively positioned corporate quality, digitalization, innovation, and sustainability as interdependent pillars of Turkiye's development strategy. While these themes appear as forward-looking and transformative, critical junctures—such as economic crises and the COVID-19 pandemic—reveal how external shocks accelerate the reconfiguration of discourse, prompting the association to adapt its messaging to maintain relevance and influence. At the same time, the persistent emphasis on standards, global integration, and competitiveness highlights an enduring continuity, suggesting that TÜSİAD's vision balances adaptation with the preservation of its core economic and institutional priorities.

A critical analysis, however, indicates that this discourse is not neutral. By privileging innovation and sustainability primarily within a corporate and market-oriented framework, TÜSİAD may implicitly reinforce certain development pathways while sidelining alternative approaches, such as more inclusive, socially-driven, or environmentally radical strategies. This selective framing also raises questions about whose interests are foregrounded in shaping policy debates and whether business-led narratives risk narrowing the scope of public discourse on national development. Furthermore, the close alignment with global standards and external integration, while beneficial for international competitiveness, may perpetuate dependencies and limit the consideration of context-specific or grassroots-driven policy solutions.

These findings contribute to a nuanced understanding of how business associations influence policy narratives, not merely as reactive actors responding to crises, but as proactive architects of development agendas. They also underscore the importance of interrogating the assumptions embedded in such discourses, particularly regarding the intersections of economic growth, innovation, and social equity. Future research should explore how these narratives intersect with institutional reform, public policy design, and broader societal outcomes, examining the potential tensions between innovation-led strategies and inclusive, sustainable development.

REFERENCES

Aysan, A. F., et al. (2007). Turkey's Financial Crisis of 2001: Causes, consequences, and lessons. *Journal of Policy Modeling, 29*(6), 853–874.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in A Time of Brilliant Technologies.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Claessens, S., & Yafeh, Y. (2012). How Does Corporate Governance Affect Bank Performance? *Journal of Financial Intermediation, 21*(4), 407–432.

Dangelico, R. M., & Pujari, D. (2010). Mainstreaming Green Product Innovation: Why and How Companies Integrate Environmental Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(3), 471–486.

European Commission. (2021). *NextGenEU: Recovery and Resilience Plan.* Brussels: EC.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Hajer, M. A. (1995). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hajer, M. A. (2006). Doing Discourse Analysis: Coalitions, Practices, Meaning. In M. Howarth & A. J. Torfing (Eds.), *Discourse Theory in European Politics* (pp. 197–218). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hausmann, R., Hwang, J., & Rodrik, D. (2008). What You Export Matters. *Journal of Economic Growth, 12*, 1–25.

IMF. (2009). *Global Financial Stability Report.* Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

Kaya, A. (2003). Corporate Governance in Turkey: Challenges and Reform Pathways. *Turkish Studies, 4*(2), 45–68.

Kose, M. A., et al. (2010). Financial Crises and Macroeconomic Policy. *World Bank Economic Review, 24*(2), 171–201.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1998). Law and Finance. *Journal of Political Economy, 106*(6), 1113–1155.

Lozano, R. (2015). A Holistic Perspective on Corporate Sustainability Drivers. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 22*(1), 32–44.

OECD. (2011). *Turkey: Innovation and R&D Policy Review.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2020). *Environmental Performance Review: Turkey 2020.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Öniş, Z. (2004). Globalization and Turkish Political Economy: Crisis and Reform in the Early 2000s. *Middle Eastern Studies, 40*(4), 13–34.

Öniş, Z. (2009). Domestic Politics, International Norms, and EU Integration in Turkey. *South European Society and Politics, 14*(1), 1–19.

Öniş, Z., & Şenses, F. (2020). *Turkey's Development Strategy: EU Integration, Institutions, and Industrial Policy.* Routledge.

Rodrik, D. (2013). The Past, Present, and Future of Economic Growth. *Challenge, 56*(2), 5–39.

Schimmelfennig, F., & Sedelmeier, U. (2005). *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe.* Cornell University Press.

TÜSİAD. (2002–2024). *Annual Economic Reports.* Istanbul: TÜSİAD.

UNCTAD. (2021). *Digital Economy Report 2021: Cross-border Data Flows and Development.* Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

World Bank. (2003, 2019). *Turkey Economic Reports.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Annex A: Detailed Annual Policy Highlights, 2000–2024

Period	Year	Key Events (Micro-Level)	Meso-Level Synthesis (Themes, Breakpoints, Continuity)
2000–2004	**2000**	Institutional Reforms; Preparation For EU Alignment; Early Vulnerabilities (Financial, Bureaucracy Gaps)	*Common Themes:* EU Alignment, Transparency, Post-Crisis Institutional Capacity. Breakpoint: 2001 Crisis. Continuity: Rule/Standard-Based Integration As Growth Strategy.
	2001	Crisis Emerges; Fiscal Discipline, Banking Regulation, Investment Climate	
	2002	Democratization, EU Political Criteria; Electoral System Debates; External Economic Openness	
	2003	Financial Reporting Transparency; Shift Toward IAS/IFRS	
	2004	Competition Law, Technical Regulations; Sectoral Impacts Of EU Acquis	
2005–2009	**2005**	EU Technical Legislation Convergence Accelerates	*Common Themes:* Crisis Management, Financial Stability, Export Rebalancing, EU Alignment. Breakpoint: 2008 Global Crisis. Continuity: Institutional Alignment And Openness.
	2006	Investment Climate, Competitiveness, SME Productivity Debates	
	2007	Energy Security, Logistics, External Market Diversification	
	2008	Global Financial Crisis; Policy Response For Stability And Demand Contraction	
	2009	Recovery: Export Composition, Productivity, Cost Competitiveness	
	2010	Post-Crisis Growth Focus;	

Period	Year	Key Events (Micro-Level)	Meso-Level Synthesis (Themes, Breakpoints, Continuity)
		Productivity, Structural Reforms	
2010–2014	2011	Middle-Income Trap; Innovation And R&D Ecosystem Discussions	*Common Themes:* Innovation, Digitalization, Human-Capital-Driven Growth. Breakpoint: Shift To Productivity-Driven Growth. Continuity: External Integration And Standards Alignment.
	2012	Education–Employment Skill Mismatch; Early Digital Infrastructure Focus	
	2013	Logistics/Productivity, Energy Costs, Value-Added Production	
	2014	Corporate Governance, Investor Confidence, Rule-Of-Law Triangle	
2015–2019	2015	Industrial Transformation, SME Digitalization, Supply Chains	*Common Themes:* Accelerating Digital Transformation, Human Capital And Regulatory Adaptation. Breakpoint: 2018 Financial Fluctuations. Continuity: EU/Global Standard Alignment; Productivity Agenda.
	2016	Geopolitical Uncertainties; Resilience And Institutional Capacity	
	2017	Digital Transformation Policies Institutionalized; STEM Workforce Skills	
	2018	Exchange Rate Shocks; Access To Finance And Risk Management	
	2019	Platform Economies, E-Commerce, Data Governance, Competition Policy	
	2020	Digitalization & Blockchain (Governance, Pilots), Digital Trade & China, Agriculture/Food Reforms, Tourism, EU & Pandemic	

Period	Year	Key Events (Micro-Level)	Meso-Level Synthesis (Themes, Breakpoints, Continuity)
2020–2024	**2021 – 2024**	Policies, Women's Labor Vulnerabilities, Global Power Trends, Climate Regime Actions Standards & SEP/5G, Software Ecosystem, Retail Future, Human-Science-Institutions Vision, TTK M.376 Guidance, Education (Remote Learning)	*Common Themes:* Dual Transformation (Green + Digital), Standards/IP/SEP, Human Capital & Inclusion, Institutional Capacity. Breakpoints: Pandemic Shock, Nextgeneu, CBAM, E-Commerce Acceleration. Continuity: Standards Alignment Extended To 5G/SEP-FRAND And Digital Trade/Logistics; Institutional Quality Focus Reinforced.

Annex B: Macro-level Evolution (2000–2025)

Decade	Key Trends	Continuities	Transformations
2000s	EU Alignment And Institutional Reforms (Democratization, Competition, IFRS, Technical Regulation)	Rule/Standard Compliance, External Integration	–
2010s	Global Crisis, Innovation, Digitalization; Productivity-Driven Growth, R&D, Human Capital, Infrastructure	–	Shift From Institutional Alignment → Innovation/Digital Infrastructure
2020s	Pandemic, Green Transition, Digital Economy, Social Inclusion; CBAM/Green Deal Compliance, E-Commerce, Standards (5G-SEP), Women's Employment, Education Equity; Human-Science-Institutions Vision	–	Dual Transformation + Inclusion; Institutional Capacity Central