CIVIL SOCIETY IN TURKEY:

AN ERA OF TRANSITION

CIVICUS CIVIL SOCIETY INDEX COUNTRY REPORT FOR TURKEY

Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı
Third Sector Foundation of Turkey

CIVICUS
World Alliance for Citizen Participation

CIVIL SOCIETY IN TURKEY: AN ERA OF TRANSITION

CIVICUS CIVIL SOCIETY INDEX COUNTRY REPORT FOR TURKEY

EDITORS

FILIZ BIKMEN

ZEYNEP MEYDANOGLU

Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı
Third Sector Foundation of Turkey

CIVICUS
World Alliance for Citizen Participation

CIVIL SOCIETY IN TURKEY: AN ERA OF TRANSITION
CIVICUS CIVIL SOCIETY INDEX COUNTRY REPORT FOR TURKEY

Publication and Cover Design
Rauf Kösemen, MYRA

Page Layout
MYRA

Figures
Harun Yılmaz, Dinçer Şenol, Onur Bilgi, MYRA

Printed at Sena Ofset Ambalaj, Matbaacılık Sanayi ve Ticaret Ltd. Şti.

Civil Society Index Project and Approach
CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation

TUSEV, December 2006, İstanbul
TUSEV Publications No 42
ISBN 975-01025-2-5

Project Sponsors

CIVIL SOCIETY IN TURKEY: AN ERA OF TRANSITION

CIVICUS CIVIL SOCIETY INDEX COUNTRY REPORT FOR TURKEY

EDITORS

FILIZ BIKMEN

ZEYNEP MEYDANOGLU

TÜSEV
Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı
Third Sector Foundation of Turkey

CIVICUS
World Alliance for Citizen Participation

CIVIL SOCIETY IN TURKEY: AN ERA OF TRANSITION
CIVICUS CIVIL SOCIETY INDEX COUNTRY REPORT FOR TURKEY

Editors
Filiz Bikmen
Zeynep Meydanoğlu

Country Report Authors
Filiz Bikmen
Prof. Fuat Keyman
Zeynep Meydanoğlu

Country Report Contributors
Assoc. Prof. Ahmet İçduygu and Z. Müge Dane, Koc University (Regional analysis of civil society)
Assoc. Prof. Aslı Tunç, İstanbul Bilgi University (National level media analysis and report)
Başak Ekim, Boğaziçi University, Social Policy Forum (CSO social policy impact case study)
Gülhan Özdemir, TUSEV (National budgeting process and corporate social responsibility study)
Murat Aksoy, Human Rights Expert (CSO human rights policy impact case study)

Project Team
Assoc. Prof.Ahmet İçduygu, Koç University, Participatory Researcher
Filiz Bikmen, TUSEV, Project Director
Prof. Fuat Keyman, Koç University, Civil Society Expert
Gülhan Özdemir, TUSEV, Project Coordinator
Sevda Kılıçalp, TUSEV, Project Coordinator
Zeynep Meydanoğlu, TUSEV, Project Assistant
Z. Müge Dane, TUSEV, Project Assistant

National and Local Level Media Review Teams
Alper Özçakır, İstanbul Bilgi University
Doç. Dr. Aslı Tunç, İstanbul Bilgi University
Erkan Saka, İstanbul Bilgi University
Ertuğrul Kürkçü, Bianet Independent Communication Network
Hacer Foggo, Bianet Independent Communication Network
Itır Akdoğan, İstanbul Bilgi University
Özge Aktaş, İstanbul Bilgi University
Pınar Sayan, TUSEV, Project Intern

Translation
Zeynep Meydanoğlu
Z. Müge Dane

Table of Contents

TABLES AND FIGURES

Tables

FIGURES

Foreword

The Third Sector Foundation of Turkey (TUSEV) was established in 1993, with the pioneering leadership of 23 foundations. Today, TUSEV comprises of a network of over 100 foundations, in support of a common mission to *'strengthen the legal, fiscal and operational infrastructure of the non profit sector in Turkey'* with programs in policy advocacy, research, and building partnerships. To date, the CIVICUS Civil Society Index (CSI) project has been one of most important initiatives undertaken by TUSEV, and was the first comprehensive and internationally comparative study on civil society in Turkey. Aside from an invaluable collection of data presented in the country report, the project offered a number of other benefits.

The analytical and conceptual framework enabled the assessment of the complex construct of civil society in a structured manner. A multitude of indicators assessed ranged from structural issues (resources, participation), environmental factors (rule of law, rights and freedoms), values (empowering women, environmental sustainability) and impact (on policy and improving the lives of people).

Another important contribution of CSI was the variety of research methods used to collect and analyze data. Some methods (particularly the media review) were used for the first time in the Turkish context, bringing a range of skills and tools to be employed in future studies. This also contributed to building the research capacity of TUSEV as well as other individuals and organizations involved in the CSI project.

Last but certainly not least, this project was more than a research initiative- it had convening power, bringing over 300 stakeholders and experts together over the course of the project, to reflect on civil society and their role as part of this burgeoning movement. It created a sense of empowerment that knowledge is power; and that by reflecting and planning, we could unlock the immense potential of civil society and civil society organizations in Turkey.

We are hopeful that both the process and the outcomes of this study will shed a new perspective on civil society, with a view to promoting more initiatives aimed at strengthening this vibrant and dynamic sector.

Prof. Dr. Üstün Ergüder
Chairman of the Board
TÜSEV- Third Sector Foundation of Turkey

Acknowledgements

The Civil Society Index (CSI) study was an enormous undertaking, made possible with the dedication and support of several individuals and institutions; mainly CIVICUS, our donors, advisory committee members, the project team, and research participants. On behalf of TUSEV and the CSI project team, I would like to acknowledge and thank each of these groups for their support.

First and foremost we are thankful to the international non-governmental organization **CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation** for pioneering the design of the methodology, awarding TUSEV the opportunity to implement the project in Turkey, and providing training and guidance throughout the project. We are grateful particularly to Mahi Khallaf, Finn Henrich and other CIVICUS colleagues for their assistance.

Our funding partners helped make this project possible: Chrest Foundation (USA), Charities Aid Foundation (UK) and TUSEV (Turkey). The CSI National Forum was made possible with contributions from the Open Society Institute Assistance Foundation in Turkey, and Heinrich Böll Association in Turkey. Istanbul Bilgi University kindly allocated us space and equipment for the final conference in which research outcomes were discussed. I express utmost appreciation to all of our donors for their support of this important endeavour.

The **National Advisory Group (NAG)** of the project provided guidance on the local implementation of the CSI.[1]: **Aziz Çelik** Kristal Trade Union, **Bilgi Buluş** UNDP Global Environment Facility, **Derya Akalın** Mother Child Education Foundation, **Fikret Toksöz** Istanbul Policy Center, **Funda Erdem** Kars Municipality, **Gülcan Korkmaz** Youth for Habitat and World Bank Youth Voice Project Group, **Hakan Gümüş** Turkish Youth Council, AEGEE-Ankara, **Neslihan Tombul** Education Volunteers Foundation Board Member, Bank of New York Director, Turkey, **Murat Çelikkan** Helsinki Citizens Assembly, **Nurhan Yentürk** Bilgi University NGO Training Programme, **Ömer Çaha** Fatih University and Civil Society Journal Editor, **Pınar İlkkaracan** New Ways- Women for Women's Human Rights, **Sunay Demircan** Civil Society Development Center, **Şeyhmus Diken** Diyarbakır Art Center and **Şentürk Uzun** Department of Associations, Ministry of Interior. We are most grateful for their time and insightful contributions.

The project was coordinated by a core **'National Index Team"** or **NIT**, established at the Third Sector Foundation of Turkey to manage the data gathering and research activities, project implementation, and preparation of research for publication of this final report: Prof. Ahmet İçduygu (Koc University), Prof. Fuat Keyman (Koc Univeristy), Gülhan Özdemir, Z. Müge Dane, Zeynep Meydanoğlu. Without their efforts this project would not have been possible. We also acknowledge the efforts of the media review teams at Istanbul Bilgi University (led by Assoc. Prof. Aslı Tunç) and Hacer Foggo from IPS Communication Foundation; and Başak Ekim and Murat Aksoy, experts who prepared the reports on CSO policy impact. Finally, a special thanks to our project intern Pınar Sayan for her work on the media database, the National Forum team of facilitators and note-takers for their efforts, TUSEV colleagues who provided critical inputs and feedback, and our support staff for their diligent project administration.

1 Note: organizational affiliations may have changed since the beginning of this project.

I would also like to thank the key informants which were consulted throughout the process of conducting this study- especially Rana Birden, previously from the Civil Society Development Project (CSDP).

Last but not least I would like to thank all of those actively working with and supporting CSOs- and especially CSI survey and consultation participants who patiently shared their perspectives and provided great inputs to this study. Your tireless efforts and dedication are an inspiration to us all.

I anticipate this report will provide an informative perspective on civil society, guidance on developing initiatives to strengthen the sector, and set a precedent for additional research efforts. Perhaps most importantly, I hope that it will leave you, as it did me, with great admiration for civil society's vitality and conviction to further enable its role for the benefit of Turkish society.

Filiz Bikmen
CSI Project Director, Country Report Co-Author and Editor
Executive Director, TÜSEV- Third Sector Foundation of Turkey

List of Acronyms

AKP	Turkish acronym for Justice and Development Party
BIA	Bianet Independent Communication Network
CBO	Citizen-based Organization
CHP	Turkish acronym for Republican People's Party
CIDCM	Center for International Development and Conflict Management
CS	Civil Society
CSDC	Civil Society Development Centre
CSDP	Civil Society Development Project
CSI	Civil Society Index
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CVC	Corporate Volunteer Council
DoA	Department of Associations
DYP	Turkish acronym for True Path Party
EGITIM-SEN	Turkish acronym for Trade Union of Turkish Teachers and Academicians
EIHDR	European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights
EU	European Union
GDF	General Directorate of Foundations
GNP	Gross National Product
GoT	Government of Turkey
GRECO	Group of States against Corruption
ICN	International Communication Network
ILO	International Labor Organization
MHP	Turkish acronym for National Movement Party
MIKOM	Turkish acronym for National Assembly Members Watch Program
MP	Member of Parliament
NAG	National Advisory Group
NCO	National Coordinating Organisation
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NIT	National Index Team
NPO	Non-Profit Organisation
OGSD	Turkish acronym for Corporate Volunteer Council
PKK	Kurdish acronym for Kurdistan Workers Party
RC	Red Crescent
RDA	Regional Development Agency
SME	Small and Medium Size Enterprise
SKIP	Turkish Acronym for Technical Support Project for Improving Public Sector – CSO Cooperation
STGP	Turkish acronym for Civil Society Development Project
TEMA	Turkish acronym for Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion
TESEV	Turkish acronym for Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation
THK	Turkish acronym for Turkish Aeronautical Association
TOBB	Turkish acronym for The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey
TOG	Turkish acronym for Community Volunteers Foundation
TURK-IS	Confederation of Turkish Workers' Unions
TUSEV	Turkish acronym for Third Sector Foundation of Turkey
TUSIAD	Turkish acronym for Turkish Businessmen and Industrialists Association
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VAT	Value Added Tax
WWHR	Women for Women's Human Rights- New Ways Foundation

Executive Summary

This publication presents findings of the Civil Society Index (CSI) project, the first comprehensive and internationally comparative study on civil society's structure, environment, values and impact in Turkey. The purpose of this report is to convey current challenges and opportunities facing civil society in Turkey, and ultimately simulate greater discussion and action to strengthen its ability to promote a sustainable and democratic society.

The analytic framework of this complex study was based on four main dimensions (structure, environment, values, and impact) and 74 corresponding indicators[2]. The indicators were supplied with a wealth of data collected between 2004 and 2005 by the National Index Team (NIT) of practitioners and academics from a broad range of secondary sources. Additional field studies included case analyses and active consultations with over 300 representatives from civil society, government and private sector. Data was subsequently synthesized in a draft report similar to this final country report, and 'scored'[3] by the project's National Advisory Group (NAG) which yielded a quantified assessment and visual graph of CSI findings (see figure 1, Civil Society Diamond for Turkey). In December 2005, approximately 100 participants came together in a two-day National Forum to discuss outcomes, implications and draft action plans. Hence, this country report presents a substantial amount of information compiled from a broad array of research activities conducted as part of the CSI project.

While the study revealed a great deal of insight on the current 'state' of civil society, it also confirmed the 'reality' (based on experiences and perceptions of the research team and other stakeholders) that civil society in Turkey is of limited strength, yet undergoing a significant era of transformation. The Diamond (Figure 1) presents a general visualization of research outcomes, which are described in great detail in the comprehensive country report.

In terms of a brief discussion of the main dimensions, the **structure** of civil society and civil society organizations (CSOs) in Turkey faces greatest limitations. This is particularly apparent given *the narrow depth and breadth of civic participation, inadequate skills and resources of CSOs,* and u*ndeveloped linkages among CSOs*. Relative to structure, other dimensions scored almost twice as high, yet still relatively low on the scale of 0 to 3.

The **environment** within which civil society operates is ostensibly hindered by a *lack of adherence to rule of law, corruption and highly centralized state administration,* as well as *undeveloped linkages between state-civil society and private sector-civil society.* However, recent reforms suggest a progressively more enabling legal framework for CSOs and expanded *civic rights and liberties.*

The **values** dimension reveals a limited adoption of practices such as *tolerance, democratic practices* and *good governance* within CSOs and limited actions to promote *poverty eradication*. However, these limitations are balanced by civil society's strength in promoting *gender equity, non-violence* and *environmental sustainability*.

Finally, the **impact** dimension yields a rather low score; partly as a result of limitations on CSO advocacy initiatives (due to state interference), as well as lack of civil society

2 Please see Appendix 6 for detailed explanation of indicators.

3 Please see 'Methodology' section for more on the research activities and scoring process.

FIGURE 1:
CIVIL SOCIETY DIAMOND FOR TURKEY



activities in *holding the state and private sector accountable and responding to social interests*. These limitations however, are balanced by a particularly strong role *in meeting societal needs, empowering citizens* and *increasing level of engagement around policy issues*.

The following sections provide an overview of the current context and major trends in Turkey, followed by a summary of key findings.

OVERVIEW OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE TURKISH CONTEXT

In order to decipher the 'current' assessment of civil society, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of the current context in which it exists. While the historical roots of civil society are described in more detail later in the report, several events over the past ten years have been significantly important in shaping this context. The first was the Habitat Forum in 1996, an international meeting in Turkey that mobilized hundreds of Turkish CSOs and other key stakeholders, paving the way for participation in the global movement of civil society while also increasing awareness of the role of CSOs in addressing mandates around social justice and sustainable development in Turkey.

A few years later in 1999, a devastating earthquake in the Marmara region created widespread destruction, leading to the death of over 20.000 people. In response to this catastrophic disaster, CSOs mobilized thousands of volunteers and donations to help affected populations. During this time, the general public witnessed the crucial role of CSOs in meeting the urgent needs of citizens; far beyond the capacity of the government.

Following this incident was perhaps one of the most significant milestones affecting the recent changes in Turkey's civic landscape on a political level. With the acceptance of Copenhagen Criteria in 2001, the Government of Turkey (GoT) demonstrated political will adopted significant reforms- many of which directly affected civil society in terms of rights and freedoms. These reforms were critical for enabling space for civil society in Turkey (granting freedom of association and assembly), which had been

under significant restriction over the past 20 years. Subsequent reforms included new provisions in key laws at the central and local level to promote dialogue on strategy and policies affecting human rights and social policy.

As a backdrop to these specific events, a number of other factors have affected social and economic life and ultimately, the role of civil society- among them the peaks and troughs of Turkey's burgeoning market economy, government de-centralization, and less public spending for key services. Not unlike other developing countries and emerging democracies, these factors brought forth a new set of mandates for the role of CSOs in Turkey's plight for sustainable development and democratization.

In response to these opportunities, CSOs are shifting from being loose, informal groups to more structured and organized institutions. While the number of CSOs remains relatively low given the size of the overall population- with only 108 associations and 6 foundations per 100.000 citizens- the recent onset of the 'project culture' phase, has created more impetus for CSOs in mobilizing toward specific objectives.

As such, the portrait of civil society presented in this study was taken in a time of great transition (which continues in the present), during which both the concept and practice of civil society was undergoing drastic and rapid changes. In this sense, taking a picture was more like following a moving target. However, this research offered a previously unavailable opportunity to look at civil society from a number of different angles- its role in society, levels of participation and impact, values espoused and practiced- to gain a better understanding of what civil society looks like as a result of these transitions, and what to expect in the future. Key findings are summarized below.

Overview of Key Findings

These findings highlight both the strengths and limitations of civil society as assessed through the CSI lens.

Meeting Societal Needs

Given the relatively nascent stage of the sector overall, a handful of CSOs are demonstrating an impressive ability to respond to societal needs- whether it be a new school, a dorm, rescue missions and relief efforts for natural disasters or human rights training for judges and border police training on working with refugees. There are also an increasing number of CSOs working beyond Turkish borders, such as helping victims of the tsunami in South East Asia. However, in order to continue providing services and expanding their reach, CSOs necessitate better fiscal benefits (e.g. VAT discounts for purchasing and mobilizing large quantities of goods) and incentives for donors.

Individual Participation

This study reveals that while a group of strong and highly capable CSOs is emerging, the majority of Turkish citizens remain rather disconnected from this movement. Per 100.000 citizens, only 5790 are registered members of associations[4]. While Turkish citizens demonstrate a proclivity to support one another among their close networks of kinship, they are less likely to make donations to other CSOs or participate as volunteers. CSOs share concerns about limited membership and their outreach to society, noting the need to promote more citizen involvement.

Organizational Capacity

Recent changes in the Turkish context have created new mandates for CSOs in the area of service delivery and advocacy. Yet many newer CSOs struggle with building skills (in basic management as well as programmatic delivery) and securing resources. CSOs with established capacity face challenges with scaling up and sustainability in light of growing need for their programs. While a number of recent training programs have been launched to provide training and support, demand still outweighs supply. In addition, training tends to be focused on new or emerging organizations, leaving more experienced CSOs without support on how to advance their organizations to the next level. Finally, a lack of resources and organizational management skills limits CSOs' ability to recruit and compensate professional staff, resulting in a conundrum of limitations with skills and capacity. These challenges merit significant attention in a number of areas, especially 1) creating mechanisms to facilitate the flow of resources to CSOs 2) increasing training opportunities around basic skills of fundraising, program delivery and other areas, and 3) investing in capacity (human and technical infrastructure).

Collective Action and Cooperation among CSOs

Over the past few years there has been a rise in the number of CSO networks and platforms. Two very commendable examples are the environmental movement, which is extremely well organized as a sub-sector with a number of regional and national platforms. The women's movement has also become rather well networked as a sub-sector. Human rights groups and other organizations are following a similar trend. A comparable increase is observed in the number of meetings and conferences organized with international CSOs- likely a result of EU related initiatives that encourage collaboration. However, this study reveals that CSOs continue to remain concerned about cooperation and communication among their fellow organizations- both within and between sub-sectors and internationally. It is yet to be seen whether larger networks and umbrella organizations will be formed, or if, given the vast size and diversity of the country, a number or smaller organizations will fulfil this role.

Civil Society Relations with the Public Sector

Relations between civil society and the Government of Turkey (GoT) is a critical issue affecting the development of civil society in Turkey. The new Associations Law was not even one year old during the time this study was conducted; yet many stakeholder discussions and other reports indicated its rapid impact on improving relations between CSOs and the GoT. However, concerns regarding the gap between laws to protect rights of civil society and the actual practice of implementing these laws create a sense of cautious optimism. Several cases of excessive government interference and control continue to emerge, leaving CSOs feeling uneasy in expressing opinions that challenge the state, with fear of sanction. This is reflected in low levels of civil society activity in holding the state accountable and promoting state transparency. Thus, while Turkey has effectively begun transitioning out of an era of state control over civil society, there is still a long road ahead in achieving a fully enabling environment.

The GoT recently ratified a number of new provisions to promote cooperation and dialogue with civil society- such as encouraging CSO participation in city councils, cooperation in service delivery, a joint human rights commission and a social policy

4 Not including trade unions.

commission. These developments have served to further relations between the two sectors. While these points of progress merit acknowledgement, looking forward, the GoT must continue to develop clear frameworks and mechanisms to translate policies into practice, and ensure transparent and accessible relationships between the two sectors. Finally, tax reforms are critical to ensuring fair access to advantages for CSOs that contribute to the public good; on the other hand, CSOs must also fulfil their role as a partner in developing policy which affects the sector, and be organized to effectively negotiate new policies and practices which will shape the sector and relations with the GoT.

Philanthropy: Individual and Institutional Donors

As the sector continues to expand in size and scope of activity, so do corresponding needs for resources. While the EU is emerging as a significant source of funds for CSOs, Turkish funders are far behind. Both individual and institutional donors are not familiar with organized giving, grantmaking, and other stratagies to support CSOs. While 80% of Turkish citizens give in one form or another (religious, to needy close kin and friends, to CSOs), most have a proclivity toward making small donations directly to needy individuals in their close circles (86%), rather than CSOs (18%). Annual total donations (including all forms of giving) are estimated to be less than 0.01% of GDP, or an average of 53 USD per household. Private foundations in Turkey are 'operating foundations', i.e. generally funding their own programs and/or institutions rather than grantmaking. Corporates are increasingly keen to 'partner' with CSOs on projects, framed as 'sponsorship' initiatives rather than grants through corporate giving or corporate philanthropy programs. The GoT is not an official grantmaker per se; to date, transfer of funds and/or in kind support has been on a one-off basis. However, incoming structural funds from EU matched with Turkish funds will increase their role as donors for CSOs.

With a lack of structured funding practices (and a corresponding lack of skill in 'fundraising' on behalf of CSOs), the sector faces limitations in terms of its resource base. This is especially challenging for CSOs working on rights-based issues as opposed to service delivery. New strategies and mechanisms to broaden the base of donors and thus increase the flow of resources to CSOs will be of great benefit to the sector both in terms of increasing participation and support from Turkish funders and donors, and creating access to more financial resources for CSOs.

Trust and Social Capital

While Turkish people tend to display a great deal of 'helpfulness', by and large, levels of trust and tolerance toward those outside of immediate family and social networks are quite low. This manifests itself in a lack of cohesive and cooperative action-especially in the civil society arena where many groups remain divided along lines of ideology, geography and in some cases, ethnicity. Although CSOs express concern about these divides, and attribute an important role for civil society, they remain vague and uncertain in addressing root causes and building greater social cohesion. On a positive note, while overall levels of trust in institutions are low, CSOs fare quite well in comparison. Recent studies also reveal that 1 out of every 2 people think CSOs can make a positive contribution to Turkish society. This suggests that CSO have an opportunity to harness public support in their plight to 'bond' and 'bridge' diverse groups in society.

Good Governance: Transparency and Accountability of CSOs

Although CSOs are playing an active role in promoting democracy, they are self critical of their lack of good governance and practices. The sector is not perceived to be corrupt per se; however, CSOs are keen to advance their practices of institutional transparency and accountability. Codes of conduct, standards and other self-regulatory mechanisms will be important to facilitate the advancement of CSO governance.

Rights-Based Work and Policy Impact of CSOs

An increasing number of CSO initiatives on a broad array of issues from freedom of speech to torture and right to trial, women's rights, and children's rights are taking the rights-based agenda to a new level. Not only are these organizations providing services to disadvantaged groups (e.g. shelters for women and street children, legal aid); they also take active positions on a number of policies affecting their target populations. Most notable efforts include human rights CSOs efforts on expanding civic liberties, and women's CSOs that succeeded in their plight for gender-based reforms to the Turkish Penal Code. These are especially worthy of merit given the adverse conditions and restrictions under which they are undertaken- not to mention the scarcity of resources for such efforts (many of which rely on volunteers). This study reveals an increase in the number of CSOs which wish to take a more active role in the policy making process which will be of great value to society given the immense amount of legislative reform awaiting Turkey in the EU accession process. As the rights-based CSO movement expands, staff and volunteers also express the need to scale up programs and enhance ability to impact policy, mobilize participation and generate more awareness and involvement of citizens.

Media Coverage of Civil Society

This study reveals a fascinating assessment of Turkish media's portrayal of civil society. A highlight from this study reveals minimal television coverage, as compared to national-level print media. A majority of news items are short headings (announcement of activities, events), rather than longer pieces and/or opinion editorials which contain more insightful reflections. While diversity of coverage (in terms of themes) is impressive, depth and breadth is limited. In addition, trade unions and business associations tend to receive most visibility in the media. Media organs and especially columnists (which have a particularly important impact on public opinion) are encouraged to allocate more attention to CSO issues and help generate more awareness of the general public.

Corporate Social Responsibility and Support of CSOs

As mentioned briefly under 'philanthropy', companies in Turkey appear to be increasingly aware of their role as donors and supporters of CSOs. However, they lack sound strategic practices in making grants and working with CSOs beyond a 'one-off' sponsorship level. Companies would benefit from donor education and services to increase their capacity in working with CSOs, and broaden their involvement through employee volunteering and donor programs (which could be encouraged with greater tax benefits). But most importantly, CSOs and companies should seek to create partnerships for project funding with a view to aligning mutual objectives and respective strengths to address critical development challenges.

EU, the Accession Process and CSOs

CSOs participating in the CSI survey report a generally positive impact of the EU and pre-accession process on the development of civil society in terms of legal frameworks and promoting certain values (see table below). Some of the more negative affects of the EU on civil society were related to funding (noting the cumbersome procedures, bureaucracy and lack of transparency). The most significant and positive effects were related to the enabling environment (reform of CSO laws) and increased ability of CSOs to promote democratic values. Among the least significant yet still positive effects were promoting capacity for collective action and CSO dialogue with the state. In focus group discussions, the EU was frequently referred to as an elixir in addressing challenges with regards to rights and freedoms, providing funding for CSOs, promoting connections among CSOs, enabling citizens to make better use of their civic rights and increasing public awareness of CSOs. This emphasizes the critical importance of EU support for civil society and democratization efforts in Turkey's trajectory as a future member of the Union. However, CSOs and other Turkish stakeholders are encouraged to balance this support with national sources and help promote broader ownership of these critical social changes.

TABLE 1: THE IMPACT OF THE EU PROCESS ON CSOS (%)

	No impact	Limited / Negative	Limited / Positive	Somewhat Positive	Significant / Positive
Legal frameworks	0	9,4	7,1	46,5	35,4
Dialogue with state	3,1	0,8	33,9	38,6	19,7
Financial capacity	6,6	2,5	29,5	33,6	24,6
Promoting democratic values	1,6	1,6	14,2	48,8	33,1
Promoting capacity for collective action	3,2	2,4	42,1	32,5	17,5

CONCLUSION

Findings of the CSI study underline that civil society is at a critical turning point in its role as an agent of positive social change. The nascent stage of its development is clearly reflected in the CSI Diamond and outcomes, which clearly reveal a greater number of limitations as compared to strengths. However, the study also puts forth a number of opportunities to strengthen civil society's contribution in pursuit of a sustainable, democratic and open Turkish society.

The full report includes a detailed section on findings related to each of the 4 dimensions and respective 74 indicators, as well as a summary of recommendations and next steps. This rich study has much to offer stakeholders in the public, private and non profit sectors, at both the national and international level, especially with regards to developing respective strategies, policies and projects targeting Turkish civil society. As such, this report will surely help inform and guide initiatives in the journey of enabling and encouraging private citizen action for public good in Turkey.

Introduction

This report presents the results of the CIVICUS Civil Society Index (CSI) in Turkey carried out from January 2004 to December 2005 as part of the international CSI project coordinated by CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation and currently implemented in more than 50 countries.

The CSI is a participatory action-research project assessing the state of civil society in countries around the world. The project links this assessment with a reflection and action-planning process by civil society stakeholders, aiming to strengthen civil society in those areas where weaknesses or challenges are detected. By seeking to combine valid assessment, broad-based reflection and joint action, the CSI attempts to make a contribution to the perennial debate on how research can inform policy and practice.

In each country a National Coordinating Organization (NCO) implements the CSI, with support from the CSI project team at CIVICUS and guidance of a National Advisory Group (NAG). The NCO – TUSEV in Turkey - collected and synthesized data and information on civil society from a variety of primary and secondary sources.[5] This information was then employed by the NAG to score the 74 CSI indicators, which together provide a comprehensive assessment of the state of civil society. The findings were then discussed at a National Forum, where civil society stakeholders identified specific strengths and weaknesses of civil society, as well as developed recommendations on how to strengthen civil society. The international CSI project team at CIVICUS provided training, technical assistance and quality control throughout implementation.

The CSI is an international comparative project currently involving more than 54 countries from around the world. It was conceived with two specific objectives: (1) providing useful knowledge on civil society and (2) increasing the commitment of stakeholders to strengthen civil society. The first objective inherits a certain tension between country-specific knowledge and knowledge comparable cross-nationally on a global scale. CIVICUS sought to resolve this tension by making it possible to adapt the methodology and the set of more than 70 indicators to country-specific factors. While TUSEV made use of this option to some extent, the overall project framework remained unchanged.

This project was the first comprehensive and internationally comparative research initiative on civil society to be undertaken in Turkey. As such, this was a particularly important exercise in compiling existing (albeit quite limited) information available about civil society, and collecting new data on perceptions and actions. The interactive and participatory nature of the project allowed TUSEV to convene a relatively broad base of stakeholders and draw on different perspectives regarding civil society in Turkey. This comprehensive country report presents findings with a view to future action and how to further strengthen the sector.

STRUCTURE OF THE PUBLICATION

Section I, "The Civil Society Index Project & Approach", provides a detailed history of the CSI, its conceptual framework and research methodology.[6]

5 More information on these primary and secondary sources can be found under Section I, 2.2.1 Data collection and Appendix 2.

6 See also Appendix 6 for The Scoring Matrix.

Section II, "Civil Society in Turkey", provides a background on civil society in Turkey and highlights some specific features of Turkish civil society. It also describes the use of the civil society concept in Turkey as well as the definition employed by the CSI project.

Section III, entitled "Analysis of Civil Society", is comprised of four segments – Structure, Environment, Values and Impact – which correspond to the four main dimensions of the CSI. Presentation of the results according to individual dimensions and subdimensions are in a resource repository. This section also makes reference to a range of case and overview studies, which are described in greater detail in the Appendices.

Section IV, "Strengths and Weaknesses of Turkish Civil Society" summarizes ideas, arguments and opinions raised at the National CSI Forum, which was held on 2-3 December 2005 at the Istanbul Bilgi University in Istanbul. Close to 100 participants from CSOs and academic institutions had the opportunity to comment on, criticize and supplement the findings through their participation in plenary sessions and small group discussions.

Section V, "Recommendations" presents suggestions put forth by participants at the National CSI seminar and other project events. These recommendations focus on concrete actions on how to strengthen civil society and its role in Turkey.

Finally, the conclusion in Section VI maps the Civil Society Diamond and offers an interpretation on the report's implications for the overall state of Turkish civil society. [7]

7 The Civil Society Diamond is a visual tool developed by CIVICUS and Helmut Anheier, Director of the Center for Civil Society at the University of California, Los Angeles, which presents the overall findings of the CSI study in form of a Diamond-shaped graph.

I

Civil Society Index Project and Approach

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The idea of a Civil Society Index originated in 1997, when the international non-governmental organization CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation published the *New Civic Atlas* containing profiles of civil society in 60 countries around the world (CIVICUS 1997). To improve the comparability and quality of the information contained in the *New Civic Atlas*, CIVICUS decided to embark on the development of a comprehensive assessment tool for civil society, the Civil Society Index (Heinrich/Naidoo 2001; Holloway 2001). In 1999, Helmut Anheier, the director of the Centre for Civil Society at the London School of Economics, played a significant role in the creation of the CSI concept (Anheier 2004). The concept was tested in fourteen countries during a pilot phase lasting from 2000 to 2002. Upon completion of the pilot phase, the project approach was thoroughly evaluated and refined. In its current implementation phase (2003-2005), CIVICUS and its country partners are implementing the project in more than fifty countries (see Table I.1.1).

At the end of 2003, TUSEV applied to conduct the project due to the CSI's aim to combine a comprehensive assessment on the state of civil society with the identification of concrete recommendations and actions on part of civil society stakeholders. The project was implemented from January 2004 to December 2005 by the Third Sector Foundation of Turkey.

TABLE I.1.1: COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE CSI IMPLEMENTATION PHASE 2003-2005 [8]

1. Argentina	19. Germany	37. Orissa (India)
2. Armenia	20. Ghana	38. Palestine
3. Azerbaijan	21. Greece	39. Poland
4. Bolivia	22. Guatemala	40. Romania
5. Bulgaria	23. Honduras	41. Russia
6. Burkina Faso	24. Hong Kong (VR China)	42. Scotland
7. Chile	25. Indonesia	43. Serbia
8. China	26. Italy	44. Sierra Leone
9. Costa Rica	27. Jamaica	45. Slovenia
10. Croatia	28. Lebanon	46. South Korea
11. Cyprus[9]	29. Macedonia	47. Taiwan
12. Czech Republic	30. Mauritius	48. Togo
13. East Timor	31. Mongolia	49. Turkey
14. Ecuador	32. Montenegro	50. Uganda
15. Egypt	33. Nepal	51. Ukraine
16. Fiji	34. Netherlands	52. Uruguay
17. Gambia	35. Nigeria	53. Vietnam
18. Georgia	36. Northern Ireland	54. Wales

2. PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The CSI uses a comprehensive project implementation approach and broad range of research methods. At the core of the CSI lies a broad and encompassing definition of civil society, which informs the overall project implementation process. To assess the state of civil society in a given country, the CSI examines four key dimensions of civil society, namely its structure, external environment, values and impact on society at large. Each of these four dimensions is composed of a set of subdimensions, which again are made up of a set of individual indicators. These indicators form the basis for the CSI data collection, which includes secondary sources, a population survey, Regional stakeholder consultations, a media review and a series of case studies. The indicators also inform the assessment exercise undertaken by a National Advisory Group. The research and assessment findings are discussed at a gathering of key stakeholders, whose task is to identify specific strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations on key priority actions to strengthen civil society. The CSI project approach, conceptual framework and research and assessment methodology are described in detail in the remainder of this section.[10]

8 This list encompasses independent countries as well as other territories in which the CSI has been implemented as of June 2006.

9 The CSI assessment was carried out in parallel in the northern and southern parts of Cyprus due to the de facto division of the island. However, the CSI findings were published in a single report as a symbolic gesture for a unified Cyprus.

10 For a detailed description of the CSI approach, see Heinrich (2004).

2.1 Conceptual Framework

How to define civil society?

At the heart of the CSI's conceptual framework is obviously the concept of civil society. CIVICUS defines civil society as the space between the family, state and the market, where people come together to pursue their interests (CIVICUS 2003). In this respect and different from most other civil society concepts, the CSI has two interesting features. Firstly, it aims to go beyond the usual focus on formal and institutionalized CSOs and to take account of informal coalitions and groups. Second, while civil society is sometimes perceived as a sphere in which positive activities and values reign, CIVICUS seeks to also include negative manifestations of civil society in the assessment. The concept therefore covers not only charitable associations or environmental organisations but also groups such as skinheads and aggressive sports fans. The CSI assesses not only the extent to which CSOs support democracy and tolerance, but also the extent to which they themselves are intolerant or even violent.

How to conceptualize the state of civil society?

To assess the state of civil society, the CSI examines civil society along four main dimensions:

- The **structure** of civil society (e.g. number of members, extent of giving and volunteering, number and features of umbrella organisations and civil society infrastructure, human and financial resources);
- The external **environment** in which civil society exists and functions (e.g. legislative, political, cultural and economic context, relationship between civil society and the state as well as the private sector);
- The **values** practiced and promoted within the civil society arena (e.g. democracy, tolerance or protection of the environment) and
- The **impact** of activities pursued by civil society actors (e.g. public policy impact, empowerment of people, meeting societal needs).

Each of these main dimensions is divided into a set of sub-dimensions which contain a total of 74 indicators.[11] These indicators are at the heart of the CSI and form the basis of the data presented in this report. The indicator – subdimension - dimension framework underpinned the entire process of data collection, the writing of the research report, the NAG's assessment of Turkish civil society and the presentations at the National Forum. It is also used to structure the main part of this publication.

FIGURE I.1.1: CIVIL SOCIETY DIAMOND TOOL



To visually present the scores of the four main dimensions, the CSI makes use of the Civil Society Diamond tool[12] (see Figure I.1.1 for an example). The Civil Society diamond graph, with its four extremities, visually summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of civil society. The diagram is the result of the individual indicator scores aggregated into subdimension and then dimension

11 See Appendix 6.

12 The Civil Society Diamond was developed for CIVICUS by Helmut Anheier (see Anheier 2004).

scores. As it captures the essence of the state of civil society across its key dimensions, the Civil Society Diamond can provide a useful starting point for interpretations and discussions about how civil society looks like in a given country. As the Diamond does not aggregate the dimension scores into a single score, it cannot and should not be used to rank countries according to their scores on the four dimensions. Such an approach was deemed inappropriate for a civil society assessment, with so many multi-faceted dimensions, contributing factors and actors. The Diamond also depicts civil society at a certain point in time and therefore lacks a dynamic perspective. However, if applied over time, it can be used to chart the development of civil society over time as well as compare the state of civil societies across countries (Anheier, 2004).

2.2 Project Methodology

This section described the methods used to collect and aggregate the various data used by the CSI project.

2.2.1 *Data Collection*

The CSI recognized that, in order to generate a valid and comprehensive assessment of civil society, a variety of perspectives need to be included – insider, external stakeholder and outsider views, ranging from the local, regional to the national level. The CSI therefore includes the following set of research methods: (1) Review of existing information, (2) Regional stakeholder consultations and survey, (3) Population survey, (4) Media review and (5) Fact-finding studies.

It is believed that this mix of different methods is essential to generate accurate and useful data and information, but also to accommodate the variations of civil society, for example in rural vs. urban areas etc. Also, the CSI seeks to utilize all available sources of information to avoid 're-inventing research wheels' and wasting scarce resources. Lastly, the research methodology is explicitly designed to promote learning and, ultimately, action on the part of participants. Besides feeding into the final national-level seminar, data collection processes also aim to contribute to participant learning. This is done, for example, through group-based approaches that challenge participants to see them as part of a "bigger picture", think beyond their own organizational or sectoral context, reflect strategically about relations within and between civil society and other parts of society, identify key strengths and weaknesses of their civil society and assess collective needs. It is important to note that the CSI provides an aggregate needs assessment on civil society as a whole and is not designed to exhaustively map the various actors active within civil society. Yet, it does examine power relations within civil society and between civil society and other sectors and also identifies key civil society actors when looking at specific indicators under the structure, values and impact dimensions.

For the CSI study in Turkey, it was possible to implement all but the population survey[13] from the entire list of proposed data collection methods, yielding an extremely rich information base on civil society. The specific methods are listed here in the sequence of their implementation:

- **Secondary sources:** The project team began with a review of information from the many existing studies and research projects on civil society and various related subjects and synthesized this in an overview report on the state of civil society in Turkey;
- **Regional stakeholder survey:** Representatives from CSOs, government, business and other stakeholders were surveyed in

13 TUSEV used results from a recent similar public opinion survey conducted in 2004.

seven selected regions. A total of 222 persons were contacted and 132 questionnaires were completed;

- **Regional stakeholder consultations:** In the same seven regions, the same people were invited to participate in a day-long discussion on the results of the survey and other topics. A total of 120 persons participated in the consultations;
- **Representative population survey conducted in 2004 by TUSEV ('Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and the Pursuit of Social Justice):** A representative sample of 1536 adults in Turkey were surveyed. Questions were asked regarding their membership in CSOs, the level of giving and volunteering and their opinions of the role of CSOs.
- **Media monitoring:** Nine media sources (3 national, 4 regional newspapers, 1 private and 1 government owned national TV news programs) were monitored over a period of two months regarding their coverage of civil society actors, related topics and values, and;
- **Expert interviews:** Finally, a total of 18 expert interviews were conducted on specific issues which emerged through the various research activities. Most of them focused on issues related to civil society's policy impact and corporate social responsibility in Turkey.

2.2.2 Data Aggregation

The various data sources were collated and synthesized by the CSI project team in a draft country report, which is structured along the CSI indicators, subdimension and dimensions. This report presents the basis for the indicator scoring exercise carried out by the NAG. In this exercise, each score is rated on a scale of 0 to 3, with 0 being the lowest assessment possible and 3 the most positive. The scoring of each indicator is based on a short description of the indicator and a mostly qualitatively defined scale of scores from 0 to 3.[14] This NAG scoring exercise is modelled along a "citizen jury" approach (Jefferson Centre 2002), in which citizens come together to deliberate and make decision on a public issue, based on presented facts. The NAG's role is to give a score (similar to passing a judgment) on each indicator based on the evidence (or data) presented by the National Index Team (NIT) in form of the draft country report.

In Turkey, the scoring process was conducted as follows: First, the members of the NAG scored each indicator individually. Then, an average of these scores was calculated for each indicator, from which the scores for the sub-dimensions and dimensions were calculated through averaging. For some of the 74 indicators (indicators that were quantitatively defined and therefore did not leave any room for interpretation (e.g. indicators 1.1.1; 1.2.1)), it was straightforward to determine the final score and it did not require a judgment by the NAG. There were about 50 indicators, for which the scores of NAG members differed considerably, i.e. by more than one point. The NAG debated these controversial indicators at a day-long meeting and a new vote was taken for each of these indicators. A vote was also taken on the sub-dimensions and dimensions in case the average of the individual indicators and the result of an instant assessment of the whole sub-dimension or dimension by the NAG differed considerably. The final scores of the four dimensions (structure, environment, values and impact) were plotted to generate the Civil Society Diamond for Turkey. Then, the NAG spend some time discussing and interpreting the shape of the Civil Society Diamond as well as the potential causal

14 See Appendix 6 The CSI Scoring Matrix.

relations among the scores for the four dimensions.[15]

2.3 Linking Research with Action

The Civil Society Index is not a strictly academic research project. As its declared objective is to involve the actors of civil society in the research process, to contribute to discussions about civil society and to eventually assist in strengthening civil society, it falls into the category of action-research initiatives. In the case of Turkey, the extent of widespread stakeholder participation in the CSI took place on several levels.

First, from the very beginning, a diverse group of consultants and advisors guided the project implementation as the NAG. The group comprised representatives of CSOs and specialists in civil society research. At the beginning of the project, the NAG had the opportunity to amend the definition of civil society used for the purpose of the project and provided input on the planned methodology. The NAG followed interim findings from the project and in the end developed an assessment of the state of civil society in Turkey.

Another interactive element of the CSI was seven, day-long, regional stakeholder consultations with a total of 155 representatives of CSOs. These consultations were held in Istanbul, Diyarbakir, Ankara, Adana, Samsun, Izmir and Kars (covering all major regions in Turkey). The aim was to bring together representatives of a wide range of CSOs as well as stakeholders from government, business, universities and donor agencies. They were encouraged to discuss their views on Turkey's civil society and its actors.[16]

Last and most importantly, a two-day long National Forum was held at the end of the project with a twofold goal. First, it aimed to engage stakeholders in a critical discussion of and reflection on, the results of the CSI initiative in order to arrive at a common understanding of its current state and major challenges. This was a prerequisite for the second goal, which was for participants to use the findings as a basis for the identification of specific strengths and weaknesses as well as potential areas of improvement for civil society in Turkey.

At the National Forum, the Civil Society Diamond and the study's main findings were presented. Participants had the opportunity to discuss these in four small groups and determine priority problem areas and action plans.[17]

Overall, every attempt was made to be as participatory and consultative as possible during the entire course of the project implementation. The project also had its own website,www.step.org.tr in Turkish and in English.

2.4 Project Outputs

The CSI implementation in Turkey yielded a range of products and outputs, such as:

- A comprehensive country report on the state of civil society;
- A list of key recommendations, strategies and priority actions for strengthening civil society in Turkey, developed by a broad range of stakeholders;
- Several in-depth reports on the research and consultations conducted as part of the CSI project: (*An Analysis of the Impact of Civil Society on Freedom of Speech, The State of Social Policies (Unemployment) and Civil Society in Turkey, Civil Society in Turkey and the National Budgeting Process, Corporate Social Responsibility Study, Civil Society in Turkey: A Qualitative Analysis, Media Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey*) and
- Consultative meetings with more than 215 civil society stakeholders, discussing the state of civil society in Turkey.

15 See Section VI.

16 See Appendix 2 for further information on the Regional Stakeholder Consultations.

17 See the summary of outputs from the National Forum in sections IV and V.

3. LIMITATIONS OF THE CSI STUDY

While the CSI framework and methodology is complex and far-reaching, the implementation of the project in Turkey was not without limitations.

3.1 Civil Society Definition and CSO Types: Theory vs. Practice

The definition suggested by CIVICUS is quite broad and was adopted with only a slight modification for the study in Turkey. In the process of discussing with the NAG which CSO types would be included in the scope of this project, many differences of opinion emerged. While everyone agreed that political parties should not be included, there was much debate about organizations such as faith-based groups, trade unions and business associations. In the end the NAG reached a consensus that according to the definition of civil society, all organizations originally suggested by CIVICUS (save political parties) should be included. As such, the concept of inclusiveness was important in sending a message to the sector, that in fact this space is very wide and diverse.

However, when it came to including this diverse set of CSOs in the research, the project team faced two obstacles. One was the low level of participation/ response rate from certain CSO and non-CSO actors, such as trade unions, chambers, business associations, cooperatives, the media and the private sector. Although we made every effort to include these types of CSOs in the survey, focus groups and national forum, their participation was low. Second, as the project progressed, it became apparent that while these CSOs share the same 'space' in the civil society sphere (in terms of the types of activities they engaged in), to examine their 'realities' with regards to the four dimensions required a much more detailed analysis.

For example, trade unions, chambers and cooperatives are structurally (i.e. in terms laws, regulations, membership, resources) very different than associations and foundations, which are generally always referred to as CSOs.[18] As such, the analysis of this study is more reflective of CSOs established as associations and foundations, which engage in activities which are generally oriented toward development and rights issues, for the benefit of the public at large.

Another limitation was the vast diversity of CSOs in the country. CSOs, such as mosque-building associations and 'township' associations account for an estimated 20,000 (approximately 8,000 township and 12,000 mosque building associations) of the total 80,000 formally registered associations in Turkey.[19] Very little literature is available regarding these organizations, and their representatives were not accessible for this research. As such, we were unable to obtain a better understanding of these 'sub sectors' in this study, thus limiting the diversity of our understanding of civil society in Turkey.

In summary, this study was unable to fully capture the myriad of different actors and organizations which comprise Turkey's incredibly diverse civic landscape. The reader is cautioned to keep this in mind and to note that by 'CSOs' the authors are referring mainly to the associations and foundations working on broader national issues of public concern, rather than smaller club-like or community organizations at the local level.

3.2 Existing Literature and Studies

As in many developing countries, the literature regarding civil society in Turkey

18 The primary difference is that the chambers of commerce are not based on 'voluntary membership'. In addition, chambers are established by law and are therefore not similar to other CSOs in this respect. However, their 'activities' were determined by the NAG to resemble aspects of CSOs. Therefore, it was decided to include them in the study.

19 Described below in 'Typology' section.

is quite scarce. Most of the literature tends to be based on related areas of international studies (e.g. Freedom House Reports, World Bank studies, etc.). National studies are limited and mainly in essay/opinion format. The exercise of determining what type of literature does exist was however, a very useful one and revealed significant gaps in research -especially in the values and impact dimensions.

3.3 Sample Size, CSO Questionnaire and Scoring Matrix

The sample size of the CSO questionnaire and focus groups was relatively small (155) and therefore cannot be considered representative of civil society in Turkey. However this sample was selected as much as possible based on diverse range of CSO thematic areas and was balanced to some degree with supplemental (secondary) data that did encompass a wider sample (depending on the study).

Despite attempts to adapt the CSI questionnaire to the Turkish context, post-survey administration analysis revealed that some questions required further modification and/or were not relevant. In addition, a small number of questions were asked in a manner that did not yield easily (or usefully) interpretable answers. Finally during the survey and focus groups, although the CSO types were presented and discussed, it seems likely that respondents had their own individual interpretations about what civil society encompassed (different from the working definition of the CSI project), which may have affected their answers to some of the survey questions (e.g. regarding civil society impact, values, etc.). However, this limitation was addressed as much as possible by reminding respondents about the CSI working definition and scope.

Although the CSI methodology allows for flexibility in allowing country teams (NIT and NAG) to modify the scoring matrix by adding and subtracting indicators, the Turkish team initially found it appropriate to stick to the original as much as possible. In retrospect, modifications could have been made to the scoring matrix, in order to take into account some of the idiosyncrasies for assessing civil society in Turkey. In order to address this limitation, the NAG and NIT used discretion in eliminating indicators that were deemed 'un-scorable'.

II

Civil Society in Turkey

1. SPECIFICS OF CIVIL SOCIETY

In recent years, in both academic and public discourses in Turkey, the concept of civil society has revived, civil society activities in the country have increased and civil society organizations (CSOs) have increasingly become key actors of social change. In theory, civil society "is perceived to play an important role in the creation of important values such as social stability, solidarity, trust, and social responsibility, in finding solutions to social problems, and as a network of communication" (Keyman and Icduygu, 2005). In other words, in recent years, global civil society has gained importance as a network seeking to find solutions to social problems through its position as a public sphere situated outside of the state. The following is a record of Turkish civil society's conceptual and historical development and aims to provide a backdrop to CSI findings presented in the following sections of this report.

It could be argued that civil society's history in Turkey is both a short and a long one, depending on how one approaches civil society conceptually. For instance, if civil society is seen solely as "an associational life outside of the state", it could be argued that civil society has a long history in Turkey: the importance of non-governmental organizations and associational life in Turkey's modernization and democratization history can be traced back to the late Ottoman Empire era (1850-1917). For example, foundations emerged in the Ottoman Empire as "philanthropic institutions", which created social solidarity outside political and economic spheres through charitable activities. Following the declaration of the independent Turkish republic as a modern nation-state, associations which operated outside, but in a close relation with the state, emerged. In other words, hand in hand with the state, the associational sphere acted as an integral and important component of modernization and parliamentary multi-party democratic life (Zurcher, 2004).

Yet, if we define civil society as something more than an associational life outside of the state and as a sphere that contributes to public participation and democratization on a voluntary basis, then civil society's history in Turkey would be a rather short one since such a civil society only gained importance after the 1980s. For this reason, when discussing civil society in Turkey, one could talk about a paradox-one that indicates the simultaneous existence of a long history of civil society as an associational life and a new history of a civil society contributing to democratization in Turkey (Keyman, 2006).

One of the main factors that prevented the development of civil society from loosely formed groups to organizations

FIGURE II.1.1: COUNTRY INFORMATION[1]

Country size: 814,578 sq km

Population: 72.6 million

Population density: 89 per sq km

Population under 15 years: 26%

Urban population: 67%

Form of government: Republican Parliamentary Democracy

Freedom House rating: Partly Free

Seats in parliament held by women: 4.4%

Official language: Turkish

Ethnicity: Turkish 80%, Kurdish 20% (estimated)

Religion: Muslim 99.8% (mostly Sunni), other 0.2% (mostly Christian and Jewish)

HDI Score & Ranking: 0,750 (94th)

GDP per capita: purchasing power parity - $7,900 (2005 est.)

Unemployment rate: 10.3%

1 UNDP (2005) Human Development Report, CIA (2005) World Fact Book, Freedom House (2005) Country Report for Turkey.

with a participatory democratic mission was the state-centred modernization process in Turkey. During the modernization process, including the nation-state modernization period (1923-1945) and multi-party parliamentary democracy (1945-1980), the Turkish state was the "primal, sovereign and most powerful actor" in political, economic and cultural spheres, as well as in social life. This overarching and encompassing role of the Turkish state resulted in the existence of an associational life subject to state control. While the state-centred, top-down modernization functioned based on the idea of unity between state and society and state and nation, it assumed that associations of citizens existed on the basis of serving the state and state interest, not on the basis of social relations based on individual interest or economic class (Pope, 1997). Turkish society during this period was composed of citizens who, in the eyes of the state, did not have rights based on individual freedoms or economic class differences, but rather duties towards the state "to serve the modernization process politically, economically and socially".

In consequence, state dominance and control over associational life continued and prevailed post 1945 as civil society developed to incorporate business chambers, unions and township associations (Ozbudun, 2000). This control steadily increased and reached its peak during three subsequent military interventions (1960, 1971, 1980) severely disrupting the democratic fabric of the country. In addition, ethnic and religious identity claims also affected the development of civil society in a negative sense: Islamic and Kurdish identity demands and their politicization during the 1980s caused the state to approach civil society as it approached identity problems – via a focus on "state security" and legal mechanisms to control CSOs (Ustel, 2005).

Yet, since 1980, there have been other factors leading to the weakening of state authority and control in social life and hence enabling the development of civil society. Transition to free market based economy, political and cultural conflicts, as well as globalization, all led to the rise and development of a civil society with autonomy vis-à-vis the state. The organization of economic life around a free market did not only bring serious criticism to state interventions in the economy and its moves as a powerful economic actor, but it also caused the rise of a new liberal discourse on the axis of entrepreneurship, individualism and individual rights and freedoms. As indicated in the studies on civil society in Turkey, free market and individualism's criticisms of the tradition of strong state contributed to the development of a civil society heavily oriented toward holding the state accountable and promoting lessening of control and authority (Keyman, 2001).

The turn of the century came with some catalyzing events for Turkish civil society, which resulted in an increase in CSOs quality and quantity, as well as importance in the public realm. In 1996, the UN Habitat meetings in Istanbul rallied awareness around civil society and CSOs; in 1999 the Marmara and Kaynasli earthquakes (which led to the death of 20.000 people) mobilized CSOs and increased the society's interest and trust in civil society as citizens participated in search and rescue activities through volunteering and donations. These earthquakes revealed that a modernization and development completely dependent on the state could not adequately come up with solutions or address social problems. Following these tragic events a number of other factors influenced the growth of civil society in Turkey. The clarification and deepening of Turkey's EU integration process, the state's legitimacy crisis at economic,

political and cultural levels and a decrease in political parties' support in society all paved the way for the more enabling environment (Aydin, Keyman, 2005) in which this study has been conducted. Yet, as the findings reveal, civil society as a sector is just beginning to adapt to this new environment and as such, is still in a nascent stage of development.

2. THE CONCEPT OF CIVIL SOCIETY

In Turkey, a two-dimensional conception of civil society is used in academic and public discourses. In these debates, civil society is described as "an important arena and actor in the democratization and governance of state-society and state-individual relations"- and the problems embedded in the revival of civil society in Turkey are strongly emphasized. It must be noted that these problems have occurred mainly as a result of the use and abuse of civil society in Turkey (Ehrenberg, 1999) which refers to the fact that civil society was both used as a fundamental component of the democratization process and abused by different political actors (such as islamists, nationalists, conservatives and liberals) to maximize their own power and societal visions. This use and abuse of civil society has created a conceptual ambiguity and has attached both positive and negative connotations to our understanding of civil society.

The ambiguity surrounding the concept of civil society is further deepened by the existence of two similar yet, different definitions on the issue. First, in general terms, civil society is defined as the **"arena of voluntary organizations which are autonomous from the state"**. This definition conceptualises the civil society arena in Turkey as one which is formed free from state control and based on voluntary membership, but it does not necessarily embrace political or moral values such as democracy. The second definition defines civil society with reference to such democratic values, as "**the common arena founded and populated by diverse voluntary organizations which participate actively in the process of finding efficient and long-term solutions to societal problems and seek to orient political actors to produce policies to implement these solutions"**. Such an approach to civil society attributes importance to moral and political values which are thought essential to the process of establishing democratic social governance, but this feature is not perceived as the sole defining characteristic of civil society. Another defining characteristic of civil society is the existence of voluntary organizations, which by actively working in the arena of their choice, produce solutions to problems and operate autonomously from the state. In this sense, when defining civil society, instead of adopting a minimalist or maximalist approach on the level of moral and political values, it has become increasingly common to conceive civil society in terms of its impact and on the basis of its contribution to solving social problems.

The Concept of Civil Society Used in This Study

CIVICUS defines civil society as *the space between the family, state and the market, where people come together to pursue their interests* (CIVICUS 2003). In this respect and different from most other civil society concepts, the CSI has two interesting features. Firstly, it aims to go beyond the usual focus on formal and institutionalized CSOs and to take account of informal coalitions and groups (minimalist approach). Secondly, while civil society is sometimes perceived as a sphere in which positive activities and values reign (maximalist approach), CIVICUS seeks to also include negative

TABLE II.1.1 TYPES OF CSOs INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

1. Faith-based organisations
2. Trade unions
3. Organisations working for the protection of human rights (eg. community movements, social justice movements, peace movement, consumer rights groups)
4. Social services organisations (eg. literacy, health, education)
5. Educational organisations (eg. think tanks, research centres, non-profit schools)
6. Non-profit media
7. Women's organizations
8. Youth and student organisations
9. Organizations working for the socio-economically disadvantaged groups (eg. the poor, homeless, refugees)
10. Professional organisations (eg. employees' federations, business federations and chambers)
11. Community level groups (eg. parents associations)
12. Economically orients organizations (cooperatives, credit unions)
13. Ethnic, racial and traditional organisations
14. Organisations for the protection of the environment
15. Cultural organizations
16. Other recreational CSOs and sports clubs
17. Grantmaking organizations
18. Networks/federations/support centers for CSOs

manifestations of civil society in the assessment. The concept therefore covers not only charitable associations or environmental organisations but also groups such as racist groups and aggressive sports fans. The CSI assesses not only the extent to which CSOs support democracy and tolerance, but also the extent to which they themselves are intolerant or even violent.

In the first National Advisory Group (NAG) meeting, the proposed definition of civil society to be employed for the purposes of this study was discussed at length. The views expressed focused on a theme of a need to further 'define' this rather large space- as such it was an important exercise in debating what civil society is and what it is not. The issue that created the most debate was the use of the term 'common interest', which was viewed to have a more negative connotation in the Turkish language (implying some sort of self-interest). Thus the NAG eventually agreed to change only this term from 'interest' to 'benefit'.

After reaching consensus on using the CIVICUS definition with this minor change in terms, the NAG was asked to determine what types of CSOs to include in the study. Political parties were immediately eliminated from the list; yet, there was much debate around faith-based organizations, chambers of commerce, trade unions and sports clubs. It was agreed that professional sports clubs would be excluded, but the category would remain as part of the list. In the end, the discussion kept coming back to the definition, which is rather all encompassing. As such, no other CSO types (outside of political parties) were eliminated from the original list proposed by CIVICUS (Table II.1.1.). However an additional discussion around typology contributed to further defining the diverse landscape of CSOs in the Turkish context and for this study (Table II.1.2.).

The definition of civil society was also discussed during regional stakeholder consultations where both the original CIVICUS definition and the revised NAG definition were presented for debate. Again, one of the focal points of the debate was the view that 'common benefit' was more appropriate. In addition when asked about views regarding the definition of civil society, participants suggested that the concept of civil society should emphasize that civil society refers to *"individuals engaging in voluntary action for a common aim"* and that these actions encompass *"service,*

making a difference, opposition". Finally, civil society was viewed to also include characteristics such as *"participation, trust, cooperation and transparency"*. In addition, the "blurry boundaries" between civil society, state and the market were acknowledged, resulting in a common consensus that it is not always possible to say who is 'in' and who is 'out' of civil society; which depends very much on where one is standing.

Discussions in the national forum also revealed additional views on the definition of civil society and the type of CSOs, very similar to those of regional stakeholder consultations. Participants were seeking a more values-based definition of civil society (beyond the spatial explanation) and some proposed to debate the boundary between market and civil society. With regards to CSO types, feedback suggested that stakeholders are more apt to view organizations working on service delivery or advocacy as 'CSOs' rather than those which are more loosely formed and organized for local issues (planting flowers, building mosques). This underlines that views of the newly emerging generation of CSOs (post 1980) are more along the lines of democratization and respective values rather than seeing more local community based/social organizations as 'civil society'.

In conclusion, the process of determining the working definition of civil society and the 'CSO types' for the CSI project was a reflective exercise that encouraged various stakeholders to question their notions and perceptions of civil society in Turkey- both in terms of the arena itself, and in terms of its 'organized' groups (CSOs). These discussions revealed the diversity of views, yet, with

TABLE II.1.2 TYPOLOGY OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS IN TURKEY

CSOs (Civil Society Organizations and/or Non-Governmental Organizations): **Private, non-profit citizen organizations: Think tanks, cultural groups, organizations working mainly for public benefit (as opposed to member benefit). Tend to be foundations and associations (most common legal form).**

Business or Trade Associations: **Includes associations with restrictive corporate/business person membership and mainly act as pressure groups to advance interests of their own members and/or a particular sector. However some of these organizations (mainly TUSIAD, Turkish Businessmen and Industrialists Association which is one of the largest) also commissions policy papers and makes public statements/pressure on the government regarding social and political reforms (e.g. education, etc.). They are legally organized as associations.**

Trade Unions: **Organized associations of the workers in an industry or profession working for the protection and furtherance of their rights and interests. Membership is voluntary but can be pressured in some environments. State employees have unions but are not allowed to strike. They have a separate law governing their organizational structure.**

Professional Associations: **Includes chambers and associations which require membership for the specific profession or sector (e.g. accountants, artisans, doctors, etc.). They are established by the government and have a separate law governing their organizational structure.**

Citizen Based Organizations (CBOs): **Grassroots based organizations such as mosque building and township associations (which are associations established in cities by migrants of a certain town to support one another and send remittances back home to communities).**

an overwhelmingly common reaction to attach the civil society movement to values of democracy and the common good. While this study does not claim to find a final definition for civil society and CSO types, it suggests that the definition employed for the purposes of this study remains to be one that is all encompassing and inclusive of civil society and CSOs in their many forms and various purposes.

III

Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey

THIS SECTION PRESENTS THE INFORMATION AND DATA COLLECTED DURING THE CSI IMPLEMENTATION. THIS SECTION IS DIVIDED ALONG THE FOUR DIMENSIONS OF THE CSI DIAMOND: STRUCTURE, ENVIRONMENT, VALUES AND IMPACT. AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH SECTION, GRAPHS ARE PROVIDED WITH SCORES FOR ALL SUBDIMENSIONS ON A SCALE FROM 0 TO 3.[1] FINDINGS FOR EACH DIMENSION ARE THEN EXAMINED IN DETAIL. A SEPARATE BOX PROVIDES THE SCORES FOR THE INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS FOR EACH SUBDIMENSION.

1 Please see the Scoring Matrix in Appendix 6 for further information on indicator scores.

1. STRUCTURE

This section evaluates the structure of civil society in Turkey in terms of breadth and depth of citizen participation, level of organization and resources. The score for this section is 0.9, indicating a "limited" structure of civil society in Turkey. Figure III 1.1 presents a summary of the sub-dimension scores for structure, followed by a detailed description of each indicator.

FIGURE III.1.1: SUBDIMENSION SCORES IN STRUCTURE DIMENSION

1.1 The Breadth of Citizen Participation in Civil Society

This subdimension looks at the extent of various forms of citizen participation in Turkish civil society. Table III.1.1 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.1.1: INDICATORS ASSESSING BREADTH OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Ref #	Indicators	Score
1.1.1	Non-partisan political action	1
1.1.2	Charitable giving	1
1.1.3	CSO membership	0
1.1.4	Volunteering	0
1.1.5	Collective community action	--[2]

1.1.1 *Non-partisan political action*

A low percentage of Turkish citizens participate in non-partisan political action (such as participating in a demonstration, boycott, or signing a petition). According to most recent statistics (1999 World Values Survey), only 17.8% of Turkish citizens have participated in at least one of these activities.

1.1.2 *Charitable giving*

People in Turkey have strong traditions of giving and community assistance. Of all forms of participation assessed in this study, donations were most prevalent, followed by membership and volunteering (discussed below). According to the World Bank's Social Justice Report for Turkey, "Philanthropy in Turkey has become a deeply rooted practice owing to Islamic traditions that uphold the duty of caring for the poor and disadvantaged of society" (World Bank, 2002).

A recent public opinion survey on philanthropy in Turkey (Çarkoğlu, 2006) supports this assumption. Approximately 80% of Turkish citizens report making donations in one form another, but a clear majority make these donations directly to individuals in need rather than making a donation and/or provide some form of assistance directly to a CSO (18%). In the case of organizational donations (to CSOs), donors tend to give to mosque building associations and religious organizations that provide religious instruction (mainly Koran courses, 32%), the Turkish Aeronautical Association[3] (19%) and other charities (7%). Organizations that receive the highest average amount of donations (per donor) are the Society for the Protection of Children (a state agency) ($373), other charity organizations ($116) and religious organizations ($60). In addition, 40% of respondents report giving zekat and 70% for fitre (both forms of religious giving as dictated by Islam and can be given directly to a person or an institution).

A majority of individuals (86%) prefer giving directly to individuals in need, expressing that this is the most effective way of helping and ensuring the donation will be spent correctly. Although this may suggest a lack of trust in CSOs, results suggest a different scenario. Respondents claim that the limited nature of donations to CSOs is mainly because the amount of donation/assistance is very small (53%) and spontaneous (21%). Only 9% reported lack of knowledge regarding CSOs needing / collecting donations and 12% reported distrust in these organizations. In a similar light, the general public believes CSOs can make a difference in addressing social problems in Turkey (50%).

According to this data, both the practice of giving and amount of donations to CSOs in Turkey are rather low. This suggests that there are opportunities to create new mechanisms to stimulate 'organized' giving (to CSOs) and capture smaller donations. This will be critically important for strengthening the resource base of CSOs and increasing the broader

2 The indicator 1.1.5 Collective community action was removed from the report due to lack of data.

3 Turkish Aeronautical Association (THK) was founded in 1925 by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. The aim of the association was to increase awareness in Turkey on the military, economic, social and political importance of aviation, to support the development of military, civil, sporting and touring aviation in Turkey and to prepare all the necessary material and equipment for these activities. It is also entitled to be the only aviation federation in Turkey and it is a public benefit association. Its main sources of income are membership fees, the skins of the sacrificed animals (there exists a mechanism to ensure that THK is the organization capable of receiving these kinds of donations) and other income generating activities.

participation in supporting CSO activities.

1.1.3 CSO membership

Participation in associational life in Turkey is rather limited in terms of CSO membership. Of all forms of participation assessed in the CSI study, membership scored second (most being donations, least being volunteering).

In 1999 7.8% of citizens reported being a member of a CSO (according to the World Values Survey which includes trade unions and other CSOs and organizations that have involuntary membership such as chambers ('odalar' in Turkish)[4] (see Figure III.1.2). Other recent studies examining participation through membership reinforce these results: general participation in CSOs through membership is 5%. CSOs working on education, culture and the arts benefit from highest membership rates, at 11.7% while lowest membership rates are to women's organizations with 3.9% (ARI and Infakto Research, 2006). In addition, according to the Ministry of Employment and Social Security figures, trade union membership is rather low: Turkey's labour force is estimated at 24.7 million whereas membership in trade unions is at 3 million. According to the 2005 Department of Associations statistics, the total number of members for associations is around 4,326,248.

It should be noted, however, that exact data on membership is not yet available through the regulatory department (which is only now beginning to collate data collected through annual reports of associations). As such, this study is unable to report which CSOs have the most and/or least members. Within the next year, it is anticipated that this data will be available.

The issue of participation through membership was one of central importance, and raised in almost every stakeholder consultation (see CSI reports: "Civil Society in Turkey: A Qualitative Analysis"[5] and National Forum Report, hereby referred to as 'consultations'). Most focus group participants expressed ongoing negative socio-economic conditions and restrictions on freedom of association as barriers for civic participation. However, there were some regional differences in causality. Participants in Diyarbakir (South-eastern region) and Ankara (Middle Anatolian region) attributed low participation to the lack of 'societal consciousness' and little regard for the obligations of 'responsible citizenship'. Adana (Mediterranean region) participants attributed this to a lack of public trust in CSOs.

Proposed remedies to promote membership included civic education for children and increased training and involvement from media organs to promote public awareness around the contributions of CSOs to society.

FIGURE III.1.2: CSO MEMBERSHIP



SOURCE: 1999 WORLD VALUES SURVEY

1.1.4 Volunteering

Of all forms of participation assessed in this study, volunteering was by far the lowest. Only 1.5% of Turkish citizens reported to have been involved in voluntary activities (1999 World Values Survey). Another survey reports that respondents are most active as volunteers in religious organizations

4 Trade associations, trade unions and cooperatives were also included in the World Values Survey. Yet these organizations were not taken into consideration under 1.6.1 Financial resources. These organizations tend to have significant resources and do not share the same challenges as other CSOs which are working on public benefit issues, advocacy and service delivery.

5 "Civil Society in Turkey: A Qualitative Analysis" has been prepared based on the regional stakeholder meetings by Assoc. Prof. Ahmet İçduygu and Z. Müge Dane. These meetings were held in the following cities that represented different regions, Istanbul, Diyarbakir, Adana, Ankara, Samsun, Izmir and Kars. Telephone interviews were conducted with the respondents before the regional stakeholder meetings. See Appendix 3 for more detail.

(26%), political parties (13%) and sports organizations (9%) (Çarkoğlu, 2006).

However, NAG members and other stakeholders indicated a positive trend in volunteering, especially given recent natural disasters (e.g. 1999 earthquake in the Marmara region of Turkey). Rescue and relief efforts of CSOs during the tragic earthquake mobilized thousands of people in voluntary efforts. Although few in number, a handful of CSOs (with significant financial and human capacity) have several thousand volunteers working mainly in the area of education and environment. Women's CSOs are also noted to be working almost completely with volunteers, as are many human rights organizations (yet numbers of volunteers are significantly less).

However, it is also likely that a number of voluntary efforts go unreported, making it difficult to quantify. A new study on volunteering indicates that people interpret the term and practice in a very broad manner. Some believe donating clothes, being a member to a CSO and making a donation to a CSO as well as to just any person is a form of volunteering (CVC, Akademetre, 2005). This further complicates matters of assessing the construct of volunteering without being more specific.

There are an increasing number of efforts, however, to promote voluntarism. The recent establishment of the Corporate Volunteer Council (CVC) (www. osgd.org) is a positive indicator of this trend. The CVC matches individuals and employees of companies to voluntary projects and works with CSOs to help them develop capacity to recruit, manage and retain volunteers. They have recently designed a portal (www.gonulluyum.org) in an effort to make volunteer opportunities more accessible. The Sabanci University requires a certain number of volunteer hours as a pre-requisite for graduation; another foundation (Community Volunteers Foundation/TOG) has recently promoted a network of student clubs in universities to promote voluntarism.

Such efforts will likely yield an increase of volunteering in CSOs. Specific fiscal incentives for companies and individuals, (such as the ability to 'deduct' time contributed together with donations) would also help to promote this form of participation.

1.2 Depth of Citizen Participation in Civil Society

This subdimension looks at the depth of various forms of citizen participation in Turkish civil society. Table III.1.2 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.1.2: INDICATORS ASSESSING DEPTH OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
1.2.1	Charitable giving	0
1.2.2	Volunteering	2
1.2.3	CSO membership	0

1.2.1 Charitable giving

As discussed in the section on charitable giving above, although a strong culture of giving exists, organized 'giving' or donations directly to CSOs is not a widespread practice in Turkey. While there are a number of larger CSOs raising significant funds from individuals, the 'fundraising' practice is still both unfamiliar to most CSOs as well as the general public. In terms of annual dollar amounts, a recent public opinion survey (Çarkoğlu, 2006) reports that 80% of the population gives an estimated average of 53 USD (per family/per annum) to charitable causes. This calculation is estimated to amount to approximately 0.9% of yearly household; and for 12.5 million households this adds up to 662.5 million US$. Only 18% of this is given directly to a CSO; the remainder is given

directly to individuals in need and street beggars.

Lack of mechanisms to promote and facilitate organized philanthropy (e.g. community foundation and other 'intermediary' organizations which connect donors to CSOs), lack of tax incentives and limited skills of CSOs to develop fundraising strategies are all cited as factors that limit contributions from individuals. Developing mechanisms and strategies to address these limitations will be of much benefit to the sector. In addition, systems to track donations (perhaps through declaration on tax forms, or specific data reported by CSOs on funds raised from the general public) would be beneficial in collecting data on how much individuals are contributing to civil society organizations through donations.

1.2.2. *Volunteering*

A recent study estimates those who volunteer dedicated between 2 and 24 hours per week (Navaie, 2004). The NAG and other stakeholders confirm the view that those who do volunteer, albeit a very small percentage of the overall population, are extremely dedicated and contribute a significant amount of time to CSO efforts.

Efforts to increase voluntarism on behalf of CSOs should be coupled with initiatives to gather data (perhaps on behalf of CSOs and/or regulators) so as to have a better understanding of the degree to which citizens are contributing voluntarily to CSOs.

1.2.3. *CSO membership*

According to 1999 World Values Survey findings, approximately 30% (of the 7.8% which report membership) are a member of more than one CSO (Figure III 1.2). Other studies report similar findings: Among CSO members, 31% of association members, 29% of foundation members, 27% of trade union members and 14% of business association members have other CSO memberships (Aksit, Tabakoğlu, Serdar, 2002).

Efforts to increase membership on behalf of CSOs should be coupled with initiatives to gather data (perhaps on behalf of CSOs and/or regulators) so as to have a better understanding of the levels of membership in civil society.

1.3 Diversity of Civil Society Participants

This subdimension examines the diversity and representation within the civil society arena. It analyses whether all social groups participate equitably in civil society or whether there are any groups which are dominant or excluded. Table III.1.3 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.1.3: INDICATORS ASSESSING DIVERSITY OF CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPANTS

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
1.3.1	CSO membership	1
1.3.2	CSO leadership	1
1.3.3	Distribution of CSOs	1

1.3.1 *CSO membership*

Diversity of membership in CSOs is rather low. Findings from the "Survey on Civil Society in Turkey"[6] (TUSEV, 2006) indicate that 80% of CSOs consider women to be under-represented; while 73% consider the upper class / elites to be over-represented (see Table III.1.4). The 2005 statistics from the Department of Associations support the perceptions of the survey participants: associations have 770,671 women members while men members' numbers reach 3,555,577.

Some stakeholders in the CSI study suggested that the term 'elite' required more clarity, since respondents may have very different notions and definitions for this category. However, this did not negate the outcome and overall

6 "Survey on Civil Society in Turkey" is the report prepared on the basis of the data gathered through the CSI survey. The survey was conducted through telephone interviews with 132 respondents from civil society, state employees and private sector located in 26 city and villages of Turkey. The findings of this survey are touched upon in "Civil Society in Turkey: A Qualitative Analysis" report and will be referred to as the CSI survey further in the report.

TABLE III.1.4: REPRESENTATION OF DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IN CSOS (MEMBERSHIP)

	Not represented at all%	Under-represented%	Equally represented%	Over-represented%
Women	3,1	79,5	14,2	3,1
Rural population	39,5	55,7	4,0	0,8
Ethnic minorities	13,0	57,4	21,3	8,3
Religious minorities	15,1	52,9	20,8	11,3
Poor people	48,4	46,8	2,4	2,4
Elites	0,8	13,3	12,5	73,3

SOURCE: "SURVEY ON CIVIL SOCIETY IN TURKEY"(TUSEV, 2006)[7]

agreement that CSO membership was lacking significantly in diversity and representation of different social groups. It is also widely accepted that many CSO members of the 'elite' are in, or retired from, positions of significant power in the public and/or private sector. It is not uncommon to find high-level academicians, other thought leaders, business leaders and influential government officials on the boards of influential CSOs.

Discussions in regional focus groups indicate variances as to the underlying causes for lack of diversity in membership. Participants in Diyarbakir stressed that representation of disadvantaged groups is low and although there might be dominant groups, some groups such as gays, lesbians and women are purposefully excluded. Samsun (Black Sea Region) participants expressed more diversity in CSO membership, which are based on strong ties to ethnic identity- and leading to politicized views. There was a strong belief that this deterred participation from other social groups. In Kars (Northeast region), participants underlined the lack of initiative on behalf of citizens to participate, linking causality to dominant CSO leaders (see below).

1.3.2 CSO leadership

Findings related to CSO leadership were very similar to those observed for membership. 'Elites' are considered over-represented, while most other social groups are under-represented (see Table III.1.5). A recent study on foundations (Çarkoğlu, 2006) suggests that there is a particular indication of male dominance in the sector. Over 80% of 500 foundation executives were reported to be male, average 52 years of age. This

TABLE III.1.5: REPRESENTATION OF DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IN CSOS (LEADERSHIP)

	Not represented at all%	Under-represented%	Equally represented%	Over-represented%
Women	9,5	76,2	8,7	5,6
Rural population	45,0	50,8	3,3	0,8
Ethnic minorities	17,9	54,7	18,9	8,5
Religious minorities	15,8	56,4	16,8	10,9
Poor people	60,2	35,8	3,3	0,8
Elites	1,7	10,8	12,5	75,0

7 All figures and tables (excluding the indicator score tables for each subdimension) are from the CSI Survey unless stated otherwise.

clearly demonstrates the lack of women in leadership roles particularly within the foundation sector. Trends regarding highly influential persons in leadership positions mentioned in the section on membership apply to this topic as well.

Regional stakeholder meetings raised the important issue of individual leadership in CSOs, which in some cases tend to limit participation. Leaders tend to sustain very long terms without opportunities for rotating leadership.

CSOs may benefit from reviewing their charter/by-law provisions on limits for re-election of leadership positions, as well as including certain quota goals to increase diversity of both age and social group. In addition, activities to develop young people in the CSO sector could be helpful in creating a new generation of civil society leadership.

1.3.3 Distribution of CSOs

When considered in ratio to the total population (70 million), the actual number of active CSOs is quite limited. Table III.1.6 provides an overview of the number of all the different forms of CSOs in Turkey. Due to constraints in obtaining data, it is not possible to determine what percentage of associations are member benefit (alumni, social, sports clubs, etc.) as opposed to public benefit (environmental, education, youth, etc.).

CSOs are unevenly distributed throughout the 81 provinces of Turkey- yet there is a broad regional distribution of associations with at least ten in almost every province. However, concentrations in urban centres are observed (as displayed in Figure III.1.3). In addition, the Department of Associations reports that the most common association type is mosque-building associations (12760 in total), followed by social assistance (8590) and township associations (7566).

TABLE III.1.6: NUMBER OF ASSOCIATIONS, FOUNDATIONS, TRADE UNIONS, CHAMBERS AND COOPERATIVES IN TURKEY

Type of organization	Number	Percentage (%)
Associations[8]	80,750	54
Foundations	4,494	3.03
Trade Unions[9]	96	0.06
State Workers Unions	54	0.03
Chambers	4,749	3.20
Cooperatives [10]	58,090	39.18
Total	148,233	100

Unlike associations, foundations are not as dispersed. They are much fewer in overall numbers and are more difficult to establish due to the endowment requirement, which requires a certain degree of capital/wealth.

The actual geographical distribution of CSOs in Turkey may be an indicator of socio-economic disparities and other specific local conditions. For example, the post-conflict condition in the south-east has led to an increase of CSOs established over the past few years. As the government and other donors turn their focus to the development of extremely impoverished regions, mainly in the northeast and southeast, new projects and opportunities may lead to an increase in the number of CSOs established.

8 Ministry of Interior, Department of Associations (number of associations and foundations) 2005

9 Celik; Lordoglu (2005).

10 2001 Statistics of Turkey's National Cooperative Union.

SOURCE: UNICEF AND THE TURKISH MINISTRY OF INTERIOR, 'STANDARDS OF LIVING SURVEY' 2003

FIGURE III.1.3: GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF CSOS IN TURKEY



1.4 Level of Organisation

This subdimension looks at the extent of infrastructure and internal organisation within Turkish civil society. Table III.1.7 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.1.7: INDICATORS ASSESSING LEVEL OF ORGANISATION

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
1.4.1	Existence of umbrella bodies	1
1.4.2	Effectiveness of umbrella bodies	1
1.4.3	Self-regulation	1
1.4.4	Support infrastructure	1
1.4.5	International linkages	1

1.4.1 Existence of CSO umbrella bodies

According to data from Ministry of Interior Department of Associations, there are 265 federations and 8 confederations. A majority are for sports clubs and associations working for people with disabilities. There are nine trade union confederations in total, three private and six for state workers. However, current Associations Law still requires 'common objectives' in the bylaws of associations in order to form federations. As such, there are no 'cross-sectoral' federations.

The establishment of platforms and networks are, however, increasingly common. These are formed by organizations working in the same sector (e.g. environment, education). CSOs from common regions are also starting to form networks (e.g. the Izmir CSO platform). When asked about umbrella organizations, CSI survey respondents provided examples of existing networks, such as environmental platforms, the 'Democracy Platform', youth platforms, various trade union confederations, women's groups and platforms and various local 'civic' networks.

The media analysis[11] produced 100 news items regarding CSO cooperation, which were mainly related to joint CSO meetings as well as advocacy efforts on issues such as earthquake victims, headscarf and F-type jail protests. While not necessarily organized around formal umbrella organizations, there is an increase in coalitions of CSOs around specific efforts.

In the Civil Society Development Program's (STGP) "Needs Assessments Report" CSOs reported feeling deprived from a common platform to communicate with each other and to share information.[12] Similarly, stakeholder consultations revealed a frustration among participants regarding the lack of formal networks for CSOs. In Istanbul, participants emphasized that with the exception of sports federations or CSOs operating for the benefit of disabled people, most CSOs are not part of an umbrella organization. It has been emphasized that there is a need to join forces under an umbrella organization and examine existing examples in the international community, such as CIVICUS and other CSO membership organizations.

Given the increase in efforts to promote CSO involvement in policy related reforms, as well as cooperation in areas of service delivery, counterparts in the public and private sectors are increasingly seeking counterparts in establishing procedures, reviewing policy and other similar activities. It will also be critical for Turkish CSOs to unite under larger bodies to interact with counterparts at the EU level.

Umbrella organizations are also important for the development of self-regulatory codes (discussed more below), which will increase in importance as the sector increases in size and scope and seeks increased support from the general public. It is likely that the new

11 For more on "the Media Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey" please see Appendix 5.

12 "Needs Assessment Report" reflects the outcomes of consultations organized by STGP in order to outline general problems of civil society in Turkey and to increase their capacity. Between, February 5- March 4, 2003, 6 regional meetings were held in Istanbul, Ankara and Gaziantep. 170 CSOs from different regions representing different thematic groups participated in these meetings and the consultations provided healthy and objective information on CSO's in Turkey.

era of civil society development will lead to the establishment of more platforms, umbrellas and federation-type entities. Models and experiences of other countries will certainly be useful in this endeavor.

1.4.2 *Effectiveness of CSO umbrella bodies*

The CSI Survey reports that most respondents do not have a clear view on the impact of federations / networks / umbrella bodies – 44% are undecided, 20% consider them largely ineffective.

Participants at the regional stakeholder meeting held in Izmir (Aegean region) discussed the importance of umbrella organizations in increasing the effectiveness of CSOs and their ability to cooperate and unite under a common cause. This is one region which has been able to mobilize an umbrella organization of CSOs. In discussions during the national forum, groups debated the pros and cons of umbrella organizations noting that some added more difficulty in terms of bureaucracy rather than cohesive action and mutual benefit.

As Turkish civil society organizations work through future efforts of establishing these organizations, it will be important to keep in mind common pitfalls, experiences of previous efforts, and develop a set of key success factors to enable fruitful collective action.

1.4.3 *Self-regulation*

While there has been discussion regarding the need for common codes of conduct and ethics in the sector, preliminary efforts have not translated into widespread adoption by other CSOs. CSI survey respondents report no knowledge of such efforts (16%), yet a majority (56%) expressed that preliminary efforts were made, and that impact as yet is extremely limited.

There are several reasons cited for the lack of impact such as: 1) lack of organized networks, platforms and umbrella organizations to facilitate the process of developing codes and encouraging adoption; 2) the over-regulated aspect of the sector (in terms of government oversight) which has to date already created such a heavy burden of regulation that there was limited room for self-regulatory practices to emerge and 3) the early stage of development of the sector, which has just recently begun the discussion on governance issues and other critical aspects of effective non profit management which are not intended to be regulated by law, but rather by self-regulation and 'codes of practice'.

However, as the CSO sector expands, standards and codes will be of increasing importance- especially for donors seeking some form of 'standard' or 'accreditation' when identifying grantees and/or partners for projects. Self regulatory mechanisms can therefore help not only to ensure a high standard of governance practice internally but also serve as a 'seal' for donors and partners to refer to in their process of seeking partners.

1.4.4 *Support infrastructure*

As the mandate for CSO activity increases, so does the need for technical support (e.g. training, organizational development, etc.). Over the past ten years, a number of CSOs have provided services to this end, such as convening CSO conferences on management, delivering training and developing databanks of resource materials.

In the past five years, an impressive number of new initiatives specifically aimed at increasing the capacity of CSOs and providing training and support have emerged, such as CSO support centres, programs, university certificate and training programs and other training programs. EU-based trainings have been particularly prevalent, to help CSOs prepare grant applications. While these

services have reached a number of CSOs in both urban and rural areas, centres tend to be physically based in Istanbul or Ankara. Keeping in mind the importance of access, these programs have began using methods to increase participation from other locations, such as distance learning and/or travelling training seminars. This has also been helpful in building a network of Turkish experts on civil society and non-profit management, of which there are still not many, as well as developing Turkish learning materials and a local knowledge base on which to build programs which did not exist before.

Not surprisingly, demand still outweighs supply in terms of training and support centres. CSOs in this study report a significant lack of resource centres and organizations (see Table III.1.8). Contrary to popular opinion, this study does not observe significant regional disparities regarding the existence and sufficiency of CSO capacity building centres and programs; in other words, CSOs in Istanbul need this support as much as CSOs in the Northeast province of Kars.

Given the current trends and increase in funds and projects, (primarily from the EU and Turkish government) it is likely that the next five to ten years will bring a surge of activity in this area, with more organizations, especially in less developed areas of the country, establishing support centres for CSOs. While funding is likely to be a challenge for these organizations, creating opportunities to generate revenue will be very important in ensuring sustainability.

1.4.5 *International linkages*

Although a small segment of Turkish CSOs interact with international organizations, an overall assessment points toward a need for more relationships and networking. Until recently, legal restrictions on CSOs in developing international relationships, memberships and networking have deterred these connections. Only recently have CSO regulations loosened to permit correspondence and cooperation with international organizations (once requiring permission from authorities). Since then, partnership opportunities (many of them part of EU projects) have developed further; as observed though the number of international conferences and project partnerships.

Regardless of the upward trend, the CSI study reveals international linkages are still very low – when survey participants were asked how many CSOs they knew were members of international networks, a total of 74.4% stated that they knew none (2.6%) or very few (71,8%). The obstacles are many; language, travel (visa requirements) and resources are among the most critical. As in most cases, the organizations that are stronger financially have more access; for example, the CSI media analysis

TABLE III.1.8: CSO CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAMMES (%)

	Izmir	Adana	Ankara	Diyarbakır	Istanbul	Kars	Samsun
None	17,6	17,6	0	6,7	6,7	28,6	21,1
Limited	58,8	58,8	70	73,3	66,7	38,1	73,7
Average	23,5	23,5	25	20	26,7	33,3	0
Effective	0	0	5	0	0	0	5,3

indicates that 85 news items have been classified as related to international linkages. Most of these are regarding the cooperation or communication of TUSIAD[13] and TOBB at the international level.[14]

Umbrella organizations and other support systems could help facilitate increased linkages between international and Turkish CSOs. This will indeed be critical as Turkey continues on the path to EU accession and the integration issues continue to be discussed. Yet, at the same time, an increase in EU related funds encouraging cross border cooperation among CSOs may increase opportunities for international partnerships.

1.5 Inter-Relations within Civil Society

This subdimension analyses the relations amongst civil society actors in Turkey. Table III.1.9 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.1.9: INDICATORS ASSESSING INTER-RELATIONS WITHIN CIVIL SOCIETY

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
1.5.1	Communication	1
1.5.2	Cooperation	1

1.5.1 Communication

Over the past ten years, a number of email list serves, such as yahoo groups, databanks with CSO contact information and a series of CSO symposiums were initiated. Most of these efforts remain in use today. For instance the CSO Yahoo Group "STK Duyuru" ('CSO Announcements') has 2,870 members, while its sister group targeting youth "STK Gençlik" ('CSO Youth') has 1,827 members. Both groups actively inform their members about civil society issues and CSO activities on a daily basis. Although these are the two major list serves, other alternatives exist as well. In addition, Turkey's first 'Civil Society Journal' was published by EDAM in 2003, with quarterly editions. Thus, there have been a number of efforts to increase communication and documentation about the sector.

Regardless of these efforts, CSOs still report the tendency of CSO actors to remain within their own 'circles', limiting dialogue and engagement with other organizations. When survey participants were asked to describe the level of communication between civil society actors, 8% described it as insignificant, while 73,3% described it as limited. Focus groups and national forum discussions highlight this as a critical problem for the sector's ability to achieve any future progress.

Specific reports on inter-relations among CSOs (STGM, 2003) report that CSOs have a tendency to be territorial about their work and feel threatened by sharing of information. Yet focus group discussions within this study and in other contexts point to a sincere desire among many to make more concerted efforts to foster increased communication among CSOs, especially among CSOs working in different sectors.

13 TUSIAD is the Turkish acronym for the Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen's Association. The Association has restrictive corporate/business person membership and seeks to advance its members interests. In addition, it is often very influential as a pressure group on public policy and produces public statements along with policy papers on social and political reforms.

14 TOBB is Turkish acronym for the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey. The Union is the highest legal entity in Turkey representing the private sector. Today, TOBB has 364 members in the form of local chambers of commerce, industry, commerce and industry, maritime commerce and commodity exchanges. TOBB leads and guides the Turkish entrepreneurs and like TUSIAD submits opinions and comments to the political power in line with the requirements of the private sector, in the form of reports, public statements or policy papers.

FIGURE III.1.4: LIMITED INTER-RELATIONS IN CIVIL SOCIETY



1.5.2 Cooperation

As with communication, cooperation between CSOs is also reported to be limited. Yet the current context of joint projects (mainly EU grants) as well as common advocacy platforms (e.g. Penal Code Reforms) are giving rise to an inspiring movement of platforms and networks, such as those mentioned above under umbrella organizations. Yet given the current weaknesses reported in communication, it is not surprising that 50% of respondents to the CSI survey could only think of 'very few' examples of organisations from different sectors forming alliances on issues of common concern. A smaller amount (7%) could not think of any examples. Among the examples given were different interest groups coming together against the establishment of nuclear plants, volunteers' organizations and women's organizations.

Challenges around cooperation were raised as a key issue of discussions in regional focus groups as well as the national forum. Blockages to cooperation were similar to those mentioned regarding communication; feelings of territorialism and lack of outreach in forging new relationships. Another issue consistently raised regarding cooperation among CSOs is the increasing tendency of larger and financially more capable CSOs to establish projects in other regions without the cooperation of local CSOs. This exclusion leads to resentment among CSOs in that particular region as well as to concerns regarding sustainability of those initiatives once the 'national' CSO has completed the project.

Regardless of this rather bleak picture, the number of cooperative efforts has ostensibly increased in the past few years; due to a number of factors, not excluding the impact of EU funded initiatives, which in most cases require some form of cooperation with other CSOs. The "Media Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey" included approximately 100 news items regarding cooperation among CSOs, with 56 items indicating cross-sectional cooperation, though mainly regarding joint meetings or seminars or the gathering of few CSOs from the same sector in order to visit government institutions. While the increase in number of networks and coalitions (mainly issue/theme based) is a positive trend, the cross-sectoral collaboration remains limited.

1.6 Civil Society Resources

This subdimension examines the resources available for civil society organisations in Turkey. Table III.1.10 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.1.10: INDICATORS ASSESSING CIVIL SOCIETY RESOURCES

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
1.6.1	Financial resources	1
1.6.2	Human resources	1
1.6.3	Technical and infrastructural resources	1

1.6.1 Financial resources

Financial resources are reported to be somewhat inadequate for CSOs. This 'resource' challenge has many dimensions: 1) lack of fundraising and finance skills 2) lack of institutional and individual donors and incentives for philanthropy and grantmaking and 3) existence of 'mega' CSOs.

To begin, CSOs are lacking knowledge and skills around financial management and fundraising are critical for CSOs, which is seriously hindering their ability to manage existing finances (investments, etc) as well as raise new income (either through donations, grants or earned income). Second, the absence of a 'funding' sector (individual

and institutional) is also problematic. In Turkey, there is simply not enough 'philanthropic' mechanisms to facilitate grants and donations to CSOs . The government and private sectors are just beginning to adopt roles as potential 'grantmakers', while private Turkish foundations have neither a history nor any orientation toward grantmaking. Individuals, as mentioned in the section on giving, are not accustomed to making donations to CSOs, nor are there many fiscal incentives. And finally, there is the issue of an un-level playing field; 'Mega CSOs', which raise funds through their patrons and high-profile leadership absorb a significant segment of donor funds, leaving newer and smaller CSOs with great challenges.

Yet these 'mega CSOs' require a closer look, as it suggests that with the right capacity and strategy, fundraising from the public is indeed possible. But what are the factors that contribute to this success? Founders and leaders of these organizations play a fundamentally important role in their ability to achieve financial sustainability. These organizations tend to be established and seed-funded by well-known and highly skilled figures in the private, public and academic sectors. Through their personal networks, these CSOs are able to attract a strong board of highly visible and respected members of society, capable teams, media attention and make use of famous actors and musicians in their fundraising efforts. All of these aspects raise the credibility and visibility of the CSO, thereby increasing their prospects for broader public participation through donations and volunteering. This in turn leads to increased financial sustainability, which translates to stronger capacity and staff resources to deliver high-quality programs and operate in multiple regions across the country. The multiplier effect of this cycle takes these CSOs to a level of operation and quality that makes them at par with some of the most well-known and respected CSOs internationally.

The majority of emerging CSOs fall outside this circle of influential networks and thus face significant difficulty in attracting more funding which, in turn, prevents them from strengthening their capacity to operate. As such, while all CSOs share these challenges, the scale at which more evolved CSOs face them varies dramatically compared to the majority which are trying to mobilize support and participation and build capacity without access to powerful figures and skilled experts.

As such, findings from the survey reveal that approximately 19% of CSOs feel their financial resources are adequate and another 36% feel they are somewhat adequate (see Figure III.1.5) In terms of income diversity, 11% of the participants stated that their CSOs obtained government funding, while 21% enjoyed funding from corporate sources. In addition, foreign funding (28%) and service fees (35%) constituted a source of income. A majority of the participants reported membership fees (88%) and individual donations (60%) as major sources of income (see Table III.1.11).

A similar outcome is observed in another study (TUSEV, 2004); where only 37% of foundation administrators report that their financial resources are adequate. In this study, 80% of foundation administrators report that donations constitute approximately 57% of their foundations' revenues. While the financial income sources of CSOs seem rather diverse, with an emphasis on individual donations, average income of CSOs is anticipated to be quite low. While there is no data regarding the size of operating budgets of CSOs, a study examining only foundations reported that 60% of the sample had budgets between 0-250,000USD (Çarkoğlu, 2006).

FIGURE III.1.5: FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF CSOS



The NAG, which also highlighted that not all CSOs face financial challenges, noted that aside from a small group of associations and foundations, a majority of trade unions and chambers of commerce have significant funding. NAG members have also emphasized that the increase in EU funds are having a positive impact on financial resources of CSOs.

As the sector continues to expand rapidly in size and scope of activity, so does the corresponding need for resources. New paradigms and practices around allocation of resources to civil society require serious consideration. Most giving currently takes place informally; meaning, individuals have a proclivity toward small donations to other needy individuals in their immediate environment. For institutions, the 'grantmaking' concept is rather foreign: Corporates are increasingly keen to 'partner' with CSOs on projects, which are framed as 'sponsorship' initiatives rather than grants through corporate giving or corporate philanthropy programs. This unstructured approach is creating difficulty for both corporate donors and CSOs, which would benefit from more structured procedures to make the funding process more transparent and effective.

The GoT is not an official grantmaker per se; transfer of funds and/or in kind support has been on a one-off basis. However, incoming structural funds from EU matched with Turkish funds will increase their role as donors for CSOs- and as such, will require more structured grantmaking procedures. Private foundations in Turkey tend to be 'operating foundations', i.e. generally funding their own programs and/or institutions. As such, these limitations create blockages in the flow of resources from individuals, private sector and GoT to CSOs.

The issue of financial resources is not only about CSOs' ability to raise, earn and manage funds; it is also about developing the fund giving/grantmaking aspect of the sector. This requires tailored services and programs to cultivate and educate donors, as well as promoting fund development and grantmaking to increase resources for CSOs.

1.6.2 Human resources

A recent study (Çarkoğlu, 2006) reports that foundations on average have 24 active persons working for their organizations; 2 are paid administrators, 14 are volunteer managers (likely to be members of the executive board), 3 are paid staff and 5 are volunteer staff. Respondents reported that management capacity of their organization was sufficient in achieving set goals.

In the CSI Survey, 58% of the respondents reportedly work for a CSO which employs paid staff. A majority (60%) consider the human resources of the organization to be adequate (see Figure III.1.6)

NAG members expressed frustration with the available human resources. They indicated that CSOs often expect too much from a limited team of staff, which have a tendency to be over-worked. As such, they had a sense that the human resources aspect was problematic. The difference in survey outcomes with the NAG perception could be based on the

FIGURE III.1.6: HUMAN RESOURCES OF CSOs



TABLE III.1.11: FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF CSOs: DETAILED (%)

	International Funds	Individual Donations	Membership Dues	Services/Fees
Cash	27	43.8	69.6	33.9
In kind	0	4.5	2.7	0.9
Both	0.9	11.6	5.4	0
None	72.1	40.2	22.3	65.2

fact that NAG members tended to be leaders or managers of CSOs and face great difficulties and pressures with human resource issues, making them a bit more sensitive- and pessimistic- about this issue.

Given the increase in EU-funded projects, more CSOs are able to bring on paid staff. The challenge with this, however, is sustainability- since most employees are working contractually and must leave when funding dries up. Standards around positions and remuneration levels in the sector are currently lacking, but needed as the sector grows and becomes a place of preferred employment for an increasing number of professionals.

1.6.3 Technological and infrastructural resources

Compared to relative challenges with financial resources, CSOs report sufficient infrastructure. The CSI survey indicates that CSOs have somewhat adequate (40%), or adequate (30%) technological and infrastructural resources (see Figure III.1.7).

FIGURE III.1.7: TECHNOLOGICAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL RESOURCES OF CSOS



Conclusion

This section explores the **structural** limitations of civil society in great detail. The current context in Turkey creates an important backdrop to interpreting these findings. As mentioned at the beginning of this report, civil society and a majority of CSOs are still at a stage of nascent formation, which unfortunately results in a longer list of limitations rather than strengths. However, their strengths should also be duly acknowledged; for example, there is a growing number of CSOs (albeit still few in comparison to the country size) that have very strong infrastructure and capacity and raise tremendous support from the public at large. These CSOs are even working cross-borders to assist other countries in areas of youth development, women's issues, poverty alleviation and search/ rescue. In addition, while the overall levels of volunteering and donations are still limited in the general populace, those who are closely involved with CSOs demonstrate an inspiring level of passion and dedication to their work. In many cases it is quite clear that the achievements are mainly due to mobilizing support from a small circle of individuals. Finally, an emerging rights-based movement is making an important contribution to democratic reforms and policies during this critical era.

Yet in terms of limitations, the sector faces great challenges regarding a scaling up of its efforts, particularly with regard to building internal capacity (skills, resources, linkages, platforms) and external outreach (mobilizing participation of individuals). The internal structure of civil society (organizations, the sector), could benefit from concerted efforts in the form of skill building, capacity grants,

and organizational development tools to provide necessary support to both burgeoning organizations, as well as more mature organizations which struggle for sustainability. As the sector moves further along in the phase of 'institutionalization', the formation of self-regulatory codes and common platforms will provide an important 'bonding' function between CSOs. In addition, the common policy reforms, and discussions with EU CSO platforms will likely result in a more 'organized' emergence of Turkish CSO platforms.

In terms of building bridges to the broader public, CSOs will benefit from making greater efforts to increase visibility of their efforts and organizations, with a special focus on strategies for outreach programs around volunteering, fundraising and membership. This will not only help inform the public about key issues CSOs are tackling, but also rally their support and participation in their activities.

2. ENVIRONMENT

This section defines the political, social, economic, cultural and legal environment in which civil society functions. The average score for this dimension was 1,4 indicating that the environment, through improving, still holds disabling aspects for the growth and prosperity of civil society in Turkey. Figure III.2.1 presents the scores for seven subdimensions within the environment dimension.

FIGURE III.2.1: SUBDIMENSION SCORES IN ENVIRONMENT DIMENSION



2.1 Political context

This subdimension examines the political situation in Turkey and its impact on civil society. Table III.2.1 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.2.1: INDICATORS ASSESSING POLITICAL CONTEXT

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
2.1.1	Political Rights	1
2.1.2	Political competition	2
2.1.3	Rule of law	1
2.1.4	Corruption	1
2.1.5	State effectiveness	1
2.1.6	Decentralisation	0

2.1.1 Political rights

The Turkish constitution grants the right to elect and re-elect governments to its citizens and in application, the electorate uses these rights freely. It is estimated that 80% of voting age population goes to the polls. However, according to both the Freedom House Report on Turkey (2004) and the US Department of State's Human Rights Report for Turkey (2003), despite the freedoms of a multiparty system, some barriers for political parties continue to exist. Both reports mention the new legal amendments that were made in January 2003 that loosened restrictions on party names and candidates, while limiting the reasons for closure of a political party. However, it is also noted that a party can still be shut down if its program is not in "agreement" with the constitution, where the concept of "agreement" is open to interpretation. A second barrier mentioned in both reports is the 10% rule. This rule requires a party to win at least 10% of the votes cast nationwide to earn representation in parliament. As a result, while a large number and variety of parties participated in the 2002 elections, only two parties, Justice and Development Party (AKP) and the Republican People's Party (CHP), won seats in the parliament. Nevertheless, the Freedom House Report notes that both parties had been in the opposition, thus demonstrating the ability of the electorate to precipitate change.

There have been attempts to minimize these barriers through the deepening of Turkey's relations with the EU since 2001. To start, the constitutional amendment accepted on October 2001 now requires the ban of a political party to have three-fifths majority in the constitutional court, thus rendering the ban of political parties more difficult. In addition, legal action for the ban of a political party can only be pursued based on "reasons cited in the constitution". However, the EU progress report for Turkey (2004) draws attention to the legal actions taken to ban some parties and thus indicates that there have been no improvements in terms of political rights.

According to regional focus groups in the CSI study, citizens' rights to vote, to become political candidates and their membership to political parties is a strong aspect of political life in Turkey. However, these rights are not used in all segments of the society. Factors such as the inability of individuals to express thoughts freely, arbitrary rule of governments and limited understanding of citizenship rights have a negative impact on political rights. Participants in the southeast region mentioned that these obstacles often lead citizens to politicize the civil society arena and use CSOs in pursuit of their political goals, which in turn deters widespread citizen participation in CSOs.

2.1.2 Political Competition

Turkey is a secular, republican parliamentary democracy and has a political system with multiple parties. The current constitution was adopted on November 7, 1982 after a period of

military rule. Executive power rests in the President, while legislative power is invested in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi), representing the country's 81 provinces. To be represented in Parliament, a party must win at least 10% of the national vote in a national parliamentary election.

Currently, the Justice and Development Party (AKP) holds an overwhelming majority of the parliamentary seats. The opposition has been in disarray since the 2002 elections, as confirmed by the tremendous victory of AKP in the March 2004 local elections. The AKP appears to have abandoned its former Islamist aspirations and although the party has supported some loosening of restrictions on religious activity, it has not made any attempt to undermine Turkey's secular foundation, but instead has pursued the aim of starting EU accession negotiations. It has come to portray itself as a moderate conservative party with plans to combine elements of Islam with Turkey's everyday democratic and secular lifestyle (Freedom House Country Reports, 2005).

The *Republican People's Party* (CHP) is currently the largest opposition party in Turkey. It opposes the conservative yet moderate Islamist government and considers itself a social-democratic party - but it is also a Turkish nationalist party based on the fundamentals of Kemalist Ideology.[15]

Other major parties that have fallen under the 10% barrier and hence currently have no seats in the national assembly are the right-wing, secularist, conservative True Path Party (DYP), the far-right nationalist political party Nationalist Movement Party (MHP), the left-wing pro-Kurdish Democratic People's Party, Youth Party, Motherland Party and the Democratic Left Party.

In Turkey, political parties use their policies as means to transfer electoral demands into public policies. Due to recent scandals and corruption, most of the political parties have lost their credibility and weakened their ties with society. Also, there is little ideological or programmatic difference between parties, which is even valid when Left and Right parties are considered. The main reason for these problems is the strong state tradition in Turkey and the parties' affiliation to the state rather than the people. Increasingly, political parties are being perceived not as organizations of civil society, but as "appendages of the state apparatus." In recent times, with the democratization reforms, political parties have begun to adopt a much more positive and serious approach towards civil society by recognizing and validating the important role these organizations play in mobilizing citizens and representing interests. When the AK Party was running for election in 2003, civil society and CSOs were explicitly referred to in its party strategy document. Many party members are increasingly supportive and active in CSOs themselves as well. However this situation carries the risk of the linkages between CSOs and political parties being based on 'buying votes' rather than pursuit of common goals around policies and issues (White, 2002).

A recent governmental commission has been established to explore political ethics. There are several think tanks that also examine the topic of ethics and political participation, some focusing on participatory democracy and youth, others focusing on better integration of MPs in policymaking. These developments indicate important steps toward promoting a more encouraging political climate and system in which representation can be further enabled.

2.1.3 Rule of law

Both practice and confidence in the rule of law in Turkey is not yet very deeply

15 *"Politics and Government of Turkey" Wikipedia Article,http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_of_Turkey*

entrenched, and subject to frequent violations of the law by citizens and the state. However, this area has been one of the key focal points of recent reforms, taken on as part of the EU requirements. Two main accomplishments highlight these reforms: 1) Adoption of Article 90 which claims supremacy of international laws and conventions on basic rights and freedoms and 2) empowerment of the judiciary and ensuring lack of influence from political forces (EU 2004 Progress Report for Turkey p.20-21).

These reforms indicate the remarkable era of reform taking place in Turkey. However, as with other reforms, implementation remains a concern. Reports indicate that court rulings are not objective and coherent, with existing constitutional decrees that weaken the judiciary due to an organic link between the judiciary and the executive Branch. Although Article 90 has been adopted, Turkey is the country with most petitions to the European Court of Human Rights (after Russia, Poland and Romania) leaving the notion and enforcement of provisions regarding international law supremacy under doubt.

Given the short period of time in which these reforms were adopted, hiccups in implementation may be expected. However, what will be key, especially for civil society and CSOs, will be the monitoring of implementation and holding state actors accountable for systemic flaws that prevent the proper implementation of reforms which aim to strengthen the respect for, and practice of rule of law in Turkey.

2.1.4 Corruption

Perceived corruption of the public sector in Turkey is quite substantial. Corruption is a very serious challenge on a broad level for Turkey, especially in sectors such as media, government, construction and medical services. 80% of businessmen believe that the main obstacle before foreign investments is corruption (EU progress report, 2003 p.23).

According to a series of general populace studies undertaken by the Turkish think tank TESEV (2001; 2004), practices of bribery are perceived to be widespread. Findings reveal that while the highest level of bribery was perceived to take place at the central governmental level; a more moderate level of bribery is perceived at the local governmental level (*TESEV; 2001 - 2004*). Transparency International scored Turkey at 3.2 on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being highly corrupt (Transparency International, 2004).

Recent efforts to address corruption, however, should not go unnoticed. Recent ratification of civil law concerning corruption made Turkey a member of Group of States Against Corruption (GRECO) on 1 January 2004 and several other efforts to address government and private sector corruption show an increasing 'no tolerance' approach. EU progress reports from 2003 and 2004 specifically mention of positive steps in this direction.

What is more surprising is the lack of civic initiatives and CSOs that aim to address corruption issues and hold state and private sectors accountable (for more discussion of this issue please see the values dimension section). Increased CSO attention on these issues will provide for important pressure to adopt stricter reforms in the fight against corruption.

2.1.5 State effectiveness

The capacity of the state bureaucracy is extremely limited. Significant regression in social policies and state spending on basic services, especially regarding education and health are of great concern to the future of public services. According to World Values Survey, 81% of respondents expressed that they felt the government was not doing enough to

meet the basic needs of the poor (Esmer, 1997, p. 70). Professional associations are quite verbal regarding the lack of quality in health and education services, but no clear data is available on the extent to which public services are effective.

Yet, it should be noted that a recent opinion poll on "the Public's Perspective on Public Services and Reform"[16] (TESEV, 2004), revealing comparative evaluations with two previous studies conducted in 1999 and 2000, points towards an improvement in trust in public institutions and satisfaction with the services provided by them. For instance, the general satisfaction levels from central government services more than doubled from a dismal average of 2.8 (out of 10) to 5.8 in four years, while the satisfaction level with the local governments continued to hover slightly above 15.

Nonetheless, the scores for satisfaction as well as trust for both national and local government institutions are quite mediocre. In terms of central government services, the top three institutions that delivered the most satisfactory services were the Turkish Armed Forces, primary and secondary schools and the justice system. The three least satisfactory services were the customs, tax offices and public hospitals. In terms of local government services the most satisfactory ones were the fire departments, hydro services and garbage removal, while the least satisfactory ones were traffic arrangements, street maintenance and maintenance of parks and playgrounds. In addition, respondents who become involved with an institution's services (at both the local or central levels) tended to declare lower satisfaction levels.

2.1.6 Decentralization

Sub-national share of government expenditure is less than 20.0%. A recent set of reforms of local governments and municipalities has initiated a trend of decentralization in Turkey. Municipalities have traditionally faced significant challenges in meeting local needs due to the highly centralized financial system which limits their autonomy (White, 2002).

Yet, the new laws, adopted in 2005, introduced a significant paradigm shift, including increased authorization for income generation and decision-making at the local level. In addition, the 'Regional Development Agencies' (RDA) law was recently ratified, which will be established at the regional level to distribute funds (mainly EU funding allocated to the Turkish government) and manage projects and CSO partnerships at the regional and local levels.

National budget allocations to support these reforms are expected to increase. According to local government and municipality expert Fikret Toksoz, in 2005 the flow of resources from central budget to local municipalities was 14 to 16% and is expected to reach 30% in the next few years (not including the 'RDA' budgets which are still to be determined).

The current trend of 'decentralization' has just begun, and the effects of reforms in practice are yet, to be seen. It is important to note that these changes have also brought on new paradigms of cooperation among CSOs, local governments, municipalities and other government agencies with regards to both service delivery and policy development (for more on this, see 'state-civil society cooperation').

2.2 Basic Rights and Freedoms

This subdimension examines to what extent basic freedoms are ensured by law and in practice in Turkey. Table III.2.2 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

16 The study aims to provide an overall performance evaluation of the central and local governments in the wake of attempts to reshape public administration system in Turkey. A total of 1220 face to face interviews representative of urban voting age population were carried out in February-March 2004. The study was designed to reveal comparative evaluations with the two previous studies conducted in 1999 and 2000.

TABLE III.2.2: INDICATORS ASSESSING BASIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
2.2.1	Civil liberties	1
2.2.2	Information rights	1
2.2.3	Press freedoms	2

2.2.1. *Civil liberties*

Despite a host of reforms in the past five years, frequent violations of civil liberties in Turkey continue to hamper CSO efforts.

Compared to a mere five years ago, laws enabling civil liberties- mainly freedom of association and assembly- are considerably more enabling (ECNL and TUSEV, 2004). A new commission on human rights was established as part of this reform era, with a system to report and track violations of civic liberties. Yet according to a public opinion poll in 2004, freedom of expression was included as one of Turkey's most important challenges (TESEV, 2004). Freedom House Country Rankings list Turkey as "Partly Free" with respect to political rights and civil liberties (Freedom House, 2004).

Despite reforms in law, violations continue in practice. Trade unions in particular remain subject to considerable restrictions in assembly and expression. The 2004 EU Progress Report for Turkey points at the necessity to broaden and complete legal reforms, especially strengthening the "zero tolerance policy" regarding torture and ill treatment, freedom of faith, women's rights, union rights and minority rights.

Stakeholder meetings at the regional and national level, and discussions within the NAG highlighted the trend of improvements in the area of civil liberties. There was however, a cautious optimism regarding lack of implementation of reforms. The CSI media analysis revealed news items regarding restrictions of civic liberties such as limitations on union rights and the 1st of May (workers day) regulations, excessive force on protests by unionized state employees in the education sector (EĞİTİM-SEN) and police violence against participants at the 2005 World Women's Day celebrations.

While there is a political will to encourage respect of civil liberties and address inconsistencies in implementation, the more profound cultural shift in attitudes toward civic liberties and a culture of democracy will is taking longer than desired. In the meantime, CSOs and the state would benefit from developing reform monitoring systems to address the inconsistencies in implementation. CSOs would also benefit from increasing awareness among citizens regarding their civil liberties, which they are often unaware of.

2.2.2 *Information rights*

The Right to Information Act was ratified in June 2004 and granted citizen access to government information. This was an important step for Turkey in terms of expanding basic rights and freedoms, especially considering that many other democratic nations still have not implemented similar laws. However, as with other reforms, there are concerns about practice and accessibility of information. Not all government agencies are operating at the same standard of service and accessibility of information rights.

Some civic initiatives have been launched to promote awareness of this law and monitor implementation. A report prepared by the think-tank, TESEV, cites that the most important deficit in the implementation process is that Turkish culture (civic and bureaucratic) is still not oriented toward this concept of the 'right' to information. The report also indicates that while the Act was passed, provisions regarding 'state secrets' have not been

defined, which allows the state broad discretion as to the amount and type of information shared with the public (TESEV, 2005).

Stakeholder consultations at the regional level and discussions with NAG members underline the limitations in implementation, citing uneven practices across government agencies and lack of standardized practices regarding rate of response. Also mentioned was the urgent need to promote awareness of citizens to use this right, as well as to continue implementation and monitoring efforts.

2.2.3 Press freedoms

Although there have been improvements related to freedom of press as part of the EU integration framework, isolated violations of press freedoms continue to take place. 2004 Freedom House Report ranks Turkey as "partly free" in this respect. Recent changes in the Turkish Penal Code and lawsuits against certain journalists and publishers continue to create a rather chilling atmosphere. And as mentioned above, civic liberties related to press freedoms (freedom of expression and thought) are still somewhat restrictive in Turkey.

NAG members regarded the recent changes to provisions in the Turkish Penal Code as a violation of press freedom. The Penal Code contains harsh penalties for journalists such as: Article 215 which considers it a crime to publicly acknowledge (in the press) a committed crime or a person who committed a crime, Article 300 regarding insulting the President of the Republic, the Turkish flag, other state symbols, or national unity and Articles 330 & 331 regarding "unveiling the information that is forbidden by the competent authorities and should remain confidential because of its nature." (Bianet, 2005, "Anti-democratic Articles in the New Turkish Penal Code").

As such, Turkey continues to struggle in achieving a higher standard of freedom for press. There are CSO efforts, such as the platform of journalists and the initiative to promote freedom of expression that lobby the government for laws which protect press freedoms; it remains to be seen how successful these efforts will turn out.

2.3 Socio-Economic Context

This subdimension analyses the socio-economic situation in Turkey. Table III.2.3 shows the respective indicator score.

TABLE III.2.3: INDICATOR ASSESSING SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

Ref. #	Indicator	Score
2.3.1	Socio-economic context	2

2.3.1 Socio-economic context

In order to assess the socio-economic context, CIVICUS determined eight socio-economic conditions that may effect the functioning of civil society. These conditions are: 1) widespread poverty 2) armed conflict 3) severe ethnic and/or religious conflict 4) severe economic crisis 5) rate of population affected by major natural disaster 6) severe socio-economic inequalities 7) pervasive adult illiteracy and 8) lack of IT infrastructure.

These socio-economic conditions in Turkey were evaluated according to data gathered from international sources. Results of this evaluation reveal that social & economic conditions are not extremely limiting to the effective functioning of civil society in Turkey:

1. **Widespread poverty** – *In Turkey, do more than 40% of people live on $2 per day?* No; According to the World Bank's 2004 World Development Report only 10,3% of people in Turkey live on $2 per day.

2. **Armed conflict –** *In Turkey has there been an armed conflict in last five years?* Yes; According to 2003 Prio/Uppsala Armed Conflict Database, Turkey has gone through armed conflict between 1999-2003 although it was regional and disordered
3. **Severe ethnic and/or religious conflict –** Yes; according to Centre for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM) resources, there are ethnic and religious tensions in Turkey. There are severe problems of individual security, free will and discrimination in the country (CIDCM, Peace and Conflict Ledger, 2003).
4. **Severe economic crisis –** *Has there been a severe economic crisis (e.g. external debt is more than GNP) in Turkey in past two years?* No; According to World Bank development figures Turkey's external dept in 2003 is not more than its GNP and remains at a ratio of 61%. According to this measure, there has been no severe economic crisis in the country in past two years.
5. **Severe social crisis –** *Has a large portion of the population been effected by major natural disaster?* No; in Turkey, the rate of the population effected by major natural disasters is below 0.1%, thus at a very low level. (International Disaster Database, 2003-2004)
6. **Severe socio-economic inequalities –** This condition has been evaluated based on the UNDP GINI Index which aims at measuring socio-economic inequalities sin the world and Turkey's score does not indicate severe inequality in socio-economic conditions.
7. **Pervasive adult illiteracy –** *In Turkey is the rate of pervasive adult illiteracy more than 40%?* No; According to 2004 UNDP report, the rate of illiteracy for adults over the age of 15 is only 13.5% of the population.
8. **Lack of IT infrastructure –** *In Turkey, is the rate of hosts is less than 5 per 10.000 inhabitants?* No; According to 2003 data from International Telecommunication Union, the rate of hosts per 10,000 inhabitants in Turkey is 53.

An analysis of these conditions reveals that the socio-economic context presents only some limitations to the development and functioning of civil society since only two of the eight negative conditions exist in Turkey, namely the presence of armed conflict and severe ethnic and/or religious conflict. Regional Stakeholder Meeting participants expressed that other socio-economic conditions such as dense rural population and rapid urbanization, are also barriers for the effective functioning of civil society. They add that economic conditions, including unemployment, have a negative impact on the civil society at large.

Eight conditions assessing the socio-economic environment were one of the most debated topics in the NAG scoring meeting. In the Turkish context, terms such as "ethnic/ religious conflict" and "armed conflict" are highly politicized and charged, making them impossible to separate from the events they have materialized into over the years. From the NAG's perspective, the concept of armed conflict and severe ethnic/religious conflict were closely associated with the Kurdish problem, a complex issue that could not be handled without taking into consideration the armed conflict that took place in South East Anatolia from early 1980s to mid 1990s, where the lines between "armed conflict" and "civil war" remained blurred. In addition, the NAG expressed their belief that the problem of deep-rooted and widespread poverty, income inequality and ethnic conflict along with the rise and demands

of the Islamic identity in the recent years formed an extremely preventive socio-economic context for the development of civil society.

Hence, although in contradiction with international data on certain individual socio-economic conditions, the NAG determined the socio-economic context, when considered as a whole, to be limiting civil society's functioning to a great extent.

2.4 Socio-Cultural Context

This subdimension examines to what extent socio-cultural norms and attitudes are conducive or detrimental to civil society. Table III.2.4 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.2.4: INDICATORS ASSESSING SOCIO-CULTURAL CONTEXT

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
2.4.1	Trust	1
2.4.2	Tolerance	1
2.4.3	Public spiritedness	3

2.4.1 *Trust*

Widespread mistrust is observed among members of Turkish society. According to the World Values Survey results in 1999 only 16% of the population exhibits trust in one another.

Other studies that measure levels of trust reveal similar outcomes. For instance, in terms of trust, the most recent World Values Survey puts Turkey at the second lowest place after Brazil. According to a recent poll on "Turkish Society and Social Capital", only 13% believe that one could trust the majority of the people. The same study points to a huge lack of trust in Turkish society: while 94% trust their family members, once one looks beyond the family,
trust levels go down drastically. Only 40% trust their neighbours, 33% trust people they know, 23% trust people from the same region as themselves, 7% trust people from other religions and 6% trust people from other nationalities (ARI Movement and Infakto Research, 2006).

Stakeholder consultations at the regional and national level reveal that this is a serious problem in society- and a difficult one to tackle. CSOs role in promoting trust was discussed as being critical to helping to create a more cohesive society, yet few actions and examples of initiatives were provided.

2.4.2 *Tolerance*

Low levels of tolerance prevail in Turkish society. According to the World Values Survey in 1999, the level of tolerance for individuals from other race, religion and ethnic groups, individuals with HIV/AIDS and homosexuals is 2.6 (out of a scale of 3 which indicates least tolerance). During the period when the CSI study was conducted, there were a number of issues raised within this context, including but not limited to the "Armenian Issue', which have led to ultra-nationalist expressions of intolerance.

This was a subject of much discussion in stakeholder consultations at both regional and national levels. In general, CSOs agreed that Turkish society in general does not support tolerant views regarding diverse members. There were however, some regional differences in the degree to which this was problematic. For example, in Diyarbakir and Ankara, CSOs expressed that there are very low levels of tolerance for diversity, and in Istanbul and Izmir (Aegean region), participants expressed that once higher levels of tolerance are deteriorating rapidly.

2.4.3 *Public spiritedness*

There is a high sense of public spiritedness (level of helpfulness among society members) in Turkey, according to the World Values Survey

results of 1999 (score is 1.2 on a scale of 3, with 1 being strongest). This is especially interesting when contrasted with low levels of trust and tolerance, which comprise social capital. High levels of individual assistance and the general culture of 'helpfulness' observed in Turkish culture further enforce this outcome. This culture is observed to positively influence the CSO movement, especially in terms of helping disadvantaged populations.

2.5 Legal Environment

This subdimension examines the legal environment for civil society and assesses to what extent it is enabling or disabling to civil society. Table III.2.5 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.2.5: INDICATORS ASSESSING LEGAL ENVIRONMENT

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
2.5.1	CSO registration	2
2.5.2	Allowable advocacy activities	2
2.5.3	Tax laws favourable to CSOs	1
2.5.4	Tax benefits for philanthropy	1

2.5.1 CSO Registration

The CSO registration process in Turkey was recently simplified. CSOs perceive the process as being inexpensive, following legal provisions and consistently applied. Yet CSOs are concerned about the speed and simplicity of the process, and still perceive this to be a cumbersome process.

As a result of reforms to the law on associations, registration has become more simplified. In the new system, associations are registered the moment they present their required paperwork to local state officials. If within 30 days they are not contacted by the registering authority (local government office with input from the Department of Associations), they are considered fully registered. Most stakeholders in CSI study (of which a high percentage were associations) agreed that the registration process is being implemented consistently (in accordance with the law). But they still consider the process to be complicated and slow, which suggests that procedures for registration (perhaps the preparation of required paperwork) are still considered cumbersome (see Figure III 2.2).

FIGURE III.2.2: CSO REGISTRATION PROCESS



On the contrary, the registration process for foundations is more difficult and expensive. Foundations are registered by courts (based on the initial review of the Foundations Directorate, a division of the Turkish Prime Ministry), and require an endowment (currently the requirement is between 500.000 – 1.000.000 New Turkish Lira depending on the objective of the foundation). According to a survey on foundations (Çarkoğlu, 2006), 13% of foundations report that legislation is very limiting in registration (followed by: raising funds other than donations (12%), purchase and sale of assets (11%) and taxation (9%)). The new foundations law, if accepted by parliament and subsequently ratified, will bring important reforms (for more see TUSEV and ICNL, 2004).

2.5.2 *Allowable advocacy activities*

Constraints on CSO advocacy activities are minimal as stated in the law- in fact, there are no restrictions per se for associations and foundations. Yet in practice, CSOs face significant interference by government officials. Trade unions are facing specific difficulties in realizing their freedom to organize and protest. Associations and foundations, are free to engage in advocacy activities and criticise the government; can and often do face sanctions for doing so.

The EU progress report for Turkey (2003) reports: "There are many court cases opened against human rights associations and their activities. Although most of these cases result in the ruling of 'not guilty' or the transformation of the jail sentence into monetary sanction, human rights activists feel that these cases are at the level of harassment. It is estimated that there are 500 ongoing suit cases against human rights activists". The 2004 report continues: "There are reports that video taping of CSO activities and the use of force against activists continues, though authorities are taking positive steps to end such actions. Although the number is decreasing, human rights activists remain subject to judicial harassment" (p.174).

CSI Survey results confirm this: A majority of respondents (63%) perceive the state to exert some limitations on advocacy activities of CSOs, while another 24% regard the restrictions to be excessive (see Figure III.2.3). Stakeholder consultations reveal serious concerns about the use of excessive force and control over CSOs that present an opposing view to the state. This excessive control is likely to hamper advocacy activities of CSOs- especially with regards to holding the state accountable (which is also reported to be limited in Turkish civil society- see Values dimension for more).

Findings convey that while there are important reforms taking place to enable civil society, the process of shifting the paradigm from state control to freedom of civic expression will clearly be a long journey. The culture of controlling civil society is too deeply embedded in the state system (security forces, judicial system, and central/local government bodies). As such, changes in law are not enough to change practice.

The right of CSOs to peacefully express opinions and views that may be opposing the state is a critical role for civil society, and to silence this voice would render CSOs useless. There are several approaches to facilitating this change in practice- none of them mutually exclusive. One is the critical role of CSO monitoring to track and report state violations of regulations which protect civic freedoms; or in other words, being the 'watchdog' of implementation. Another is the important role CSOs can play in educating various government

FIGURE III.2.3: EXTENT OF LIMITATIONS ON ADVOCACY ACTIVITIES



agencies about the civic landscape and CSOs, so as to promote more understanding and respect between the sectors.

CSOs can also play an important role in working closely with state officials to set up a system in which complaints can be logged and an ombudsman-type function can mediate the cases- for those that do not warrant judicial action. The state would benefit greatly from developing their own monitoring and tracking systems, to protect civil society from excessive use of force and other practices which violate civic freedoms. Regardless of the activity, this is an area where civil society and the state should work together.

2.5.3 Tax laws favourable to CSOs

The tax system is considered burdensome to CSOs. Tax exemptions or preferences are available only for a narrow range of CSOs (those eligible for public benefit status) and for limited sources of income. As a rule, CSOs are exempt from corporate tax (although economic enterprises are subject to corporate tax) but are liable for other taxes including VAT. There are additional benefits for CSOs and their donors, which are able to obtain 'public benefit status'. Obtaining this status is tremendously political and complicated; and therein lays the actual problem for CSOs in Turkey.

'Public benefit activity' is defined differently for associations (defined very broadly) and foundations (defined very narrowly), which causes unjust conditions in tax considerations. As such from the outset, these two organizations are liable to drastically different regulations regarding this status. Another major challenge is that for both associations and foundations, the final decision maker is the Council of Ministers, which not only makes this decision under the influence of political tendencies, but also lengthens the process significantly and sometimes unfairly. Due to these and other procedural difficulties, only 474 associations (approximately 1%) and 222 foundations (approximately 7%) have been able to obtain this status, to date. A recent report prepared by ECNL and TUSEV (2006) prepared for the SKIP project on CSO-state cooperation outlines these issues in more detail.

Stakeholders in the CSI study agreed that the limitations brought forth by the current 'public benefit status' procedures must be addressed and that this constituted the main obstacle in terms of tax exemptions for CSOs. It is absolutely critical that the GoT takes up the issue of public benefit status as the next key reform agenda to enable civil society.

2.5.4 Tax benefits for philanthropy

Tax deductions or credits, or other tax benefits to encourage individual and corporate giving are available on a limited basis, to a few number of CSOs. Tax benefits for encouraging individual or corporate donations, credits or other tax benefits do exist, as up to 5% of annual income can be donated with a tax deduction. However, the critical issue is that only CSOs with public benefit status can offer their donors a deduction for their donations. As stated in the previous paragraph, the system for granting this status is extremely complicated and constraining. As long as the public benefit system does not improve, only a small number of CSOs will continue to be able to benefit from donations.

In addition to increasing the 5% deduction for donations, additional incentives to promote philanthropy can be considered and should be pursued. Examples include the 1% law in Hungary and other provisions that can encourage giving for a range of donors- from those which would like to make large gifs to those who would like to make smaller contributions. One urgent issue to address is that paid employees are

currently unable to claim their deductions that the law allows, due to procedural problems in the taxation system. This is a serious obstacle to potentially widespread contributions from this segment of society. The GoT is therefore strongly advised to review current tax incentives for donations to CSOs so as to enable a broader base of individual and institutional philanthropy.

2.6 State-Civil Society Relations

This subdimension describes and assesses the nature and quality of relations between civil society and the Turkish state. Table III.2.6 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.2.6: INDICATORS ASSESSING STATE-CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONS

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
2.6.1	Autonomy	1
2.6.2	Dialogue	1
2.6.3	Cooperation/ Support for CSOs	1

2.6.1 Autonomy

Technically (by law), civil society can exist and function independently of the state; CSOs are free to operate without excessive government interference and government oversight reasonably designed and limited to protect legitimate public interests. But in practice, CSOs are subject to frequent unwarranted interference in their operations.

Between 1980 to 2004, freedom of association – and thus, the autonomy of civil society in Turkey was restricted and CSOs were subject to laws which were draconian in nature. The initial clamp down on civic rights was in reaction to the three military interventions from 1960 through 1980 (discussed in more detail in Section II). Security forces were responsible for oversight of associations. Both the law on associations and foundations required significant levels of prior approval and notification for most activities, including receipt of foreign grants, cooperation with other entities, buying and selling of assets, just to name a few. State officials, usually security forces, were required to attend and monitor general assembly meetings.

With the beginning of the Copenhagen Criteria reform process in 2001, significant reforms were undertaken to effectively re-instate the freedom of association in Turkey (see above section on legal frameworks) A new civilian department in the Ministry of Interior was established for the oversight of associations; and the associations' law was completely re-vamped. The result of these reforms, on paper, has been critically important in promoting the autonomy of CSOs.

In practice, however, government interference continues to be reported (see above on advocacy activities of CSOs). This is most apparent for trade unions, which experience significant government interference, as well as human rights organizations and other CSOs working on more 'sensitive' issues like torture and mistreatment. In addition, laws and regulations continue to express vague language, increasing the discretionary powers of government authorities to decrease the autonomy of civil society.

CSOs continue to report instances of government interference with their activities; 36% report this as being somewhat common, 33% claim it is frequent. The CSI media review also highlighted news items related to police raids and arrests of protesters; even citing physical harm. A significant number of news items were related to the State's attempt to shut down the trade union of educators (EGITIM-SEN).

As such, while reforms to laws and regulations demonstrate the will to grant civil society more autonomy, it seems

actual practice and the mindsets of some government agencies are not comfortable with these changes yet. As mentioned above, monitoring and continued reforms as well as programs to help government agencies implement these reforms will be important in protecting the autonomy of civil society in Turkey.

2.6.2 Dialogue

The state only seeks to dialogue with a small sub-set of CSOs on an ad hoc basis. There are no defined or institutionalized terms and rules of engagement.

In 2002, a World Bank report stated, "channels of effective communication and cooperation between the state and CSOs are limited in Turkey. The state is more willing to engage, yet, remains hesitant in engaging with CSOs (based on fears of fostering extremism)" (World Bank, 2002, p86).

However, since 2002, the state's propensity to engage with civil has been increasing in both intention and practice. State-civil society dialogue has become an increasing area of focus given the current trends and reforms mainly vis-à-vis the EU accession process.

This positive assessment is observed in some concrete practical improvements. In 2003 the Prime Ministry initiated activities to examine and monitor human rights issues. As part of its mission a joint-commission was established with state and CSO participation (please see Section 4.1 and Appendix 3 for a detailed discussion of this case). Other examples of state-CSO dialogue are rapidly emerging around other key issues as well, such as social policy and service delivery and poverty alleviation. As such, it can be said that this trend is positive and expected to improve further. CSOs warn, however, that objective and clear frameworks for cooperation and dialogue are needed to ensure equal access and representation. This concern is being addressed through projects such as the civil society-public sector cooperation initiative, which is supported by the EU and aims to increase the capacity of the government to engage more effectively with civil society. SKIP, the Turkish acronym for the Technical Support Project for Improving Public Sector – CSO Cooperation, aims to improve the democratic participation of civil society and the levels of cooperation between civil society and the public sector during the EU accession period.

In addition, new provisions have been introduced in local government laws to promote CSO participation in strategic planning and service delivery. Along similar lines, the parliament recently approved legislation regarding the consultation of CSOs in the process of preparing draft policies and laws. This provision intends to encourage- but not require- state actors to obtain valuable inputs of CSOs on thousands of new laws which will come into existence during the EU accession process.

Such initiatives are still very new, and how they will actually reflect practices is still unknown. As such, a majority of CSOs in the CSI survey still perceive civil society-state dialogue to be quite limited (62%). In addition, CSO sense that the state is engaging mainly with trade unions, chambers and private sector business organizations. CSOs attribute lack of dialogue with other CSOs to a lack of trust and understanding of the sector and its diverse range of actors (on behalf of the state). The media analysis of the CSI study confirmed these perceptions: A total of 124 news items were reported on this indicator, indicating that professional associations/chambers, business associations and trade unions received the most coverage in news items related to dialogue with the State (see Table III.2.7) At the same time, some CSOs still harbour feelings of resentment

and fear that engaging with the state will lead to control and cooptation of their independence.

With encouraging changes in the legislation regarding state-civil society engagement and the increasing call for CSO participation, as well as the positive impact of EU reforms, it is likely that this trend of inclusion and participatory practices will continue to improve. This will however challenge the state to develop appropriate mechanisms to manage this process. This will also challenge CSOs to develop their skills and capacity to provide useful and relevant inputs to policy review and such issues.

Time, practice and patience will be needed for these two sectors, once very much at odds with one another, to develop a relationship based on mutual trust, cooperation and benefit. If current attempts to develop strategies and mechanisms are pursed, it is very likely that within the next few years, the state-civil society dialogue will be much stronger.

2.6.3 Cooperation / support

Only a very narrow range of CSOs receive state resources- these tend to be in the form of project partnerships rather than formal grants or contracts which is currently not a defined practice in Turkey. Given the rather informal linkages between CSOs and the state, it is not easy to track the number of cooperative efforts between the state and CSOs. However, a study of foundations (Çarkoğlu, 2006) reveals that 1/3 of private foundations have some level of cooperation with state actors- though the extent to which this is based on any resource allocation from the state is not known. It is important to note that cooperation tends to take place more on the local level rather than the central level (see Table III.2.8).

TABLE III.2.7: MEDIA ANALYSIS REGARDING THE CSO TYPES AND GOVERNMENT DIALOGUE

CSO Type	Number of news items
Religious or Spiritual group	2
Trade Union or Labour Union	22
NGO / civic group / human rights organisation (e.g. Rotary Club, Red Cross, Amnesty International)	3
Service providing	6
Education centres	2
Women's group	1
Professional Associations (including chambers)	46
Co-operative, credit or savings group	23
Ethnic-based community group	3
Environmental or conservational organisation	3
Cultural group or association (e.g. arts, music, theatre)	1
Fundraising organizations	1
Federation / umbrella body or network of civil society	11
Total Number of News Items	124

Source: "Media Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey" (TUSEV, 2006)

While only 12% of CSOs report receiving any funds from state resources (see Table III.2.9), it is currently not possible to determine the exact amount of state resources allocated to CSOs. Table below provides a breakdown of state's support to CSOs in goods and cash, where most government aid comes in the shape of cash rather than goods. There are no official grantmaking mechanisms at either the central or local government levels, yet, new procedures are currently in the process of being developed.

Focus group discussions on this topic brought up mixed results. Some stakeholders view cooperation with the state as a loss of autonomy and 'non governmental' identity, while others view this as critical for social service delivery, considering the unique role CSOs can play in this respect, which would lessen the burden from government.

Regardless, recent legislation is increasingly presenting opportunities for both dialogue and financial

TABLE III.2.8: STATE COOPERATION WITH FOUNDATIONS (%)

	Municipality	Governorship	Administrative District	Mufti	National Education Department in the Province
Foundations in cooperation	32.5	29.2	18.8	9.1	32.5
Spheres of Cooperation:	–	–	–	–	–
Student accommodation credit fund.	6	11.7	8.2	3.3	53.5
Information exchange	6	10.4	8.2	3.3	4.7
Infrastructure services	6	1.3	–	–	–
Real estate	12	2.6	–	3.3	1.2
Environmental and traffic arrangements	8	2.6	2	3.3	1.2
Providing Food	2	1.3	–	–	–
Official writings	8	15.6	22.4	3.3	9.3
Socio-cultural activities	17	15.6	20.4	13.3	14
Issues for providing help	11	13	8.2	10	3.5
Administration. project and organization	14	15.6	14.3	13.3	3.5
Needs of the mosque	–	–	–	33.3	–
Other	10	10.4	16.3	13.3	9.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Çarkoğlu, 2006

TABLE III.2.9: PRIVATE SECTOR'S SUPPORT AND GOVERNMENT AID TO CSOs (%)

	State	Private Sector
None	88.3	67.9
Cash	7.2	11.6
Goods	3.6	8.9
Goods and cash	0.9	11.6

TABLE III.2.10: INDICATORS ASSESSING PRIVATE SECTOR – CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONS

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
2.7.1	Private sector attitude	1
2.7.2	Corporate social responsibility	1
2.7.3	Corporate philanthropy	1

cooperation with CSOs, starting with local government legislation reforms, which will allow governorships and municipalities to have joint projects with CSOs and include them in city councils, as well as the central level (the SKIP initiative mentioned above).

2.7 Private Sector-Civil Society Relations

This subdimension describes and assesses the nature and quality of relations between civil society and the private sector. Table III.2.10 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

2.7.1 Private sector attitude

The attitude of private sector toward civil society is considered to be generally indifferent. However, as the notion of Corporate Social Responsibility or 'CSR' becomes more prevalent, combined with Turkey's increasingly critical development agenda and EU accession process, there is also an increased awareness on behalf of the private sector to support civil society initiatives especially in the area of social and economic development.

Analysis and discussions in the CSI study do not point toward an overwhelmingly supportive nor discouraging attitude of the private sector toward civil society,

since 68% of the CSI survey participants report that they don't receive any funding from the private sector (see Table III.2.9)

Most of the discussion and analysis on this topic has focused mainly on the way in which business supports civil society (i.e. CSR and philanthropy) rather than their general attitude toward civil society actors.

2.7.2. Corporate social responsibility

Major companies are paying more attention to notions of corporate social responsibility. However, their operations frequently disregard negative social and environmental impacts.

Over the past five years the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has picked up more momentum and acceptance in Turkey's business community. "With the increasing social obligation to promote community investments, the importance and value of CSR is no longer limited to a theory, but a living practice" (Bikmen, 2004, p3). However, the term itself is interpreted quite differently; most regard CSR as the 'social support' actions of the businesses, such as sponsorship of projects, rather than their obligations in terms of human and environmental sustainability. As such we observe an increase in discussion about the topic, yet, still a high level of confusion regarding the concrete meaning and actions that fall under it. This confusion rests within the civil society sector as well, so that having separate discussions about CSR and corporate philanthropy were difficult. In short, companies tend to think that meeting CSR standards is limited to sponsoring CSO projects; which of course is not the case.

CSO perceptions share this perspective. Only 5% of the respondents of CSI Survey think that Turkey's major companies take into account the social and environmental consequences of their activities. In fact a majority (63%) see Turkish companies as having a very limited scope of CSR activities.

A detailed examination of Turkey's top 10 companies' (by revenue) CSR activities reveals that these companies tend not to publish their CSR activities and/or expenditures in their annual reports (TUSEV, 2006). The study's findings illustrate clearly that the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is still in its nascent stages in Turkey. Many large companies take on sponsorships in the fields of culture, education and environment and yet, they fail to be consistent or to form a strategy when it comes to ensuring the consistency of such actions. In addition, in Turkey, the areas the private sector supports falls short of the international list of CSR areas. For instance, the private sector hardly ever addresses areas such as human rights, social justice, good governance, economical development, urbanization, workplace environment and such. It rather prefers to fund what one could call "safe" areas such as education, environment, culture/ the arts and sports.

Results point towards an increasing awareness and activity in CSR in the private sector. However, companies still lack an overarching strategy in determining their target groups and the types of projects that they support. The research also gives the impression that most of these companies do not adopt CSR as part of their corporate culture. In cases where researchers were unable to obtain annual financial reports and public relations departments were contacted, many companies gave the impression that they saw CSR as "something they had to do" or as any activity done with CSOs. Though these companies often supported CSOs in some activities, they often saw

such cooperation as sponsorship or PR activities.[17]

CSO stakeholders taking part in regional and national focus group discussions agree on the trend that companies are taking a more active role in supporting CSOs; yet, concerns remain about the level of transparency of these practices and their true intention. In other words, are these projects yet another marketing scheme or a concerted effort to address social problems? What is the balance between project expenditures and advertising/promotional expenditures about the companies' support of a particular project? Are business practices respecting employment and environmental laws? In this sense, CSOs should be increasingly keen to hold private sector accountable in terms of their practices, and emphasize that CSR is not only about joint projects and donations but about sustainable and responsible business practices.

2.7.3 Corporate philanthropy

Only a very limited range of CSOs receive funding from the private sector.

The term 'corporate philanthropy' has yet to enter the lexicon of the corporate sector, which has a proclivity to regard donations as sponsorship expenditures. This leads to further blurred lines between 'CSR' and 'sponsorship', as mentioned above. According to the CSI survey, 68% of CSOs do not obtain any funding – for sponsorship or otherwise- from corporates. This highlights that corporate funding is still not very developed in the Turkish context.

Although the number of companies supporting CSO projects is increasing, procedures for systematically and strategically making funding decisions are not common. A study on donors and funding in Turkey revealed that CSO partners and projects are selected and supported on an ad-hoc basis, generally with the advice of public relations/ corporate communications consultants, commonly funded from the companies' PR or marketing budgets. Decisions are rarely made according to any set guidelines and the practice is often treated as a 'sponsorship' rather than a 'grant'.

Corporate foundations do not exist as a separate form, although a handful of companies have established foundations which resemble the corporate foundation model of Europe and the US. These foundations obtain significant income from a certain percentage of profits allocated to the foundation, which in turn uses this income for its operational and project costs. Turkey's largest foundations in this respect are those established by industrialists; and their operating foundations tend to establish museums, schools and hospitals. As such, grantmaking to CSOs is still quite uncommon for both 'corporate-related' foundations as well as companies (Bikmen, 2004).

With regards to 'corporate giving', projects based on education, environment, arts and culture seem to be of most interest. Most corporates do however express that they have more than one interest area for projects. The average 'grant' in grants for companies is unknown, but contributions tend to be cash rather than in-kind. Companies report that they do not have separate budgets for these initiatives. Still, recognition that companies need to take a more structured approach to their 'philanthropy' and be more careful about clearly distinguishing between sponsorships and support is increasing.

A majority of companies have yet to develop structured mechanisms and procedures for 'corporate giving'. Currently, these practices tend to be ad-hoc in nature, where CSO grantees are selected with the assistance of public

17 See Appendix 4 for a summary of the CSR study.

relations and corporate communications experts and/or through the network of senior management. As such, 'equal opportunity' to access support from companies does not necessarily exist and application procedures, decision making criteria and funding preferences are not clearly and publicly defined, which makes it difficult for CSOs to know of and apply for such support. In addition, the lack of extensive tax benefits for companies may certainly be limiting the potential of corporate philanthropy in Turkey.

CSOs, given their rather nascent size, capacity and experience in the area of fundraising and project management also face challenges in their ability to prepare competitive dossiers and connect with corporate donors. This study revealed that many corporates feel frustrated with CSOs lack of professional capacity and project management skills. This may be leading corporate businesses to only work with a handful of 'well known' CSOs or those in their personal network.

In order for the notion and practice of corporate philanthropy to develop further, it is important to institutionalize the process of giving for companies, and create services and mechanisms to enable their giving potential.

Conclusion

Civil society in Turkey is greatly affected by the **environment** within which it operates. Significant systemic changes, mainly due to the democratization reform process has created implications on a range of issues such as the rule of law, basic civic rights and freedoms, legal frameworks for CSOs and relationships between civil society and the state. As such, these were themes of central focus in the environment dimension.

This study reveals that the GoT has demonstrated important progress in law reforms to expand civic liberties (expression, thought, religion), enable civil society (association and assembly, registration and autonomy), and has developed new legislation to increase cooperation and dialogue with CSOs. However, concerns regarding implementation remain- mainly with regards to violation of civic rights and the threat to the autonomy of civil society. This may prove to be a very serious challenge for the GoT in translating policy to practice. It also may threaten the recent improvement of relations between civil society and the state.

The GoT would benefit from developing mechanisms to ensure adherence to rule of law and consistent implementation of regulations at the local and national level. In addition, the new legislation reform should continue, and focus on creating incentives for donations from individuals, government and the private sector to the non-profit sector. Improvements to tax policies to provide incentives for individual and private giving will be especially critical in helping CSOs mobilize resources.

CSOs would be highly encouraged to take an active role as 'watch-dog' to monitor reforms and provide necessary feedback to government officials. Both sectors would benefit from working together to develop standards and frameworks around cooperation and dialogue. Joint commissions and initiatives to discuss these issues openly would be beneficial at this time.

Although not as much of a focal point in the study, the issue of civil society and private sector relations also merits attention. While a wave of CSO-private sector projects has attracted some attention to the potential of this cooperation, the scope and size of private sector support for civil society remains quite limited. There is a clear need to increase support from businesses and to encourage their role as a strategic donor rather than only a 'project

sponsor'. Developing mechanisms to enable corporates' role and capacity as grantmakers and facilitating better partnerships with civil society will be important to achieving this objective.

Finally, the socio-cultural context- mainly low levels of trust and tolerance- reveal concerns about the weak levels of social capital among Turkish citizens. CSOs would benefit from seeking different ways to integrate trust-building measures to their programming efforts, given the low levels of social capital and their opportunity to play a bonding and/or bridging role. Additional research to pursue this topic in more detail may be of great benefit to furthering our understanding of linkages between social capital and civil society in Turkey.

3. VALUES

The values dimension of the CSI study assesses to what degree values, such as democracy, environmental sustainability or gender equality, are practiced within CSOs and promoted by CSOs in society at large. The overall score for this dimension is 1.3, which reflects a limited internalization and promotion of these values in Turkish civil society. Figure III.3.1 summarises the subdimension scores in the values dimension.

FIGURE III.3.1: SUBDIMENSION SCORES IN VALUES DIMENSION



TABLE III.3.1: CSO ACTIONS TO PROMOTE POSITIVE VALUES (%)

	Democracy	Transparency (State)	Transparency (Companies)	Tolerance	Non Violence	Gender Equity	Eradication of Poverty	Environmental Sustainability
None	13,3	41,8	77,9	38,4	23,2	15,2	24,8	4,1
Only 1 or 2 examples	33,7	29,0	10,3	32,6	27,4	41,9	33,3	36,9
A few examples	38,8	27,8	8,8	22,1	41,1	32,4	26,7	43,4
Multiple examples	14,3	1,3	2,9	7,0	8,4	10,5	15,2	15,6

TABLE III.3.2: CSOs ROLE/IMPACT IN PROMOTING POSITIVE VALUES (%)

	Democracy	Transparency (State)	Transparency (Companies)	Tolerance	Non Violence	Gender Equity	Eradication of Poverty	Environmental Sustainability
Insignificant	5,4	14,0	44,0	11,2	9,5	5,3	18,8	3,1
Limited	42,3	26,5	23,9	44,0	39,7	37,4	37,5	39,2
Average	15,4	9,3	8,3	8,8	10,3	18,3	11,7	16,9
Significant	36,9	30,2	23,9	36,0	40,5	38,9	32,0	40,8

Tables III.3.1 and III.3.2 refer to the CSI survey findings which constitute a major source of data for this dimension. For each positive value, the CSI survey sought to measure both how active and how effective CSOs were in the promotion of these values. Hence, while Table III.3.1 provides an assessment of how active CSOs are (i.e. examples of civil society public campaigns, actions or programmes dedicated to promoting a certain value), Table III.3.2 assesses civil society's current role in promoting a certain value at the societal level (i.e. whether it has significant, average, limited or insignificant impact). Both tables are frequently referred to throughout this dimension.

3.1 Democracy

This subdimension examines the extent to which Turkish civil society actors practice and promote democracy. Table III.3.3 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.3.3: INDICATORS ASSESSING DEMOCRACY

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
3.1.1	Democratic practices within CSOs	1
3.1.2	Civil society actions to promote democracy	1

3.1.1 Democratic practices within CSOs

A majority of CSOs perceive weaknesses in their practice of internal democracy and good governance. While leaders are elected through democratic elections, members are seen to have little control over decision-making. Concerns regarding transparency and accountability prevail.

Turkish law requires certain procedures around elections and documentation to ensure some adherence to democratic procedures. Associations, foundations and other forms of CSOs are required to have certain bodies and procedures in place to protect democratic functions within the organization. Yet, in practice, it seems CSOs are facing many challenges in this respect- especially with regards to transparency and accountability.

One reason that was cited for this was 'strict individual and institutional territorialism' both within and among CSOs (CSDP 2003). CSOs in the CSI study report that existing mechanisms

within CSOs limit widespread input and participation from members who are not part of official committees.

There is a general conviction that CSOs are not democratic within themselves. Almost all decisions are claimed to be made in a hierarchical manner, from top to bottom. CSOs have inherited the bureaucratic-centralist attitude of the state and hence give the most power to their managing commitees. For this reason, the decisionmaking power resides with these commitees and functions through hierarhical, male dominated mechanisms, hence constituting a barreer to wider participation levels (Usterci, 2002, p.414).

A survey conducted in Turkey's third most developed city, Izmir, illustrates these challenges. Four hundred and eight members of 178 associations were asked to report on CSO internal practices. Respondents were asked about "who has the authority to change policies and rules". Of the respondents, 46.6% indicated that headquarters were authorized, 37.7% of the respondents indicated that the president and board of directors were authorized and only 10% of the respondents indicated that members had the authorization. When respondents were asked who had the authority to make decisions on expenditures, 81.9% of the respondents indicated that the president and board of directors had the authority. Moreover, according to 88.9% of respondents, the authority to represent organization externally almost completely belongs to the president and board of directors (Tosun, 2000, p 52-60). These outcomes indicate several frustrations, including those between headquarters and branch offices, as well as between members and authorized decision making bodies, suggesting that there are many disconnects internally which lead CSOs to believe that democratic practices are weak.

Regional and national level focus group discussions participants also raised issue that notions of democracy, particularly within institutions, are underdeveloped in civil society. Yet, the level of effectiveness of members in the decision making process is reported to be quite high; approximately 48% report moderate effectiveness. Rather than being contradictory, this outcome points to the importance of procedures and practices in addition to voting, which aim to strengthen democratic practices within CSOs.

Given the limited extent of institutionalization among CSOs, these challenges are to be expected. It will take time for leaders and members to take more ownership to learn and apply standards of good governance within their organizations. It will be important for CSOs to recognize that formal establishment and registration of their organizations do not automatically ensure that these practices will be put into action. Internalization of values regarding team work, decision making, transparency and accountability is a process of evolution which many CSOs have not yet undergone. As such, support organizations which provide training and education on these issues will be very important to building this capacity, as will the development and application of 'self-regulatory' codes which can ensure a higher standard of internal practices within CSOs.

3.1.2 Civil society actions to promote democracy

A rather low level of civil society activity to promote democracy in society is observed: only a few activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and actions are not attributed much importance by civil society as a whole.

Yet the extent to which civil society actions promote democracy at a societal

level in Turkey is a complex issue, requiring a better understanding of what attributes constitute 'democracy' and how citizens and society currently view and practice (if at all) these attributes. While there is an increase in the number of reforms to further enhance democracy in Turkey, the discourse among CSOs about the meaning and application of democracy is quite limited. However, when examined from a normative perspective, a segment of civil society working on rights-based issues is taking an active stand on promoting values and practices which are more democratic- such as freedom of thought, press, expression and gender equity.

The results of this study reveal a paradox: On one hand civil society is working on 'rights based issues', are inherent to democractic societies; on the other, civil society is seen as rather weak in their 'promotion of democracy'. According to findings of the CSI survey, promoting democracy was perceived to be an area where CSOs are moderately active, but with limited impact (supported by 42%)- see Table III.3.2. When asked to provide examples, stakeholders cited examples related to the work of human rights CSOs and other organizations in promoting the penal code reform, right to information and freedom of association, anti-war campaigns, public campaign against government corrpution ('one minute of darkness') and the petition to allow headscarves in public offices and universities. Focus group discussions underlined the strength of recent initiatives to address this issue at the societal level, but criticized the lack of democracy practices within CSOs (see above section for more on this).

The type of examples offered provides some indication of the broad and diverse interpretation of 'actions to promote democracy'. Some CSOs see their very existence, their formation and organizations, to be an action which promotes democracy, however some equate actions to promote democracy with anti-war campaigns. Again, the diversity in interpretation calls for more discussion and discourse among CSOs with regards to what constitutes democracy and what their role is in promoting these notions.

3.2 Transparency

This subdimension analyses the extent to which Turkish civil society actors practice and promote transparency. Table III.3.4 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.3.4: INDICATORS ASSESSING TRANSPARENCY

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
3.2.1	Corruption within civil society	2
3.2.2	Financial Transparency of CSOs	1
3.2.3	CSO actions to promote transparency	1

3.2.1 Corruption within civil society

There are occasional instances of corrupt behavior within civil society. Yet the issue of corruption in civil society requires distinguishing between perception and reality. In terms of perceptions, a study conducted by Transparency International (see Table III 3.5) reveals CSOs to be perceived as one of the least corrupt organizations respective to others such as government, military and private sector.

The most commonly cited example of CSOs is the corruption incident at the Red Crescent (RC), which is Turkey's version of the Red Cross. The RC was established by law and has a special status making it more quasi-governmental than non-governmental. During the 1999 earthquake, funds sent to the RC had been misused and a scandal emerged. In terms of reality, government

officials claim that corruption is more widespread than only the incident with the Red Crescent, yet these incidents are generally not widely known or made public. Government officials also note that the capacity to undertake sufficient audits is weak, which leads to a lack of oversight, leaving potential cases of corruption undiscovered.

The respondents in the CSI survey and focus groups did not have the sense that corruption was widespread within civil society; 49% reported occasional instances, 33% said this was a rare occurrence. Putting aside the fact that CSOs are likely to be subjective in this assessment, the lack of highlighted cases and the fact that so few CSOs have enough resources to be cause of (financial) corruption may support this. However, without any hard data, ideally from government audit reports, it is difficult to make an accurate assessment.

Credibility and trustworthiness are critical in building trust and broader particiaption from citizens. As such, it is important for CSOs to develop self-regulatory mechanisms that can help facilitate this. On the other hand government officials and regulators must develop and maintain effective systems and procedures to ensure that cases of corruption are addressed. This will help increase public trust that the government is doing its part in monitoring the sector. As it only takes one to ruin the reputation of the whole sector, preventing corruption in civil society is the responsibility and of all stakeholders.

3.2.2 Financial transparency of CSOs.

Only a minority of CSOs make their financial accounts publicly available.

Turkish laws for associations and foundations do not require public publishing of financial records, even if the organization has public benefit status (which offers additional tax exemptions). According to these laws, detailed yearly financial reports are required to be submitted to regulators, i.e. the Foundations Directorate for foundations and the Department of Associations under the Ministry of Interior for associations. These reports are required to be made available to the public through the use of "suitable mechanisms". However, the definition of these "suitable mechanisms" is left rather vague and open to interpretation. As a result, many CSOs do not make their financial reports available on their websites or on newspapers and they prefer to post them on bulletin boards in their offices. Hence, most financial reports remain inaccessible to the public at large. As such, this is yet another area in which a good balance

TABLE III.3.5: PERCEIVED CORRUPTION LEVELS OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS AND SECTORS IN TURKEY (1: NOT CORRUPT, 5: VERY CORRUPT)

Political Parties	Parliament	Justice System	Police	Private Sector	Tax Income	Customs	Media	Health Services	Education System	Authorizations/Permits	Electricity/Hydro/ Gas	Military	CSOs	Religious Organizations
4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.1	3.5	3.3

Source: Transparency International - 2004 Global Corruption Barometer

between regulatory requirements as well as standards of practice for CSO transparency must be in good balance.

According to the CSI survey, approximately one-third of respondents' organizations voluntarily post their financial records for public review. NAG members added some perspectives to this issue by noting some of the common reasons for not sharing financial records. One was the concern of revealing donors to 'competition' of other CSOs. Another was reluctance to project an image to the public that they were 'financially well-off'. In addition, concerns about government and public reactions to income statements which reveal a high level of foreign donor funding have a chilling effect on CSOs which would otherwise be willing to publicize financial statements. This indicates that CSOs are still rather uncomfortable with public perceptions about their financial status as well as sources of funding- especially foreign funding (see below on public trust for more on this topic).

As such, the fear of sanctions CSOs could face for their fiscal transparency may be affecting their practices. Yet, again, if the sector aims to increase participation from a broader segment of citizens and earn increased credibility, fiscal transparency must be assured and practiced.

3.2.3 CSO actions to promote transparency

Only a few civil society activities in promoting transparency are detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by civil society as a whole.

The notion of accountability is central to the functioning of democratic societies. In the case of Turkey, this notion is still quite new. CSOs making attempts to address these issues still face some uneasiness with the risk of facing government pressure or worse sanctions for attempting to portray a negative image of the state.

However, CSOs seem to be more active in the area of promoting the government's transparency as opposed to corporate transparency. The CSI survey reveals that 42% of respondents could not name any examples of CSO actions to promote government transparency. Some examples included right to information act campaigns and the protests for the deadly train accidents of 2004, F-Type jails, 'one minute of darkness' campaign against a government corruption scandal, campaigns against traffic accidents, program to monitor activities of MPs.

On the other hand, the percentage of participants who could not list any CSO actions for corporate transparency was 78% and the respective list of examples was much shorter. These included campaigns of environmental organizations, especially those for nuclear power plants and genetically modified foods, consumer protection organization efforts, the 'Bergama'[18] campaign and CSO efforts to promote quality and ethics in corporations.

In terms of CSOs role in promoting these values, stakeholders clearly express that civil society plays a more active role in promoting state transparency. While 27% of CSOs' view their role as 'limited' in promoting state transparency, 44% consider CSOs' role to be insignificant in promoting corporate transparency (see Table III.3.2).

These findings point toward CSOs lack of activity and role especially with regards to promoting corporate transparency. In focus group discussions, participants called on CSOs to do more in holding both the state and private sector accountable and to promote legal frameworks that ensure accountability toward citizens. Given the increasing importance of transparency and accountability for all stakeholders, civil

18 The Bergama Campaign started in the late 1990s and went on into the 2000s. It is a civil movement during which local villagers linked up with Turkish and international environmental groups to protest the formation of a gold mine by a leading European mining concern in their area. *Please see page 100 for more information.*

society actions to promote and practice these values will be an important contribution to the development of a more democratic society.

3.3 Tolerance

This subdimension examines the extent to which Turkish civil society actors and organisations practice and promote tolerance. Table III.3.6 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.3.6: INDICATORS ASSESSING TOLERANCE

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
3.3.1	Tolerance within the civil society arena	1
3.3.2	Civil society activities to promote tolerance	1

3.3.1. Tolerance within the civil society arena

Significant forces within civil society do not tolerate others' views without encountering protest from civil society at large.

As indicated in the environment dimension, according to the World Values Survey in 1999, the level of tolerance for individuals from another race, religion and ethnic group, individuals as well as people living with HIV/AIDS and homosexuals is 2.6 (out of a scale of 3 which indicates least tolerance).

The events of the 1970s and 1980s which led to a military intervention were mainly due to social tensions and polarization between extreme left and right groups. This history of social intolerance still affects Turkish society to the present day. Accordingly 45% of CSI survey respondents reported that intolerance and discriminating forces are prevalent in the civil society arena, while 29% felt these forces play a limited role.

Examples provided by respondents were related mainly to ultra-nationalist movements, the headscarf issue and actions based on ethnic and religious minority tensions. Focus groups were mixed on this topic; some participants mentioned tendencies of intolerance among and within CSOs on a basis of identity; while others perceived CSOs to be somewhat more tolerant compared to overall society. There were some comments that suggested that some of these problems had a regional basis (e.g. in the southeast with Kurdish separatist and terrorist actions). The media review produced a limited number of news items (3) that were all related to instances of intolerance exhibited by CSOs.

Many members of the NAG agreed that tolerance in civil society is not improving. There was a strong sense that societal tensions negatively affect CSOs, creating polarized 'camps' and movements based on political ideology.

3.3.2 Civil society actions to promote tolerance

Only a few civil society activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by civil society as a whole.

Given the forces of intolerance within the civil society arena, CSO actions and role in addressing these issues seems to be quite limited. The highly charged and sensitive nature of these topics has a tendency to create a sense of trepidation within CSOs.

Reflecting these sensitivities, a relative majority of stakeholders (38%) could not think of any examples of civil society activities promoting tolerance in Turkey, 33% could come up with one or two and only 22% could list several (See Table III.3.1). Most of the examples were related to events and projects which promote understanding among different minority/ethnic groups and religions,

human rights initiatives relating to freedom of religion and expression, Turkish-Greek relations, demonstrations organized against terrorism after the bombings in 2004, protests in the name of peace and democracy, 'Differences yes, discrimination no' campaign and the 'please' campaign of the soccer/football federation to address violence among football fans from different clubs. There were also a significant number of examples regarding festivals in celebration of different religious and ethnic groups, indicating that CSOs acknowledge the importance of celebrating diversity rather than denouncing it.

The media review revealed only seven news items on CSO activities, which were similar to examples provided by CSOs in the survey. This is a positive reflection that media takes account of these actions and helps to increase visibility.

Stakeholders also assess CSOs role in promoting tolerance to be limited (44%) while still a significant minority of 36% considers it to be significant (see Table III.3.2). This indicates a 'split' among respondents, where the minority probably assessed the role of CSOs in terms of future potential rather than based on actions to date. Focus group participants expressed growing concern at the increase in intolerant actions and forces with the agreement that CSOs can be doing more to help dissolve these tensions. This will be an important area for CSOs, which can potentially play a bridging role to neutralize lack of tolerance.

3.4 Non-violence

This subdimension describes and assesses the extent to which Turkish civil society actors and organisations practice and promote non-violence. Table III.3.7 summarizes the respective indicator scores

TABLE III.3.7: INDICATORS ASSESSING NON-VIOLENCE

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
3.4.1	Non-violence within the CS arena	2
3.4.2	CS actions to promote non-violence	1

3.4.1 Non-violence within the civil society arena

The use of violent means (such as damage to property or personal violence) among civil society actors to express their interests in the public sphere is not considered widespread. Civil society actors often denounce such actions when they do occur.

Although the expression of intolerance in the civil society arena seems somewhat prevalent, expression of violence, aggression, hostility, brutality, fighting and other instances are seen as isolated and rare by a clear majority of stakeholders (71%). Many respondents provided examples referring to ultra-nationalistic movements and terrorist groups. It is interesting to note that although some of the examples were regarding extreme physical violence, others were examples that indicated no violence but very aggressive statements and behaviour. These instances of violence were reported to be denounced by civil society actors most or all of the time (63%).

Turkish civil society groups denounce violence not only in Turkey but at the international level. Several public denouncements of recent terror attacks all over the world have been made. As such, Turkish civil society does express solidarity and humanitarian values for non-violence.

3.4.2 CS actions to promote non-violence and peace

While civil society in Turkey actively denounces violence, it is less prominent

in actively promoting a non-violent society. Only a moderate number of civil society activities in the area of supporting non-violent resolution of social conflicts and peace, violence against women, child abuse, violence among youth and other issues can be detected. Their visibility is moderate and these issues are attributed moderate importance by civil society as a whole.

According to Women's Human Rights, New Ways Foundation's field research on domestic violence, 28% of the women had experienced physical violence, 89% had experienced psychological violence and 15% had experienced sexual violence in their households. Women are often subject to violation of their rights in both public and private sphere. In addition, there is a severe lack of independent grassroots organizations among women. CSOs concerned with women's problems try to prevent violent acts against women and to promote women's human rights; to influence local and civil policies (Gulcur, 1999, "WWHR-New Ways Domestic Violence Field Survey).

According to the CSI Survey, stakeholders were divided in their assessment of civil society's current role in promoting non-violence and/or peaceful conflict resolution at the societal level: while 40% found it significant, another 40% stated that it was limited. In addition, 41% of the participants could think of examples of civil society public campaigns, actions or programmes dedicated to promoting non-violence and/or peaceful conflict resolution. Some examples provided were the peace and anti war movement, the 'no to torture' campaign, the 'please' campaign of the Football Federation, the anti-gun campaign, Peace Mothers (meeting every Saturday to protest missing sons in prison) and the intellectuals for peace initiative were among them. The war tribunal for Iraq was held in cooperation with Turkish and international human rights organizations in 2005, bringing light to civil society actions that denounce violence and promote peace.

Following environmental sustainability, the media review produced the most number of news items for CSO activities regarding non-violence (a total of 31 items). Many of the news items reported on the campaigns overlapped with those mentioned by CSOs as well as pro-Palestine campaigns, anti-terrorism (specifically against PKK actions) and campaigns to end violence in the family- especially against women. The majority of these items were simply denouncements of violence through press releases, while only five were related to non-violence campaigns.

NAG members and focus group participants claimed that CSOs have made important, albeit minor contributions in this area, especially considering the greater scope of problems and challenges. The question of how to use the media and other communication methods more effectively to share their messages with larger audiences was central to this discussion.

3.5. Gender Equity

This subdimension analyses the extent to which Turkish civil society actors practice and promote gender equity. Table III.3.8 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.3.8: INDICATORS ASSESSING GENDER EQUALITY

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
3.5.1	Gender equity within the CS arena	1
3.5.2	Gender equitable practices within CSOs	--[19]
3.5.3	CS actions to promote gender equity	2

3.5.1. *Gender equity within the CS arena*

Civil society is not considered to be a very gender equitable arena in Turkey;

19 Indicator 3.5.2 Gender equitable practices within CSOs, was removed from the report due to lack of data.

Women are largely absent from civil society leadership roles.

Low levels of women's participation in leadership and membership of CSOs was discussed under the Structure dimension. This section is a continuation of that topic, which presents a weak level of gender equity within the civil society arena. Several studies support this outcome, such as Nese Doster who reveals that women's participation rate in CSOs is 24% whereas it's 13% in political parties and% 6 in labour unions. Although it differs from region to region, women in Turkey are under-represented in general; this is also valid for the business world in which women generally have assistant positions whereas men occupy management positions (Doster, 2001, interview on women's issues).

In a 2002 study conducted by Bianet Independent Communication Network (BIA), political parties, labour unions, chambers and associations were asked to present membership distribution in their delegation and administration bodies according to gender.[20] Most CSOs could not provide such data due to the fact that they had never felt a need for this kind of a classification. The survey indicated that more female members doesn't necessarily imply more females in management or presidency, these are almost impossible for women while they most commonly take on secretarial and support positions within the organization.

CSOs are perceived to play a somewhat less important role in promoting gender equity within the civil society arena, which is an interesting outcome given the extremely active role women's organizations have played in the past year with regards to penal code reforms affecting women's rights (see below section for more on this subject). While focus group discussions recognized these achievements, they underlined the lack of gender equitable values and practices in society as well as within CSOs. Regarding the issue of gender equitable practices within civil society, respondents claim that explicitly sexist or discriminatory forces within civil society are not existent or limited (71%). Most of the comments in the survey and focus groups regarding this issue were related to the significant obstacles preventing women from being in positions of leadership and equal participation. Such actions are denounced by civil society actors sometimes (52%) or all of the time (27%).

It can be concluded that CSOs tend to be more active in promoting gender equity as a value, rather than practicing themselves within the civil society arena and in CSOs.

3.5.3. *CS actions to promote gender equity*

A number of civil society activities in this area are detected. Broad-based support and / or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.

CSOs have made critically important contributions to promoting awareness on gender equity issues, ranging from gender-based violence, honour killings to equal access to education. In 2005 the women's movement and platform achieved important successes in lobbying for provisions in the civil code and penal code, which promoted gender equity in the law.

Since the mid 1980's, women's organizations managed to overcome constraints imposed on them by patriarchal and hierarchic structures. In order to support emancipation through information-sharing and consciousness building, women's organizations accelerated their activities, organized meetings, campaigns, published brochures, magazines and books about women's rights. As such, services provided by women's organizations filled the gap in large cities where women are strongly affected by poverty which is

20 "Freedom of media and independent journalism watch and news network" project has been carried out by IPS Communications Foundation since November 17th 2003. The project is called ICN (Independent Communication Network) in short and 80% of its funding comes from EIHDR (European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights).

further acerbated due to immigration waves and inflation.[21]

During the 1990's, women's organizations focused more on issues such as economic empowerment, political empowerment, and prevention of abuse. Research centres and shelters were established, and a Directorate of Woman's Status and Issues was created in the GoT.

Yet throughout this period, one of the most critical issues facing the women's movement has been the struggle for gender equitable amendments in the Turkish Civil Code. In 2005, 129 women organizations came together to successfully influence the parliament to reform the Code and make it more gender equitable. As such, an increasingly active and powerful movement to address women's issues continues to develop in the present context.

The CSI survey indicates that stakeholders were rather divided when it came to assess civil society's current role in promoting gender equity at the societal level: approximately 37% found its role limited, while 39% found it to be significant. However, 85% of the participants could think of some examples of civil society promoting gender equity (see Tables III.3.1 and III.3.2). Some examples included: advocacy work regarding recent penal code and civil code reform initiatives (which encompasses many issues from marriage rights to punishment of sex offenders), efforts to increase representation of women in parliament and campaigns to promote literacy for young girls and women, campaigns to end violence against women, 'don't touch my body' campaign against virginity controls and equal pay for women's labour campaigns.

However, the media review reveals very few news items related directly to CSO activity in promoting gender equity (a total of 4) regarding CSOs role in promoting women in the parliament and encouraging girls schooling. However, more news items (22) were related to empowering women, most of which were about CSO campaigns on issues such as denouncing violence against women and promoting literacy courses, among others. This is particularly interesting- and disconcerting- given that the media analysis for CSI was undertaken during a period of intense lobbying efforts by the women's movement for Penal Code reforms.

NAG members stated that although women's groups have been very active and effective, there seems to be a general lack of awareness of these efforts by other CSOs. Some recent efforts of the Civil Society Development Centre (CSDP) aimed to bring together various rights-based CSOs to 'cross-fertilize' concepts of groups working on environmental issues, human rights issues and women's issues in an effort to broaden linkages between these organizations and promote a more holistic approach for rights efforts. These types of activities are seen to have an important future impact in increasing awareness and support for gender equity values both among CSOs and in society.

3.6 Poverty Eradication

This subdimension examines to what extent Turkish civil society actors promote poverty eradication. Table III.3.9 presents the indicator score.

TABLE III.3.9: INDICATOR ASSESSING POVERTY ERADICATION

Ref. #	Indicator	Score
3.6.1	CS actions to eradicate poverty	1

3.6.1. CS actions to eradicate poverty

Only a few civil society activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed

21 "Structure and participation problems in women's groups" ODTÜ Development Journal 1998, vol. 25, 559 – 583.

much importance by civil society as a whole.

While efforts to assist the poor and needy are widespread (e.g. food banks, charitable assistance), CSO efforts aimed at poverty eradication is a rather new notion. In other words, the approach of addressing the systemic issues which cause poverty is still rather unfamiliar to many CSOs working on poverty related issues which tend to help alleviate the symptoms of poverty. The Turkish government's strong centralized functions to help the poor in many ways have just recently started to consider systemic reforms as well- so this realization is happening together with civil society organizations.

The UNDP office in Turkey has taken on an increasingly active role in helping to promote this approach by increasing awareness of poverty challenges and facilitating the mobilization of more CSOs to address these issues in cooperation.

According to a report on "Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey", prepared by UNDP in 2003, "…The increasing importance of municipal governments' charity brokerage activities suggest that local governments and CSOs can play a progressively larger role in removing the danger of hunger or at least helping people when there is nothing left to eat, or no fuel to heat their homes. This role, however, is not enough to end precariousness of life for the disadvantaged and the threat of social exclusion faced by those who live in a state of increasing chronic poverty. Recently developed countries have begun to transfer their social policies almost wholly to CSOs; however, when compared to Egypt, India or countries in Latin America and Africa the existence of CSOs in Turkey remains weak".

It is difficult to report the number of CSOs working specifically on poverty-related issues, since many of them focus on various thematic areas such as education and health with a focus on poor and needy populations. A number of central and local governmental institutions overlap significantly in their efforts to help poor populations, such as the Ministry of Social Affairs, the State Planning Administration, the Directorate of Social Solidarity and Assistance (which has 931 public foundations across the country, run by governorships and a multi-stakeholder board) and the municipalities and local government offices. This creates some challenges in coordinating efforts with CSOs on addressing poverty issues. However, in the wave of new reforms on social policy, it is anticipated that increased coordination and cooperation will take place, with a more systemic and policy-oriented view to eradicating poverty, rather than the 'social assistance' focus that has been more prevalent.

When participants were asked to assess civil society's current overall role in reducing poverty, 19% found it insignificant, while 32% found it significant. In addition 49% found its role limited or average. Participants had difficulty in stating poverty eradication examples, as 25% could not think of any examples while 33% could think of only one or two (see Table III.3.1). An interesting comment during the survey was that these activities are conducted not to fight poverty as a systemic issue but to provide temporary solutions to problems created by poverty.

Although only 15% could report many examples of activities however, the list of examples was longer than any other regarding civil society activity in the dimension of values. Some examples included social welfare and relief associations, micro-credit projects, trade unions and recent programs on social risk mitigation coordinated by the state-run

foundations (mentioned above) and the World Bank. Yet, respondents seemed well aware that these efforts were mainly targeted at relief and assistance rather than addressing policy and systemic issues.

The NAG discussions highlighted the important role played by cooperatives, professional associations and unions in civil society's fight against poverty. Stakeholders were divided on the issue as to the extent of responsibility of the welfare state versus that of CSOs in terms of service delivery and assistance for the poor. This may indicate limited awareness of the role CSOs can play in pressuring the state for better service delivery, budget allocation and social policy reform- which goes beyond the role of CSOs as 'contractors' of social services.

3.7 Environmental Sustainability

This subdimension analyses the extent to which Turkish civil society actors practice and promote environmental sustainability. Table III.3.10 presents the indicator score.

TABLE III.3.10: INDICATOR ASSESSING ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Ref. #	Indicator	Score
3.7.1	CS actions to sustain the environment	2

3.7.1. CS actions to sustain the environment

A number of civil society activities in this area can be detected. Broad-based support and / or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.

Many stakeholders support the notion that the environmental CSO movement in Turkey is quite strong and in many ways and has contributed to the development of the sector overall. They do also tend to be more organized (in terms of networks and platforms at the national and regional level) and have perhaps been one of the first CSO groups to engage in advocacy activities and legislative reforms.

The CSI survey concludes that respondents agree with this; since their activity in promoting environmental sustainability was perceived to be strongest among all other values in this dimension. 37% of CSI survey respondents could think of one or two examples and 43% could name several (see Table III.3.1). Respondents attributed a limited role (supported by 40%) or a significant role (41%) to actions that promote environmental sustainability (see Table III.3.2).

Stakeholders provided a number of examples such as tree-planting, activist environmental CSOs' campaigns regarding both national and regional Turkish issues (Bergama[22] campaign, anti-nuclear power plant campaigns) as well as international issues (e.g. the Kyoto protocol). The CSI media analysis also yielded the highest number of news items regarding activities in this area (total of 72 items).

Focus group discussions suggested the need for closer connection of environmental groups to citizens and promoting overall respect for the environment rather than only advocate for better laws or engage in activities to help the environment.

Conclusion

Findings regarding the **values** dimension suggest that on an individual basis, cultural and societal norms in Turkey do not necessarily correspond to all the values listed in this dimension. This could explain the lack of 'practice' of these values within the sphere of civil society.

In addition, some of the issues associated with these values have, in the past and to some extent currently, been regarded as 'sensitive' or even 'taboo' areas 'threatening' to the government.

22 See page 100 for more information on the Bergama event.

For example, low levels of civil society activity in the realm of promoting tolerance could be linked to the chilling effect of advocacy initiatives regarding minority group issues. A recent example are groups which attempted to organize a conference to discuss the Armenian issue and promote dialogue and resolution. They were immediately placed in a category of 'Anti-Turkish' and were assumed to be promoting the interests of Armenians.

This reaction from the GoT and other fractions of Turkish society dampen civil society's freedom of expression to support certain values, which is in some cases manipulated to be viewed as 'anti-government' or 'marginal'. There have been cases in which representatives of the GoT have made dismissive comments regarding CSOs' efforts to promote law reforms related to gender equality, referring to these CSOs as 'marginal groups'. Groups promoting human rights and non-violence, especially with regards to torture and ill treatment, have been similarly disregarded. The low score of this dimension may in fact be linked to the threat of condemnation by society and/or government for promoting certain values that challenge the status quo as well as the current value system.

On the other hand, civil society appears to have a more significant and visible role in promoting environmental sustainability. This is arguably considered the least 'taboo' and least 'political' of the values examined in this dimension. Most examples provided in this category were related to organizations that plant trees and espouse environmentally friendly themes, rather than specific actions to hold state and private sector accountable in terms of environmental practices.

Civil society was also perceived to play an important role in promoting gender equity; pronounced mostly by their notable success of lobbying for reform in the penal code, to the benefit of protecting women's rights. Yet in contrast, gender equitable practices in the civil society arena and within CSOs are not perceived to be as strong. This yields an interesting outcome and food for thought for CSOs working on these issues.

Democracy was another dimension in which CSOs were perceived to be somewhat active in promoting at the societal level, but not effective in practicing within the civil society arena and their own organizations. Survey respondents and regional and national forum participants strongly conveyed severe deficits with regards to the practice of democracy (better defined as good governance in terms of transparency and accountability) within CSOs. This theme was discussed at great length and reflects that as a value, democracy remains to be weak in both principle and practice within the civil society arena. As such, the extent to which Turkish society embraces these values needs to be examined more closely, in order to better assess how CSOs promote and espouse various democratic values.

4. IMPACT

This dimension aims to assess the level of activity and impact of CSOs regarding various societal issues and policies. Figure III.4.1 summarises subdimension scores in the impact dimension.

FIGURE III.4.1: SUBDIMENSION SCORES IN IMPACT DIMENSION



As with other dimensions, a combination of methods was used to gather data for this dimension, including surveys, focus groups and a media review. However, this dimension of the CSI study included three policy studies on the following areas (as identified by CIVICUS): National Budgeting Process, Social Policy and Human Rights issues. The specific social policy and human rights issues examined in Turkey were determined based on public opinion polls indicating most important issues facing the Turkish population. In social policy it was the issue of 'unemployment'.[23] In human rights, the issue was determined as freedom of thought and expression.[24] These issues were each analyzed separately in 'policy case study analysis' reports, which are currently only available in Turkish. Please see Appendix 3 for their summaries.

Yet another unique methodology was used to examine CSO responsiveness. A list of the 'main problems' facing Turkish society was identified in a recent public opinion survey. This list was used in the CSI study to assess the extent to which respondents felt civil society was active and exerting any impact on those particular issues.

These methodologies helped generate a rich set of data and information regarding the impact of CSOs various endeavours. The result of this assessment yields two possible outcomes, not mutually exclusive. One is the ability to actually measure impact, which many CSOs have difficulty employing in their operational strategies. The other is the lack of skills and space created for CSOs to significantly impact public policy. As is described in this section, many examples reveal impressive efforts of CSOs in many realms- especially in the recent period of extensive policy reforms vis-à-vis the EU accession process. However, findings indicate that several factors- such as depth of participation of the Turkish citizenry, and skills required to conduct policy analysis and/or wide scale service delivery and government attitudes toward civil society's respective role- have an important influence on CSO impact.

23 Based on outcomes of TESEV's public opinion survey in 2004 on 'the most important problem' in Turkey.

24 Although no public opinion surveys were available, other studies and consensus of experts and the NAG determined this to be the most important issue.

4.1 Influencing Public Policy

This subdimension describes and assesses the extent to which Turkish civil society is active and successful in influencing public policy. Table III.4.1 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.4.1: INDICATORS ASSESSING INFLUENCING PUBLIC POLICY

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
4.1.1	Human rights impact: Freedom of thought and expression	2
4.1.2	Social policy impact: Unemployment	1
4.1.3	National budgeting process	1

4.1.1 Human Rights Impact

Civil society in Turkey is considered active in the area of freedom of thought and speech, but its impact remains limited.

In Turkey, freedom of thought and speech is granted as a constitutional right. However, various practices have often undermined these freedoms. The Turkish public views freedom of thought and speech/expression as one of the most critical problems in society (TESEV, 2004). Civil society initiatives have played an active role in addressing these issues. While their impact has been limited in terms of changing policy, CSO efforts have managed to raise visibility and awareness around key issues concerning human rights. The case analysis "An Analysis of the Impact of Civil Society on Freedom of Speech" [25] seeks to address the two most prominent cases of civil society initiatives to address the issue of freedom of expression and thought.

The first case, "Initiative against Violations of Freedom of Thought", concerns a 'civil disobedience movement' that began in 1995. The second case is the Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, formed under the Office of the Prime Minister's Human Rights Advisory Board.

The first case, Initiative against Violations of Freedom of Thought, is a civil disobedience movement that started as a protest when the State Security Court asked author Yasar Kemal to testify for one of his articles that was published in the German magazine 'Der Spiegel'. The movement went on for about ten years and the participants re-published and endorsed the texts that were penalized. By doing so they did not only become partners in crime with the original author but also knowingly and willingly committed new crimes in an organized fashion. The Initiative has been judged in both civil and military courts and challenged them.

The Initiative against Violations of Freedom of Thought had a strong impact on raising public awareness on the issue of freedom of thought, perhaps because those who signed the petitions and re-publications of the penalized texts were well-known intellectuals, artists and politicians. In terms of the Initiative's impact on policy formulation, it can be argued that there have been significant improvements, such as removal and modifications on certain restrictive clauses of the Turkish Penal Code. However, it remains difficult to trace how much of this is directly related to the work undertaken by the Initiative. Other factors, such as the introduction of a series of legal reforms under the Copenhagen Criteria surely have a great share in the success. Finally, it must be noted that the Initiative had limited impact on the decision-making process and the decision maker bodies, though more and more CSOs are being included in the process of reforms to restrictive laws.

The second case study was the Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, formed under the Office of the Prime Minister's Human Rights Advisory Board. The working group was founded by the

25 The report is one of the case studies under CSI framework has been prepared by human rights expert Murat Aksoy. See Appendix 3.

ex-Minister of State for Human Rights, Mehmet Ali Irtemcelik with the purpose of bringing together CSOs and state organs/departments working on human rights. The December 1999 EU summit, where the Turkish candidacy was discussed, certainly had some influence in the formation of this working group. In 2001, the Board was suspended with the resignation of the Minister from his post, since it was closely linked to the Minister himself. In the following period, with new legal regulations in 2001, the working group was institutionalized and entered a new phase. The Board was formed with state assistance and good intentions, yet, it proved to be dysfunctional because of the excessive state supervision and the appointment of CSOs not related to human rights areas.

Unfortunately, the Working Group held only two meetings and dispersed before it could make any significant impact. Though the Group members were asked to prepare potentially influencing reports to be submitted to the Office of the Prime Minister's Human Rights Advisory Board, an overwhelming majority (8 out of 10) failed to present their reports and hence failed to have any impact on the decision-making process.

In conclusion, the case studies reveal that CSOs impact on public policy in the area of freedom of speech remains limited, though they also demonstrate a trend of improvement over the past few years. In addition, they both illustrate the importance of civil society in solving these problems. However, the state presents an obstacle to any possible impact of civil society in this area through excessive interference and lack of space for civil society to contribute to the policymaking process. The studies also suggest that for civil society to be active and successful in having impact it needs to have dialogue, cooperation and coordination within itself.

The CSI survey indicates that CSOs are seen as 'somewhat active' (42%) or active (40%) in advocating for freedom of thought and speech (see Table III.4.2). A majority of stakeholders view CSO efforts as somewhat successful while a third view them as successful (see Table III.4.3). Among the 3 policy areas, freedom of expression, social policy and national budgeting, CSOs were perceived to be most active and successful in their efforts to address issues concerning freedom of expression.

TABLE III.4.2: OVERALL CSO ACTIVITY IN INFLUENCING PUBLIC POLICY IN FREEDOM OF THOUGHT (%)

	Human Rights/Freedom of Thought & Expression
Not active	5.4
Somewhat active	41.9
Active	40.3
Very active	12.4

TABLE III.4.3: OVERALL CSO SUCCESS IN INFLUENCING PUBLIC POLICY IN FREEDOM OF THOUGHT (%)

	Success in impacting public policy	Success of campaigns
Unsuccessful	14.8	14.2
Somewhat Successful	51.6	50.4
Successful	29.7	29.1
Very Successful	3.9	6.3

According to the regional stakeholder consultations, participants in almost all regions perceive CSO activities in this arena to be important yet, insufficient. For example, a respondent from Diyarbakir has indicated that CSOs in the region are partially active and have limited success in influencing public policy on human rights; CSO in the Eastern Anatolia on the other hand have indicated that they perceive CSOs as locomotives in influencing public policy. In the Izmir meeting CSO cooperation on this arena was perceived as vital yet, hardly existent.

Members of the NAG consider CSOs to have been influential on human rights issues under the EU law harmonization framework; however, they also note that the political pressure exerted by the EU on the GoT to undertake reforms cannot be disregarded. Although it has been a slow process, the state has agreed to sit at the same table with CSOs and military authorities. As such, increased dialogue with the state seems to be parallel to civil society's impact on public policies in this arena.

However, as discussed in the section on state and civil society dialogue, mechanisms and legislative provisions to increase the formal role of CSO consultations are needed to broaden the space for CSOs inputs.

4.1.2. *Social policy impact*

Contrary to the area of human rights, civil society activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.

In the realm of social policies, unemployment is highlighted as one of the most serious social problems in Turkey, as conveyed through a recent public opinion survey, followed by inflation, bribery, economic instability and education (see section on 'Responsiveness' for more detail).

Civil society's impact on the resolution of this problem remains limited. This is reflected in the report "State of Social Policies and Civil Society in Turkey"[26]. These case studies focus on the restructuring of the Economic and Social Council and the International Labour Organization (ILO) pilot project on "Expanding Employment and Preventing Unregistered Labour" and aims to define the impact of civil society on influencing public policies on unemployment.

The first case study examines the re-structuring process of the Economic and Social Council. After underlining the importance of CSOs inclusion in the Council for years, CSOs prepared a draft bill that aims to increase CSO representation and decrease the government influence in the council. The draft bill was discussed and agreed upon in the Council meeting in March 2005 and was sent to the Council of Ministers. Although the Economic and Social Council was founded in 1995, the initiative has picked up pace since 2001. This is due to the importance and increase of the contribution of civil society input on these issues- clearly mobilized in part by EU counterparts that recognize their role. The increase in the Council's importance is also conveyed by the steady increase in participation from 'social actors' such as industry and commercial service provider employers, workers, artisan, craftsman and agricultural representatives.

The second case study focuses on the ILO project on "Increasing Employment and Preventing Unregistered Employment". In 2002, the ILO decided to focus on a three pillar structure where social dialogue would contribute to the implementation of economic and social policies. Turkey was chosen as a pilot country and the ILO Turkey Office called on the national organizations to determine the most important social problem in Turkey. As a result, representatives of both the workers' and the employers' organizations came together with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security and decided that the increase of unemployment rates and unregistered labour were the most important problems. The project was launched in October 2004 by ILO and guided by CSOs actively leading the project. In December of 2005 CSOs and other related organizations will present their proposed strategies and policy recommendations for increasing employment on the local level and preventing unregistered labour.

Both examples illustrate the importance of civil society's inclusion in the process and in the progress of state-civil society

26 The report has been prepared by Başak Ekim from Bogazici University's Social Policy Forum with incorporation of case studies, analysis and interviews with experts. See Appendix 3.

dialogue. For instance, although the Economic and Social Council was formed in 1995, it is only in recent years (since 2001) that it has enjoyed increased importance and inclusion of CSOs. This increased importance can also be observed in the reorganization of the council along lines compatible with EU standards and its opening up to different and diverse groups of stakeholders. Similarly, the ILO project on "Increasing Employment and Preventing Unregistered Employment" illustrates that CSOs are becoming important stakeholders in this area. Yet, the impact of civil society in working against unemployment remains limited and most of the improvements are due to supra-national organizations operating above the state level such as the EU accreditation process or ILO policies.

CSI survey respondents and stakeholder commentary indicate that CSOs are considered inactive (55%) and unsuccessful (72%) in their efforts to address unemployment issues (see Table III.4.4). During the NAG meeting, the importance of activities conducted by unions and commerce chambers in this arena were emphasized.

Whereas the human rights reform process has attracted more attention and civil society input, social policy is only newly emerging on the agenda of reforms in Turkey. The establishment of a new commission between the Turkish government, EU and CSOs (mainly trade unions and professional associations) to examine social and economic policies is an important step which will help to formalize mechanisms for CSOs to provide key inputs into the reform process. Although formal membership in the committee is limited, CSO members are making attempts to create informal networks to channel input from a broader range of CSO actors. This process has begun and will likely gain momentum in the coming years.

The establishment of institutes focusing on social policy as well as other intergovernmental actors, such as the EU, UNDP, World Bank, will play an important role in helping to create linkages between CSOs and other key actors on these issues.

TABLE III.4.4: OVERALL CSO ACTIVITY IN INFLUENCING PUBLIC POLICY IN SOCIAL POLICY/UNEMPLOYMENT (%)

	Public policy/unemployment
Not active	54.7
Somewhat active	38.3
Active	7
Very active	0

TABLE III.4.5: OVERALL CSO SUCCESS IN INFLUENCING PUBLIC POLICY IN SOCIAL POLICY/UNEMPLOYMENT (%)

	Success in impacting public policy	Success of campaigns
Unsuccessful	71.7	61.8
Somewhat Successful	26.8	28.5
Successful	1.6	9.8
Very Successful	0	0

4.1.3 Civil society's impact on national budgeting process

Civil society activity in this area is very limited and focused only on specific budget components.[27]

In democratic systems, civil society participation and input in the national budgeting process is critically important. Civil society provides research and better understanding of the public's demands which the decision makers often lack and hence reflects better the needs and demands of citizens. Unfortunately, in the Turkish context, input from civil society to the national budget is practically nonexistent. Even employers' and workers organizations have not been able to go beyond slogans and come up with concrete recommendations or demands. Even though it is claimed that today civil society is more active than ever, the activities display limited impact. The national budget remains completely under the control of the state and the party in power.

In Turkey, the national budget is formed under the Budgeting Law, which illustrates that the central government has the responsibility and right to use public resources in order to provide services for the public. The national budget is prepared by the ruling party and submitted for the approval of the National Assembly. Until the budget is approved and submitted, the Ministry of Finance, the Treasury and the State Planning Institute are actively involved in the process. In addition, the State Supervision Council under the Presidency has the authority to supervise all these organizations. The National Budget becomes operative once it is approved in the National Assembly.

Yet, due to political competition between politicians and parties there is a gap between the needs of the public and the actual spending. In fact, public resources often serve as tools in the hands of populist politics; the subsidies set by the law are easily exceeded; and supplementary budgets are easily introduced; hence undermining the credibility of the Budget Legislation.

Due to lack of examples of civil society being included in the process, the "Civil Society and the National Budgeting Process in Turkey" report focuses mostly on expert consultations and research rather than specific cases and aims to analyze why it is excluded and how it could be included in the process.[28] The CSI Survey supports the lack of activity and impact in this area: Civil society is considered to be inactive (75%) and unsuccessful (77%) in the national budgeting process (see Tables III.4.6 and III.4.7).

TABLE III.4.6: OVERALL CSO ACTIVITY IN INFLUENCING THE NATIONAL BUDGETING PROCESS (%)

	National budgeting process
Not active	75.4
Somewhat active	17.5
Active	6.3
Very active	0.8

TABLE III.4.7: OVERALL CSO SUCCESS IN INFLUENCING THE NATIONAL BUDGETING PROCESS (%)

	Success in impacting the budgeting process	Success of campaigns
Unsuccessful	76.8	74.6
Somewhat Successful	21.6	22.9
Successful	1.6	2.5
Very Successful	0	0

27 The term "specific budget component" refers to a single issue or sub-section of the budget, such as the defence budget or welfare grants. Higher scores are assigned for those civil society activities, which provide an analysis, input and advocacy work on the overall budget.

28 "Civil Society and National Budgeting Process in Turkey" report was prepared by Gulhan Ozdemir. See Appendix 3 for more information.

An example of a successful civil society activity is TESEV's research on the support of a wide range of specialists to analyze the national budget and monitoring. Their main objectives are to enable economic press and financial actors, who have to follow both the public and the economy at the same time, to see the budget figures behind the curtains objectively. In order to realize this goal, they aim to conduct periodical studies and to present the budgeting results to the public (TESEV, 2004, Civil Society Budget Monitoring Report).

The most visible and influential form of public policy influence is carried out by businesses and labour unions. Organizations such as TOBB (Turkish Union of Chambers and Stock Exchanges), TUSIAD (Turkish Businessmen and Industrialists Association), and Turk-Is (Confederation of Turkish Workers Unions) actively lobby with the state over economic policy. However, since many professional trade organizations were formed by the state and require mandatory membership, the relationship is prone to corporatism; and groups with affiliation to certain parties or bureaucratic structures of the state emerge. This situation leads to doubts on their autonomy and ability to truly change (rather than rubber stamp) policy outcomes. In fact, sometimes their position moves between lobbying or technocratic advisory functions. This situation essentially arises when they aim to secure gains of the groups they represent.

The NAG noted a recent increase in the amount of the national budget reserved for "environmental sustainability" and "pre-school education" as a result of the efforts of CSOs working in these areas. Hence, it can be concluded that instead of efforts to increase participation and monitoring of the overall budgeting process, there are some successful CSO activities in modifying specific budget lines.

In conclusion, despite a positive trend and the existence of few examples of CSOs actively monitoring the budgeting process, their impact is rather limited and the budgeting process remains a dominantly state controlled process. If civil society intends to be more active and successful in influencing public policies regarding the national budgeting process, then it must be more knowledgeable in how the national budget is prepared, the legislation, implementation and tactics for monitoring. In short, CSOs have to increase their capacity in many ways. Many CSOs with similar missions fail to act together which constitutes and obstacle to further impact. Civil society also needs to improve its communication with related state organs such as the Treasury, the Ministry of Finance, the State Planning Institute and the Chamber of Accounts. Finally, CSOs can create more awareness on the importance of participation in budget processes through better use of media.

4.2 Holding the State and Private Corporations Accountable

This subdimension analyzes the extent to which Turkish civil society is active and successful in holding the state and private corporations accountable. Table III.4.8 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.4.8: INDICATORS ASSESSING HOLDING STATE AND PRIVATE CORPORATIONS ACCOUNTABLE

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
4.2.1	Holding state accountable	1
4.2.2	Holding private corporations accountable	1

4.2.1. Holding state accountable

Civil society activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.

Given the nascent stages of broad understanding and application of democratic principles in Turkish society, as well as the restrictive space for civil society to engage, CSO practices of holding state and private sector accountable are quite limited. This is also related to the discussion in the values dimension regarding low level of civil society activity in promoting state and private sector transparency. On one hand, there is the tendency of the state to react negatively to CSOs that express opinions against state policy; on the other, CSOs have yet to fully realize their role as a 'watchdog'.

However, as the dynamics and values of civil society in Turkey begin to shift, we can observe an increasing rise in the level of awareness and need for such activities. Two major events that occurred in Turkey in 1990s increased civil society's impact on holding state accountable. These events have revealed that state activities must be questioned to a deeper extent. The first event revealed that corruption within the Turkish state has reached a critical level. The Susurluk scandal (involving government, military officials and mafia members) in 1996 created resentment at the social level and turned into a campaign of turning lights on and off at the same hour everyday, everywhere in Turkey. This was a demand for more transparency and accountability (commonly referred to as 'one minute for darkness for a life time of light'- see references to this under values section "promoting state and private sector transparency').

Another event was Bergama Campaign of the late 1990s, during which local villagers linked up with Turkish and international environmental groups to protest the formation of a gold mine by a leading European mining company, who was initially permitted to do so by the Turkish government. The coalition of activists lobbied very actively to have this decision overturned, asserting that the gold mine would be detrimental to the health of the locals. Despite outcries by the public and many officials, the executive branch decided in the end to permit the company to set up a mine in the Bergama area. Groups involved in this movement were then subject to charges of treason due to the fact that they had accepted foreign funding for this campaign- a perfect example of how civil society can be sanctioned for expressing opinions against state policy.

While the importance of holding the state accountable is increasingly recognized, it remains to be seen if CSOs are carrying out monitoring activities in a consistent, systematic and effective way. According to the CSI survey, respondents view CSOs to be in active (34%) or somewhat active (51%) with regards to holding state accountable. In terms of success, 50% view efforts as being unsuccessful, whereas 43% attribute some degree of success in these efforts (see Tables III.4.9 and III.4.10).

TABLE III.4.9: OVERALL CSO ACTIVITY IN HOLDING STATE ACCOUNTABLE (%)

	Activeness in holding state accountable
Not active	34.1
Somewhat active	51.2
Active	14
Very active	0.8

During focus groups, Ankara meeting participants indicated that CSOs do not even know which issues they should be

TABLE III.4.10: OVERALL CSO SUCCESS IN HOLDING STATE ACCOUNTABLE (%)

	Success in holding state accountable
Unsuccessful	50.4
Somewhat Successful	43.3
Successful	5.5
Very Successful	0.8

holding the state accountable for. Kars meeting participants shared this view and added that in the Turkish case, holding state accountable in any area was out of the question- due to the repercussions and sanctions which could lead to extensive fines or beyond. According to these participants, rather than the state being accountable to the citizens and civil society, it was often perceived to be the opposite: the state often held civil society accountable and hardly ever felt the need to explain its actions to these actors. However, participants of the Diyarbakir meeting exhibited a more optimistic approach and indicated that civil society is successful in this area even if only partially. This may be due to the regional politics and affairs of the Kurdish people, in which civil society has been very active in voicing their perspectives.

The media review classified 125 news items under this indicator. Some examples include: Reactions of trade unions against privatization of Seydisehir Aliminium Facility, TUPRAS and Ereğli Iron and Steel Factory. Also noted was the criticism from Eğitim-sen's (Turkey's largest education trade union) former members and other unions' members concerning the attempted ban and closing of Eğitim-sen, criticisms on the new Turkish Criminal Code from Bar Associations and Community of Journalists, as well as the criticisms of the government about the cancellation of the conference on Turkish- Armenian issues. The declarations of Turkey's Bar Association, Law and Life Association and Turkish Law Institute on the increase in the number of unresolved court cases and the incapability of the state to solve these is a special case under this topic.

As such, while CSOs perceive a limited impact and success in holding the state accountable, it seems like organizations such as trade unions, professional associations and other civil society actors are making serious attempts in this area. New initiatives have emerged such as the assembly members watch program, MIKOM. The EU candidacy process has also led to the creation of a set of joint bodies and structures to monitor the implementation of reforms and to hold the state accountable. A determination of the impact of these mechanisms and initiatives requires further investigation.

4.2.2 Holding private corporations accountable

Civil society activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.

A few CSOs have been active in protecting consumer rights, holding corporations accountable for their goods and pricing strategies. Yet, in general, there are very few organizations undertaking activities to hold the private sector accountable. According to CSI findings, a majority of respondents perceive CSOs as inactive (69%) or somewhat active (28%) in holding private corporations accountable (see Table III.4.11). These outcomes correlate with those relating to limited levels of CSO activity in holding the private sector accountable (discussed above in the section on values). According to regional stakeholder meeting participants, CSOs are still rather passive in holding private corporations accountable.

In summary, limited levels of

TABLE III.4.11: OVERALL CSO ACTIVITY IN HOLDING PRIVATE CORPORATIONS ACCOUNTABLE (%)

	Activeness in holding private corporations accountable
Not active	69
Somewhat active	27.6
Active	3.4
Very active	0

holding private sector accountable may be linked back to the general culture in which Turkish civil society operates. Holding institutions accountable per se is not entirely a common notion or practice as of yet. However, as civil society gains more space and autonomy to operate, it is likely that efforts to hold the private and public sectors more accountable will increase.

4.3 Responding to Social Interests

This subdimension analyses the extent to which Turkish civil society actors are responsive to social interests. Table III.4.12 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.4.12: INDICATORS ASSESSING RESPONDING TO SOCIAL INTERESTS

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
4.3.1	Responsiveness	1
4.3.2	Public trust	1

4.3.1 Responsiveness

According to this study, several examples of crucial social concerns are finding a limited level of support among existing civil society actors.

FIGURE III.4.2: MOST IMPORTANT SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN TURKEY (%)



SOURCE: TESEV HOUSEHOLD SURVEY STUDY, 2004

As per the CSI methodology, civil society's response to social concerns was measured against the top 5 main concerns expressed by the Turkish general populace in a study conducted in 2004 (TESEV, 2004).

According to this report, the top five most critical problems in Turkey were the following: "unemployment, inflation, bribery, economic instability and education" (see Figure III.4.2). We expanded this analysis to examine all of problems listed and asked CSOs to respond with their perceived level of impact and response CSOs have demonstrated on these topics (Table III.4.13)

The methodological approach for measuring this indicator was reason for great debate among both NAG members and other stakeholders.

The NAG's expressed disagreement on this methodology was mainly due to the following reasons: First, it was debatable to which extent CSOs **should** be active in, for example, addressing unemployment issues. Second, it was debatable to which extent CSOs **could** be active in such areas, simply due to financial, skills and other factors which limit their involvement in certain issues. Third, CSO respondents were not seen as effective assessors of responsiveness; instead, it should have been the general public/ beneficiaries making this assessment.

Although some of these concerns are indeed valid, the very intention of this indicator was to determine to what extent CSOs are indeed expressing any inclination and subsequent success in addressing issues which are of critical importance to the general public. The CSI survey outcomes reveal some interesting findings (see Table III 4.13). Stakeholders perceive CSOs to be 'very effective' in their efforts to address the following social concerns: EU relations (27%), Democracy/Freedom of thought (22%) and Education (15%). Indeed especially in the past year, CSOs have mobilized quite a bit on EU relations (for example organizing meetings, going to Brussels to promote 'civil society support for EU accession'), democracy and freedom of thought (see case studies and section 4.1.1), as well as education (most notably the 'seven is too late' campaign on early childhood education, the 'girls to school' campaign by UNICEF).

On the other hand, CSOs are perceived to be completely ineffective in addressing social concerns around inflation (supported by 55% of respondents), unemployment (50%), economic instability, (50%) and moral values (22%). As expected, there are fewer examples in these areas; perhaps the most likely actors around inflation would be consumer rights organizations which have been active in protesting inflation on bridge and tunnel fees, telephone prices and other such increases deemed unfair.

TABLE III.4.13: CSO EFFECTIVENESS (%)

	Very effective	Effective	Somewhat effective	Completely ineffective
Unemployment	0.8	11.7	37.5	50
Inflation	2.3	10.1	32.6	55
Corruption	5.5	20.5	41.7	32.3
Economic instability	2.3	17.1	30.2	50.4
Education	15.2	41.7	38.6	4.5
Health/Social security	7.6	28.2	48.1	16
Ethical degeneration	6.3	26.2	45.2	22.2
Democracy/freedom of thought	22.1	41.2	33.6	3.1
Kurdish problem	10.9	17.6	48.7	22.7
EU relations	26.6	40.6	29.7	3.1
Cyprus	7.9	23.8	39.7	28.6

In light of these results on most effective and least effective areas, the highest mean response for all areas was somewhat effective (ranging in the 30-50 percentile range for each area). This suggests that on average CSOs are

emerging actors in voicing these issues and representing interests of public but are still not at the forefront and somewhat limited in their effectiveness and impact.

The media analysis mapped the topic of news items related to CSO activities according to the top five issues of most concern and revealed a total of only 19 news items. As expected, most were related to education. After education the most number of news items were on unemployment and economic instability with a focus on EU projects regarding increasing employment opportunities (with participation from SMEs- small and medium size enterprises - and trade union organizations). On the issue of education, national media organs reported more news items where as local media organs reported more news items on economic instability and unemployment.

Another encouraging statistic is that of public opinion related to the potential impact of CSOs in addressing social problems: more than one out of every two people report that CSOs can make a positive contribution to the resolve of key social and economic issues (TUSEV, 2006).

Taken together, these results are promising and suggest CSOs currently play a limited and indiscernible role in addressing social concerns. However, the initial expectation that CSOs would not be active in these areas was proved to be entirely too pessimistic. It is encouraging to see that CSO involvement does span a wide spectrum of issues, which are of concern to the public. Combined with public opinion, which perceives CSOs as able to make a positive contribution to society, CSOs have great potential to mobilize more support and involvement of a broader range of stakeholders. This also suggests that CSOs can benefit from employing strategies and mechanisms to promote their work and increase participation from the general public.

4.3.2 Public Trust

Although there is no one study which directly measures the Turkish populations' trust in civil society actors, a recent study on public perceptions and actions of philanthropy reveals that CSOs are trusted less than the military, but more than political parties (Çarkoğlu, 2006).

In this survey, respondents were asked to level their trust in institutions on a scale of 1 (least) to 10 (most). According to results indicated in the table below, the most trusted institution is the military; the least are political parties. Although the research does not include a direct question on trust for all CSOs, respondents were asked to rate their trust of some CSOs that were suggested by name. The environmental foundation TEMA enjoys trust by the public.[29] However, the Cem Foundation has been classified as one of the least trusted institutions after political parties.[30]

There was much discussion regarding the problem of 'trust' in Turkish society at the regional and national consultations. The lack of trust between state and civil society actors was considered to significantly limit the ability of CSOs to operate freely and without state interference. Also, while CSOs perceive that the public does not have much trust in the civil society sector, other studies suggest that this is a misperception; according to a recent study on giving in Turkey, one out of every two citizens feels that CSOs can make a positive contribution to Turkish society.

One of the main issues discussed among members of the NAG were factors contributing to the perceived distrust of CSOs. The EU process and funds, however, beneficial in many respects to CSOs and their work, has been

29 TEMA is the Turkish acronym for Turkish Foundation for Combating for Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of the Natural Habitats. TEMA is a leading, conscious, close to the public CSO. Its activities are oriented towards preventing erosion, desertification, drought, pollution and the use of environmentally destructive agriculture techniques on the land and towards building effective and conscious public opinion.

30 The Cem Foundation represents the Alevite minority in Turkey, which is often underrepresented among the sunni majority. Today, Alevites are getting their share neither from the budget spared for Presidency of Religious Affairs nor the budget spent for education at national level. The Cem Foundation organizes cultural events to bring Alevites together, arranges meetings to increase cooperation and communication among Alevites and demands changes in the budget and the education systems in its publications.

perceived as 'corporatizing' CSOs, making them move away from their non-profit objectives. In addition, the government and media tendencies to report CSO use of foreign funds, for example, Open Society Institute, as a reason to suspect that CSOs are not acting in the interests of the Turkish nation and people. Many CSOs have been accused of somehow deceiving the country by using these funds and thereby leading to significant distrust of CSOs which make use of foreign funding.

Another theme, raised among the NAG as well as other consultation groups, was related to the disconnect between CSOs and citizens leading to a lack of understanding about their role and purpose as well as suspicion of their 'true' intentions. This is especially true for organizations which have paid staff, since many regard (and expect) CSOs to be strictly voluntary with no institutionalization or professional staff.

Finally, many still associate CSOs with the highly political and tense polarization in the 1970s, which led to the military intervention- and as such, carry feelings of resentment, mistrust and suspicion.

As reflected in the recommendations section, one of the most important issues for stakeholders in this study was to create closer linkages with people and communities, in order to address these misperceptions and create a better image of CSOs in the minds of Turkish citizens. It has been underlined that the government would also play an important role in promoting civil society's image as one that is beneficial and not 'dangerous' or risky to the stability of society.

4.4. Empowering Citizens

This subdimension describes and assesses the extent to which Turkish civil society is active and successful in empowering citizens, especially traditionally marginalized groups, to shape decisions that affect their lives. Table III.4.15 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.4.14: AVERAGE LEVELS OF TRUST FOR CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS IN TURKEY

	Average (between1-10)	Rate of full trust (10 points)
Military	8.46	55%
Institution for protection of children (government agency)	6.95	25%
Turkish Air Aviation Institution (GONGO)	6.76	23%
TEMA Foundation (private foundation)_	6.65	21%
Red Crescent (GONGO)	6.61	24%
Central Government	6.37	24%
Muftis (religious authority)	6.06	18%
Turkish National Assembly	5.99	19%
Municipalities and Local governments	5.39	12%
Private TVs	5.04	8%
Journals	4.76	7%
CEM Foundation (private foundation)	4.23	6%
Political Parties	3.91	5%

Source: Çarkoğlu, 2006.

TABLE III.4.15: INDICATORS ASSESSING EMPOWERING CITIZENS

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
4.4.1	Informing/educating citizens	1
4.4.2	Building capacity for collective action	1
4.4.3	Empowering disadvantaged people	2
4.4.4	Empowering women	2
4.4.5	Building social capital	x [31]
4.4.6	Supporting livelihoods	1

4.4.1 Informing/educating citizens

Civil society activity in this area remains limited and there is no discernible impact. Yet, as CSOs take on more active roles beyond charitable and social purposes, they show an increasing level of activity regarding informing and educating citizens on key issues.

31 The indicator 4.4.5 Building social capital was not scored because the NAG did not find any clear linkages between CSO actions and social capital.

On the other hand, CSOs repeatedly express difficulties in maximizing their ability to reach target groups and use media and other mechanisms to do so. According to the CSDP's Needs Assessment Report, CSOs face difficulties in reaching the media, which lowers their visibility and their programs, hindering their ability to effectively raise public awareness (CSDP- Needs Assessment Report, 2003)

According to the CSI Survey, respondents view CSOs as mainly being somewhat active (49%) or active (37%) in their efforts to inform and educate citizens. These efforts are perceived as being somewhat successful (62%) or fully successful (25%). Some examples of these efforts cited were: awareness regarding the education of women and girls (Girls, Let's Go to School Campaign) educating the public in general (e.g. literacy courses), youth empowerment, environmental issues, initiatives to inform/empower citizens about their civic rights and liberties, consumer rights, environmental issues such as genetic foods, women's rights and the EU process. The media review produced the most number of news items for this aspect of CSO activity (a total of 82). News items were about CSO efforts to inform citizens on public health issues (i.e. dental health), early education (i.e. 'seven is too late' campaign), education enrolment campaigns (especially for girls) and environmental issues (i.e. genetically modified foods, hazards of environmental pollution), and other news items on research reports prepared by CSOs, or press conferences of public statements and announcements.

There were very few items on informing citizens about their rights, which focus groups participants also underlined as a significant weakness, particularly given the current increase in changes and expansion of civil rights and liberties. CSOs feel an important obligation to inform and educate citizens about these rights and help promote their use of them.

The main discussion among NAG members and other regional and national stakeholders concerned CSOs' ability to increase capacity have more impact on informing citizens. Although CSOs were seen to be strong in this respect (as per the CSI findings), discussions pointed toward CSOs' desire to have more effective links with media and use more communications vehicles to get their messages out to the public. In addition, while the number of public information campaigns is increasing, CSOs are also learning that they have to partner these information campaigns with information about ways that citizens can get involved and help address these issues, rather than only serve to inform.

4.4.2 Building capacity for collective action

Civil society activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact- however, a positive trend is observed. One frequently cited example is the Bergama movement which is famous for organizing villagers in a mass campaign to protest the goldmine work which would harm the environment in their community (cited above under holding state accountable). Another example is the Arnavutkoy campaign against the building of a third bridge across the Bosphorus, which would have damaged the community and homes. According to some reports however, many efforts have a strong start but lack continuity and sustainability (CSDP - Needs Assessment Report, 2003). When looking at the issues concerning the participation of civil society (under the structure dimension) we also have a sense that in general, CSOs are having some challenges fully mobilizing more participation and communities. Yet, a few successful examples leave a positive

impression that CSOs are mobilizing communities for collective action.

Recently, centres to train and support CSOs have added a new dimension to their work, which includes helping CSOs design and mobilize efforts to solve common problems (mainly those working at the grassroots level).

In the CSI survey, a majority of respondents found CSOs to be somewhat active (60%) and somewhat successful (65%) in these efforts. Among examples provided to support this were: regional and local civil society development training, Local Agenda 21 programme, 'township associations'[32] literacy courses, special efforts for the 1999 earthquake region and training courses for professional associations. A number of examples in this long list referred to national level CSOs activities in regional locations (e.g. southeast, eastern Anatolia) that aim to mobilize action in those communities (mainly around themes of education, environment and women). In addition, the increase in regionally based trainings on rights issues and lobbying tactics for human rights organizations were mentioned.

Together with increased decentralization, (an increase on regional and local initiatives) and in CSO support activities, it is anticipated that there will be more efforts to promote CSO capacity building at the grassroots level to help facilitate civic engagement and mobilization.

4.4.3 Empowering disadvantaged people

Civil society is active in this area but its impact is limited.

The term 'marginalized' in Turkish refers to groups and persons with uncommon or unpopular opinions; in this context the term 'disadvantaged' was used to more appropriately encompass the meaning of this indicator. The NAG also found it appropriate to include disabled, homosexuals and trans-sexuals in this category of disadvantaged persons (which were not in the original scoring matrix of CIVICUS).

There are a number of CSO efforts that aim to assist disadvantaged groups; however, among all of these different groups, the strongest CSO actions concern women and children. Yet, according to the "Leave No Child Out" report prepared by UNICEF and the European Commission: 'in Turkey, institutions working on the violation of children's right are not well known by society and the media does not reflect these from a "children's rights" perspective. One reason for this may be the lack of information sharing campaigns across the country' (UNICEF, European Commission (2003), Leave No Child Out – Need Evaluation Report, p.64).

CSI survey results reveal that stakeholders regard the general population (41.7%) or the poor (31.5%) are major benefactors of CSO services. These groups are followed by women, which were mentioned by 17.6% (see Figure III.4.3). A study on foundations in Turkey reveals very similar patterns, with a higher percentage of beneficiaries falling under 'general population'. Some examples are associations and federations for the handicapped; gay and lesbian associations; women's groups; support groups for troubled youth, etc. yet, stakeholders still report a degree of insensitivity toward disadvantaged groups on a societal level. For example, accessibility for persons in wheelchairs are not widespread; positive discrimination for disadvantaged groups not institutionalized.

Findings suggest that notion of 'empowerment' is becoming increasingly integrated into CSO programs which have traditionally been more focused on service delivery and alleviation of

32 Township associations are associations established in cities by migrants of a certain town to support one another and send money back home to communities. There are 7874 associations that are township associations.

FIGURE III.4.3: SOCIAL GROUPS THAT BENEFIT FROM CSO SERVICES (%)



their immediate problems (i.e. shelters for women and children, food and clothing for the poor). As reflected in the high score for this indicator, CSOs are increasingly active in this area and are more cognizant of the importance of creating solutions to assist disadvantaged groups beyond immediate needs and facilitate their empowerment. Fostering cooperation with government agencies in this regard and promoting pro-poor policies, for example, will likely yield increased impact of CSOs in these endeavours.

4.4.4 *Empowering women*

Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.As mentioned in previous sections related to gender equity and disadvantaged groups, CSOs that aim to specifically empower women have made incredible gains in the past ten years. Some examples are CSOs which promote literacy and education for women; the introduction of micro-finance and micro-credit models to Turkey for the first time; CSOs which promote women's work and employment; and those which promote the role of women's participation in politics. Just recently Turkey's first 'Women's Fund' was launched to make small grants to women's CSOs across the country (see www.kagider.org).

In the "Media Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey" there are several examples of CSO activities to promote empowerment of women, suggesting that these organizations have been somewhat successful in promoting awareness of these issues in the general public. The report includes 22 news items from the media review many of which relate to education and empowerment of women. News items reveal a significant focus of these efforts in South-Eastern and Eastern Anatolian regions with regards to literacy classes, preventing honour killings, conscious mothering and family planning. Women who were subject to violence are taken under civil society's protectorate and put on the public agenda.

According to NAG members, CSOs working on women's issues have been very successful in terms of empowerment, reflected in the high score for this indicator. However, measuring impact remains a concern: How CSO efforts are benefiting women in terms of long-term empowerment is not easily measured. Yet, it will be beneficial for CSOs to determine qualitative and quantitative measures to examine the impact of their efforts on target populations so as to adjust and design programs strategically.

4.4.5 *Building social capital*

This indicator was not scored because the NAG did not see any clear linkages between the data presented and civil society actions towards building social

capital. Yet, it is important to note that recent research on social capital in Turkey continues to point towards low levels of political participation, trust and tolerance (ARI Movement and Infakto Research, 2006).

4.4.6 Supporting livelihoods

Civil society activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact. Projects to support employment and income generating opportunities for women in particular are more prevalent than those for the poor, also indicating that CSOs' activities in the area of poverty alleviation, beyond service delivery and immediate assistance, are quite limited.

The media review analysis revealed 16 news items in relation to this indicator, with a significant focus on business associations, professional associations and cooperatives. These CSOs tend to promote SME (small and medium size enterprise) development, training courses on EU related issues and English language courses to help promote the growth of business. Yet, the focus tends to be less on the poor and disadvantaged and more on the general population.

Findings indicate that CSOs could be doing more in this area, especially for the poor. Yet, this would require closer collaboration with government agencies and a shift in paradigm from providing the needy with immediate assistance to creating more opportunities for communities to become economically self-sufficient. CSOs can potentially play an important role in this process, benefiting from similar initiatives in other developing countries where pro-poor policies and systems are of critical focus. Cooperation and engagement with other key stakeholders such as the World Bank, the EU and UN agencies will also be critical- especially in increasing their efforts to engage CSOs in the development of various programs and strategies to address this topic.

4.5 Meeting Societal Needs

This subdimension examines the extent to which Turkish civil society is active and successful in meeting societal needs, especially those of poor people and other marginalized groups. Table III.4.16 summarizes the respective indicator scores.

TABLE III.4.16: INDICATORS ASSESSING MEETING SOCIETAL NEEDS

Ref. #	Indicators	Score
4.5.1	Lobbying for state service provision	2
4.5.2	Meeting societal needs directly	2
4.5.3	Meeting the needs of disadvantaged groups	--33

4.5.1 Lobbying for state service provision

Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.

Given the paradigm of a social welfare state, many CSOs express frustration at the failure of the state in terms of delivery of basic services. This is not a surprising outcome in a country such as Turkey where taxation rates are incredibly high. Yet, instead of focusing heavily on lobbying, CSOs in Turkey tend to take on a role of 'filling the gap' left by lack of state service provision. Factors which contribute to this approach are discussed in various sections of this report, mainly with regards to the social and cultural tradition of charity in Turkey, as well as the reluctance of CSOs to take on adversarial positions with regards to state policies and holding them accountable (again, refer to sections on 'holding state accountable' and 'promoting state transparency').

However, this trend is changing. Although few in number, CSO initiatives to promote awareness on taxation, for example, as well as national budgeting, are creating new perspectives of civic engagement and holding the state

33 This indicator was not scored due to lack of data.

accountable for spending and service delivery. Legislative and systemic reforms Turkey will undergo as part of the EU accession process (in the adoption of some 85,000 pages of 'aquis') will provide more space and opportunity for CSOs to take on a more active role.

Approximately one out of every two respondents in the CSI survey considers CSOs to be active in lobbying the state for service provision (55% yes, 45% no). A majority (59%) found these efforts to be somewhat successful and to a lesser degree fully successful (25%). Most examples concerned education, health, the EU process, freedom of expression, law and justice system, foreign policy and economy. Judging from these examples, respondents likely interpreted 'lobbying the state' in a more general sense, rather than a specific focus on service delivery. In fact a number of the examples were related to lobbying the state on rights issues, indicating perhaps that rights issues carry more prevalence in terms of CSO lobbying as compared to service delivery issues.

As such, anecdotal evidence for CSOs holding the state accountable specifically on service delivery is not prevalent. Privatization of government services and companies has recently created much opposition from trade unions and some professional associations, which could be considered somewhat relevant to this issue. Increasing standards of public education and public health are the main agenda items for CSO lobbying in terms of state service delivery and even in this sense, efforts to pressure for more reforms are less evident than those which aim to address reforms related to rights.

These findings suggest that CSOs are not as active in this area as compared to rights-based initiatives; yet, they are willing to play a complementary role in improving the situation. They are also increasingly eager to be more than an outsourced agent. CSOs seek increased involvement as a consultative partner in policy design. This highlights the transformational nature of this 'progressive era' in Turkey and in the minds of some citizens. Efforts to increase awareness of budgets and fiscal issues with regards to spending and government service delivery may lead to an increase of CSO activity in this area. This is a critical next step for civil society, especially in ensuring that charitable efforts to service citizens are not regarded as a replacement for the basic right of the citizen and obligation of the state to provide basic services.

4.5.2 Meeting societal needs directly

Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.

The 1999 earthquake was a milestone in terms of CSOs taking on a stronger role with regards to service delivery. Yet, the perception of the public remains that it is mainly the responsibility of the State (38.2%), and wealthy citizens (31%), to help the needy (Çarkoğlu, 2006).

However, CSOs in Turkey have been oriented mainly toward meeting societal needs directly (for health, education, etc.), rather than engaging in active advocacy to urge government to do so- as discussed above. Foundations in particular played a key role in this respect throughout the Ottoman Empire, though less so in the Republican Era due to a significant decrease in autonomy and wealth. The nature of these private institutions has not changed dramatically; they endow buildings, such as universities, hospitals, museums, generally 'approved' by the government, provide a visible benefit to society and greatly lessen the burden of the state.

Even rights-based organizations have a strong service delivery angle- for example, a majority of human rights

organizations mainly serve to provide legal counsel and assistance to citizens whose rights have been abused; women's CSOs provide shelters and counselling to assist battered women; CSOs working to help street children and youth at risk create homes and save havens to rescue and rehabilitate them.

CSOs are acutely aware of the extensive activity regarding service delivery; 92% report civil society to be very active in this area. Of all requests for examples, the greatest number were listed for this indicator. CSO efforts in this area ranged from education, health and environment to helping the poor and needy and migrants. Yet, regardless of these numerous and rich examples, CSOs seem to be split on the level of success of these efforts; 48% view these efforts as successful, whereas 46% consider them to be somewhat successful. These findings raise interesting reflections on the degree to which CSO efforts are measured for their impact, quality, reach and usefulness. Results from another study on foundations (Çarkoğlu, 2006) indicate that the number of beneficiaries served through these programs are very few (excluding large hospitals and universities). This suggests that although there are variety of organizations and services, they are not actually reaching a significant segment of the population in need- and thus, limiting impact.

Focus group participants debated this issue with different outcomes. Whereas Istanbul participants were adamant about the impact and importance of CSO services, participants in Kars and Samsun felt they were unable to fully provide services due to lack of resources and capability.

This is indeed a key area of debate, as the government seeks to involve more CSOs in service delivery contracts. One part of the debate is to what extent civil society should be responsible for delivering services, versus their role in lobbying the state to do their 'job' more effectively. The other is the extent to which CSOs in Turkey have the capacity and ability to be able to deliver services which can meet the needs of citizens. The role of CSOs in this respect requires analysis of needs and the feasibility of their potential ability to meet them, which are quite immense in a population of 70 million.

According to NAG members, CSOs are particularly successful in specific areas where the state can not reach. For example, training border police and judges in human rights issues, providing education to incarcerated persons and training the military on environmental issues. This discussion indicates a potential role for CSOs in service delivery- where the beneficiaries are government agencies.

As the findings in this section reveal, the debate on the role and impact of CSOs in service delivery is yet another area in which significant transformation is taking place. CSOs in Turkey are indeed taking on unique and highly valuable projects not only with regards to serving the general population but also in addressing the training needs of government officials and agencies. Frameworks to structure cooperation between CSOs and the state in these areas will be crucial to providing a more systematic approach and ensure that CSOs can balance their role as service providers as well as lobbying organizations.

Conclusion

The impact dimension of the CSI study brings to light many interesting aspects of the rapidly emerging role for civil society in meeting societal needs, empowering citizens, representing social interests and concerns, holding the state and private sector accountable and advocating for policy reforms around human rights, social policy and national budgeting.

Rich examples and cases on human rights and social policy, reveal findings that Turkish CSOs have some impact, albeit limited, in key areas of Turkey's social and economic development. This is especially true for, rights-based development reforms. Yet in conclusion, the common theme among various facets of civil society's impact is that activity is limited but increasing; and impact remains barely discernable but holds great potential.

A long list of examples, provided for how CSOs meet societal needs – especially for disadvantaged populations and women- is compelling; as is the surprising thematic diversity within which civil society operates in serving the public. But again, the factor affecting the low score is the question of impact, depth and breadth of these efforts that seem only to skim the surface of these critical issues.

While the accomplishments to date of CSOs in this respect should be acknowledged limitations hampering impact merit attention, such as:

- Most CSOs focus on service delivery roles rather than policy analysis and advocacy. There is an increasing awareness of the importance of these activities, coupled with a lack of clarity on how to become more involved and create greater impact;
- CSOs tend not to evaluate their programming, which makes discerning the impact of their efforts difficult;
- CSOs shy away from organizing coalitions in joint advocacy initiatives, thus weakening their ability to be effective, and
- Limited space for civil society to fully engage in policy formulation creates barriers for CSOs.

In light of these limitations, CSOs would benefit from: building in more strategic measures of impact into their programming; learning more about the policy issues which are causing the 'symptoms' which they aim to address through services; building coalitions with other CSOs on policy initiatives; and broadening outreach activities to rally a larger base of civic participation and awareness. The state would benefit from enabling civil society to take a fair and active stand on important issues, and eliminating the limitations on civil society's ability to perform its natural role as watchdog and policy advocate. The state has much to gain from CSOs in the process of policy reform, and should create mechanisms for civil society to be a more active partner.

IV

Strengths and Weaknesses of Civil Society in Turkey

Strengths and Weaknesses of Civil Society in Turkey

This section provides an overview of strengths and weaknesses (limitations) of civil society in Turkey, based on data collected throughout this study. Views and comments of consultation participants who took part in the seven regional consultations (a total of 120 participants from 26 of the 81 provinces in Turkey) and the national forum (95 participants from 18 of the 81 provinces in Turkey) formulated much of the basis for this section.

1. STRENGTHS

During the consultations, it was observed that participants are more likely to raise weaknesses than strengths and accomplishments. Yet, when the data was analyzed in close detail, it was impossible to ignore the increasing strength of the sector, and the rich array of activities, accomplishments and impressive efforts of CSOs to address social and economic problems in Turkey. In fact, compared to a mere 15-20 years ago, the rate at which civil society and CSOs are developing is inspiring. Regardless of the obstacles, civil society, albeit in a more limited space, has persevered and demonstrated noteworthy strengths.

Diversity of CSO Activities

This study reveals a wealth of rich examples of CSOs working in innovative ways in a broad range of areas, such as organic farming and ecology, summer camps for autistic children, gay and lesbian rights, peace movement, consumer rights, women's shelters, literacy, migration, and EU policy and reform. In addition, CSOs exhibit at least some activity- and in some cases even impact- on a range of issues which are considered to be of utmost importance for the Turkish population, such as corruption, health and democracy/ freedom of thought. The emerging strength of certain sub-sectors is also worthy of mention – such as the environmental movement and the rights-based movement, which has enabled significant contributions from civil society to key reform.

Dedication to Voluntarism and Giving

Given the rather limited level of participation and support from the Turkish population at large, ostensibly small CSO staff and volunteer teams, and rather modest amount of resources available for CSO programs, it is quite apparent that the success of many CSOs to date rests on the shoulders of a rather small group of citizens. The dedication and perseverance of these individuals is truly inspiring as they generously donate their personal funds and time to their organizations. Although current levels of participation of the general population are rather low, recent studies show that 1 in 2 people believe that CSOs can make a positive contribution to society. This demonstrates a potential for CSOs to build greater level of donors, members and volunteers.

CSOs and Social Service Provision

A long list of CSOs currently provide premier services to address health and education needs of the public. From hospitals, schools to literacy programs and after school centres for youth, Turkish CSOs are delivering high quality programs to target populations. CSOs are also amassing technical skills of professionals and academics.

They provide services to government agencies which are in dire need of technical training to meet the massive administrative reform and increased service standard mandates- such as training of judges on human rights and border police on working with refugees. The technical skills CSOs are able to mobilize in response to critical needs- whether it be a new school, a dorm, rescue missions and relief efforts for natural disasters or legislative reforms which require expert review and input- is impressive.

Civil Society Relations with the State

Relations between civil society and the state have a very tenacious past. Yet, in a rather short period of time the GoT has taken important measures to promote better relations with civil society. An increasing number of government agencies at the local and central levels are cooperating with CSOs in service delivery and policy reforms. These measures and visible examples of cooperation and inclusion, combined with legislative reforms, have contributed significantly to improving relationships between civil society and the GoT at the local and central levels.

2. WEAKNESSES (LIMITATIONS)

Civil society and CSOs in Turkey are facing several challenges in their plight to address new mandates brought about by an era of social and economic development. Some of the key limitations are summarized below.

Individual Participation

Respective to the size of the Turkish population, the number of CSOs (77,000 foundations and associations in a country of 70 million) and their geographic diversity (much higher density in urban areas) is quite limited. This conveys the rather low level of associational life in Turkey. While a strong group of CSOs are emerging, Turkish citizens remain rather disconnected from the current movement of organized civil society. While citizens demonstrate a proclivity to support one another within their close networks of kinship, they are less likely to make donations to CSOs or participate through formal CSO membership or as volunteers.

Organizational Capacity

Many CSOs struggle with building skills in basic management, programmatic delivery and raising resources to operate programs. CSOs with some capacity face challenges with scaling up and sustainability. While a number of recent training programs have been launched to provide training and support, demand still outweighs supply. In addition, programs tend to be focused on new or emerging organizations, leaving more experienced CSOs without support on how to advance their organizations to the next level. Finally, lack of resources and organizational management limits ability of CSOs to recruit and compensate professional staff, resulting in a conundrum of limitations of skills and capacity.

Collective Action and Cooperation among CSOs

Although the past few years has shown a rise in the number of new CSO platforms-mainly linked to common reform objectives, CSOs remain concerned about the limited extent of cooperation and communication between other organizations nationally and internationally.

Low Levels of Trust

Whether among citizens, or between citizens and the state, low levels of trust have a negative impact on civil society's development. Although CSOs express concern, they do not necessarily demonstrate any specific examples

of how they aim to address this issue through their respective activities.

Relations with the State

The climate of reform has had a positive impact on relationships between civil society and the GoT. However, there are still many concerns, which lend themselves to a rather cautious feeling about how long the 'good weather' will last. Civil society remains subject to arbitrary whims of government regulations- such as excessive force on protesters, unannounced audits and other discretionary actions of government officials which violate not only the rights of citizens but also threaten the still newly gained levels of trust. As such, while CSOs applaud reforms, they remain concerned about implementation and systemic abuses of justice and rights. They are also concerned about the mechanics of cooperation and dialogue- in other words, ensuring equal access for all CSOs.

Good Governance: Transparency and Accountability of CSOs

CSOs express concerns about the degree to which organizations practice internal and external transparency and accountability. While the sector is not perceived to be corrupt per se, CSOs are keen to ensure that their organizations adhere to standards of good governance.

V

Recommendations

Recommendations

The following recommendations suggest specific actions to address respective limitations revealed in this study. This section will be especially useful for CSOs, government, funders and academics, who are keen to support and/or develop specific activities to strengthen civil society and CSOs in Turkey.

DEEPENING AND BROADENING RELATIONSHIPS WITH CITIZENS

CSOs are conscious of their need to establish broader, deeper and more meaningful relationships with citizens and society at large. While this study shows rather low levels of participation through volunteering, donations and membership, CSOs should take a more proactive to attract more citizen participation via:

- Creating and/or strengthening volunteer outreach, recruitment and management programs;
- Devising fundraising strategies and activities; and,
- Designing membership recruitment 'programs' (for organizations which rely on broad membership).

These actions require investment in strategy, communications materials and PR (including use of media), all of which are expensive services that CSOs are often unable to obtain. In addition to seeking in-kind support to cover some of these costs, donors could be instrumental in developing grant programs which help CSOs develop fundamental strategies and plans.

CSOs would also benefit from investing time and resources in the field studies to better understand needs and problems of their respective target groups, as well as monitoring and evaluation studies to ensure that services and/or activities are producing intended results.

PROMOTING INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH OF CSOs

Democratic Practices in CSOs

Lack of democratic practices in CSOs was highlighted as a major challenge for CSOs. Board governance is a critically important function in positioning CSOs for future success; not only internally in promoting effective program management and transparency/ accountability among staff and members (also see below: promoting transparency and accountability in the sector), but also externally to promote a positive and credible reputation for the organization. CSOs would benefit greatly from increased training in governance practices- with a special focus on board management. Turkish materials (training dossiers, publications) on this subject are scarce, as are training opportunities. Donors could facilitate CSOs working to strengthen the sector by helping to cover costs of brining in experts for 'train the trainer' programs, and to create materials on this subject which can be made available to board members of CSOs.

Promoting Collaboration Among CSOs

Collective efforts and joint activities play an important 'bonding' role among CSOs within and across sub-sectors. CSOs should seek ways in which cooperation could bring more voice to their respective objectives and endeavours; especially in

the realm of policy reform where this type of collective action is absolutely critical to making an impact. Donors could help facilitate the establishment of such platforms by providing the technical and financial support needed to coordinate joint campaigns, platforms and other initiatives. As for collective action across sub-sectors, CSOs themselves will have to determine when it is the right time, and which model will be appropriate for the Turkish context.

Institutionalizing Philanthropy

A current lack of systematic mechanisms to enable funding from Turkish sources is creating a blockage in mobilizing resources to flow from individuals and institutions to CSOs. The sector must start exploring the notion of 'institutionalizing philanthropy' with the creation of alternative mechanisms – such as intermediary organizations like community foundations which can: 1) enable individuals and institutions which are interested in making contributions to CSOs 2) promote best practices on grantmaking among Turkish donors and 3) facilitate the strategic allocation of funds in the form of grants to CSOs.

Enabling Effective Use of Media

The media is a fundamentally important vehicle to increase visibility and inform public opinion about civil society. CSOs could benefit from increasing their skills on PR and media access in order to make better use of this conduit to the Turkish public. An especially important objective for CSOs is to find ways in which their organizations and issues can achieve greater coverage by columnists-who are critical in influencing public opinion in Turkey.

The media can promote the visibility of the sector by creating special sections in newspapers and specific programs on TV and radio. Specialized media, communications and PR agencies could provide advisory and support services to CSOs in developing messages, campaigns and other media activities.

Promoting the Role of CSOs in Building Social Capital

The link between CSOs and building social capital has been explored by many recent publications. CSOs would benefit from raising this issue and devising ways in which their standard programming incorporates a 'social capital' lens- in other words, being proactive in strengthening links between individuals rather than seeing their work as a 'one-way' street of delivering services and/or messages.

Sustaining Civil Society-State Relationships

As this report conveys, this theme is of central importance to civil society in Turkey. The state would benefit from creating stronger monitoring mechanisms to ensure consistent implementation of regulations and taking action to prevent excessive and highly discretionary actions toward civil society. CSOs on the other hand would benefit from taking a more active role in the monitoring process and assuming responsibility to protect rights of citizens and hold the state accountable for fair practice.

As the state begins to open up to cooperation and dialogue, the risks for self-dealing and clientelistic relations may increase. The state would benefit from devising structured frameworks and mechanisms to prevent such occurrences from happening. Joint commissions should be established with CSOs to prepare policies and procedures based on principles of good governance and with a special focus on transparency.

VI

Conclusion

Conclusion

The conclusion seeks to draw together the main findings and recommendations of the CSI project in Turkey. It offers a thorough interpretation of the state of Turkish civil society as depicted in the Civil Society Diamond and engages with some of the key findings and recommendations resulting from the CSI project.

CIVIL SOCIETY DIAMOND IN TURKEY

Looking at the CSI Diamond for Turkey (Figure VI.1.1) and the multitude of findings presented in this detailed report, civil society's **structure** emerges as the dimension with the greatest opportunity and need for improvement, especially in the areas of increasing *the depth and breadth of civic participation, building skills and resources of CSOs,* and *reinforcing linkages among CSOs*.

The environment within which civil society operates continues to be hindered by a *lack of adherence to rule of law, corruption* and *highly centralized state administration* as well as *undeveloped linkages between state-civil society and private sector-civil society*. However, recent reforms indicate an increasingly enabling legal framework for CSOs and expanded civic *rights and liberties*.

The values dimension reveals faint indications of civil society's ability to internally incorporate practices such as *tolerance, democratic practices* and *good governance* within CSOs and limited actions to promote poverty eradication. However, these limitations are balanced by civil society's strength in promoting *gender equity, non-violence* and *environmental sustainability*.

FIGURE VI.1.1 CIVIL SOCIETY DIAMOND FOR TURKEY



Finally, the impact dimension yields a rather low score; partly as a result of limitations on CSO advocacy initiatives (due to state interference), as well as lack of civil society activities in *holding the state and private sector accountable* and *responding to social interests*. These limitations however are balanced by a particularly strong role *in meeting societal needs, empowering citizens* and *increasing level of engagement around policy issues*.

This study was undertaken during a time of significant transition in Turkey in which a significant number of CSOs have progressed from loose, informal groups to more structured and formal institutions. Given this backdrop, the findings of this report suggest that there is an improving trend regarding many of the existing limitations. As such,

this study has captured civil society undergoing transition- and facing respective challenges in that process. The key findings and conclusions are summarized below:

Meeting Societal Needs

Given the relatively nascent stage of the sector, a handful of CSOs are demonstrating an impressive ability to respond to societal needs- whether it be a new school, a dorm, rescue missions and relief efforts for natural disasters or human rights training for judges and border police training on working with refugees. There are also an increasing number of CSOs working beyond Turkish borders, such as helping victims of the tsunami in South East Asia. However, in order to continue providing services and expanding their reach, CSOs necessitate better fiscal benefits (e.g. VAT discounts for purchasing and mobilizing large quantities of goods) and incentives for donors.

Individual Participation

This study reveals that while a group of strong and highly capable CSOs is emerging, a majority of Turkish citizens remain rather disconnected from this movement. Per 100.000 citizens, only 5790 are registered members of associations[1]. While Turkish citizens demonstrate a proclivity to support one another among their close networks of kinship, they are less likely to make donations to other CSOs or participate as volunteers. CSOs share concerns about limited membership and their outreach to society, noting the need to promote more citizen involvement.

Organizational Capacity

Recent changes in the Turkish context have created new mandates for CSOs in the area of service delivery and advocacy. Yet many CSOs struggle with building skills (in basic management as well as programmatic delivery) and securing resources. CSOs with established capacity face challenges with scaling up and sustainability in light of growing need for their programs. While a number of recent training programs have been launched to provide training and support, demand still outweighs supply. In addition, training tends to be focused on new or emerging organizations, leaving more experienced CSOs without support on how to advance their organizations to the next level. Finally, a lack of resources and organizational management skills limits CSOs' ability to recruit and compensate professional staff, resulting in a conundrum of limitations with skills and capacity. These challenges merit significant attention in a number of areas, especially 1) creating mechanisms to facilitate the flow of resources to CSOs 2) increasing training opportunities around basic skills of fundraising, program delivery, and other areas, and 3) investing in capacity (human and technical infrastructure).

Collective Action and Cooperation among CSOs

Over the past few years there has been a rise in the number of CSO networks and platforms. Two very commendable examples are the environmental movement, which is extremely well organized as a sub-sector with a number of regional and national platforms. The women's movement has also become rather well networked as a sub-sector. Human rights groups and other organizations are following a similar trend. A comparable increase is observed in the number of meetings and conferences organized with international CSOs- likely a result of EU related initiatives that encourage collaboration. However, this study reveals that CSOs continue to remain concerned about cooperation and communication among their fellow organizations- both within and between sub-sectors and

1 Not including trade unions.

internationally. It is yet to be seen whether larger networks and umbrella organizations will be formed, or if, given the vast size and diversity of the country, a number of smaller organizations will fulfil this role.

Civil Society Relations with the Public Sector

Relations between civil society and the Government of Turkey (GoT) is a critical issue affecting the development of civil society in Turkey. The new Associations Law was not even one year old during the time this study was conducted; yet many stakeholder discussions and other reports indicated its rapid impact on improving relations between CSOs and the GoT. However, concerns regarding the gap between laws to protect rights of civil society and the actual practice of implementing these laws create in a sense of cautious optimism. Several cases of excessive government interference and control continue to emerge, leaving CSOs feeling uneasy in expressing opinions that challenge the state, with fear of sanction. This is reflected in the low levels of civil society activity in holding the state accountable and promoting state transparency. Thus, while Turkey has effectively begun transitioning out of an era of state control over civil society, there is still a long road ahead in achieving a fully enabling environment.

The GoT recently ratified a number of new provisions to promote cooperation and dialogue with civil society- such as encouraging CSO participation in city councils, cooperation in service delivery, a joint human rights commission and a social policy commission. These developments have served to further relations between the two sectors. While these points of progress merit acknowledgement, looking forward, the GoT must continue to develop clear frameworks and mechanisms to translate policies into practice, and ensure transparent and accessible relationships between the two sectors. Finally, tax reforms are critical to ensuring fair access to advantages for CSOs that contribute to the public good; on the other hand, CSOs must also be fulfil their role as a partner in developing policy which affects the sector, and be organized to effectively negotiate new policies and practices which will shape the sector and relations with the GoT.

Philanthropy: Individual and Institutional Donors

As the sector continues to expand in size and scope of activity, so do corresponding needs for resources. While the EU is emerging as a significant source of funds for CSOs, Turkish funders are far behind. Both individual and institutional donors are not familiar with organized giving, grantmaking, and other means to support CSOs. Most individuals have a proclivity toward providing small donations to other needy individuals in their immediate environment, rather than CSOs (total donations estimated to be less than 0.01% of GDP). Private foundations in Turkey are 'operating foundations', i.e. generally funding their own programs and/or institutions rather than grantmaking. Corporates are increasingly keen to 'partner' with CSOs on projects, framed as 'sponsorship' initiatives rather than grants through corporate giving or corporate philanthropy programs. The GoT is not an official grantmaker per se; to date, transfer of funds and/or in kind support has been on a one-off basis. However, incoming structural funds from EU matched with Turkish funds will increase their role as donors for CSOs.

With a lack of structured funding practices (and a corresponding lack of skill in 'fundraising' on behalf of CSOs), the sector faces limitations in terms of its resource base. This is especially challenging for CSOs working on rights-

based issues as opposed to service delivery. New strategies and mechanisms to broaden the base of donors and thus increase the flow of resources to CSOs will be of great benefit to the sector both in terms of increasing participation and support from Turkish funders and donors, and creating access to more financial resources for CSOs.

Trust and Social Capital

While Turkish people tend to display a great deal of 'helpfulness', by and large, levels of trust and tolerance are quite low. This manifests itself in a lack of cohesive and cooperative action- especially in the civil society arena where many groups remain divided along lines of ideology, geography and in some cases, ethnicity. Although CSOs express concern about these divides and attribute an important role for civil society, they remain vague and uncertain in addressing root causes and building greater social cohesion. On a positive note, while overall levels of trust in institutions are low, CSOs fare quite well in comparison. Recent studies also reveal that 1 out of every 2 people think CSOs can make a positive contribution to Turkish society. This suggests that CSO have an opportunity to harness public support in their plight to 'bond' and 'bridge' diverse groups in society.

Good Governance: Transparency and Accountability of CSOs

Although CSOs are taking an active role in promoting democracy, they are self critical of their own lack of good governance and practices. The sector is not perceived to be corrupt per se; however, CSOs are keen to advance their practices of institutional transparency and accountability. Codes of conduct, standards and other self-regulatory mechanisms will be important to facilitate the advancement of CSO governance.

Rights-Based Work and Policy Impact of CSOs

An increasing number of CSO initiatives on a broad array of issues from freedom of speech to torture and right to trial, women's rights, and children's rights are taking the rights-based agenda to a new level. Not only are these organizations providing services to disadvantaged groups (e.g. shelters for women and street children, legal aid); they also take active positions on a number of policies affecting their target populations. Most notable efforts include human rights CSOs efforts on expanding civic liberties, and women's CSOs which succeeded in their plight for gender-based reforms to the Turkish Penal Code. These are especially worthy of merit given the adverse conditions and restrictions under which they are undertaken- not to mention the scarcity of resources for such efforts (many of which rely on volunteers). This study reveals an increase in the number of CSOs which wish to take a more active role in the policy making process which will be of great value to society given the immense amount of legislative reform awaiting Turkey in the EU accession process. As the rights-based CSO movement expands, staff and volunteers also express the need to scale up programs and enhance ability to impact policy, mobilize participation and generate more awareness and involvement of citizens.

Media Coverage of Civil Society

This study reveals a fascinating examination of Turkish media's portrayal of civil society. Highlights from this complex study reveal minimal television coverage, as compared to national-level print media. A majority of news items are short headings (announcement of activities, events), rather than longer pieces and/or opinion editorials, which contain more insightful reflections. While diversity of coverage (in terms of

themes) is impressive, depth and breadth is limited. In addition, trade unions and business associations tend to receive most visibility in the media. Media organs and especially columnists (which have a particularly important impact on public opinion) are encouraged to allocate more attention to CSO issues and help generate more awareness of the general public.

Corporate Social Responsibility and Support of CSOs

As mentioned briefly under 'philanthropy', companies in Turkey appear to be increasingly aware of their role as donors and supporters of CSOs. However, they lack sound strategic practices in making grants and working with CSOs beyond a 'one-off' sponsorship level. Companies would benefit from donor education and services to increase their capacity in working with CSOs, and broaden their involvement through employee volunteering and donor programs (which could be encouraged with greater tax benefits). But most importantly, CSOs and companies should seek to create partnerships for project funding with a view to aligning mutual objectives and respective strengths to address critical development challenges.

EU, the Accession Process and CSOs

CSOs participating in the CSI survey report a generally positive impact of the EU and pre-accession process on the development of civil society in terms of legal frameworks and promoting certain values. Some of the more negative affects of the EU on civil society were related to funding (noting the cumbersome procedures, bureaucracy and lack of transparency). The most significant and positive effects were related to the enabling environment (reform of CSO laws) and increased ability of CSOs to promote democratic values. Among the least significant yet still positive effects were related to promoting capacity for collective action and CSO dialogue with the state. In focus group discussions, the EU was frequently referred to as an elixir in addressing challenges with regards to rights and freedoms, providing funding for CSOs, promoting connections among CSOs, enabling citizens to make better use of their civic rights and increasing public awareness of CSOs. This emphasizes the critical importance of EU support for civil society and democratization efforts in Turkey's trajectory as a future member of the Union. However, CSOs and other Turkish stakeholders are encouraged to balance this support with national sources and help promote broader ownership of these critical social changes.

Data Gathering and Research on Civil Society

This study revealed a significant lack of research in many areas of civil society- especially around values and impact. Researchers and practitioners alike would benefit from taking note of these gaps and conducting follow up studies on issues that merit further exploration. The CSI study (in its entirety or some segments of it, e.g. media review, focus groups, etc.) may be useful to re-administer at regular intervals in order to track new developments over time. Government officials also gather important data in the annual reporting process; this data should be compiled to be made publicly available so that metrics on membership, funding and other structural issues can be compiled.

In summary, this study puts forth a dense amount of data regarding the state of civil society in Turkey. While some results yield substantial analysis, others are lacking- mainly due to the absence of any similar research initiatives which explored civil society in: a) such close detail, b) through a range of dimensions,

and c) through the employment of various data gathering activities. As such, readers are encouraged to note that some findings may be more conclusive while others are not as linear and require more debate and discussion. Nevertheless, if this report is able to stimulate discussion and catalyze additional research, it will have achieved part of its mission.

In terms of next steps and programmatic applications, the outcomes of this study will inform TUSEV's future focal areas, especially regarding legal and fiscal reforms, promoting new mechanisms for individual and institutional giving, and increasing institutional standards and governance in CSOs. If possible, TUSEV will aim to replicate the CSI study in 3 years to assess progress and changes in the sector. TUSEV will also make this report available to a broad national and international stakeholders, and organize a series of meetings to jointly reflect on findings and advocate for additional initiatives to strengthen civil society.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of NAG Members

Aziz Çelik (Kristal Trade Union)
Bilgi Buluş (UNDP Global Environment Facility)
Derya Akalın (Mother Child Education Foundation)
Fikret Toksöz (Istanbul Policy Center)
Funda Erdem (Kars Municipality)
Gülcan Korkmaz (Youth for Habitat and World Bank Youth Voice Project Group)
Hakan Gümüş (Turkish Youth Council, AEGEE-Ankara)
Murat Çelikkan (Helsinki Citizens Assembly)
Neslihan Tombul (Education Volunteers Foundation Board Member, Bank of New York Director)
Nurhan Yentürk (Bilgi University NGO Training Programme)
Ömer Çaha (Fatih University and Civil Society Journal Editor)
Pınar İlkkaracan (Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways Foundation)
Sunay Demircan (Civil Society Development Center)
Şeyhmus Diken (Diyarbakır Art Center)
Şentürk Uzun (Department of Associations, Ministry of Interior)

Appendix 2: Overview of the CSI Research Methods

The CSI project employed the following research methods to collect data and assessments on civil society issues: regional stakeholder consultations and survey, media review, fact-finding studies, review of existing information and expert interviews. It was possible to implement all but the population survey from the entire list of proposed data collection methods and instead TUSEV used results from a recent similar public opinion survey conducted in 2004. The approach of each data collection method is described in greater detail below.

REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS AND SURVEY

The regional stakeholder consultations (RSC) and survey were carried out from 16 April to 16 June 2005 in seven different cities representing the seven different regions in Turkey. These cities were Istanbul, Diyarbakir, Adana, Ankara, Samsun, Izmir and Kars; representing the Marmara, South Eastern Anatolia, Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, Black Sea, Aegean and Eastern Anatolia regions respectively. Participants were invited from neighbouring towns and cities near the location of the meeting to increase geographic diversity. The participants were first asked to complete the regional stakeholder surveys on the phone and they were then invited to participate in a face-to-face meeting which took place approximately between 1-2 weeks after the survey was conducted.

The aim of both the consultations and survey was to contact a diverse group of 15 to 20 participants in each region, who would represent the full range of CSOs and different sectors. In addition, in accordance with the CSI methodology, the ratio of the CSO representatives was kept at 2/3 of the total participation, while 1/3 consisted of other sectors such as academia, public and private sectors and media. Hence, the selection of the respondents was based on (a) a list of 19 types of organisations (see Table II.1.1 Types of CSOs included in the study), (b) the advice of the NAG members, (c) consultations with other CSOs such as the Civil Society Development Centre in Ankara, the CSO Support Centre at the Istanbul Bilgi University, lists of UNDP Micro Grants Program and the Education Reform Initiative. In the case of representatives from non-CSO organizations, individuals who had extensive knowledge on CSOs and the state of the civil society in Turkey were asked to participate.

TABLE A.2.1: REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSE RATE

City	People contacted	Questionnaires completed (response rate)
Istanbul	33	15 (% 45)
Diyarbakir	34	16 (% 47)
Adana	33	18 (% 54)
Ankara	30	20 (% 66)
Samsun	29	21 (% 72)
Izmir	35	18 (% 51)
Kars	28	24 (% 85)
Total	222	132 (% 60)

For each meeting, on average, five people who answered the survey failed to show up and approximately three people who had not answered the survey participated.

TABLE A.2.2: PARTICIPATION AT REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

City	Number of participants	Date
Istanbul	13	11 March 2005
Diyarbakir	21	18 March 2005
Adana	19	1 April 2005
Ankara	18	8 April 2005
Samsun	14	29 April 2005
Izmir	18	6 May 2005
Kars	17	21 May 2005
Total	120	

In the regional stakeholder consultations and survey, a majority of the participants were male (69%) and lived either in urban (57%) or metropolitan (37%) areas. In terms of the age distribution, most participants aged between 31- 40 years (35%), closely followed by the 41-50 age group (%32%). Half of the participants were university graduates, while a quarter held post-graduate degrees. Participants generally had middle (68%) and higher (19%) income status. The representation of types of CSOs was similar across the regions. In the sample as a whole organisations working in the field of social services and advocacy were most strongly represented (15% each), followed by organisations working in the field of education with 11% (such as those working on educational development and research organizations) and various professional organizations with 8%. Fifteen other types of organisations accounted for the remaining 51%. These were: faith-based organizations, trade unions, non-profit media, women's organizations, organizations for the protection of socio-economically disadvantaged groups, chambers and trade associations, ethnic, racial and traditional organizations, CSOs working on culture and arts, other recreational CSOs such as sports organizations, CSO networks/federations and support centres and political initiatives.

Regional stakeholder consultations were held to gather input and opinions from all around the country and to go beyond the views expressed by CSOs in Istanbul. However, identifying regional differences was not the goal of the research. Also, the method employed did not permit such differences to be inferred from the consultations as the groups were too small in size with only one in each region. The differences between the groups resulted more from a different composition of the group than a different situation in the regions.

The regional stakeholder consultations agenda was standard in each of the seven meetings. Each regional consultation lasted almost a whole day and comprised of twelve main segments:

- General information on TUSEV
- General information on CSI
- Aims and outcomes of the project
- Introduction of the Project Team
- Introduction of the NAG
- Research period and implementation

- Analytical and conceptual framework
- Definition of civil society
- Presentation of the results of the regional stakeholder survey
- SWOT analysis (group activity)
- Presentation of working group results
- Evaluation and closing remarks

The first phase involved the introduction of the CSI with its general outlines and a brief introduction of participants and their organizations. Secondly, the concept of civil society was discussed at length and participants were informed of the discussion that previously took place at the NAG meetings. Thirdly, the participants were divided along the four main dimensions of CSI – structure, environment, values and impact. They were asked to produce SWOT analyses (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) along the CSI indicators, to come up with ways through which the weaknesses of civil society could be strengthened and its strengths could further be improved. This was followed by the presentation of these analyses, a general evaluation and closing remarks.

Group dynamics were different from region to region. In some of the meetings, a small group of participants dominated the discussions, whereas the other participants were passive, several only making a single comment during the whole meeting. In other meetings, an unconstrained atmosphere led to everyone participating actively and interacting with each other frequently. In all consultations, participants offered many practical examples for the issues under discussion.

The "Civil Society in Turkey: A Qualitative Analysis" report, available only in Turkish, presents the findings of these meetings.

REPRESENTATIVE POPULATION SURVEY

As it was mentioned earlier, it was possible to implement all but the population survey from the entire list of proposed data collection methods and instead TUSEV used results from a recent similar public opinion survey conducted in 2004. The population survey called "Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and the Pursuit of Social Justice" is the outcome of two field surveys. The household survey conducted under this research covers a total of 1536 respondents that were chosen by random selection from Turkey in general. The foundation administrators' research on the other hand was conducted with 452 foundation administrators.

MEDIA REVIEW

The CSI project methodology included a review of media conducted between April 16 and June 16 2005.[2] In selecting a sample of the media, the following criteria were used: (a) frequency: daily; (b) geographical coverage: national and local; (c) type of media: newspapers and television and (d) ownership of media: public and private. The following media organs were selected: National newspapers Hürriyet, Zaman and Cumhuriyet; Local newspapers Karadeniz, Olay, Bursa Hakimiyet, and Yeni Asır; Television stations TRT1 (public) and Kanal D (private). In the case of newspapers, all the sections were monitored but noted only the pages/sections where the news items appeared, such as those that were given priority on the cover pages or those in the columns. In the case of television channels, only the evening news bulletins broadcasts during primetime were monitored.

2 See Appendix 5 for the results of the study on how civil society is represented in the media.

TABLE A.2.3: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE MONITORED FROM APRIL TO JUNE 2005

Media	Level and type of ownership	Part monitored
Hürriyet	National Private	Main part of issue without supplements
Zaman	National Private	Main part of issue without supplements
Cumhuriyet	National Private	Main part of issue without supplements
Bursa Hakimiyet,	Regional Private	Main part of issue without supplements
Karadeniz	Regional Private	Main part of issue without supplements
Olay	Regional Private	Main part of issue without supplements
Yeni Asır	Regional Private	Main part of issue without supplements
TRT1	National Public	Television News
Kanal D	National Private	Television News

Selected media was monitored for two months. The national level of the media review was conducted by a group under the leadership of Aslı Tunç who is a faculty member at Media and Information Systems department in Istanbul Bilgi University. The local level of the media review was conducted by Bianet, which is linked to IPS Communication Foundation, under the leadership of Ertuğrul Kürkçü. Reviewers coded the selected articles according to the criteria and categories specified and then entered them into the CIVICUS Access database in cooperation with the head of the monitoring team. This helped to ensure accuracy and uniformity of the coding.

Articles were selected based on two general guidelines: (a) they dealt with civil society defined as the space between the family, state and market, in which people associate for the purpose of advancing their interests; (b) they dealt with an organisation which belong to the types of CSOs listed by CIVICUS.[3] We included articles in the monitoring process in which civil society actors or activities appear. The presence of a civil society actor in an article was sufficient, either as a participant in an activity or as a directly or indirectly quoted commentator regarding an event. The article did not have to be explicitly concerned with civil society as such.

For each article or report ("item"), the general information was recorded (date, title of the medium, etc) in addition to the following main variables:

- type of item (character of article/report, whether it was a short report, opinion, interview, analysis, etc.);
- topic of the item (primary and secondary topic, both taken from a list of themes, e.g. education, work and unemployment, accommodation, children, sport, agriculture, human rights, etc.);
- geographical scope of the item (i.e. international, national, regional, local);
- type of organisation (i.e. what types of CSOs appear in the item, i.e. written about or provide a comment on an event; according to a list of 19 CSO types);

3 See Table II.1.1.

- prominence of the item within the issue (press: article published on page 1, television: report broadcast 1st in sequence; the importance of the article or report); and
- presentation of the CSO (i.e. was the CSO presented in the article as positive, neutral or negative).

DESK AND OVERVIEW STUDIES

The case and overview studies focused on selected fields of CSO activities. Each study was done by an expert in their field. The following case studies were conducted:[4]

- An Analysis of the Impact of Civil Society on Freedom of Speech (Murat Aksoy, human rights expert, Initiative against Violations of Freedom of Thought)
- The State of Social Policies (Unemployment) and Civil Society in Turkey (Başak Ekim, Bogazici University, Social Policy Forum)
- Civil Society and the National Budgeting Process in Turkey (Gülhan Özdemir, TUSEV)
- Corporate Social Responsibility Study (Gülhan Özdemir).

EXPERT INTERVIEWS

As part of the research 18 expert interviews and shorter consultation meetings were held on specific topics that emerged through the various research activities. Most of them focused on issues related to civil society' policy impact and corporate social responsibility in Turkey. We would like to thank the following persons for agreeing to be interviewed. They are not responsible for the accuracy or truth of the information or opinions contained in this report. Also, please note that organizational affiliations may have changed since the begining of this project.

Şanar Yurdatapan	Initiative against Violations of Freedom of Thought
Elvan Öğ	Initiative against Violations of Freedom of Thought
Doç. Dr. Vahit Bıçak	Prime Minister's Human Rights Advisory Board President
Mehmet Altuntaş	Prime Minister's Human Rights Advisory Board Expert
İrfan Neziroğlu	National Assembly's Human Rights Watch Commission
Levent Korkut	Member of Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, Amnesty International
Yılmaz Ensaroğlu	Member of Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, Ex-president of Mazlumder
Kazım Genç	Member of Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, Pir Sultan Abdal Cultural Association
Kemal Akkurt	Member of Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, Ankara Bar Association
Erol Önderoğlu	Bianet Freedom of thought and Speech reporter (lawyer)
Gülden Sönmez	Mazlumder board member (lawyer)
Gülay Aslantepe	ILO Turkey Director
Nazik Işık	Women Home-based Workers Cooperative
Elif Şahin	İş-Kur Active Workforce Programmes
Prof. Refik Erzan	Boğaziçi University Economy Department
Celal Polat	Ministry of Labor EU Department
Tonguç Çoban	DİSK Trade Union
Uygar Tanrıöver	MESS Employers' Union

4 See Appendices 3 and 4 for a summary of these reports.

Appendix 3: Policy Impact Studies

To gauge civil society's impact on public policy, a set of policy studies were conducted, which looked at civil society's impact on a selected human rights policy issue, a social policy issue and on the national budgeting process.

1. AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF CIVIL SOCIETY ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH (HUMAN RIGHTS)

M. Aksoy, Human Rights Expert

Introduction

In Turkey, the freedom of thought and speech is established under the Constitution and yet, certain Acts often undermine these freedoms in implementation. Between 2001 and 2004, as a result of the legal reform period in adopting Copenhagen Criteria for Turkey's accession into the EU, a positive yet limited impact has been observed. The study seeks to address the two most successful cases of civil society activities that took place during these years. In line with the CSI methodology, the study comprises of case studies, desk research and consultations with experts.

Putting Freedom of Speech into Context

In Turkey, freedom of thought and speech is mentioned in the introductory section of the Constitution, Article 25 regarding the "freedom of thought" and Article 26 regarding the "freedom of expression and dissemination of one's thought". There are also other regulations than the Constitution regarding the freedom of thought and speech, which often constitute obstacles in the use and implementation of such freedoms. These are, Articles 159, 169 and 312 of the Turkish Criminal Code and Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the Prevention of Terrorism Act. These articles concern crimes such as: "propagating for a terrorist organization", "propagating against the unity of the nation and the homeland", "provoking resentment among the people through divisions of race, region, class, religion or sect" and "insulting the government, the Republic or the Turkish Armed Forces." These articles have been reformed between years 2002-2004 due to the legal reforms the EU accession period has initiated. However, it remains a fragile issue, since Turkish citizens as well as journalists and intellectuals continue to face hostility upon their expression of thought on issues that are considered a threat to national unity.

Two case studies were prepared to analyze the impact of civil society on public policy regarding freedom of speech. The first case, Initiative Against Violations of Freedom of Thought, is a civil disobedience act that started in 1995. The second case is the Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, formed under the Office of the Prime Minister's Human Rights Advisory Board in 1999.

Study findings

The first case, Initiative Against Violations of Freedom of Thought, is a civil disobedience act that started as a protest when the State Security Court asked author Yasar Kemal to testify for one of his articles that was published in the German magazine 'Der Spiegel'. The act went on for about 10 years and participants re-published the texts that were penalized with their signatures under them. By doing

so they did not only become partners of crime with the previous/original authors but they also knowingly and willingly committed new crimes in an organized fashion. The initiative was very active and succesful in raising awareness around violations of freedom of thought and in crowding both civil and military courts. However, rather than such civil initiatives, the Coppenhag Criteria seem to be the driving force behind the reform process.

The second case study was the Working Group on Freedom of Speech and Faith, formed under the Office of the Prime Minister's Human Rights Advisory Board. The working group was founded by the ex-Minister of State for Human Rights, Mehmet Ali Irtemcelik with the purpose of bringing together CSOs and state organs/departments working on human rights. The December 1999 EU summit where the Turkish candidacy was discussed influenced the formation of this working group. In 2001, the Board was suspended with the resignation of the Minister from his post, since it was closely linked to the Minister himself. In the following period, with new reforms in 2001, the working group got institutionalized and gained a new operability. The Board was formed with state assistance and good intentions and yet, it proved to be dysfunctional due to excessive state supervision and the appointment of CSOs not related to human rights areas.

Conclusion

Both case studies reveal that CSOs impact on public policy in the area of freedom of speech remains limited, though they also show an improving trend in the recent years. In addition, they both illustrate the importance of civil society in solving these problems and the state's realization of their capacity. Yet, the state presents an obstacle to any possible impact of civil society in this area through its excessive supervisions, which result from the fact that the issue of human rights in Turkey cannot be handled without touching upon the ethnic and religious demands of minorities, which the state perceives as a threat to its unity and secularism. The study also points to the fact that for civil society to be active and successful in having impact on the public policies regarding freedom of speech, it needs to be able to have dialogue, cooperation and coordination within itself.

2. THE STATE OF SOCIAL POLICIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN TURKEY (UNEMPLOYMENT)

B. Ekim, Boğazici University, Social Policy Forum

Introduction

In the realm of social policies, "unemployment" is one of the most serious social problems in Turkey that requires immediate attention. This is often supported by public opinion polls, including TESEV's 2004 Household Opinion Survey Results. These case studies focus on the restructuring of the Economic and Social Council with comparison to the ILO pilot project on "Expanding Employment and Preventing Unregistered Labour" and aims to define the impact of civil society on influencing public policies on unemployment. These cases were chosen because they were one of the few examples where civil society was actively seeking to have an impact on employment policies. In line with the methodology, the study comprises of case studies, desk research and consultations with experts.

Study Findings

The first case study examines the re-structuring process of the Economic and Social Council. After underlining the importance of CSOs inclusion in the Council for years,

CSOs prepared a draft bill that aims to increase CSO representation and decrease the government influence in the council. The draft bill was discussed and agreed upon in the Council meeting in March 2005 and was sent to the Council of Ministers. Although the Economic and Social Council was founded in 1995,the process has gained more momentum since 2001. The increase in the Council's importance can also be observed through the opening up of the council to industry and commercial service provider employers, workers, artisan, craftsman and farmers representatives, and increased voices of other CSOs.

The second case study focuses on the ILO project on "Increasing Employment and Preventing Unregistered Employment". In 2002, ILO decided to focus on a three pillar structure where social dialogue would contribute to the implementation of economic and social policies. Turkey was chosen as a pilot country and the ILO Turkey Office called on the national organizations to determine the most important social problem in Turkey. As a result, representatives of both the workers' and the employers' organizations came together with the Ministry of Labor and Social Security and decided that the increase of employment rates and prevention of unregistered labour was the most important problem. The project was launched in October 2004 by ILO and was guided by CSOs actively leading the project. In December of 2005 the CSOs and other related organizations will have presented proposed strategies and policy recommendations for increasing employment on the local level.

Conclusion

Both examples illustrate the importance of civil society's inclusion in the process and the state-civil society dialogue. This increased importance can also be observed in the reorganization of the council along lines compatible with EU standards and its opening up to different and diverse groups of stakeholders. Similarly, the ILO project on "Increasing Employment and Preventing Unregistered Employment" illustrates that CSOs are becoming important stakeholders in this area. Yet, the impact of civil society in working against unemployment remains limited and most of the improvements are due to supra-national organizations operating above the state level such as the EU accreditation process or ILO policies.

3. CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE NATIONAL BUDGETING PROCESS IN TURKEY

G. Özdemir, TUSEV

Introduction

The impact of civil society on public policies regarding the national budgeting process remains very limited. In fact, due to lack of examples of civil society being included in the process, the report focuses mostly on expert consultations and research rather than specific cases and aims to analyze why civil society is excluded and how it could be included in the process.

National budget framework

In Turkey, the national budget is formed under the Budgeting Law, which illustrates that the government has the responsibility and right to use public resources in order to provide services for the public. The national budget is prepared by the ruling party and submitted for the approval of the National Assembly. Until the budget is approved and submitted, the Ministry of Finance, the Treasury and the State Planning Institute are actively involved in the process. In addition, the State Supervision Council under the

Presidency has the authority to supervise all these organizations. The National Budget becomes operative once it is approved in the National Assembly.

Study Findings

Due to political competition between politicians and parties there is a gap between the needs of the public and the actual spending. In fact, public resources often serve as tools in the hands of populist politics; the subsidies set by the law are easily exceeded; and supplementary budgets are easily introduced; hence undermining the credibility of the Budget Legislation.

In democratic systems, for the budget to be productive, it is important that the national budgeting processes are open to civil society's participation. Civil society provides research and better understanding of the public's demands which the decision makers often lack and hence allows for healthier and more realistic decisions. Unfortunately, in the Turkish example, the input from civil society to the formation of the national budget is close to nonexistent. Even the well organized employers' and workers organizations have not been able to go beyond slogans and come up with concrete recommendations or demands. Even though it is claimed that today civil society is more active than ever, the activities hardly have any impact. The national budget remains completely under the control of the state and the party in power.

Conclusion

If civil society intends to be more active and successful in influencing public policies regarding the national budgeting process, then it must become more knowledgeable in how the national budget is prepared, the legislation, implementation and monitoring. In order to be able to pressure the government they also need to be consistent and responsive. In addition, many CSOs with similar missions fail to act together, creating an obstacle to greater impact. Civil society also needs to improve its communication with related state organs such as the Treasury, the Ministry of Finance, the State Planning Institute and the Chamber of Accounts. Finally, better use of media would help create public awareness around this issue.

Appendix 4: Corporate Social Responsibility Study

G. Özdemir, TUSEV

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study was to examine private sector relations with civil society, to determine the extent to which private sector promotes and practices social responsibility and to assers the degree of its adoption of corporate social responsibility principles (CSR).

CSR as a concept relates to the approach taken by companies towards their employees (motivation, education, clear rules, health and safety at work, etc.), their clients, shareholders and their surroundings (the environment, communication with the general public, the local community and even the society at large).

In this study CSR is an indicator of the supportive attitude of the corporate sector towards civil society. In line with the CIVICUS guidelines this study analysed the annual reports of the 10 largest companies in Turkey (in terms of revenue) for 2002[5], assuming large companies may lead the way in CSR initiatives. The analysis of annual reports is mainly concerned with the level of corporate responsibility as declared by the companies themselves, since it is not possible to acquire accurate information on their actual activities and impact.

In all of the financial reports that were examined, no portion of the expenses was allocated for preventing work accidents, protecting the environment, higher quality production or other similar CSR areas. It is certain that these top 10 companies gave their employees trainings throughout the year, but these were not documented in annual reports. Because of this lack of information, public relations departments of the companies were asked to share information on their CSR activities for 2002-2003. As a final resort, the company websites were also reviewed.

PUTTING CSR IN CONTEXT

As the study's findings illustrate clearly, the concept of corporate social responsibility is in its nascent stages in Turkey. Many large companies take on sponsorships in the fields of culture, education and environment and yet, they fail to form a strategy when it comes to ensuring the consistency of such actions. In Turkey, the private sector hardly ever addresses areas such as human rights, social justice, good governance, economical development, urbanization, workplace environment and such. It rather prefers to fund what one could call "popular" areas such as education, environment, culture/ the arts and sports.

STUDY FINDINGS

The research results point towards an increasing awareness and activity in CSR in the private sector. Yet, companies still lack an overarching strategy in determining their target groups and the types of projects that they support. The research also gives the impression that most of these companies do not adopt CSR as part of their corporate culture. Many companies gave the impression that they saw CSR as "something they had to do" or as any activity done with CSOs. Though these companies often supported CSOs in some activities, they often saw such cooperation as sponsorship or

5 The companies included in the study are: Petrol Ofisi, Turkcell, BP Turkiye, The Shell Company of Turkey Limited, Arcelik, Tofas Turk Otomobil Fabrikasi, Oyak Renault Otomobil Fabrikaları A.S., Vestel Dis Ticaret, Aygaz and Migros.

PR activities in areas such as education, environment, culture/arts and sports. Most activities were giving scholarships in education, building schools, planting trees and providing venues for culture/arts events.

CONCLUSION

Despite the narrow range of CSR issues tackled by the private sector and the lack of strategy in the companies' yearly reports, one could conclude that CSR principles and civil society will be increasingly supported by the private sector in the upcoming years. For instance, the accession period to the EU introduces the production of a yearly CSR report to accompany the financial reports as of 2006 and successful CSO-private sector activities continue to raise public awareness.

Appendix 5: Media Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey

Assoc. Prof. Aslı Tunç, İstanbul Bilgi University

1. INTRODUCTION

Mass media plays a crucial role in informing the public and conveying messages and facts about social issues. Thus, it forms a crucial means to promote the activities of civil society. As part of the CSI project, a specific study on the representation of civil society in the media was conducted. The study draws on data collected from Turkish media over a period of two months. The national level of the media review was conducted by a group under the leadership of Aslı Tunç who is a faculty member at Media and Information Systems department in Istanbul Bilgi University. The local level of the media review on the other hand was conducted by Hacer Foggo of Bianet, which is linked to IPS Communication Foundation, under the leadership of Ertuğrul Kürkçü. The experts coded the selected articles according to the criteria and categories specified and then entered them into the CIVICUS Access database in cooperation with the head of the monitoring team.

The selected media organs for analysis were national newspapers Hurriyet, Zaman and Cumhuriyet, local newspapers Karadeniz, Olay, Bursa Hakimiyet, and Yeni Asır and national television stations TRT1 (public) and Kanal D (private). The selection of these media was based on considerations of spread in geographical coverage, ideology, ownership and type of media. Appendix 3 contains further information on the research methodology. This summary report describes the main findings of the media analysis.

2. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Main findings and recommendations of the Civil Society in the Media Study are presented below:

Quantity: In terms of CSO coverage and level of visibility in Turkish media, CSOs get the most coverage in print media. In fact, over 70% of all CSO coverage happens in three national newspapers chosen for the study (Hurriyet, Zaman and Cumhuriyet). Cumhuriyet, is the national daily paper that gives the most coverage to CSOs (at 32% of all new items from this paper) and it is also the newspaper where civil society finds the greatest coverage by columnists. This is important in the Turkish context as columnists have great influence on public opinion. As such, the coverage/ lack of coverage of civil society by columnists has important consequences for civil society visibility.

Form: More than half of news items had a third degree importance (meaning they were in the least read pages of the newspapers or towards the end of the news), and coverage ratios by columnists also remained pretty low (5%). As a result, regardless of the subject of the CSO-related news items, CSOs were almost never given priority in the media.

Issues: An overwhelming majority of the CSO related news items are related to "economic issues". These are followed by "advocacy" and "education". Yet, CSO activities related to "human rights" only get 1,5% coverage.

When the distribution of CSO news items according to CSI dimensions, sub dimensions and indicators are considered, the impact dimension recieved most coverage (33%),

while values dimension had the least (14%). Themes with the most coverage under the impact dimension were advocacy, educating citizens and national policy. Under environment, the system of justice and basic rights and freedoms were covered frequently, followed by the legal environment and private sector-CSO relations. State-CSO relations had the most coverage of all indicators. In the structural context, the concept of volunteerism had minimum coverage by the Turkish media, national or regional.

Actors: CSO types with the most coverage were business and trade associations (35%), trade unions (13%) and CSOs working towards the economical interests of its members (such as chambers of commerce) (11%) respectively. This is not surprising since economy constitutes the most common theme in the media when civil society is concerned.

The geographical focus of most civil society news items was on the national level (48%), including the regional media organs.

Civil Society's Image: Despite the low level of coverage and importance associated with CSOs, a majority of news items were presented in a neutral fashion (95%), meaning on a scale from -1 (negative) to +1 (positive), most news items were written in an objective tone and factual style.

3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Turkish media remains detached from the idea of a civil society and hence from CSO activities. CSO news items in both regional and national media organs remain limited in number and within this limited group of items, professional associations and trade unions form a great majority. Especially in the national print media, CSOs find themselves on the first pages only when there is a conflict with a political authority. They hardly ever get any coverage on issues such as contributions to the democratization process or their voluntary services, which is the way that civil society receives coverage in societies where it is recognized and its contributions are appreciated. Efforts on such issues as environment, gender issues, children's and human rights are completely overlooked by the media. Hence, the Turkish media fails to see CSOs as a vital part of the democratization process in Turkey and it approaches civil society in a rather superficial way, not realizing the full potential it presents in solving the country's many problems.

The findings of the media study show that a large proportion of CSOs is rarely represented in the media. Building the PR capacity of social service CSOs, foundations, faith-based organisations and other civil society actors as well as providing for an exchange between media and civil society actors could address this concern.

Appendix 6: CSI Scoring Matrix

Bolded text in the matrix reflect the scores that determined the results of the CSI diamond. Scores for each dimension (Structure, Environment, Values and Impact) were obtained by averaging sub-dimension scores, which were in turn obtained by averaging respective indicator scores. The indicators that do not have bolded boxes were not scored due to lack of data (1.1.5. Collective Community Action, 3.5.2 Gender Equitable Practices within CSOs, 4.4.5 Building Social Capital and 4.5.3 Meeting needs of disadvantaged groups). For more information please see "Methodology".

1 – STRUCTURE (SCORE: 0.9)

1.1 - Breadth of citizen participation

Description: How widespread is citizen involvement in civil society? What proportion of citizens engages in civil society activities?

1.1.1 - Non-partisan political action (Score: 0.4)

Description: What percentage of people have ever undertaken any form of non-partisan political action (e.g. written a letter to a newspaper, signed a petition, attended a demonstration)?

A very small minority (less than 10%).	Score 0
A minority (10% to 30%)	**Score 1**
A significant proportion (31% to 65%)	Score 2
A large majority (more than 65%)	Score 3

1.1.2 - Charitable giving

Description: What percentage of people donate to charity on a regular basis?

A very small minority (less than 10%)	Score 0
A minority (10% to 30%)	**Score 1**
A significant proportion (31% to 65%)	Score 2
A large majority (more than 65%)	Score 3

1.1.3 - CSO membership

Description: What percentage of people belong to at least one CSO?

A small minority (less than 30%)	**Score 0**
A minority (30% to 50%)	Score 1
A majority (51% to 65%)	Score 2
A large majority (more than 65%)	Score 3

1.1.4 - Volunteering

Description: What percentage of people undertake volunteer work on a regular basis (at least once a year)?

A very small minority (less than 10%)	**Score 0**
A small minority (10% to 30%)	Score 1
A minority (31% to 50%)	Score 2
A majority (more than 50%)	Score 3

1.1.5 - Collective community action

Description: What percentage of people have participated in a collective community action within the last year (e.g. attended a community meeting, participated in a community-organised event or a collective effort to solve a community problem)?

A small minority (less than 30%)	Score 0
A minority (30% -50%)	Score 1
A majority (51% to 65%)	Score 2
A large majority (more than 65%)	Score 3

1.2 - Depth of citizen participation (Score: 0.7)

Description: How deep/meaningful is citizen participation in civil society? How frequently/extensively do people engage in civil society activities?

1. 2.1 - Charitable giving

Description: How much (i.e. what percentage of personal income) do people who give to charity on a regular basis donate, on average, per year?

Less than 1%	**Score 0**
1% to 2%	Score 1
2.1% to 3%	Score 2
More than 3%	Score 3

1.2.2 - Volunteering

Description: How many hours per month, on average, do volunteers devote to volunteer work?

Less than 2 hours	Score 0
2 to 5 hours	Score 1
5.1 to 8 hours	**Score 2**
More than 8 hours.	Score 3

1.2.3 - CSO membership

Description: What percentage of CSO members belong to more than one CSO?

A small minority (less than 30%)	**Score 0**
A minority (30% to 50%)	Score 1
A majority (51% to 65%)	Score 2
A large majority (more than 65%)	Score 3

1.3 - Diversity of civil society participants (Score: 1)

Description: How diverse/representative is the civil society arena? Do all social groups participate equitably in civil society? Are any groups dominant or excluded?

1.3.1 - CSO membership

Description: To what extent do CSOs represent all significant social groups (e.g. women, rural dwellers, poor people and minorities)?

Significant social groups are absent / excluded from CSOs.	Score 0
Significant social groups are largely absent from CSOs.	**Score 1**
Significant social groups are under-represented in CSOs.	Score 2
CSOs equitably represent all social groups. No group is noticeably under-represented.	Score 3

1.3.2 - CSO leadership

Description: To what extent is there diversity in CSO leadership? To what extent does CSO leadership represent all significant social groups (e.g. women, rural dwellers, poor people, and minorities)?

Significant social groups are absent / excluded from CSO leadership roles.	Score 0
Significant social groups are largely absent from CSO leadership roles.	**Score 1**
Significant social groups are under-represented in CSO leadership roles.	Score 2
CSO leadership equitably represents all social groups. No group is noticeably under-represented.	Score 3

1.3.3 Distribution of CSOs

Description: How are CSOs distributed throughout the country?

CSOs are highly concentrated in the major urban centres.	Score 0
CSOs are largely concentrated in urban areas.	**Score 1**
CSOs are present in all but the most remote areas of the country.	Score 2
CSOs are present in all areas of the country.	Score 3

1.4. - Level of organisation (Score: 1)

Description: How well-organised is civil society? What kind of infrastructure exists for civil society?

1.4.1 - Existence of CSO umbrella bodies

Description: What percentage of CSOs belong to a federation or umbrella body of related organisations?

A small minority (less than 30%)	Score 0
A minority (30% to 50%)	**Score 1**
A majority (51% to 70%)	Score 2
A large majority (more than 70%)	Score 3

1.4.2 - Effectiveness of CSO umbrella bodies

Description: How effective do CSO stakeholders judge existing federations or umbrella bodies to be in achieving their defined goals?

Completely ineffective (or non-existent)	Score 0
Largely ineffective	**Score 1**
Somewhat effective	Score 2
Effective	Score 3

1.4.3 - Self-regulation

Description: Are there efforts among CSOs to self-regulate? How effective and enforceable are existing self-regulatory mechanisms? What percentage of CSOs abide by a collective code of conduct (or some other form of self-regulation)?

There are no efforts among CSOs to self-regulate.	Score 0
Preliminary efforts have been to self-regulate but only a small minority of CSOs are involved and impact is extremely limited.	**Score 1**
Some mechanisms for CSO self-regulation are in place but only some sectors of CSOs are involved and there is no effective method of enforcement. As a result, impact is limited.	Score 2
Mechanisms for CSO self-regulation are in place and function quite effectively. A discernible impact on CSO behaviour can be detected.	Score 3

1.4.4 - Support infrastructure

Description: What is the level of support infrastructure for civil society? How many civil society support organisations exist in the country? Are they effective?

There is no support infrastructure for civil society.	Score 0
There is very limited infrastructure for civil society.	**Score 1**
Support infrastructure exists for some sectors of civil society and is expanding.	Score 2
There is a well-developed support infrastructure for civil society.	Score 3

1.4.5 - International linkages

Description: What proportion of CSOs have international linkages (e.g. are members of international networks, participate in global events)?

Only a handful of "elite" CSOs have international linkages.	Score 0
A limited number of (mainly national-level) CSOs have international linkages.	**Score 1**
A moderate number of (mainly national-level) CSOs have international linkages.	Score 2
A significant number of CSOs from different sectors and different levels (grassroots to national) have international linkages.	Score 3

1.5 - Inter-relations (Score: 1)

Description: How strong / productive are relations among civil society actors?

1.5.1 - Communication

Description: What is the extent of communication between civil society actors?

Very little	Score 0
Limited	**Score 1**
Moderate	Score 2
Significant	Score 3

1.5.2 – Cooperation

Description: How much do civil society actors cooperate with each other on issues of common concern? Can examples of cross-sectoral CSO alliances/coalitions (around a specific issue or common concern) be identified?

CS actors do not cooperate with each other on issues of common concern. No examples of cross-sectoral CSO alliances/coalitions can be identified / detected.	Score 0
It is very rare that CS actors cooperate with each other on issues of common concern. Very few examples of cross-sectoral CSO alliances / coalitions can be identified / detected.	**Score 1**
CS actors on occasion cooperate with each other on issues of common concern. Some examples of cross-sectoral CSO alliances / coalitions can be identified / detected.	Score 2
CS actors regularly cooperate with each other on issues of common concern. Numerous examples of cross-sectoral CSO alliances / coalitions can be identified / detected.	Score 3

1.6 – Resources (Score: 1)

Description: To what extent do CSOs have adequate resources to achieve their goals?

1.6.1 - Financial resources

Description: How adequate is the level of financial resources for CSOs?

On average, CSOs suffer from a serious financial resource problem.	Score 0
On average, CSOs have inadequate financial resources to achieve their goals.	**Score 1**
On average, CSOs have most of the financial resources they require to achieve their defined goals.	Score 2
On average, CSOs have an adequate and secure financial resource base.	Score 3

1.6.2 - Human resources

Description: How adequate is the level of human resources for CSOs?

On average, CSOs suffer from a serious human resource problem.	Score 0
On average, CSOs have inadequate human resources to achieve their goal.	**Score 1**
On average, CSOs have most of the human resources they require to achieve their defined goals.	Score 2
On average, CSOs have an adequate and secure human resource base.	Score 3

1.6.3 - Technological and infrastructural resources

Description: How adequate is the level of technological and infrastructural resources for CSOs?

On average, CSOs suffer from a serious technological and infrastructural resource problem.	Score 0
On average, CSOs have inadequate technological and infrastructural resources to achieve their goals.	**Score 1**
On average, CSOs have most of the technological and infrastructural resources they require to achieve their defined goals.	Score 2
On average, CSOs have an adequate and secure technological and infrastructural resource base.	Score 3

2 – ENVIRONMENT[6] (SCORE: 1.4)

2.1 - Political context (Score: 1)

Description: What is the political situation in the country and its impact on civil society?

2.1.1 - Political rights

Description: How strong are the restrictions on citizens' political rights (e.g. to participate freely in political processes, elect political leaders through free and fair elections, freely organise in political parties)?

6 For most of the indicators, secondary data sources are available for a broad range of countries. For each indicator, the scores indicate how to translate the original secondary data into the 4-point scale of the CSI scoring matrix.

There are severe restrictions on the political rights of citizens. Citizens cannot participate in political processes.	Score 0
There are some restrictions on the political rights of citizens and their participation in political processes.	**Score 1**
Citizens are endowed with substantial political rights and meaningful opportunities for political participation. There are minor and isolated restrictions on the full freedom of citizens' political rights and their participation in political processes.	Score 2
People have the full freedom and choice to exercise their political rights and meaningfully participate in political processes.	Score 3

2.1.2 - Political competition

Description: What are the main characteristics of the party system in terms of number of parties, ideological spectrum, institutionalisation and party competition?

Single party system.	Score 0
Small number of parties based on personalism, clientelism or appealing to identity politics.	Score 1
Multiple parties, but weakly institutionalised and / or lacking ideological distinction.	**Score 2**
Robust, multi-party competition, with well-institutionalised and ideologically diverse parties.	Score 3

2.1.3 - Rule of law

Description: To what extent is the rule of law entrenched in the country?

There is general disregard for the law by citizens and the state.	Score 0
There is low confidence in and frequent violations of the law by citizens and the state.	**Score 1**
There is a moderate level of confidence in the law. Violations of the law by citizens and the state are not uncommon.	Score 2
Society is governed by fair and predictable rules, which are generally abided by.	Score 3

2.1.4 – Corruption

Description: What is the level of perceived corruption in the public sector?

High	Score 0
Substantial	**Score 1**
Moderate	Score 2
Low	Score 3

2.1.5 – State effectiveness

Description: To what extent is the state able to fulfil its defined functions?

The state bureaucracy has collapsed or is entirely ineffective (e.g. due to political, economic or social crisis).	Score 0
The capacity of the state bureaucracy is extremely limited.	**Score 1**
State bureaucracy is functional but perceived as incompetent and / or non-responsive.	Score 2
State bureaucracy is fully functional and perceived to work in the public's interests.	Score 3

2.1.6 – Decentralisation

Description: To what extent is government expenditure devolved to sub-national authorities?

Sub-national share of government expenditure is less than 20.0%.	**Score 0**
Sub-national share of government expenditure is between 20.0% and 34.9%.	Score 1
Sub-national share of government expenditure is between 35.0% than 49.9%.	Score 2
Sub-national share of government expenditure is more than 49.9%.	Score 3

2.2 - Basic freedoms and rights (Score: 1.2)

Description: **To what extent are basic freedoms ensured by law and in practice?**

2.2.1 - Civil liberties

Description: To what extent are civil liberties (e.g. freedom of expression, association, assembly) ensured by law and in practice?

Civil liberties are systematically violated.	Score 0
There are frequent violations of civil liberties.	**Score 1**
There are isolated or occasional violations of civil liberties.	Score 2
Civil liberties are fully ensured by law and in practice.	Score 3

2.2.2 - Information rights

Description: To what extent is public access to information guaranteed by law? How accessible are government documents to the public?

No laws guarantee information rights. Citizen access to government documents is extremely limited.	Score 0
Citizen access to government documents is limited but expanding.	**Score 1**
Legislation regarding public access to information is in place, but in practice, it is difficult to obtain government documents.	Score 2
Government documents are broadly and easily accessible to the public.	Score 3

2.2.3 - Press freedoms

Description: To what extent are press freedoms ensured by law and in practice?

Press freedoms are systematically violated.	Score 0
There are frequent violations of press freedoms.	Score 1
There are isolated violations of press freedoms.	**Score 2**
Freedom of the press is fully ensured by law and in practice.	Score 3

2.3 - Socio-economic context[7] (Score: 2)

Description: **What is the socio-economic situation in the country and its impact on civil society?**

2.3.1 - Socio-economic context

Description: How much do socio-economic conditions in the country represent a barrier to the effective functioning of civil society?

7 This sub-dimension/indicator is not broken up into individual indicators to facilitate and simplify scoring. The sub-dimension/ indicator consists of 8 socio-economic conditions which are of importance to civil society. The scores for this indicator are designed in such a way that they indicate how many socio-economic obstacles are there for civil society (max: 8; min: 0). The task for the NAG scoring meeting is to simply verify the number of obstacles (as identified by the secondary data) and assign the score accordingly.

Social and economic conditions represent a serious barrier to the effective functioning of civil society. More than five of the following conditions are present: 1. Widespread poverty (e.g. more than 40% of people live on $2 per day) 2. (armed conflict in last 5 years) 3. Severe ethnic and/or religious conflict 4. Severe economic crisis (e.g. external debt is more than GNP) 5. Severe social crisis (rate of population affected by major natural disaster over last 2 years) 6. Severe socio-economic inequities (Gini coefficient > 0.4) 7. Pervasive adult illiteracy (over 40%) 8. Lack of IT infrastructure (i.e. less than 5 hosts per 10.000 inhabitants)	Score 0
Social and economic conditions significantly limit the effective functioning of civil society. Three, four or five of the conditions indicated are present.	Score 1
Social and economic conditions somewhat limit the effective functioning of civil society. One or two of the conditions indicated are present.	**Score 2**
Social and economic conditions do not represent a barrier to the effective functioning of civil society. None of the conditions indicated is present.	Score 3

2.4 - Socio-cultural context

Description: To what extent are socio-cultural norms and attitudes conducive or detrimental to civil society?

2.4.1 - Trust

Description: How much do members of society trust one another?

Relationships among members of society are characterised by mistrust (e.g. less than 10% of people score on the World Value Survey (WVS) trust indicator).	Score 0
There is widespread mistrust among members of society (e.g. 10% to 30% of people score on the WVS trust indicator).	**Score 1**
There is a moderate level of trust among members of society (e.g. 31% to 50% of people score on the WVS trust indicator).	Score 2
There is a high level of trust among members of society (e.g. more than 50% of people score on the WVS trust indicator).	Score 3

2.4.2 - Tolerance

Description: How tolerant are members of society?

Society is characterised by widespread intolerance (e.g. average score on WVS derived tolerance indicator is 3.0 or higher).	Score 0
Society is characterised by a low level of tolerance (e.g. indicator between 2.0 and 2.9).	**Score 1**
Society is characterised by a moderate level of tolerance (e.g. indicator between 1.0 and 1.9).	Score 2
Society is characterised by a high level of tolerance (e.g. indicator less than 1.0).	Score 3

2.4.3 - Public spiritedness[8]

Description: How strong is the sense of public spiritedness among members of society?

Very low level of public spiritedness in society (e.g. average score on WVS derived public spiritedness indicator is more than 3.5).	Score 0
Low level of public spiritedness (e.g. indicator between 2.6 and 3.5).	Score 1
Moderate level of public spiritedness (e.g. indicator between 1.5 and 2.5).	Score 2
High level of public spiritedness (e.g. indicator less than 1.5).	**Score 3**

8 The score is derived by averaging the means for the three variables (1. claiming government benefits, 2. avoiding a fare on public transport and 3. cheating on taxes).

2.5 - Legal environment

Description: To what extent is the existing legal environment enabling or disabling to civil society?

2.5.1 - CSO registration[9]

Description: How supportive is the CSO registration process? Is the process (1) simple, (2) quick, (3) inexpensive, (4) following legal provisions and (5) consistently applied?

The CSO registration process is not supportive at all. Four or five of the quality characteristics are absent.	Score 0
The CSO registration is not very supportive. Two or three quality characteristics are absent.	Score 1
The CSO registration process can be judged as relatively supportive. One quality characteristic is absent.	**Score 2**
The CSO registration process is supportive. None of the quality characteristics is absent.	Score 3

2.5.2 - Allowable advocacy activities

Description: To what extent are CSOs free to engage in advocacy / criticize government?

CSOs are not allowed to engage in advocacy or criticise the government.	Score 0
There are excessive and / or vaguely defined constraints on advocacy activities.	**Score 1**
Constraints on CSOs' advocacy activities are minimal and clearly defined, such as prohibitions on political campaigning.	Score 2
CSOs are permitted to freely engage in advocacy and criticism of government.	Score 3

2.5.3 - Tax laws favourable to CSOs

Description: How favourable is the tax system to CSOs? How narrow/broad is the range of CSOs that are eligible for tax exemptions, if any? How significant are these exemptions?

The tax system impedes CSOs. No tax exemption or preference of any kind is available for CSOs.	Score 0
The tax system is burdensome to CSOs. Tax exemptions or preferences are available only for a narrow range of CSOs (e.g. humanitarian organisations) or for limited sources of income (e.g. grants or donations).	**Score 1**
The tax system contains some incentives favouring CSOs. Only a narrow range of CSOs is excluded from tax exemptions, preferences and/or exemptions, or preferences are available from some taxes and some activities.	Score 2
The tax system provides favourable treatment for CSOs. Exemptions or preferences are available from a range of taxes and for a range of activities, limited only in appropriate circumstances.	Score 3

2.5.4 - Tax benefits for philanthropy

Description: How broadly available are tax deductions or credits, or other tax benefits, to encourage individual and corporate giving?

No tax benefits are available (to individuals or corporations) for charitable giving.	Score 0
Tax benefits are available for a very limited set of purposes or types of organisations.	**Score 1**
Tax benefits are available for a fairly broad set of purposes or types of organisations.	Score 2
Significant tax benefits are available for a broad set of purposes or types of organisations.	Score 3

9 This indicator combines a number of individual quality characteristics of the registration, namely whether the registration is (1) simple, (2) quick, (3) inexpensive, (4) following legal provisions and (5) consistently applied. The indicator scores are defined by how many of these five quality characteristics are existent/ absent.

2.6 - State-civil society relations (Score: 1)

Description: What is the nature and quality of relations between civil society and the state?

2.6.1 – Autonomy

Description: To what extent can civil society exist and function independently of the state? To what extent are CSOs free to operate without excessive government interference? Is government oversight reasonably designed and limited to protect legitimate public interests?

The state controls civil society.	Score 0
CSOs are subject to frequent unwarranted interference in their operations.	**Score 1**
The state accepts the existence of an independent civil society but CSOs are subject to occasional unwarranted government interference.	Score 2
CSOs operate freely. They are subject only to reasonable oversight linked to clear and legitimate public interests.	Score 3

2.6.2 - Dialogue

Description: To what extent does the state dialogue with civil society? How inclusive and institutionalized are the terms and rules of engagement, if they exist?

There is no meaningful dialogue between civil society and the state.	Score 0
The state only seeks to dialogue with a small sub-set of CSOs on an ad hoc basis.	**Score 1**
The state dialogues with a relatively broad range of CSOs but on a largely ad hoc basis.	Score 2
Mechanisms are in place to facilitate systematic dialogue between the state and a broad and diverse range of CSOs.	Score 3

2.6.3 - Cooperation / support

Description: How narrow/broad is the range of CSOs that receive state resources (in the form of grants, contracts, etc.)?

The level of state resources channelled through CSOs is insignificant.	Score 0
Only a very limited range of CSOs receives state resources.	**Score 1**
A moderate range of CSOs receives state resources.	Score 2
The state channels significant resources to a large range of CSOs.	Score 3

2.7 - Private sector-civil society relations (Score: 1)

Description: What is the nature and quality of relations between civil society and the private sector?

2.7.1 - Private sector attitude

Description: What is the general attitude of the private sector towards civil society actors?

Generally hostile	Score 0
Generally indifferent	**Score 1**
Generally positive	Score 2
Generally supportive	Score 3

2.7.2 - Corporate social responsibility

Description: How developed are notions and actions of corporate social responsibility?

Major companies show no concern about the social and environmental impacts of their operations.	Score 0
Major companies pay lip service to notions of corporate social responsibility. However, in their operations they frequently disregard negative social and environmental impacts.	**Score 1**
Major companies are beginning to take the potential negative social and environmental impacts of their operations into account.	Score 2
Major companies take effective measures to protect against negative social and environmental impacts.	Score 3

2.7.3 - Corporate philanthropy[10]

Description: How narrow/broad is the range of CSOs that receive support from the private sector?

Corporate philanthropy is insignificant.	Score 0
Only a very limited range of CSOs receives funding from the private sector.	**Score 1**
A moderate range of CSOs receives funding from the private sector.	Score 2
The private sector channels resources to a large range of CSOs.	Score 3

3 – VALUES (SCORE: 1.3)

3.1 – Democracy (Score: 1)

Description: To what extent do civil society actors practice and promote democracy?

3.1.1 - Democratic practices within CSOs

Description: To what extent do CSOs practice internal democracy? How much control do members have over decision-making? Are leaders selected through democratic elections?

A large majority (i.e. more than 75%) of CSOs do not practice internal democracy (e.g. members have little / no control over decision-making, CSOs are characterised by patronage, nepotism).	Score 0
A majority of CSOs (i.e. more than 50%) do not practice internal democracy (e.g. members have little/no control over decision-making, CSOs are characterised by patronage, nepotism).	**Score 1**
A majority of CSOs (i.e. more than 50%) practice internal democracy (e.g. members have significant control over decision-making; leaders are selected through democratic elections).	Score 2
A large majority of CSOs (i.e. more than 75%) practice internal democracy (e.g. members have significant control over decision-making; leaders are selected through democratic elections).	Score 3

3.1.2 – Civil society actions to promote democracy

Description: How much does civil society actively promote democracy at a societal level?

No active role. No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
Only a few CS activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by CS as a whole.	**Score 1**
A number of CS activities can be detected. Broad-based support and / or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking	Score 2
CS is a driving force in promoting a democratic society. CS activities in this area enjoy broad-based support and / or strong public visibility.	Score 3

10 The NAG's task in scoring the indicator is to assess the significance of corporate support to civil society. Here, the score descriptions focus on two elements: (1) the overall size of corporate support to civil society and (2) the range of CSOs supported by the corporate sector. Both elements are combined in the indicator score descriptions.

3.2 – Transparency (Score: 1.3)

Description: To what extent do civil society actors practice and promote transparency?

3.2.1 - Corruption within civil society

Description: How widespread is corruption within CS?

Instances of corrupt behaviour within CS are very frequent.	**Score 0**
Instances of corrupt behaviour within CS are frequent.	Score 1
There are occasional instances of corrupt behaviour within CS.	**Score 2**
Instances of corrupt behaviour within CS are very rare.	Score 3

3.2.2 - Financial transparency of CSOs

Description: How many CSOs are financially transparent? What percentage of CSOs make their financial accounts publicly available?

A small minority of CSOs (less than 30%) make their financial accounts publicly available.	**Score 0**
A minority of CSOs (30% -50%) make their financial accounts publicly available.	**Score 1**
A small majority of CSOs (51% -65%) make their financial accounts publicly available.	**Score 2**
A large majority of CSOs (more than 65%) make their financial accounts publicly available.	Score 3

3.2.3 – Civil society actions to promote transparency

Description: How much does civil society actively promote government and corporate transparency?

No active role. No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	**Score 0**
Only a few CS activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by CS as a whole.	**Score 1**
A number of CS activities in this area can be detected. Broad-based support and/ or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.	**Score 2**
CS is a driving force in demanding government and corporate transparency. CS activities in this area enjoy broad-based support and / or strong public visibility.	Score 3

3.3 – Tolerance (Score: 1)

Description: To what extent do civil society actors and organisations practice and promote tolerance?

3.3.1 Tolerance within the civil society arena

Description: To what extent is civil society a tolerant arena?

CS is dominated by intolerant forces. The expression of only a narrow sub-set of views is tolerated.	**Score 0**
Significant forces within civil society do not tolerate others' views without encountering protest from civil society at large.	**Score 1**
There are some intolerant forces within civil society, but they are isolated from civil society at large.	**Score 2**
Civil society is an open arena where the expression of all viewpoints is actively encouraged. Intolerant behaviour is strongly denounced by civil society at large.	Score 3

3.3.2 – Civil society actions to promote tolerance

Description: How much does civil society actively promote tolerance at a societal level?

No active role. No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
Only a few CS activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by CS as a whole.	**Score 1**
A number of CS activities in this area can be detected. Broad-based support and/ or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.	Score 2
CS is a driving force in promoting a tolerant society. CS activities in this area enjoy broad-based support and / or strong public visibility.	Score 3

3.4 - Non-violence (Score: 1.5)

Description: To what extent do civil society actors practice and promote non-violence?

3.4.1 - Non-violence within the civil society arena

Description: How widespread is the use of violent means (such as damage to property or personal violence) among civil society actors to express their interests in the public sphere?

Significant mass-based groups within CS use violence as the primary means of expressing their interests.	Score 0
Some isolated groups within CS regularly use violence to express their interests without encountering protest from civil society at large.	Score 1
Some isolated groups within CS occasionally resort to violent actions, but are broadly denounced by CS at large.	**Score 2**
There is a high level of consensus within CS regarding the principle of non-violence. Acts of violence by CS actors are extremely rare and strongly denounced.	Score 3

3.4.2 – Civil society actions to promote non-violence and peace

Description: How much does civil society actively promote a non-violent society? For example, how much does civil society support the non-violent resolution of social conflicts and peace? Address issues of violence against women, child abuse, violence among youths etc.?

No active role. No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected. Some CS actions actually contribute to societal violence.	Score 0
Only a few CS activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by CS as a whole.	**Score 1**
A number of CS activities in this area can be detected. Broad-based support and / or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.	Score 2
CS is a driving force in promoting a non-violent society. CS actions in this area enjoy broad-based support and / or strong public visibility	Score 3

3.5 - Gender equity (Score: 1.5)

Description: To what extent do civil society actors practice and promote gender equity?

3.5.1 - Gender equity within the civil society arena

Description: To what extent is civil society a gender equitable arena?

Women are excluded from civil society leadership roles.	Score 0
Women are largely absent from civil society leadership roles.	**Score 1**
Women are under-represented in civil society leadership positions.	Score 2
Women are equitably represented as leaders and members of CS.	Score 3

3.5.2 - Gender equitable practices within CSOs

Description: How much do CSOs practice gender equity? What percentage of CSOs with paid employees have policies in place to ensure gender equity?

A small minority (less than 20%)	Score 0
A minority (20%-50%)	Score 1
A small majority (51%-65%)	**Score 2**
A large majority (more than 65%)	Score 3

3.5.3 – Civil society actions to promote gender equity

Description: How much does civil society actively promote gender equity at the societal level?

No active role. No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected. Some CS actions actually contribute to gender inequity.	Score 0
Only a few CS activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by CS as a whole.	Score 1
A number of CS activities in this area can be detected. Broad-based support and / or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.	**Score 2**
CS is a driving force in promoting a gender equitable society. CS activities in this area enjoy broad-based support and / or strong public visibility.	Score 3

3.6 - Poverty eradication (Score: 1)

Description: To what extent do civil society actors promote poverty eradication?

3.6.1 – Civil society actions to eradicate poverty

Description: To what extent does civil society actively seek to eradicate poverty?

No active role. No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected. Some CS actions serve to sustain existing economic inequities.	Score 0
Only a few CS activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by CS as a whole.	**Score 1**
A number of CS activities in this area can be detected. Broad-based support and / or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.	Score 2
CS is a driving force in the struggle to eradicate poverty. CS activities in this area enjoy broad-based support and / or strong public visibility.	Score 3

3.7 - Environmental sustainability (Score: 2)

Description: To what extent do civil society actors practice and promote environmental sustainability?

3.7.1 – Civil society actions to sustain the environment

Description: How much does civil society actively seek to sustain the environment?

No active role. No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected. Some CS actions serve to reinforce unsustainable practices.	Score 0
Only a few CS activities in this area can be detected. Their visibility is low and these issues are not attributed much importance by CS as a whole.	Score 1
A number of CS activities in this area can be detected. Broad-based support and / or public visibility of such initiatives, however, are lacking.	**Score 2**
CS is a driving force in protecting the environment. CS activities in this area enjoy broad-based support and / or strong public visibility.	Score 3

4 - IMPACT (SCORE: 1.3)

4.1 - Influencing public policy (Score: 1.3)

Description: **How active and successful is civil society in influencing public policy?**

4.1.1 - Human Rights Impact

Description: How active and successful is civil society in influencing public policy in the area of human rights (freedom of speech)?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	Score 1
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	**Score 2**
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.1.2 - Social Policy Impact

Description: How active and successful is civil society in influencing public policy in the area of social policies (unemployment)?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	**Score 1**
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	Score 2
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.1.3 - Civil Society's Impact on National Budgeting process Case Study

Description: How active and successful is civil society in influencing the overall national budgeting process?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and focused only on specific budget components.[11]	**Score 1**
Civil society is active in the overall budgeting process, but impact is limited.	Score 2
Civil society plays an important role in the overall budgeting process. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.2 - Holding state and private corporations accountable (Score: 1)

Description: **How active and successful is civil society in holding the state and private corporations accountable?**

4.2.1 - Holding state accountable

Description: How active and successful is civil society in monitoring state performance and holding the state accountable?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	**Score 1**
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	Score 2
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

11 The term "specific budget component" refers to a single issue or sub-section of the budget, such as the defence budget or welfare grants. Higher scores are assigned for those civil society activities, which provide an analysis, input and advocacy work on the overall budget.

4.2.2 - Holding private corporations accountable

Description: How active and successful is civil society in holding private corporations accountable?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	**Score 1**
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	Score 2
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.3 - Responding to social interests (Score: 1)

Description: How much are civil society actors responding to social interests?

4.3.1 - Responsiveness

Description: How effectively do civil society actors respond to priority social concerns?

Civil society actors are out of touch with the crucial concerns of the population.	Score 0
There are frequent examples of crucial social concerns that did not find a voice among existing civil society actors.	**Score 1**
There are isolated examples of crucial social concerns that did not find a voice among existing civil society actors.	Score 2
Civil society actors are very effective in taking up the crucial concerns of the population.	Score 3

4.3.2 - Public Trust

Description: What percentage of the population has trust in civil society actors?

A small minority (< 25%)	Score 0
A large minority (25%-50%)	**Score 1**
A small majority (51%-75%)	Score 2
A large majority (> 75%)	Score 3

4.4 - Empowering citizens (Score: 1.4)

Description: How active and successful is civil society in empowering citizens, especially traditionally marginalised groups, to shape decisions that affect their lives?

4.4.1 - Informing/ educating citizens

Description: How active and successful is civil society in informing and educating citizens on public issues?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	**Score 1**
Civil society is active in this area but impact is limited.	Score 2
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.4.2 - Building capacity for collective action

Description: How active and successful is civil society in building the capacity of people to organise themselves, mobilise resources and work together to solve common problems?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	**Score 1**
Civil society is active in this area but impact is limited.	Score 2
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.4.3 - Empowering marginalized people

Description: How active and successful is civil society in empowering marginalized people?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	Score 1
Civil society is active in this area but impact is limited.	**Score 2**
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.4.4 - Empowering women

Description: How active and successful is civil society in empowering women, i.e. to give them real choice and control over their lives?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	Score 1
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	**Score 2**
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.4.5 - Building social capital

Description: To what extent does civil society build social capital among its members? How do levels of trust, tolerance and public spiritedness of members of civil society compare to those of non-members?

Civil society diminishes the stock of social capital in society.	Score 0
Civil society does not contribute to building social capital in society.	Score 1
Civil society does contribute moderately to building social capital in society.	Score 2
Civil Society does contribute strongly to building social capital in society.	Score 3

4.4.6 - Supporting livelihoods

Description: How active and successful is civil society in creating / supporting employment and/or income-generating opportunities (especially for poor people and women)?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	**Score 1**
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	Score 2
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.5 - Meeting societal needs (Score: 2)

Description: How active and successful is civil society in meeting societal needs, especially those of poor people and other marginalised groups?

4.5.1 - Lobbying for state service provision

Description: How active and successful is civil society in lobbying the government to meet pressing societal needs?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	Score 1
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	**Score 2**
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.5.2 - Meeting pressing societal needs directly

Description: How active and successful is civil society in directly meeting pressing societal needs (through service delivery or the promotion of self-help initiatives)?

No CS activity of any consequence in this area can be detected.	Score 0
CS activity in this area is very limited and there is no discernible impact.	Score 1
Civil society is active in this area, but impact is limited.	**Score 2**
Civil society plays an important role. Examples of significant success / impact can be detected.	Score 3

4.5.3 - Meeting needs of disadvantaged groups

Description: To what extent are CSOs more or less effective than the state in delivering services to disadvantaged groups?

CSOs are less effective than the state.	Score 0
CSOs are as effective as the state.	Score 1
CSOs are slightly more effective than the state.	Score 2
CSOs are significantly more effective than the state.	Score 3

Bibliography

Adaman, Carkoglu, Senatalar; (2001-2004) Society's Perception of Public Administration, Public Services and Reform, Istanbul, TESEV.

Anheier, H. K. (2004) Civil Society: Measurement, Evaluation, Policy. London, Earthscan.

Aksit, Tabakoglu and Serdar (2002) "Civil Society Caught between/ Developed in: Nation-state, Globalization and Community"

ARI Movement and Infakto Research, (2006) "Turkish Society and Social Capital"

Aydin and Keyman, (2005) European Integration and Democratization in Turkey, Brussels, CEPS.

Bianet (2003) "Freedom of Media and Independent Journalism Watch and News Network Project"

Bianet (2005) "Undemocratic Clauses in the new Turkish Penal Code"

Bikmen F. (2004) "Fundraising and NGOs in Turkey" Ankara, CSDP.

Carkoglu, A. (2006) "Trends in Individual Giving and Foundation Practices in Turkey" in Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and the Pursuit of Social Justice, TUSEV Publications, Istanbul.

Celik, Aziz and Kuvvet Lordoglu. (2005)"On some problems of Turkey's official unionism" Presentation given at the State Statistics Institute, 5-6 May 2005, Ankara.

CIA World Fact Book (2005) www. cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/tv.html

Civil Society Development Program (STGP) (2003) "Needs Assessments Report"

Corporate Volunteer Council (OGSD) and Akademetre (2005) "Volunteering in Turkey and in the Private Sector"

Dikmen, A. A. (ed.) (2002) Political Thought and Modernization in the Republican Period, Turkey's Social Sciences Association and Imaj Publication, Ankara.

Doster, N. (2001) Ozgur Politika interview on women's issues in Turkey

Edwards, M. (2004) Civil Society, London, Polity.

Ehrenberg, J. (1999) Civil Society: the critical history of an idea, New York, NYU Press.

EM-DAT International Disaster Database, (2005) www.em-dat.net/disasters/country.php

Esmer, Yılmaz (1999) World Values Survey.

European Commission (2003) "Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession" COM (2003) final.

European Commission (2004) "Regular Report on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession" COM (2004) 657, final.

Flying Broom (2003) Women Organizations in Turkey Database.

Freedom House (2005) Country Report for Turkey, www. freedomhouse.org

Gulcur (1999) WWHR-New Ways Domestic Violence Field Survey.

Heinrich, V. F. (2004) Assessing and Strengthening Civil Society Worldwide. A Project Description of the CIVICUS Civil Society Index: A Participatory Needs Assessment and Action- Planning Tool for Society. Johannesburg: CIVICUS.

International Telecommunication Union (ITU) (2003) Internet Indicators www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/statistics/at_glance/Interneto3.pdf

Keyman and Icduygu, (2005) Citizenship in a Global World, London, Routledge.

Keyman, F. (2001) Turkey and Radical Democracy, Istanbul, Alfa.

Keyman, F. (2006) State Problem in Turkey, Istanbul, Bilgi University Publications.

Marshall and Gurr. (2003) Peace and Conflict Ledger, Centre for International Development& Conflict Management (CIDCM).

Navaie, ArtDevelopment.Net, (2004) "How much is Turkey volunteering? Study"

ODTU "Structure and participation problems in women's groups" ODTU Development Journal 1998, vol. 25, 559 – 583.

Ozbudun, E. (2000) Contemporary Turkish Politics, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Pope and Pope, (1997) Turkey Unveiled, London, John Murray.

PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Dataset Version 3.0, (2004) www.prio.no/cwp/armedconflict/current/

armedconflicts.xls

TESEV (2004) Household Survey Study, Istanbul, TESEV.

TESEV (2004) "Public's Perception of Public Services and Reform", Istanbul, TESEV.

TESEV (2004) "Civil Society National Budget Monitoring Report", Istanbul, TESEV.

Toksoz, F. (2004) "Developing Civil Society", Economics Journal, Istanbul.

Tosun (2000) Participation within Civil Society and Democracy within Organizations.

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (2004) www.transparency.org/cpi/2004/cpi2004.en.html#cpi2004

TUSEV and ICNL (2004) "Associations Law, Foundations Law and Public Benefit Law Comparative Reports", Unpublished.

UNDP Human Development Report (2005) hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_HDI.pdf

UNICEF and European Commission (2003) "Leave No Child Out – Need Evaluation Report"

UNICEF and the Turkish Ministry of Domestic Affaires, (2003) "Standards of Living Survey"

USAID (2003) Central & Eastern Europe and Eurasia NGO Sustainability Index www. usaid.gov/locations/europe_eurasia/dem_gov/n

US Department of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (2003) Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Turkey

Ustel F. (2005) In Search of the Ideal Citizen, İstanbul, İletişim.

Usterci, (2002) Civil Society and Nationalism in Turkey.

White, Jenny B. Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics. University of Washington Press, 2002.

Wikipedia (2006) Wikipedia Article, "Politics and Government of Turkey" en. wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_of_Turkey

World Bank (2002) World Bank Social Justice Report for Turkey.

World Bank (2004) World Development Indicators (WDI).

Zurcher, E. (2004) Turkey: A Modern History, London, Tauris, 2004.

Country Report Inputs

TUSEV (2006) "Civil Society in Turkey: A Qualitative Analysis".

TUSEV (2006) "Corporate Social Responsibility Study".

TUSEV (2006) "Media Analysis of Civil Society in Turkey".

TUSEV (2006) "An Analysis of the Impact of Civil Society on Freedom of Speech".

TUSEV (2006) "Civil Society and the National Budgeting Process in Turkey".

TUSEV (2006) "The State of Social Policies and Civil Society in Turkey (Unemployment)".

About TUSEV

TUSEV's Program Areas

Civil Society Law Reform. The legal framework and environment is essential for an active and dynamic civil society. TUSEV's role in this capacity is to support and promote reforms by providing consultative input to draft laws, publishing reports on best practices in civil society law in cooperation with international experts (International Center for Not for Profit Law/ICNL), and engaging dialogue and cooperation among government officials and civil society organizations. TUSEV also provides one-to-one legal technical support for civil society organizations and provides training on laws and regulations. Since its establishment in 1993, TUSEV has published a number of articles, reports and other publications in Turkish and English on subjects related to associations and foundations law, tax law, public benefit status and government cooperation frameworks. TUSEV regularly organizes roundtables, seminars and site visits, and was the host organization for ICNL's Global Forum on Civil Society Law in 2005 which brought over 100 representatives from 60 countries together.

Research on Civil Society and Philanthropy. Research on the third sector in Turkey is vital to raising awareness about the sector; assessing strengths and challenges; and galvanizing action to address needs, strengthen capacity and build civil society organizations' role in society. In partnership with leading academic institutions and global partners, TUSEV actively organizes and conducts extensive research projects to examine current trends in civil society development and philanthropy. In 2006 TUSEV published the Civil Society Index Country Report for Turkey, in partnership with CIVICUS, and Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and the Pursuit of Social Justice with support from Ford Foundation. TUSEV's board and staff members are regular contributors to several national and international journals on civil society and philanthropy.

Promoting Philanthropy. Increasing the effectiveness and flow of resources to the third sector is essential to creating vibrant and successful civil society organizations. Donations and grants are also vital to enchaining of civic participation and cooperation. TUSEV promotes this practice and introduces new approaches by publishing reports and convening government, private and third sector actors to explore new mechanisms which can enable charitable giving for civil society organizations Turkey. TUSEV's cooperation with national organizations such as the Corporate Volunteer Association and international partners such as Charities Aid Foundation, and WINGS (Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support) has helped to generate action around creating more effective strategies and mechanisms for philanthropy in Turkey.

International Relations and Networking. Civil society organizations are increasingly active in building international networks to exchange best practices, ideas and create common platforms for cooperation. TUSEV actively participates in the global civil society community as a member of the European Foundation Center, CIVICUS and the WINGS network. TUSEV attends

and hosts international conferences promoting civil society development. TUSEV's increasing library of English publications allows for greater sharing of information and perspectives about the third sector in Turkey with the international community.

OUR TRUSTEES

19 May University Development Foundation

21st Century Education and Cultural Foundation

Adnan Menderes University Foundation

Agean Culture Foundation

Alarko Education and Culture Foundation

Anadolu Education and Social Assistance Foundation*

Anatolian University Development Foundation

Ankara Ataturk Schools Education Foundation

Ankara Science Schools Foundation

Ankara Young Businessmen's Association

Antalya Foundation for Orphans and Needy Children

ARI Movement Association

Asim Kocabiyik Education Foundation

Association for the Research of Women's Social Status

Association of Benevolent Persons

ASV Hospital Foundation

Aydin Dogan Foundation*

Birkokler Foundation

Bornova Anatolian High School Education Foundation

Bosphorus University Foundation*

Bursa Coskonuz Education and Culture Foundation

Celal Bayar Foundation

Celik Gulersoy Foundation

Cemiyeti Hayriye Foundation

Cerrahpasa Medical Faculty Foundation

Cimentas Health and Education Foundation

Contemporary Education Foundation

Cooling/Heating Mechanisms Research Foundation

Cukurova Media Society

Darussafaka Society

Denizli Foundation for the Protection of Orphans and the Needy

Development Foundation of Turkey

Dr. Nejat Eczacibasi Foundation*

Education, Health and Research Studies Foundation

Elginkan Foundation

ENKA Sports, Education and Social Assistance Foundation*

Erol Kerim Aksoy Education, Cultural, Health and Sports Foundation

Eye Health Protection Foundation

Fevzi Akkaya Basic Education Foundation

Fevziye Schools Foundation

Foundation for the Protection of Children

Gaziantep College Foundation

Hacettepe University Development Foundation

Haci Omer Sabanci Foundation*

Haydarpasa Schools Education Foundation

Heart Surgeons Foundation

Hisar Education Foundation*

Humanitarian Foundation

İhsan Doğramaci Foundation*

Inonu Foundation

Istanbul Boys High Schools Foundation

Istanbul Civil Servants Foundation

Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts*

Istanbul Technical University Development Foundation

Istanbul Technical University Foundation

Istanbul University Cardiology Research Foundation*

Izzet Baysal Foundation

Kadikoy Health and Education Center Foundation

Kocaeli Education and Youth Foundation

Kocaeli Education and Youth Foundation

Lises Foundation

Marmara University Contemporary Studies Foundation

*(founders)

Marmara University Medical Faculty Foundation
Marmara University Nihad Sayar Education Foundation
Marmara University Technology Foundation
MESS Education Foundation
Middle East and Balkan Studies Foundation
Mother Child Education Foundation
Publishing Industry Education Foundation
Sema Yazar Youth Foundation
Sevda Cenap And Music Foundation
Social Assistance and Retirement Foundation
Spastic Children's Foundation
State Theatre, Opera and Ballet Studies Foundation
TED Ankara College Foundation
TED Black Sea Eregli College Foundation
TEVDAK Education Foundation*
Tevfik Fikret Education Foundation
Turkish Aviation Society
Turkish Cancer Foundation
Turkish Chemical Society
Turkish Education Association
Turkish Education Foundation*
Turkish Education Volunteers Foundation
Turkish Family Health and Planning Foundation*
Turkish Family Planning Association
Turkish Foundation for Assisting the Needy and Destitute
Turkish Foundation for Soil Erosion, Reforestation and Protection of Natural Habitats
Turkish Gastroenterological Association
Turkish Kidney Foundation
Turkish Lions Foundation
Turkish Maritime Education Foundation
Turkish National Federation of Tuberculosis Association
Turkish Petrol Foundation*
Turkish Red Crescent Association
Turkish Retired Civilians Association
Turkish Retired Policemen's Social Support Association
Turkish Retired Teachers Association
Turkish State Hospital and Patient Assistance Foundation
Turkish Technology Development Foundation
Turkish Women's Associations Federation
Turkish-German Assistance and Education Foundation
Türkiyem Foundation
TUSIAD Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen's Association*
Umut Foundation
Urgent Need Project Foundation
Vehbi Koc Foundation*
White Point Foundation
Yasar Education and Cultural Foundation*
Yildiz Technical University Foundation

TUSEV's trustees share a vision of strengthening the legal, fiscal and operational capacity of the third sector in Turkey. With over 100 supporting foundations, TUSEV has been contributing to improving civil society laws, generating research about the sector, and encouraging dialogue and cooperation among private, public and non-profit actors since 1993.

TUSEV pursues 5 main objectives in strengthening the third sector:

- Enhancing the capacity of civil society organizations
- Creating an enabling environment
- Promoting individual and corporate philanthropy
- Facilitating dialogue among private, public and non profit actors
- Strengthening linkages with global civil society actors and promoting awareness about the third sector in Turkey in the international community

TÜSEV (Third Sector Foundation of Turkey)
Bankalar Caddesi Minerva Han No 2 Kat 5 34420 Karaköy, İstanbul Turkey
Tel +90 212 243 83 07 **Fax** +90 212 243 83 05 **email** info@tusev.org.tr **web** www.tusev.org.tr