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This document presents the main findings of the EuroBroadMap survey that was performed using students in three cities in Turkey (Istanbul, Izmir and Erzurum) in the winter of 2009. This study highlights the most interesting features of Turkish students' mental perceptions of the world and Europe. This picture is drawn from the answers of 734 students, who were asked about their experiences and vision of the world.

The findings show that the spatial mobility of families in Turkey is fairly low: only 14 out of the 734 students who were surveyed were not born in Turkey. Turkish students seem to have a strong sense of belonging on the national (40%) and global (37%) levels. The average number of languages spoken by Turkish students is 2.06. Turkish students had visited an average of 1.9 countries. Most of the students declared that they had not yet visited any other countries (75%).

In line with the visiting tendencies of the Turkish students, most Turkish migrants (1.8 million) choose Germany as their destination. The other chosen destinations are France, the Netherlands, the USA and the UK.

The analysis also deals with the countries in which the students would or would not like to live in the near future. The results reflect the fact that the students mentioned mostly Western European countries (France, Germany), North America (Canada, the USA) and countries in the Mediterranean (Spain, Italy), which are perceived as favourable. Countries which are perceived negatively are primarily those in the Middle East and Asia because of conflicts within these areas. The choice of cities provides a similar picture of the world as perceived by Turkish students. London, Paris, New York and Rome are the most desirable cities, while Baghdad, Tehran, Tel Aviv and Yerevan are perceived negatively.

The analysis of words associated with Europe reveals that Turkish students perceive Europe as predominantly a cultural and economic place or as a political entity (in a positive or negative way). They also mention words connected to religious values or their perception of the European quality of life. The results of the Turkish survey indicate that, in general, Turkish students' perception of Europe and European countries, especially Italy, France, Germany, Spain and the UK, is positive. However, Western and Central Europe are preferred over Eastern Europe and the Balkan countries.

European countries (especially Western ones) are well-known by Turkish students. One of the factors which contributes to this awareness and the positive perceptions of Turkish students about Europe is the education system in Turkey. From primary school to higher education, all courses relating to the social sciences focus on one or more of the following subjects: the politics, culture, economics, history and geography of Europe, European countries, the EU and the relationship between these entities and Turkey. In Turkey, students know the Reformation, the Renaissance period and the geography of Europe better than the history and culture of America or the Far East, or the socio-political structure, economy, culture and history of anywhere other than Europe. This is the result of the education given by the Turkish authority which has embraced a policy of Westernisation since its establishment and Europeanisation since its application for full membership of the EU.

In addition to the education system in Turkey, Westernisation and the EU-oriented foreign policy of the Turkish authorities, the geographical proximity of European countries to Turkey, migration flows from Turkey to European countries (in particular to Germany in the 1960s) and trade relations between Turkey and European countries can be regarded as other factors which determine students' positive attributes towards Europe. Regarding the economic position of Turkey, it is accepted that the developments experienced thus far indicate that the Customs Union, while exposing Turkish industry to intense international competition, has launched a challenging process which facilitated the integration of Turkey into the EU.
The Turkish economy and social statistics, for all their recent improvements, are still a work in progress. Inflation has not been wholly defeated, the current account deficit is large and Turkey's competitiveness in manufacturing is a matter of concern. Worst of all, unemployment is distressingly high, especially in the east and southeast and among women and young people.

The importance of this shift extends far beyond the economic gains that accompany access to more diversified markets. As Turkey fans out across the Middle East and renews contacts in the old Turkic world (which stretches from Turkey through Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan and as far as Xinjiang in China), it is helping to underpin a stronger presence in a region that Turkey largely ignored for many years. This reflects a significant shift in Turkish foreign policy - one with which some in the West are far from comfortable.

This result can be interpreted as showing that Turkish students are prone to locating Turkey closer to the southeastern region, which indicates a feeling of belonging to this region. As regards the maximal extension, 10% of the students think of Turkey as part of the highest construct, simply called "the world". Overall, these results are consistent with previous results and experiences. According to these results, we can tell that Turkish students conceptualise Europe according to the EU and that they consider this entity to be "developed" in every way. This result indicates a positive attitude towards Europe. As regards the next most commonly cited words, "development", "economy", "education" and "freedom" all attract attention. These words again show positive thoughts and feelings towards Europe. However, in third place, out of the words "colonialism", "power", "wealth" and "culture", colonialism has negative connotations when considered alongside the words "power" and "wealth"; the Turkish students perhaps want to stress the economic imbalance between Europe and other countries which are in need. Turkish students' emphasis on the word "Turkey" indicates a perception of their country as separate from other countries. After seeing their country as a distinct entity, the students place their country within a larger construct, called the "world". Turkey is regarded as a country of the world, which does not belong to a specific region. Next, not a geographical but a semantic location is pronounced: developing countries. According to Turkish students, their country is among the developing countries, and is not yet developed. In a comparison of the Turkish sample with the entire EuroBroadMap sample, it can be seen that Turkish students have nearly the same vision as the EuroBroadMap sample as regards the extension of Europe. However, Turkish students accept the eastern lands of Turkey as part of Europe, while the EuroBroadMap sample as a whole considers only the western lands of Turkey to be part of Europe. In this report, the variation in the Turkish sample according to field of study and city is also analysed. Although the visions of the students in Izmir and Istanbul, which are located in the western lands of Turkey, are fairly similar, the students in Erzurum have different visions about Europe's limits and extension. In addition, Turkish students' perceptions of Europe sometimes differ according to their field of study. This report also examines the variation in the vocabulary used by the Turkish sample according to gender, the level of income, the scale of belonging, the number of languages the students speak, their field of study and the city. Although there are some differences in the students' perspectives on Europe, in general, Turkish students' views on Europe are positive, and they see Europe in terms of its political, social, cultural and economic aspects.

According to the results of the survey in Turkey, the most frequently mentioned positively perceived countries are Italy, the UK, France, Spain and Germany, which are all located in Western Europe. It is possible to argue that the positive perceptions held by Turkish students of Western Europe are in line with the foreign policy of Turkey. Turkey has always preferred to be Western-oriented in its foreign policy since its establishment. Thus, Turkish students’ choices are appropriate for Turkish foreign policy. In addition, it can also be seen that there is no direct correlation between positively perceived countries and countries which Turkish students have visited. The most commonly visited countries are Germany, Azerbaijan, the USA and France. However, out of these, only France and Germany are included in the list of countries which are positively perceived. Although Azerbaijan is one of the most frequently visited countries, fewer students see Azerbaijan as a country in which they would like to live. The survey results from Turkey show that Syria, Armenia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Israel and Iran are the countries in which Turkish students declare that they would least like to live. These negative perceptions can be explained by the ongoing conflicts, turmoil and wars in the regions in which these countries are located. These states have also faced common development and transitional problems, such as an unwillingness to democratise, weakness regarding human rights, Islamic religious fundamentalism, a lack of reforms to the market economy, a deficient work and investment environment, an unjust income distribution and difficulty integrating into the world economy. As these conditions are well-known by Turkish students, it is understandable for Turkish students to have negative perceptions of these Middle Eastern countries. The USA and Russia are among the countries in which Turkish students would both like to live and not like to live. As Turkey has had economic, political, social and cultural relations with these two countries since its establishment, they were mentioned by most of the students. Negative or positive perceptions of Russia and the USA may depend on the students’ political views. While more liberal or capitalist students would like to live in the USA, more socialist students would prefer to live in Russia. Countries that are simply ignored by Turkish students include Australia, Far East Asian countries, Latin American countries, the Balkan countries and African countries. The reason for this ignorance may be the distance between these countries and Turkey.

1.1 MENTAL ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE WORLD

"IN WHICH COUNTRIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO LIVE IN THE NEAR FUTURE?" : COUNTRIES VISION IN TURKEY

The mental map of the world can be characterised by three type of areas: countries positively perceived, countries negatively perceived and countries simply ignored.
The difference between the EuroBroadMap sample as a whole and the Turkish students concerning the countries in which they would like to live reveals a general distance effect, but also a specific attraction towards the eastern Mediterranean Sea, the Middle East and Central Asia. As regards African countries (except North Africa), the southern and western parts of Latin America (especially Colombia and Ecuador), Greenland, Latvia and Canada, the difference between the observed and predicted flows is negative, which means that these parts of the world are mentioned less frequently as potential destinations by Turkish students compared to the rest of the EuroBroadMap sample. In contrast to the rest of the sample, Turkish students declare that they would like to live in countries such as Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, followed by Russia, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Norway, the UK, Spain, Sweden. The places that are almost the same (i.e. Turkish students have the same preferences as other students from the EuroBroadMap sample) are the USA, Australia, Morocco, Finland, Romania, France, Germany, Central Europe and the Benelux countries. In general, for Turkish students, their views on the attractiveness of European countries are more or less equal to those of the rest of the EuroBroadMap sample. Turkish students are familiar with European countries; however, they do not have sufficient information about African countries. Although Italy, the UK, France, Spain and Germany are attractive to Turkish students, complementary analysis indicates that among them, France and Germany are less attractive to Turkish students than the rest of the sample, but that Italy is much more attractive. Although Russia, the Turkic republics, Egypt and Azerbaijan are not among the countries in which Turkish students would like to live, they quote these countries in a positive way more than the rest of the EuroBroadMap sample. The reason for this may be Turkish students’ unusual awareness of these countries as a result of their historical, economic and political ties with Turkey. In addition, although Turkish students have positive or neutral perceptions of the countries of Canada, South Africa, Australia, France, Germany and the Netherlands, the number of Turkish students who declare that they would like to live in these countries is a smaller proportion than in the rest of the EuroBroadMap sample.

**WHICH COUNTRIES ARE SPECIFICALLY ATTRACTIVE FOR THE STUDENTS OF YOUR COUNTRY?**

As compared to the 17 other countries of the EuroBroadMap survey, students of your country are characterised by specific preferences concerning the countries where they would like to live in a near future.

The difference between the EuroBroadMap sample as a whole and the Turkish students concerning the countries in which they would like to live reveals a general distance effect, but also a specific attraction towards the eastern Mediterranean Sea, the Middle East and Central Asia. As regards African countries (except North Africa), the southern and western parts of Latin America (especially Colombia and Ecuador), Greenland, Latvia and Canada, the difference between the observed and predicted flows is negative, which means that these parts of the world are mentioned less frequently as potential destinations by Turkish students compared to the rest of the EuroBroadMap sample. In contrast to the rest of the sample, Turkish students declare that they would like to live in countries such as Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, followed by Russia, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Norway, the UK, Spain, Sweden. The places that are almost the same (i.e. Turkish students have the same preferences as other students from the EuroBroadMap sample) are the USA, Australia, Morocco, Finland, Romania, France, Germany, Central Europe and the Benelux countries. In general, for Turkish students, their views on the attractiveness of European countries are more or less equal to those of the rest of the sample. Turkish students are familiar with European countries; however, they do not have sufficient information about African countries. Although Italy, the UK, France, Spain and Germany are attractive to Turkish students, complementary analysis indicates that among them, France and Germany are less attractive to Turkish students than the rest of the sample, but that Italy is much more attractive. Although Russia, the Turkic republics, Egypt and Azerbaijan are not among the countries in which Turkish students would like to live, they quote these countries in a positive way more than the rest of the EuroBroadMap sample. The reason for this may be Turkish students’ unusual awareness of these countries as a result of their historical, economic and political ties with Turkey. In addition, although Turkish students have positive or neutral perceptions of the countries of Canada, South Africa, Australia, France, Germany and the Netherlands, the number of Turkish students who declare that they would like to live in these countries is a smaller proportion than in the rest of the EuroBroadMap sample.
With the completion of the Customs Union with the EU (signed in 1995), the Turkish economy has been integrated into an important economic block. Through the Customs Union, Turkey has opened its internal market to competition from the EU and other countries, while guaranteeing free access to the EU market. Accordingly, in the course of its 16-year implementation, both positive and negative perceptions of the Customs Union have been experienced.

The EU is clearly the biggest trading partner of Turkey. In 2010, the EU accounted for nearly 47% of Turkey's total exports and 40% of its total imports. Turkey is an important trading partner of the EU as well. The foreign trade statistics of the EU for the year 2010 demonstrate that Turkey ranked seventh in terms of imports and fifth in terms of exports, with shares of 3% and 4% respectively.

The Customs Union has strengthened these traditionally comprehensive trade relations. Turkish exports to the EU increased from US$11 billion in 1995 to US$67 billion in 2010. During the same period, Turkish imports from the EU increased from US$16.8 billion to US$78 billion. Due to the Customs Union, Turkey's trade relations with the EU also grew, as exports increased by 472%, showing a higher rate of growth than imports, which increased by 343%. In the same period, the total exports increased by 510% and the total imports increased by 465%.

However, due to the global economic crisis in 2009, the EU witnessed an important economic recession and the EU economy contracted by 4.1%. As a result of this recession, total EU imports decreased by 24% in 2010. Accordingly, the EU's share in Turkish exports decreased to 43.8% in 2010. On the other hand, Turkish imports from the EU decreased by 24.4% in 2010 and the EU's share in Turkey's imports remained at 40.1%. As a result, the volume of trade between Turkey and the EU reached over US$105 billion in 2010, while it was US$27.9 billion in 1995. A remarkable development was also experienced with regard to exports to Africa. African countries' share in Turkey's total exports rose by 12.3% and reached the level of US$10.2 billion. Germany continued to be Turkey's largest export market, with a share of 9.6%. However, the total exports to Germany in 2009 fell by 24.3% and amounted to US$9.8 billion. France followed Germany with US$6.2 billion in exports, with the UK in third place with US$5.9 billion.
The major trading partners of Turkey are located in its immediate neighbourhood, including Russia, as well as in Western Europe. In contrast, other major economic powers, notably the USA, have limited trade relations with Turkey. We can observe that Turkey has a negative balance with regard to manufacturing medium- and high-technology goods with all major developed areas, but especially with East Asian economic powers. However, Turkey also has a negative balance with South and South East Asia and most of Latin America. This illustrates its rather weak position in the international division of labour. However, Turkey still dominates large parts of the world in terms of trade. It has a positive balance for manufacturing goods with all of Africa, the Middle East (except Saudi Arabia), notably its Eastern neighbours and, more surprisingly, the former USSR and the Balkans, including Greece. As an offshoring economy, Turkey sells manufacturing products to these regions, including medium-technology goods, such as cars manufactured by large Western European companies in Turkey.

The preferential trade links of Turkey cover four different areas around Turkey: the Islamic world, except South and East Asian Islamic countries, but including Arabic and Persian countries; the Balkan countries; the former USSR; and, to a lesser extent, Western Europe. Distance as well as cultural and historical relations may play a role in explaining the geographical pattern of Turkish trade. On the one hand, cultural links with the Islamic world and, more specifically, with Turkish-speaking countries such as Azerbaijan, are probably an important factor in explaining this geography. Moreover, the Ottoman Empire dominated this whole area for centuries until the First World War, including the Balkan countries. Preferential links with Western Europe have a clear core/periphery pattern, with Turkey selling low-technology goods and buying equipment and more sophisticated products.
Regarding the similarity of Turkish votes to those of other countries at the UNGA during the 2009-2010 sessions, it is interesting to note that one of the countries which made exactly the same choices as Turkey (with a rate of 80-100%) is Greece. It is widely known that Greece has experienced political conflict, such as border disputes and the Cyprus issue with Turkey. This fact indicates that in the case of Greece and Turkey, it is not possible to draw a picture of diplomatic alliances and similarities simply by looking at the rate of similarity of votes for resolutions passed at the UNGA. This result may mean that these resolutions were not related to Turkish or Greek interests. It is possible that looking at the content of the resolutions or evaluating other factors may achieve a better result.

Other countries that have an 80-100% rate of similarity with Turkey are Portugal, Norway, Slovenia, Iceland and Cyprus. As in the case of Greece, Cyprus does not have a diplomatic alliance with Turkey. Turkey votes in a similar way to the whole of Latin America (except three countries: Bolivia, Venezuela and Colombia), almost all European countries (except countries with a rate of 80-90%), Oceania, Canada, some African countries (especially those in the southeast) and some Asian countries such as China, Kazakhstan, Iraq, the UAE and Oman. It is also interesting to note that an evaluation on the basis of the similarity of votes at the UNGA for this period indicates that Turkey is least similar to the USA, which has been accepted as one of Turkey's more important diplomatic alliances since it was founded. As stated in the document prepared for EuroBroadMap WP4, Turkey remains Western-oriented in its foreign policy and Turkey's foreign policy has been largely shaped by its collaboration with the USA in the post-Cold War era. However, an effort to draw a picture of diplomatic alliances and similarities just by looking at the rate of voting similarity is also not valid for the case of Turkey and the USA. The rate of voting similarity between Turkey and the rest of the world is 40-60%.
In terms of similarities between Turkish votes and those of other countries at the UNGA before the Cold War period, there was almost a state of harmony between the countries, as 60-80% of 145 votes were the same as Turkish votes. As in the 2009-2010 sessions, the USA was the one exception. The rate of similarity between American and Turkish votes for the resolutions passed at the UNGA during the 1987-1988 sessions was 0-20%. Only 10 countries had a 40-60% rate of similarity with Turkey's voting habits. These countries were French Guiana and Surinam in South Africa, the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Sudan and the Central African Republic in Africa, France and the UK in Europe and India in Asia. The rest of the world had a 60-80% rate of similarity for resolutions before the end of the Cold War.

Once again, it is difficult to correlate the percentage similarity of votes at the UNGA before the Cold War period with the possibility of diplomatic alliances. Like the evaluation of resolutions passed during the 2009-2010 sessions, the results of the case of Turkey and the USA in 1987-1988 did not reflect reality. Despite the lowest level of voting similarity on resolutions at the UNGA, it is well known that Turkey collaborated with the USA on political, military, strategic, economic, social and cultural efforts during and after the Cold War period.
According to the maps, we can state that the majority of foreign countries visited by Turkish students had been visited by no more than 1 and 10% of Turkish students. This finding can be interpreted as showing that the number of countries visited by Turkish students is not very high. It can be clearly observed that Turkish students visit European countries most frequently, followed by the USA. While very few students visit Russia, Canada, China and Australia, none visit South America or many of the African countries, except for Kenya and Egypt. In addition, no-one from the Turkish sample had visited the South Asian countries of India, Pakistan and Afghanistan. Overall, these results reveal that the visiting attitudes of Turkish students are based on close frontiers and historical interaction. However, the USA is the only country which had been visited by 1-5% of the students at a moderately high frequency. If we elaborate on these attitudes to visiting, especially for Europe, we can see that Germany stands out as a destination (5-10%). Other countries which were visited at a higher frequency are France, Italy, the UK and the Netherlands. On the eastern border, Georgia and, to a greater extent, Azerbaijan are the two countries visited by Turkish students. To the south, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and, to a lesser extent, Syria had been visited. Overall, we can claim that historical interaction and then geographical proximity are determinants of Turkish visiting attitudes.
According to the International Organisation for Migration (IOM, http://www.iom.int/jahia/jsp/index.jsp), with 1.9% of migrants, Turkey is among the countries with the lowest percentage of migrants when compared to the percentage of the world’s population which is made up of migrants (3.1%). Although this percentage is considered to be low when compared with other countries, Turkey's annual rate of change in its stock of migrants experienced an upward trend in the period between 2000-2010, compared with the period between 1995-2000 (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2009). This can also be observed in figures. Based on these percentages and numbers, migration is considered to be a crucial social and demographic issue for Turkey today. Turkey's geographical location as a bridge between Asia and Europe and its relatively high level of prosperity compared to its neighbouring countries contribute to this migration issue, especially as it is one of the main destination countries affected by human trafficking (IOM, http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/turkey). Immigration has been a reality for Turkey since the Ottoman period. However, large-scale labour emigration started at the beginning of the 1960s (Castles 2007). While it is an attractive country for other citizens, Turkey also has emigrants in several other destinations. According to the World Bank’s reports in 2005, 4.4 million Turkish people are emigrants, constituting approximately 5-6% of the total population. In line with the visiting tendencies of Turkish students, most Turkish nationals (1.8 million) have chosen Germany as their destination country. The second most popular destination is France; however, it has a relatively low number of 359,000 Turkish people. The Netherlands is in third place, with 358,000 Turks (including dual citizenship holders). The USA is fourth, hosting 250,000 Turkish people, followed by the UK, with 150,000 Turks (Devlet 2007). Castles (2007) assumes that nearly 4 million people with Turkish origins live in Western Europe, the majority of them (approximately 2.5 million) in Germany. Approximately 1.3 million people of Turkish origin are thought to have become EU citizens, although many of these may have dual citizenship. According to the estimates of the World Bank (2007), the top 10 countries that host Turkish migrants are as follows (in order): Germany (2,706,232); France (197,819); the Netherlands (184,424); Austria (153,836); the USA (100,325); Saudi Arabia (95,752); Bulgaria (95,248); Greece (66,402); Switzerland (61,861) and the UK (60,110) (Siar 2008). However, in addition to major movements of Turkish people to European countries, there has also been recent mobility to the Gulf oil states, Russia and some Central Asian countries (Castles 2007). To sum up, Turkey can be regarded as a country which both sends and receives migrants. Turkish people nowadays are witnessing a period of sharp decline in emigration, while the country has become a destination for economic migrants from Eastern European and the former Soviet countries (including Moldova, Georgia, Armenia and Bulgaria) (Castles 2007), and very recently from Syria because of the conflicts.
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For this question, the students were asked to divide the world into a maximum of 15 regions. In other words, the students were invited to differentiate between world regions according to their own perceptions, in addition to the classical divisions they had learnt through their primary education. The evaluation of the Turkish sample's answers will enable us to determine the region of the world in which Turkey is located in a probabilistic way. According to this map, at its minimal core (which is represented by 10% of the students), Turkey lies within the borders of Anatolia, excluding Thrace and part of southeastern Anatolia. This result is in accordance with our theoretical knowledge of continents. In the second step, 80% of the students included the southeastern part of Anatolia, whereas Thrace, together with Northern Cyprus, was taken into account by 70% of the sample. In terms of the median expansion, 50% of the Turkish sample perceived Turkey to lie within a greater region composed of its closest neighbouring countries. In this version, there is an inclination towards the southeastern part more than other directions. This result can be interpreted as showing that Turkish students are more likely to locate Turkey closer to the southeastern region, which indicates a stronger sense of belonging to this region. For the maximal extension, 10% of the students think that Turkey belongs in the largest construct, "the world". Overall, these results are consistent with the previously obtained results and experience.
Turkish students were asked to locate Turkey in their drawings in an attempt to reveal Turkey's position among the world regions. Among the names given to these regions, "Turkey" is mentioned most frequently, followed by "world", "developing countries", "Europe", "Middle East" and "Asia". Turkish students' emphasis on the word "Turkey" indicates a perception of their country as separate from other countries. After seeing their country as a distinct entity, the students place their country within a larger construct, called the "world". Turkey is regarded as a country of the world, and not as belonging to a specific region. Next, not a geographical but a semantic location is pronounced: developing countries. According to Turkish students, their country is among the developing countries, and is not yet developed. Although they are not mentioned as frequently, the words "exploited" and "underdeveloped" are consistent with this finding. Therefore, it is clear that the Turkish students positioned Turkey in a vulnerable region by emphasising exploitation and the fact that Turkey is an underdeveloped but promising country, by stressing the word "developing" intensely. After this semantic focus, a geographical focus is observed with the words "Europe", "Middle East" and "Asia". This indicates the sample's inclination and desire to be seen as a European country more than a Middle Eastern or Asian country.

**WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE WORLD REGION WHERE THE STUDENTS LOCATE THEMSELVES?**

What are the names given by the students to the World region where your country is located?
As regards the delimitations of Europe proposed by Turkish students, it can be seen that France, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany and Italy are included in a "small Europe". We can say that this result may derive from the fact that these countries are at the centre of the European continent. In addition, with the exception of Italy, we know that other countries at the core of Turkish students' mental maps are those which Turkish people migrate to in Europe.

The area which is accepted as "medium Europe", including the entire European continent, is bordered by Finland and Norway to the north, Estonia, Latvia, Belarus, Ukraine, Bulgaria and Thrace (which is the part of Turkey in the European continent) to the east and Greece (except the Aegean islands), Italy, Spain, Ireland and Portugal to the west. In this region, it can be seen that Ireland, Norway, Finland, Latvia and Moldova are included less frequently compared to other students. In contrast, the area encircled by Spain, Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Austria and Italy is included more frequently by Turkish students than by the EuroBroadMap sample as a whole. The border of the "large Europe" consists of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Iraq, Iran and Syria to the east, the Mediterranean Sea, Morocco, Algeria and Tunis to the south, the Atlantic Ocean to the west and Iceland, Greenland and Russia to the north. In addition to the information from other regions, regarding the borders of the large Europe, Turkish students include Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Iceland and Greenland less frequently than other students. On the other hand, in their visions of a large Europe, Iran, Iraq and Syria are included more commonly than by the EuroBroadMap students.

WHAT IS THE GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENSION OF "EUROPE" FOR THE STUDENTS OF YOUR COUNTRY?
On the basis of the answers to the question "Draw your own limit of Europe", what are the various delimitations of "Europe" proposed by the students of your country

As regards the delimitations of Europe proposed by Turkish students, it can be seen that France, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany and Italy are included in a "small Europe". We can say that this result may derive from the fact that these countries are at the centre of the European continent. In addition, with the exception of Italy, we know that other countries at the core of Turkish students' mental maps are those which Turkish people migrate to in Europe. The area which is accepted as "medium Europe", including the entire European continent, is bordered by Finland and Norway to the north, Estonia, Latvia, Belarus, Ukraine, Bulgaria and Thrace (which is the part of Turkey in the European continent) to the east and Greece (except the Aegean islands), Italy, Spain, Ireland and Portugal to the west. In this region, it can be seen that Ireland, Norway, Finland, Latvia and Moldova are included less frequently compared to other students. In contrast, the area encircled by Spain, Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Austria and Italy is included more frequently by Turkish students than by the EuroBroadMap sample as a whole. The border of the "large Europe" consists of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Iraq, Iran and Syria to the east, the Mediterranean Sea, Morocco, Algeria and Tunis to the south, the Atlantic Ocean to the west and Iceland, Greenland and Russia to the north. In addition to the information from other regions, regarding the borders of the large Europe, Turkish students include Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Iceland and Greenland less frequently than other students. On the other hand, in their visions of a large Europe, Iran, Iraq and Syria are included more commonly than by the EuroBroadMap students.
In this section, it can be seen that Turkish students delimitate Europe using large borders. According to this map, most of the students see continental Europe as Europe, with a border including Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Germany, the Scandinavian countries and some Eastern European countries such as Ukraine, Belarus, Latvia and Estonia. In other words, Turkish students focus on those countries when they draw the limits of Europe. It is worth noting that Turkey is also included within the limits of Europe. However, while some students prefer to draw the borders of Europe to only include Thrace, some students include Turkey as a whole, with Thrace and Anatolia together. Another notable point is the situation regarding the UK and Ireland. For Turkish students, these two countries are included less frequently when compared with other countries in continental Europe. In addition, Russia is accepted as part of Europe by some (but not many) students in Turkey.
In order to complement the geographical analysis, this semantic analysis of Europe was realised by asking the students to provide five words that they associate with Europe. According to this analysis, “developed” and “union” are the two popular words chosen by the Turkish sample. According to this result, we can tell that Turkish students conceptualise Europe as the EU and that they consider this entity to be “developed” in every sense. This result indicates a positive attitude towards Europe. When we look at the next most frequently cited words, “development”, “economy”, “education” and “freedom” attract attention. These words once again show positive thoughts and feelings towards Europe. However, in third place, out of the words “colonialism”, “power”, “wealth” and “culture”, colonialism has negative connotations when considered alongside the words “power” and “wealth”. It seems that Turkish students may want to stress the economic imbalance between Europe and other countries which are in need. When we examine the words which are emphasised by Turkish students significantly more than the rest of the sample, we can see that “modern” and “imperialism” are two striking words. While the entire sample did not evaluate Europe as being “modern”, it is interesting that the Turkish sample focused on this aspect. This may be regarded as an expression of admiration for Europe, which is a more positive evaluation than the other countries. However, thinking of Europe as an “imperialist” construct shows a more negative attitude, while the rest of the sample does not stress this point. Next, “civilisation” and then “technology” and “Christian” are emphasised by Turkish students more than others. Among these, the word “Christian” needs further explanation. As the majority of Turkish students are Muslims, compared with the rest of the sample, it is expected that they will stress this religious difference. In addition, Turkey’s exclusion from the European Union could also be attributed to religious factors by Turkish students.
First, there are some gender differences regarding the view of Europe among Turkish students. While women describe Europe using words such as "modern", "education", "developed", "contemporary", "health" and "power", which concern the improvement of living standards, words such as "imperialism", "football", "Christianity", "justice" and "nationalism" are over-represented in the men's discourse. According to women, Europe is a functional space and an ideal for human development. On the other hand, for men, Europe is seen mainly as a political and economic space. This is why words such as "democracy", "imperialism", "nationalism", "peace", "liberalism" and "wealth" are used more frequently by men than women. One of the interesting results is that men in Turkey perceive Europe as a religious community. The over-representation of football by Turkish men is also interesting. The reason for this may be that football is the most popular sport among men, and that the football teams of Spain, Italy and Germany are the favourites in Turkey.

Second, there is some variation in vocabulary according to the income level of families. Overall, with the exception of students with low- and high-level incomes, the image of Europe remains positive. Students from families with a low income perceive Europe negatively and describe Europe using the words "crusader" and "expedient". The over-representation of Islam by low-income students may be a result of their efforts to indicate their antipathy towards the religious characteristics of Europe. Students with a high-level income tend to have a more objective image of Europe. On the one hand, they see Europe as a space which is associated with prosperity and a good standard of life. On the other hand, they describe Europe as a negative space using the words "crusader" and "discrimination".

Third, vocabulary analysis of the students' field of study reveals field-related conceptions of Europe. In Turkey, arts students value democracy, freedom and being comfortable when they think of Europe, whereas they do not emphasise development and technology. The arts sample produced contradictory findings: while "exploitation" (or synonyms thereof) is one of the most commonly stated words, "imperialist" is generally ignored by the same sample. In the business sample, most of the words associated with Europe have a positive meaning, such as "opportunity", "wealth", "richness", "civilisation" and "democracy". "Union" and "European Union" stood out as being emphasised by business students. Engineering students have positive perceptions of Europe, including perceptions of modernity. They associate words such as "contemporary", "modern", "culture", "civilised", "justice" and "developed" with Europe, while ignoring the negative words "imperialism" and "religion". While devaluing culture, students from the field of health mostly emphasise technical aspects of Europe, with words such as "technological", "science" and "powerful". As befits their area of study, politics students' associations reflect a political perspective. They primarily emphasise the law, and consider political views such as liberalism, capitalism and politics when thinking about Europe. "Imperialist", "heartless" and "arrogance" are the negative words highlighted by politics students, while they underestimate material words such as "wealth" and "money". Students of the social sciences have sophisticated views about Europe, stating both positive and negative words. While "racism", "colonialism", "colonial" and "hostility" are negative attributes mentioned by these students, the same students emphasise positive words such as "expedient", "prosperity" and "development", which are related to Europe. Ignoring the word "modern", these students report "football" as a word which they associate with Europe.

In the vocabulary analysis of Turkey according to the city in question, there seems to be a wide variation in both the over- and sub-representation of words. It is interesting to see that students from Erzurum associate technical and neutral words such as "technology", "industry", "science" and "power" with Europe, while ignoring positive words such as "wealth", "wealthy", "welfare", "modern", "civilised" and "contemporary". In addition, it should also be emphasised that negative words are also related to Europe by students in Erzurum, e.g. "racism", "heartless" and "hostility". Unlike Erzurum, positive words such as "wealthy", "developed", "modern" and "contemporary" are associated with Europe by the students of Istanbul. Interestingly, "Christian" is seen to be the most relevant word for Europe by the Istanbul sample. As regards sub-represented words, we can see that "technology", "quality" and "science" are ignored by the students in Istanbul, while they are emphasised by the Erzurum sample. When compared with Istanbul, the sample from Izmir stresses the lifestyle provided by wealth without ignoring wealth, prosperity, welfare and comfort. This result is validated by the words which are sub-represented by the Izmir sample, by whom "wealth" and "wealthy" are mostly ignored.