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PREFACE

This is one in a series of Country Reports produced under the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (JHU/CNP), a collaborative effort by scholars around the world to understand the scope, structure, financing, and role of the nonprofit sector using a common framework and approach. Begun in 1991 in 13 countries, the project continues to expand, currently encompassing more than 40 countries.

The Country Reports are typically disseminated locally to report on the findings of our work and put them into comparative context for the benefit of country stakeholders. Prior to their incorporation in the book series that the Project has generated, these reports are also released Working Papers of the JHU/CNP Project for initial dissemination to an international audience of scholars, practitioners, and policy analysts interested in the social and economic role played by nonprofit organizations in different countries, and in the comparative analysis of these important, but often neglected, institutions. Prior versions of these Working Papers are available at ccss.jhu.edu.

The production of these Country Reports owes much to the devoted efforts of our project staff. The present paper benefited greatly from the contributions of Senior Research Associate S. Wojciech Sokolowski and CNP Project Manager Megan A. Haddock as well as of our lead Local Associate in Turkey, Dr. Mustafa Ozer. On behalf of the project's core staff, I also want to express our deep gratitude to our project colleagues around the world and to the many sponsors of the project over its lifetime.

The present Country Report was completed in July of 2015 and made available to officials at Turkey's Anadolu University, our partner in this project, for local dissemination. For a variety of reasons, the originally planned dissemination events did not occur. Subsequently, some additional data became available that we judged germane to providing an accurate view of nonprofit realities in Turkey, and that additional data has now been incorporated in this new version of that original report. It should be noted, however, that aside from the incorporation of this additional data, no attempt has been made to update this report to take account of the somewhat dramatic developments that have transpired in Turkey in the intervening months.

As is customary, the views and opinions expressed in this and our other Country Reports and Working Papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of the institutions with which they are affiliated, the Johns Hopkins University, its Institute for Health and Social Policy and Center for Civil Society Studies, any of their officers or supporters, the series' editors, or any organizations that have supported their work.

We are delighted to be able to make the major results of this project available in this form and welcome comments and inquiries either about this paper or the project as a whole.

Dr. Lester M. Salamon
Project Director
Foreword

This is a comprehensive report on civil society organizations (CSOs) in Turkey, and presents the findings of several years’ worth of work. It is a thorough study of the definition, legal environment, history, policy, size, scope, activities, and financing of the sector. It thus represents the only report of its kind on CSOs in Turkey. The report is part of the Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, the oldest and largest project of its kind.

This study underlines the weaknesses of the nonprofit sector in Turkey. Firstly, it is underdeveloped and therefore its share of the economy is very low. Secondly, citizen participation in CSOs is weak, both quantitatively and qualitatively. There are historical/political, societal, and economic reasons behind these weaknesses. Historically speaking, civil society as a formal sector in Turkey only truly started developing since the 1990s. Before that, civil society was mainly shaped by the experience of charity culture during the pre-republican period and of the politicization during the republican period. The authoritarian state has always been an important obstacle for civil society development and the participation of citizen in CSOs. Therefore, for a very long time there was not a mature and prevalent civil society culture in Turkey. At the same time, it only emerged in recent decades and has thus not matured enough to be a strong counter-force to the state.

In this context we can also state that the nonprofit sector is not yet attractive for citizens to work for, volunteer for, or participate in. In its current immature form, the sector is largely unable to generate the economic force needed to draw attention to itself and attract workers and volunteers. This situation is strongly exacerbated by the low levels of state support to nonprofits. Where the Turkish people do participate in the sector, their participation depends mostly on self-sacrifice.

The picture presented in this report provides a convenient basis for civil society discussions. It furthermore tries to argue why the civil society sector in Turkey today developed the way it did, i.e., it is the result of historical forces that have shaped its development.

While the sector is small in comparison to other countries, Turkey’s civil society is not a prisoner of its history, and there are concrete steps that can be taken to strengthen it and help it to grow. Civil society organizations themselves need to embrace certain changes, and important changes in the current policy environment would go a long way in furthering its development.

We hope that civil society organizations and policy-makers will use this report as an opportunity to embrace the changes that are needed to strengthen the sector. An important element here is the institutionalization of data collection and reporting on the nonprofit sector and volunteering by the Turkish National Statistics Office so that regular updates of these data may be available to gauge progress over time. The 2004 and 2005 EU Progress
Reports\(^1\) stressed that the government's steps towards liberalization of civil society-state relations were satisfactory. The Report noted that since the Helsinki Summit in 1999, in which Turkey gained EU-candidate status, and especially after the 2002 General Elections, the AK Party Government made important institutional reforms towards the development of democracy, empowering the civil sphere over military tutelage, and strengthened civil society through legal and administrative arrangements.\(^2\)

**Mehmet Ali Çalışkan**
YADA Foundation
Chair, Turkey CNP Advisory Committee

---

\(^1\) Reports of the European Commission in which Commission services present their assessment of what each candidate and potential candidate has achieved over the last year; reports for Turkey available at: [ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm).

Executive Summary

The Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project is the first of its kind to measure the economic size of the nonprofit or civil society sector in Turkey, and to compare this sector to its counterparts in other countries.

The principal findings include the following:

1) Turkish civil society organizations employ 369,045 full-time equivalent (FTE) workers and volunteers, or 1.4% of the country's total workforce. While significant in the aggregate, this puts Turkey well below the 5.2% average share of the workforce among the 42 countries covered by the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project.

2) Of the 369,045 FTE workers in the Turkish civil society workforce, 47,378 are full-time equivalent volunteer workers (about 13% of the entire civil society workforce), while the remaining 87% are paid employees.

3) A majority (53%) of the civil society workforce in Turkey is engaged in the provision of human services—including health care, social assistance and education. The remainder perform a variety of expressive functions, including recreation, culture, and interest representation.

4) The main source of civil society financial support in Turkey is income from fees (including market sales, membership dues and investment income). These sources account, on average, for about 65% of total revenues. Private philanthropy accounts for about 27% of overall Turkish civil society organization revenue—a share that is much higher than the international average (15%). By contrast, the government share of civil society organization support in Turkey, at about 8%, is significantly below the international average of 35%.

The relatively small size of the civil society workforce in Turkey, the below-average volunteer share of that workforce, and the low share of government payments in civil society revenue suggest that Turkey resembles countries in the “statist” pattern of civil society development as defined by the social origins theory of civil society development. According to research carried out by the Johns Hopkins University team, this pattern tends to emerge in countries with top-down, state-led economic development policies that constrain the growth of the civil society sector. Countries exhibiting this pattern include Japan, Russia, Mexico, and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.
Turkey has a long tradition of charity (zakat) stemming largely from the religious faith of its people. This tradition took institutional form in the creation of philanthropic foundations, or waqfs, organized independently from the state, and creating social networks outside of the political and economic realm. Despite this, however, the civil society sector in Turkey today is quite small—it engages only about 1.4% of the country’s economically active population. This surprising finding emerges from the first systematic, empirical study of the Turkish civil society sector ever undertaken.3

As is common in many countries, the concept of civil society as a unified sector is not fully recognized in popular perceptions in Turkey. Rather, different types of organizations—such as associations, foundations, universities, hospitals, human service organizations, labor unions, or business associations—have their own separate “collective identities” rather than being seen as a part of a larger civil society sector.

This study adopts a broad concept of the civil society sector that includes a wide range of organizational forms that meet a core definition formulated by the international team of experts involved in the Johns Hopkins University Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (JHU/CNP). Implemented now in 44 countries (including Turkey), the CNP is the world’s largest, most systematic, comparative study of the empirical dimensions of the civil society sector ever undertaken. As has been the case for each country that has implemented this project, the findings reported here were assembled by a local research team from the Anadolu University that tested and applied the definition of the civil society sector and methodology developed by the JHU/CNP and its global partners.4

This report presents the empirical dimensions of the civil society sector in Turkey and places them in the context of 41 other countries on which both employment and revenue data are available.5 The methodology for this study contemplated four primary research stages:

1) Identification of the organizations considered to be part of the civil society sector in Turkey, as defined by the JHU/CNP;
2) Compilation of statistical data on the overall dimensions of the sector;
3) Analysis of the institutional context in which the sector developed, including a study of the sector’s legal framework, its historical origins, and its relationships with public policy; and
4) Preparation of this final report.

---

4 For a listing of the personnel involved in the research drawn on for this report, see the frontmatter of this report.
5 Revenue data are not available for two JHU/CNP countries – Egypt and Morocco.
This report also explains the seemingly paradoxical findings by examining the social-political forces that shaped Turkish civil society institutions, as proposed by the social origins theory of civil society development. By examining the history of the development of civil society in Turkey, this theory shows that Turkish civil society was shaped by a configuration of forces characteristic of the “statist” pattern, observed in Eastern Europe, Russia, Japan, and Mexico. The civil society sector in Turkey, we argue, is smaller than average because the state bureaucracy prioritized policies aiming to accelerate the industrialization and modernization of the economy, while keeping in check potential challengers to these policies by restricting freedom of assembly. These policies negatively impacted the growth of Turkish civil society.

This report is organized into five chapters. The first chapter examines the JHU/CNP’s concepts and definitions, and their application in the context of Turkey. The second chapter presents the study’s main quantitative findings. The third chapter identifies the pattern of civil society development evident in the Turkey data and tests the ability of the “social origins theory” formulated elsewhere in this project to explain this pattern. The fourth chapter discusses the key policy issues for civil society development in Turkey today. Finally, the fifth chapter summarizes the implications that flow from the study’s findings. Information on the methodology and data sources used in the study are provided in Annex I.
Chapter 1
Defining the Scope of Turkey’s Civil Society Sector

No overarching consensus definition of the civil society sector exists in Turkey, and different terms are used to describe the sector. Not only have these terms changed in different eras of Turkish history, but the lack of a clear and all-around legal description of “nonprofit organizations” as a general category makes it difficult for some to conceptualize the variety of legal forms as a collective group. More commonly, different types of organizations and legal forms, such as associations, foundations, universities, hospitals, human service organizations, labor unions, or business associations have their own separate “collective identities” rather than being seen as part of a larger civil society sector.

The most common term used to characterize the organizational structures in Turkey that would be considered part of the civil society sector by the JHU/CNP are “civil society organizations” (Sivil Toplum Kuruluşu/Örgütü [STK or STÖ]), followed by “voluntary organizations” (Gönüllü kuruluşlar [VO]), and then in rare cases “third sector organizations” (Üçüncü sektör [TSOs]). In Turkey, neither the concept of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) nor nonprofit organizations (NPOs) is widely used.

At a legal level, there is no full and particular coding of “nonprofit,” “social economy,” “non-statutory,” “public-serving,” “third,” “associational,” “voluntary,” “non-governmental,” “civil society” sector. Associations, foundations, unions, chambers, and cooperatives are lawfully defined, separate categories, with their own laws, regulations, and by-laws, but they are not seen as part of a larger legally-defined group.

As in most other countries covered in the JHU/CNP study, it was therefore necessary to locate in the Turkish reality the set of institutions that met the defining features of “nonprofit organizations” that the JHU/CNP developed through a bottom-up approach formulated by the Local Associates from the first 13 countries to join the project, and subsequently tested in each of the countries to join the project afterward.

This definition was designed to accommodate the diversity of organizations considered part of the sector in different countries, but also narrow enough to differentiate these organizations from those of the private for-profit sector or the State.

---

6 This chapter draws on the working paper by Kasım Akbaş, “Nonprofit Law in Turkey,” Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, No. 51. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies, 2014. Available at: ccss.jhu.edu/publications-findings/?did=423; references to sources used in this section are listed in the Reference section, Chapter 1.

7 In small leftist circles, the term “Democratic Mass Organizations” from the 1970s is sometimes still employed.
More specifically, this definition identifies the nonprofit, or civil society, sector as comprised of entities that share five characteristics:

1. **Organizational identity.** An entity must have some structure and regularity to its operation, whether or not it is formally constituted or legally registered. This can involve regular meetings, membership criteria, and sets of procedures for making decisions that participants recognize as legitimate, whether written or embedded in spoken tradition.

2. **Institutional independence from government.** An entity must be institutionally separate from government, whether or not it receives any government funding. Although no single feature alone determines such independence, the capacity of the organization’s leadership to refuse government funding is a good indicator of it.

3. **A prohibition on the distribution of any profit generated.** An entity must have legally binding provisions prohibiting the distribution of surpluses generated by its operations to owners, members, or stockholders. What matters here is that the owners or members are not entitled to any surpluses, even if they are generated.

4. **Self-governance.** This criterion requires the existence of an internal governance mechanism that allows the organization to control all its internal affairs, including its capacity to cease its own operations as long as it follows general laws.

5. **Non-compulsory participation.** To qualify, membership or participation in an entity must be contingent on an individual’s choice or consent, rather than being legally required or automatic by virtue of birth, ethnic origin, or similar ascribed socio-demographic characteristics.8

In the Turkish context, the JHU/CNP definition covers the following legal and organizational forms:

- **Associations (Dernekler).** Voluntary organizations formed by a group of individuals to accomplish a special purpose (advocacy, charity, solidarity, protecting environment, providing education, fundraising, etc.).

- **Traditional Foundations (Vakıflar).** “An inalienable religious endowment in Islamic law, typically denoting a building or plot of land for Muslim religious or charitable purposes.”9 Turkish Civil Code

---

8 This definition is consistent with the international definition of the nonprofit institutions outlined in the United Nations *Handbook on Nonprofit Institutions in the System of National Accounts* (United Nations, 2003), the UN’s official guidance system for the measurement of economic units.

Article 101 defines foundations as “the charity groups in the status of a legal entity formed by real persons or legal entities dedicating their private property and rights for public use.” Excluded here are “fused foundations,” i.e., foundations existing prior to the establishment of the Republic in 1921.

- **Labor unions/Trade Unions (Sendikalar).** Organizations composed of workers united to negotiate for, promote, and protect their common interests. Trade unions are united under confederations such as TÜRK-İŞ (Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), KESK (Confederation of Public Employees’ Trade Unions), and HAK-İŞ.

- **Business and employer associations (İşdünyası Kuruluşları).** Associations established and funded by businesses that operate in specific or crosscutting sectors. Examples include TÜSİAD (Turkish Industry & Business Association) and MÜSİAD (The Association of Independent Industrialists and Businessmen).

- **Professional associations (Meslek Odaları ve Birlikleri).** Professional associations have their own laws regulated in the constitution. Therefore, they are accepted as public corporate bodies. The management of the organizations is based on the free will of the members and the judiciary monitors the election process. The organizations only act within their own legal framework. They have their own budgets, which mainly consist of members’ fees and payments made for the services of the organization.

- **Political and lobbying organizations (Lobi kuruluşları).** In Turkey, lobbying is among the activities of various associations and foundations, especially political and rights-based ones. However, there are no CSOs founded only for lobbying purposes.

The JHU/CNP Project definition also covers some, but not all, of the following types of organizations:

- **Private universities (Vakıf Üniversiteleri/Özel Üniversiteler).** There are 72 private universities in Turkey as of 2015. Some examples are Bilkent, Yeditepe, Koç, Sabancı universities.

- **Disaster preparedness and relief organizations.** Such as AKUT Search and Rescue Association (AKUT:Arama Kurtarma Derneği) and the Turkish Red Crescent (Türk Kızılayı).

- **Religious organizations.** Such as Ankara Cem Houses Founding Association (Ankara Cem Kültürlü Evleri Yaptırma Derneği), which tries to help to build Cem Houses (chapels for Alevis, non-Sunni minorities), and the Mevlana Mosque Building and Maintaining Association (Mevlana Cami Yaptırma ve Yaşatma Derneği).
Community development organizations. Including Hometown Associations (Hemşehri Dernekleri), such as the Tunceli and Rize Hometown Associations, which focus much of their efforts on strengthening solidarity among people coming from rural areas, and are becoming one of the key elements in the transformation of both rural and urban areas; the Pir Sultan Abdal Association (Pir Sultan Abdal Derneği), which helps to develop the culture of the Alevis people, non-Sunni minorities in Turkey; and the Edirne Gypsy’s Culture Research and Development and Assistance Association (Edirne Çingene Kültürünü Araştırma Geliştirme Yardımlaşma ve Kalkınma Derneği [EDÇİNKAY]), which aims to prevent prejudice against Gypsies and provide young gypsies with opportunities to obtain college degrees.

Youth organizations. Such as the Ipekyolu Scouting, Youth, and Sports Club Association (İpekyolu İzci Gençlik ve Doğa Sporları Kulübü derneği), which has more than 1500 girl and boy members and focuses on anti-discrimination activities, the arts, environment, gender equality, and human rights; the Scouting and Guiding Federation of Turkey (Türkiye İzçilik Federasyonu), which is an autonomous federation; the Uludağ Scouting Association (Uludağ İzcileri Derneği), located in Bursa; the Anatolian Youth Association (Anadolu Gençlik Derneği), one of largest youth organizations, and an active participant in Turkish politics; and the Youth Association For Habitat (Habitat için Gençlik Derneği), which is organizing many projects in cooperation with leading companies (including Intel, Vodafone, and Microsoft).

Not included in the Turkish study are public (government-controlled) educational institutions, health care providers, social assistance providers, and religious congregations, “Fused Foundations,” i.e. foundations that were established prior to the establishment of the Republic in 1921 and are now controlled by the Directorate General of Foundations, and chambers of commerce because these organizations do not have all five of the features defining the civil society sector outlined above.
Chapter 2

Key Dimensions of Turkey’s Civil Society Sector

1. Size of the sector

As of 2011, Turkey’s civil society organizations, as defined in Chapter 1 above, employed 321,667 paid full-time equivalent (FTE) workers, or 1.2% of the economically active population (EAP). What is more, these organizations engaged 47,378 FTE volunteers, bringing the total workforce of the Turkish civil society organizations to 369,045 FTE workers, or 1.4% of the country’s EAP.

Figure 2.1 compares the size of Turkey’s civil society workforce to that in selected Turkish industries, such as agriculture and fishing, manufacturing, construction and the broad service industry embracing commerce, tourism, transportation, health, education, and finance. As this figure shows, even with volunteer workers included, Turkey’s civil society workforce is much smaller than that of any of these industries.

Figure 2.1

Nonprofit workforce (including volunteers) vs. employment in selected industries, Turkey, 2011
The size of the civil society sector in Turkey is also small in relation to those in other countries. Thus, measured as a share of the EAP, the workforce of the Turkish civil society sector as of 2011, at 1.4%, ranked substantially below the 5.6% average for the 42 JHU/CNP countries, including Turkey, for which such data are available, as Figure 2.2 demonstrates.

**Figure 2.2**
Size of the civil society sector workforce, by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percent of Economically Active Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-country average</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Volunteer participation

A unique characteristic of the civil society workforce worldwide is its significant reliance on volunteer input. In Turkey, 47,378 FTE volunteers are part of the civil society workforce, as noted above. Volunteers thus account for about 13% of the civil society workforce in Turkey. While substantial, however, this share of volunteer input is significantly below the international average of 40%, as shown in Figure 2.3.
3. Civil society sector activities
To identify the activities of the civil society sector, the JHU/CNP developed an International Classification of Nonprofit Organizations (ICNPO), which differentiates twelve major categories of organizations according to their activity and purpose (Box 2.1).¹⁰

As a way to simplify the functions performed by civil society organizations, they may be grouped into two main categories:

a) **Service role.** This involves the delivery of direct services, such as education, health care, social and community development and the like. It includes organizations operating in the following fields: education; health care, social services; and community development and housing.

b) **Expressive role.** This involves activities that provide ways for cultural, spiritual, professional, political and other values, interests, and beliefs to be expressed. The organizations included here fall into the following classification categories: culture and recreation; environment; advocacy and politics; religious congregations; and business and professional associations and unions.

As shown in Figure 2.4, most (about 53%) of the civil society sector workforce (paid and volunteer) in Turkey is engaged in service activities, which include social services (26%), health care (17%) and education (10%). This service share of civil society sector activities is somewhat lower than the 42-country average as shown in Figure 2.5 below. All other activities employ the remaining 47% of the workforce, with the culture and recreation activities accounting for 19%.

---

¹⁰ This classification was formulated on the basis of the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), which is the standard classification system used by most governments around the world, but expands it somewhat and organizes the categories in a way that is more useful to those in the nonprofit sector. A full listing of ICNPO categories is provided in Annex I.

**Box 2.1**
International Classification of Nonprofit Organizations (ICNPO)

1. Culture and recreation
2. Education
3. Health
4. Social Services
5. Environment
6. Community development, housing
7. Civic and advocacy, political parties
8. Financer foundations
9. International organizations
10. Religious congregations
11. Business and professional associations, unions
12. Not elsewhere classified

* For a broader view of this classification, see Annex I.
**Figure 2.5**
Distribution of service and expressive activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42-country average</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Revenue and expenditures

The civil society sector received 26.5 billion New Turkish Liras (USD $15.9 billion) in revenue in 2011. Most of this revenue (64%) came from service fees, investments and membership dues, as shown in Figure 2.6. Philanthropy accounted for another 27% of Turkish nonprofit revenue—most of it (over 90%) received by Turkish foundations. Government payments, which include grants and service purchases, accounted for just under 8% of total revenue.11

This share of government support for the civil society sector in Turkey is very low by international standards. The average share of government support in civil society revenues is about 35%, and in many European countries it exceeds 50% (Figure 2.7, below). This low level of government support is offset by relatively higher shares of fees and philanthropic giving in Turkey as compared to most other countries.

11 Due to limitations of the available data, this distribution of the civil society sector’s revenue by source has been estimated by the JHU/CNP team based on the type of institution. It is assumed that all revenue of cooperatives come from market sales, all revenue of labor unions come from membership dues and investments (counted as “fees” in Figure 2.6). It is also assumed that the difference between total revenues of foundations and associations and the revenues these two types of institutions received from investments, membership dues and government transfers come from private philanthropy.
### Figure 2.7

Nonprofit revenue, by source, by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Philanthropy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42-country average</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of South Korea</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figure shows the percentage of nonprofit revenue by source (fees, government, philanthropy) for various countries. The color coding indicates which source dominates revenue for each country.
Chapter 3
Explaining Turkey's Pattern of Civil Society Development

The data assembled by the JHU/CNP show significant cross-national variation in the main dimensions of the civil society sector around the world. The countries differ not only in the size of their civil society workforces, but also in the composition of this workforce (volunteers vs. paid staff), principal activity (service vs. expressive), as well as in the principal sources of funding (fees vs. government payments vs. philanthropic support). To explain these variations, Salamon et al. have proposed a theory, called the social origins theory of civil society, that links different patterns of civil society development to different relations among key social groupings during key historical periods. By analyzing empirical and historical data from 41 countries across the globe, the social origins theory identifies five different patterns of power relations among key socio-political actors and classes that it links to five identifiable patterns of civil society development.

Two steps are therefore needed to determine the relevance of the social origins theory to Turkish realities. Step 1 is to determine whether the pattern of civil society development evident in Turkey fits any of the patterns found in the other countries we have examined. If so, Step 2 is to determine whether the social power relations that the social origins theory associates with this pattern are evident in the historical record of Turkey.

1. Turkey as an Exemplar of the Statist Model
Table 3.1 takes up the first of these issues. To do so, it compares three key features of the Turkish nonprofit reality to those that are common to the five patterns of civil society development revealed among our broader set of countries. As this table shows, Turkey's pattern of civil society development falls squarely into one of the five patterns of civil society development identified in our prior research: i.e., the statist pattern. The distinctive features of this pattern include a relatively small civil society sector, low volunteer support, and a low level of public funding for this sector's activities. On all three dimensions Turkey's civil society sector falls within the ranges defining this pattern. Thus, for example, where the six countries

---

12 This chapter draws from the working paper by Burak Özçetin, Ulaş Tol, M.Ali Çalışkan, and Mustafa Özer. “Major Periods of Civil Society Sector Development in Turkey.” Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, No. 52. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies, 2014. Available at: ccss.jhu.edu/?page_id=61&did=427; references to sources used in this section are listed in the Reference section, Chapter 3.

13 For more on the methodology used to assign countries to the five social origins theory patterns, see Chapter 5 in Lester M. Salamon, S. Wojciech Sokolowski, Megan A. Haddock and Associates, Explaining Civil Society Development: A Social Origins Approach, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, forthcoming 2017.
falling into this pattern exhibit a share of their workforce at work in the CSO sector of 2.3%, the comparable figure for Turkey is 1.4%. Similarly, while the volunteer share of the civil society workforce in the average statist country is a relatively low 28%, the comparable share for Turkey is an even lower 13%. Finally, while the government share of CSO organization revenue in the other statist pattern countries stands at 17%, that in Turkey stands at 8%.

Table 3.1
Turkey’s pattern of civil society development compared to five patterns identified through the JHU/CNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Workforce as a share of EAP</th>
<th>Volunteers as a share of workforce</th>
<th>Government share of revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statist</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare partnership</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 countries</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-democratic</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Explaining Turkey’s Pattern of Civil Society Development

According to the social origins theory, the statist pattern emerges in those countries where modernization has been delayed by the resistance of powerful landed elites, and the resultant economic backwardness renders the countries vulnerable to challenges by foreign powers. To avert these challenges, the military or professional elites launch a “revolution from above” to take control of the state and force rapid modernization. How well does Turkey embody these characteristic socioeconomic and institutional power relationships that have led to “statist” developments elsewhere?

As it turns out, Turkey’s history fits this pattern rather well. While the country has a long tradition of private philanthropy represented by the Vakıf (foundation) system, the role these institutions played in economy and society was curtailed by the power of the autonomous central state. This control eased only in the second half of the 20th century, allowing for moderate growth of the civil society sector.

The structure of the Ottoman state was characteristically patrimonial in which the society was under the hegemony of the central state. As a result, Ottoman society lacked the intermediary bodies between the center and periphery that, in many Western societies, were tied to the interests of different socio-economic classes—such as the landed aristocracy, the commercial and industrial middle class, or industrial workers. Instead, on the one side there was a highly bureaucratized and centralized Imperial rule and its supporting military power, while on the other side was an unorganized agrarian population scattered over vast stretches of land. The
Empire was based on military expansion, and the military members that constituted the ruling elite considered military development more vital to its interests than economic and social development. This era witnessed the establishment of a few organizations, such as Türk Ocakları (Turkish Hearths Movement) and Türk Kadınlar Birliği (Turkish Women’s Union), but they represented the exception rather than the rule.

This deeply rooted dichotomy in power relations between the central state and the broader society created a strong path of institutional tradition that has affected Turkish society, and consequently civil society, into modern times. The Ottoman political system did not allow the existence of significant opposition or control mechanisms outside the state. Therefore, the source of legitimacy of the state was the military power of the state apparatus itself. The well-being of the people was bound to the well-being of the state, and protection of the state's power was the key political imperative. The limited number of organizations that did function during this time did so because they operated either in harmony with the state, or because they operated under the radar and did not threaten the state's power.

The power of the Ottoman state apparatus was rooted in its control of the military recruitment system and land use. With regard to the military recruitment system, the key element was the Janissaries—enslaved boys and young men removed from their homes in the occupied territories and conscripted into the Ottoman army. Included here was the gathering of the sons of Christian families of conquered lands, converting them to Islam, and educating them to become high ranking military or bureaucratic officials—known as the Devshirme system (or blood tax). The recruitment of young men and boys from the territories further inhibited the emergence of a strong class of local aristocracy and bureaucratic elites.

The second element of state power was the complex institutional structure of Ottoman land use. The state owned and controlled the land, which was allocated to families in small units for cultivation.

These two factors inhibited development of capitalism and its social formation in the Ottoman state, resulting in the country’s economic backwardness vis-a-vis Western powers. More specifically, the economic system in the classical Ottoman period (from the 14th to the end of the 18th century) was characterized by distinctive pre- and even anti-capitalist qualities, in which capital accumulation was inhibited by the prohibition on interest in several areas of the Ottoman economy, and strict control of prices and profit rates. The economy was thus characterized by limited commodity production and limited profit-making. Given these qualities, the Ottoman system was not only closed to capitalist development, but also opposed to it, as the economy was centered on the concept of need and subsistence.

The domination of the economy by the central state during the Ottoman period created disincentives for economic development, which set the Turkish economy behind those of Western powers. To counteract its lagging economy, the Turkish state embarked on a modernization reform in the second half of the 19th century. The resulting reforms led to increased integration of the Ottoman economy into world markets, establishment of credit institutions and a modern banking system,
and monetization of the economy. This period laid the foundation for the development of civic institutions in Turkish society.

Increased ties with the West during the 19th century reform process also resulted in a transformation of the state machinery and the emergence of a Westernized bureaucratic elite alongside the traditional Ottoman ruling classes. These forces pushed for modernization and Westernization of the Ottoman empire that otherwise lacked broad popular support. A leading force in these efforts was the Young Turks movement that emerged in the second half of the 19th century in opposition to the rule of the monarchy. Originating among medical school students and military students in schools established by the state during the reform period, the Young Turks pursued a secularist, nationalist, and statist government. In 1908, the movement resulted in the creation of a new governing elite, shifting the balance of power from the sultanate to intellectual elites recruited from the ranks of the state bureaucracy and the military. However, this movement did not change the emphasis on the consolidation of a strong central state in the continuation of the Ottoman tradition.

But this modernization movement did lay the foundation for the radical political reforms initiated by the army officer Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in response to the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I. Following a successful military campaign against Western expeditionary forces in the Turkish War of Independence, Atatürk instituted a series of reforms aiming to modernize Turkish society, which ultimately led to the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Although these reforms marked an important break from the past, the young Republic nevertheless inherited a political path rooted in the Ottoman tradition, an approach that put the interest of the state above and beyond all social concerns, the rejection of all public demands, and the oppression of any opposition that would challenge the then-existing government power. According to the social origins theory, these are precisely the kinds of historical developments that produce a “statist” pattern of civil society development, characterized by a small civil society sector, limited government support, and low volunteer involvement.

In this context, the emergence of a weak civil society as a part of the modernization movement was only possible where it was organically tied to the state. The only associations that survived in this period (1923-1946) were The People’s Houses (Halkevleri), which were responsible for disseminating information about the new regime’s values to society. Other organizations of the period that had originated in the Ottoman era, such as the Turkish Hearts Movement and the Turkish Women’s Union, were suppressed and closed down by the Kemalist regime. Civil society during this period was constructed by state elites in a top down fashion and served as the main vehicle in the consolidation and promotion of the official state ideology. In this single-party system of authoritarian state rule, the ruling elites only enabled the emergence of civil-society entities that could be held under the control of the state, and prevented the emergence of a civil society from the bottom that might challenge central rule.
Chapter 4
Recent Developments in Turkish Government-Civil Society Relations

In more recent years, Turkey has taken a variety of steps away from this “statist” pattern of civil society development, though haltingly, and still far from completely as of this writing. The situation for civil society organizations started to change as early as 1946, when the single-party system was replaced by a multi-party system, leading to the electoral victory of the Democrat Party (DP) in 1950, replacing the 30-year dominance of the Republic People’s Party (CHP). This period was an important turning point in terms of democratization and freedom of organization. In particular, the 1946 Associations Law began to invigorate the realm of civil society, enabling associations and unions to operate relatively freely. Also, DP rule enabled the periphery to be included in the political system, increasing the level of political participation. However, during this period, the top-down fashion of state-led modernization continued to prevail, which limited the development of a participatory grassroots civil society. What is more, the DP, like its predecessor, continued to oppress civil society organizations that were critical of its policies.

A 1960 military intervention ended DP rule and introduced a new constitution and new policies—including a Constitutional Court, a liberalized press law, a new trade union law, and autonomous universities—to check the excessive and unbalanced use of governmental authority. The new Constitution and legal arrangements marked a considerable liberalization of the Turkish social and political system, and breathed new life into Turkey’s weak civil society organizations. Coupled with social and economic dynamism in the following two decades, this period (1960-1980) witnessed the empowerment of an organized working class (including the founding of the DİSK-Confederation of Revolutionary Trade Unions of Turkey in 1967); the emergence of student movements; and the rise of legal and illegal leftist opposition groups. However, in a pattern that would recur, two subsequent military interventions in civil affairs—in 1971 and in 1980—led to reversals of these gains. Legislation passed in the early 1980s—particularly the Association Law of 1983—limited the rights of civil servants’ membership in associations, and gave the state the authority to control and stop the activities of associations. The election system was modified to further strengthen the role of large political parties and the powers of the office of the presidency were greatly increased.

Despite these legal restrictions, however, this period also witnessed an unprecedented dynamism in civil society in Turkey. A series of political and economic crises in the 1980s and 1990s led to increased autonomy, proliferation, and further strengthening of civil society. Important factors contributing to this development
2003-2004 witnessed the development of crucial reforms in liberalizing state-civil society relations and opening up opportunity spaces for civil society organizations.

included the influence of neoliberal ideology, which undermined developmental and statist economic policies; the rise of identity politics, especially Islamist and Kurdish nationalist movements; and increased societal demand for democratization of state-society relations.

Also working in the same direction was Turkey’s effort to secure admission to the European Union. The European Council granted Turkey candidacy in 1999, and in the following years Turkey initiated fundamental political reforms to fulfill the accession requirements—which included increased legal protection of the social, cultural, and political rights of all Turkish citizens irrespective of religious and ethnic origin; curbing the role of the military in politics; and guarantees of freedom of expression. The 2004 and 2005 EU Progress Reports stressed that government’s steps towards liberalization of civil society-state relations were satisfactory.\(^{14}\) The Reports noted that since the Helsinki Summit in 1999 in which Turkey gained EU-candidate status, and especially after the 2002 General Elections that brought the Justice and Development (ADP) Party to power, important institutional reforms were enacted towards the development of democracy, empowering the civil sphere over military tutelage, and strengthening civil society through legal and administrative arrangements.\(^{15}\) The renewed Associations Law of 2004, for example, removed many aspects of state control over associations (although amendments to the law in 2005 included some articles that might prohibit the establishment of associations that aim at disseminating a specific culture or religion).\(^{16}\)

However, recent years have been characterized by a steady closing of the civil society space as the prospect of EU accession waned and the threat of terrorism expanded. In addition to the loss of EU-backed impetus, the AKP Government’s increased authoritarianism caused many problems to emerge in public authority-civil society relations.

While inconsistent treatment by government can be blamed for many of the troubles Turkish CSOs face, internal weaknesses also hinder their development in society. Recent research on CSOs in Turkey shows that these organizations are frequently poorly organized and unequipped, lacking the necessary infrastructure and vision to pursue their goals. Maybe more importantly, CSOs in Turkey lack a culture of cooperation. They are often suspicious of each other as well as towards the state—which makes the relationship between the state and civil society troublesome.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{14}\) Progress reports of the European Commission in which the Commission services present their assessment of what each candidate and potential candidate has achieved over the previous year, are available for Turkey at: ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm.


\(^{17}\) The findings of two TÜBİTAK projects, prepared by Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen (Istanbul Şehir University), Prof. Dr. Fuat Keyman (Sabancı University), Dr. Uğurš Ulaş Tol (YADA Foundation) and Mehmet Ali Çalışkan (YADA Foundation), offer the best overview of the current conditions and challenges faced by civil society organizations in Turkey. The first research report, *Civil Society Culture in Voluntary Organizations* was completed in 2010, which published the results of a survey of 2,487 CSOs and 4,903 board members. The second research report, *The Civil Topography of Voluntary Organizations in Turkey*, was completed in 2012. Within the scope of this research, 600 organizations from 14 different provinces were interviewed, and fuzzy cognitive mapping with 240 board members was implemented.
In part to remedy these limitations and foster better state-civil society relations, civil society leaders launched an important initiative to strengthen the dialogue between the state and civil society under the banner of the “Strengthening Civil Society Development and Civil Society–Public Sector Dialogue in Turkey Project.” This project proposed a series of improvements both in government treatment of the civil society sector and in the sector’s own provisions for transparency and accountability.

The Government’s harsh response to a protest that broke out over a government plan to change the character of Istanbul’s Taksim Gezi Park, a favorite gathering place for citizens, put a chill on these discussions, however. The Gezi Park protests took the AK Party by surprise when they started on 28 May 2013 with a group of environmentalists organized under the banner of the Taksim Solidarity group protesting the government’s development plan. The passive resistance of protestors through a sit-in was violently repressed by security forces, which led to a huge wave of general protests against the government across the country over the following days. Throughout June of 2013, more than 2 million citizens participated in the protests in nearly every province in Turkey. The protestors targeted the authoritarian and arbitrary attitude of government, and more specifically, Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan. They cited increased authoritarianism; persistent police violence towards peaceful protests; Erdoğan’s targeting of women through his anti-abortion discourse; regulations regarding consumption of alcoholic beverages; and his hostile stance towards opposition as the main reasons behind public unrest. Also, as was the case in protests in Egypt, Tunisia, and Spain, the protestors opposed increased commodification of urban space and aimed to protect the urban commons through occupying urban areas.

While this protest underlines the growing resilience of Turkey’s civil society sector, the harsh government reaction and the apparent public support for it reflected in the elevation of Mr. Erdoğan to the presidency in 2014, has also made clear that the “statist” pattern is still well entrenched in Turkey and will likely continue to affect civil society development in the country for years to come. At the same time, the persistence of the civil society elements in the face of often-harsh restrictions gives reason to doubt that this genie can be put fully back into the bottle.

In addition to other publications, YADA research and interviews conducted during these projects provide us with adequate data to map CSOs’ and CSO leaders’ appropriation of the current condition of state-civil society relations in Turkey. YADA is currently working on an EU project for strengthening government-civil society relations and is still conducting field research and interviews with both parties. These reports built on a 2005 report prepared by YADA Foundation Civil Society Organizations: “Needs and Constraints,” STGM, 2005. Available at: yasamadair.org/Adminjkl/3.pdf.

18 This project was funded by The European Union and the Republic of Turkey and implemented by the Civil Society Development Center (STGM), Third Sector Foundation of Turkey, and Yaşama Dair Vakıf (YADA). See the project’s website at: siviltoplum-kamu.org/en/.

19 Taksim Solidarity consisted of 128 CSOs, including associations, chambers, cooperatives and unions.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

This report presents for the first time the empirical dimensions of the civil society sector in Turkey and places them in the context of the other 41 countries on which comparable data are available through the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project. The data show that, despite a long tradition of private philanthropy and the dynamic growth of civic and political associations during the past fifty years, the size of the civil society sector in Turkey remains relatively small in comparison to other countries, and the share of volunteers in its workforce falls below the international average.

An explanation of these seemingly paradoxical findings is provided by the social origins theory of civil society sector development that links different patterns of civil society development to different configurations of social and political forces during the period of modernization. The available data place Turkey in the “statist” pattern, which, according to the social origins theory, results from top-down, state-led policies of economic development. Turkey’s history offers a textbook example of such development in which the centralized Ottoman state came under the control of modernizing elites in the early 20th century, followed by policies of rapid modernization while keeping the civil society sector under tight control to undercut popular social opposition to these policies. Only after a period of political “thaw” beginning in the 1950s did the Turkish civil society sector experience dynamic growth as a venue for voicing political expression. However, the collaboration between the sector and the state in delivery of public services is still embryonic, limiting the sector’s access to public resources and in turn impeding its growth.

Despite these limitations, the last two decades saw growing dynamism in civil society activities in Turkey. In the 1990s, ethnic and religious minorities in Turkey started to raise their voices against policies aimed at homogenizing the society and assimilating identities. Identity politics emphasized a plurality of elements, values, colors, traditions, and histories that co-exist in society. The rise of identity politics was matched by the increased dynamism of the civil society sector. Civil society organizations were formed to protect human rights, to promote cultural diversity, and to protect the environment.

However, the dominant codes of political culture, and the legal/constitutional framework are far from conducive to this growing dynamism of civil society. No hegemonic actor emerged in the 1990s to articulate the demands of these groups for meaningful political discourse and policy engagement. The birth of the Justice and Development Party and its immediate electoral success in 2002 was met with high expectations. The AKP decisively supported the EU accession process and
took important steps to meet the Copenhagen Criteria requiring a wide variety of steps to consolidate democracy in Turkey.

Unfortunately, however, these high expectations again went unmet. While important steps were taken to strengthen the relationship between the state and civil society, it is hard to argue that the ruling AK Party fully committed to carrying this support for civil society development all the way through, and state authorities remain suspicious of civil society activities. Whether, and how fully, Turkey will escape its statist past, and if so, when, therefore remain important unanswered questions as this report goes to press. At the same time, the impressive resilience of Turkey’s civil society sector and the presence of a long tradition of charitable endowments provides at least some solid basis for hope.

There are many reasons for being both pessimistic and optimistic about the future of the Turkish civil society sector.
Annex I
Methodology and ICNPO

The data used in this report are derived from governmental sources and non-governmental organizations’ scientific research reports. Governmental data are based on mandated information submitted by registered associations, foundations, cooperatives and political parties. Information on volunteering for foundations and associations was estimated from information collected from these reports, while estimates of volunteering for political parties was generated separately in collaboration with an association of political parties.

To complement and interpret these data, we applied two sources of information from non-governmental sources. One is a scientific research project funded by Anadolu University, titled “The monitoring and data collection mechanisms of civil society organizations in Turkey,” in cooperation with the YADA Foundation. The other is the database of CSO research of the YADA Foundation.

Data sources for civil society organizations:

1. **Foundations**: Prime Ministry of the Turkish Republic, Directorate General of Foundations
2. **Associations**: Ministry of Interior, Department of Associations
3. **Cooperatives**:
   - The Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
   - The Ministry of Customs and Trade
   - National Cooperative Union of Turkey
4. **Political parties**: People Republican Party; Justice and Development Party; Nationalist Movement Party; and Constitutional Court of the Republic of Turkey
5. **Unions**: The Ministry of Labor and Social Security
6. **Professional organizations**: Turkish Medical Associations; Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects; and Union of Turkish Bar Associations

Data sources for the additional macro-economic parameters:

- Central Bank of the Republic Of Turkey
- General Directorate of Budget and Fiscal Control (BÜMKO)
International Classification of Non-Profit Organizations (INCPO)

GROUP 1: CULTURE AND RECREATION

1 100 Culture and Arts

*Media and communications.* Production and dissemination of information and communication; includes radio and TV stations; publishing of books, journals, newspapers, and newsletters; film production; and libraries.

*Visual arts, architecture, ceramic art.* Production, dissemination, and display of visual arts and architecture; includes sculpture, photographic societies, painting, drawing, design centers, and architectural associations.

*Performing arts.* Performing arts centers, companies, and associations; includes theater, dance, ballet, opera, orchestras, chorals, and music ensembles.

*Historical, literary, and humanistic societies.* Promotion and appreciation of the humanities, preservation of historical and cultural artifacts, and commemoration of historical events; includes historical societies, poetry and literary societies, language associations, reading promotion, war memorials, and commemorative funds and associations.

*Museums.* General and specialized museums covering art, history, sciences, technology, and culture.

*Zoos and aquariums.*

1 200 Sports

Provision of amateur sport, training, physical fitness, and sport competition services and events; includes fitness and wellness centers.

1 300 Other Recreation and Social Clubs

*Recreation and social clubs.* Provision of recreational facilities and services to individuals and communities; includes playground associations, country clubs, men’s and women’s clubs, touring clubs, and leisure clubs.

*Service clubs.* Membership organizations providing services to members and local communities, for example: Lions, Zonta International, Rotary Club, and Kiwanis.

1 900 Other Culture and Recreation N.E.C.

GROUP 2: EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

2 100 Primary and Secondary Education

*Elementary, primary, and secondary education.* Education at elementary, primary, and secondary levels; includes pre-school organizations other than day care.

2 200 Higher Education

*Higher education.* Higher learning, providing academic degrees; includes universities, business management schools, law schools, medical schools.
2 300 Other Education

**Vocational/technical schools.** Technical and vocational training specifically geared towards gaining employment; includes trade schools, paralegal training, secretarial schools.

**Adult/continuing education.** Institutions engaged in providing education and training in addition to the formal educational system; includes schools of continuing studies, correspondence schools, night schools, and sponsored literacy and reading programs.

2 400 Research

**Medical research.** Research in the medical field; includes research on specific diseases, disorders, or medical disciplines.

**Science and technology.** Research in the physical and life sciences, and engineering and technology.

**Social sciences, policy studies.** Research and analysis in the social sciences and policy area.

2 900 Other Education and Research N.E.C.

**GROUP 3: HEALTH**

3 100 Hospitals and Rehabilitation

**Hospitals.** Primarily inpatient medical care and treatment.

**Rehabilitation.** Inpatient health care and rehabilitative therapy to individuals suffering from physical impairments due to injury, genetic defect, or disease and requiring extensive physiotherapy or similar forms of care.

3 200 Nursing Homes

**Nursing homes.** Inpatient convalescent care, residential care, as well as primary health care services; includes homes for the frail elderly and nursing homes for the severely handicapped.

3 300 Mental Health and Crisis Intervention

**Psychiatric hospitals.** Inpatient care and treatment for the mentally ill.

**Mental health treatment.** Outpatient treatment for mentally ill patients; includes community mental health centers, and halfway homes.

**Crisis intervention.** Outpatient services and counsel in acute mental health situations; includes suicide prevention and support to victims of assault and abuse.

3 400 Other Health Services

**Public health and wellness education.** Public health promotion and health education; includes sanitation screening for potential health hazards, first aid training and services, and family planning services.

**Health treatment, primarily outpatient.** Organizations that provide primarily outpatient health services—e.g., health clinics and vaccination centers.

**Rehabilitative medical services.** Outpatient therapeutic care; includes nature cure centers, yoga clinics, and physical therapy centers.
Emergency medical services. Services to persons in need of immediate care; includes ambulatory services and paramedical emergency care, shock/trauma programs, life-line programs, and ambulance services.

3 900 Other Heath N.E.C.

GROUP 4: SOCIAL SERVICES

4 100 Social Services

Child welfare, child services, and day care. Services to children, adoption services, child development centers, foster care; includes infant care centers and nurseries.

Youth services and youth welfare. Services to youth; includes delinquency prevention services, teen pregnancy prevention, drop-out prevention, youth centers and clubs, and job programs for youth; includes YMCA,YWCA, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

Family services. Services to families; includes family life/parent education, single parent agencies and services, and family violence shelters and services.

Services for the handicapped. Services for the handicapped; includes homes, other than nursing homes, transport facilities, recreation, and other specialized services.

Services for the elderly. Organizations providing geriatric care; includes in-home services, homemaker services, transport facilities, recreation, meal programs, and other services geared towards senior citizens. (Does not include residential nursing homes.)

Self-help and other personal social services. Programs and services for self-help and personal development; includes support groups, personal counseling, and credit counseling/money management services.

4 200 Emergency and Relief

Disaster/emergency prevention and control. Organizations that work to prevent, predict, control, and alleviate the effects of disasters, to educate or otherwise prepare individuals to cope with the effects of disasters, or to provide relief to disaster victims; includes volunteer fire departments, life boat services, etc.

Temporary shelters. Organizations providing temporary shelters to the homeless; includes travelers aid and temporary housing.

Refugee assistance. Organizations providing food, clothing, shelter, and services to refugees and immigrants.

4 300 Income Support and Maintenance

Income support and maintenance. Organizations providing cash assistance and other forms of direct services to persons unable to maintain a livelihood.

Material assistance. Organizations providing food, clothing, transport, and other forms of assistance; includes food banks and clothing distribution centers.

4 900 Other Social Service N.E.C.
GROUP 5: ENVIRONMENT

5 100 Environment

Pollution abatement and control. Organizations that promote clean air, clean water, reducing and preventing noise pollution, radiation control, treatment of hazardous wastes and toxic substances, solid waste management, and recycling programs.

Natural resources conservation and protection. Conservation and preservation of natural resources, including land, water, energy, and plant resources for the general use and enjoyment of the public.

Environmental beautification and open spaces. Botanical gardens, arboreta, horticultural programs and landscape services; organizations promoting anti-litter campaigns; programs to preserve the parks, green spaces, and open spaces in urban or rural areas; and city and highway beautification programs.

5 200 Animal Protection

Animal protection and welfare. Animal protection and welfare services; includes animal shelters and humane societies.

Wildlife preservation and protection. Wildlife preservation and protection; includes sanctuaries and refuges.

Veterinary services. Animal hospitals and services providing care to farm and household animals and pets.

5 900 Other Environment N.E.C.

GROUP 6: DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING

6 100 Economic, Social, and Community Development

Community and neighborhood organizations. Organizations working towards improving the quality of life within communities or neighborhoods, e.g., squatters' associations, local development organizations, poor people's cooperatives.

Economic development. Programs and services to improve economic infrastructure and capacity; includes building of infrastructure like roads; and financial services such as credit and savings associations, entrepreneurial programs, technical and managerial consulting, and rural development assistance.

Social development. Organizations working towards improving the institutional infrastructure and capacity to alleviate social problems and to improve general public well being.

6 200 Housing

Housing associations. Development, construction, management, leasing, financing, and rehabilitation of housing.

Housing assistance. Organizations providing housing search, legal services, and related assistance.

6 300 Employment and Training

Job training programs. Organizations providing and supporting apprenticeship programs, internships, on-the-job training, and other training programs.
**Vocational counseling and guidance.** Vocational training and guidance, career counseling, testing, and related services.

**Vocational rehabilitation and sheltered workshops.** Organizations that promote self-sufficiency and income generation through job training and employment.

6 900 Other Development and Housing N.E.C.

**GROUP 7: LAW, ADVOCACY, AND POLITICS**

7 100 Civic and Advocacy Organizations

**Advocacy organizations.** Organizations that protect the rights and promote the interests of specific groups of people, e.g., the physically handicapped, the elderly, children, and women.

**Civil rights associations.** Organizations that work to protect or preserve individual civil liberties and human rights.

**Ethnic associations.** Organizations that promote the interests of, or provide services to, members belonging to a specific ethnic heritage.

**Civic associations.** Programs and services to encourage and spread civic mindedness.

7 200 Law and Legal Services

**Legal services.** Legal services, advice, and assistance in dispute resolution and court-related matters.

**Crime prevention and public policy.** Crime prevention to promote safety and precautionary measures among citizens.

**Rehabilitation of offenders.** Programs and services to reintegrate offenders; includes halfway houses, probation and parole programs, prison alternatives.

**Victim support.** Services, counsel, and advice to victims of crime.

**Consumer protection associations.** Protection of consumer rights, and the improvement of product control and quality.

7 300 Political Organizations

**Political parties and organizations.** Activities and services to support the placing of particular candidates into political office; includes dissemination of information, public relations, and political fundraising.

7 900 Other Law, Advocacy, and Politics N.E.C.

**GROUP 8: PHILANTHROPIC INTERMEDIARIES AND VOLUNTARIsm PROMOTION**

8 100 Grant-making Foundations

**Grant-making foundations.** Private foundations; including corporate foundations, community foundations, and independent public-law foundations.

8 200 Other Philanthropic Intermediaries and Voluntarism Promotion

**Volunteerism promotion and support.** Organizations that recruit, train, and place volunteers and promote volunteering.
Fund-raising organizations. Federated, collective fundraising organizations; includes lotteries.

8 900 Other Philanthropic Intermediaries and Voluntarism Promotion N.E.C.

GROUP 9: INTERNATIONAL
9 100 International Activities
Exchange/friendship/cultural programs. Programs and services designed to encourage mutual respect and friendship internationally.
Development assistance associations. Programs and projects that promote social and economic development abroad.
International disaster and relief organizations. Organizations that collect, channel, and provide aid to other countries during times of disaster or emergency.
International human rights and peace organizations. Organizations which promote and monitor human rights and peace internationally.

9 900 Other International N.E.C.

GROUP 10: RELIGION
10 100 Religious Congregations and Associations
Congregations. Churches, synagogues, temples, mosques, shrines, monasteries, seminaries, and similar organizations promoting religious beliefs and administering religious services and rituals.
Associations of congregations. Associations and auxiliaries of religious congregations and organizations supporting and promoting religious beliefs, services and rituals.

10 900 Other Religion N.E.C.

GROUP 11: BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, AND UNIONS
11 100 Business Associations
Business associations. Organizations that work to promote, regulate, and safeguard the interests of special branches of business, e.g., manufacturers’ association, farmers’ association, bankers’ association.

11 200 Professional Associations
Professional associations. Organizations promoting, regulating, and protecting professional interests, e.g., bar association, medical association.

11 300 Unions
Labor unions. Organizations that promote, protect, and regulate the rights and interests of employees.

11 900 Other Business and Professional Associations, and Unions N.E.C.

GROUP 12: [NOT ELSEWHERE CLASSIFIED]
12 100 N.E.C.
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