
EPISODE 4

A SOCIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT ON INSTITUTIONALIZATION PROBLEMS OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS IN TURKEY

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bekir KOCADAŞ
Adiyaman University

Introduction

Institutionalized that they create a problem of NGOs in Turkey from a sociological perspective, it's also at various levels (usually publications are examining this aspect) Although not the subject of study is important because it indicates the seriousness of the situation. Given the institutionalization of the scientific dimension, it will be seen how far behind the NGOs are in this process. In the simplest case, institutions arise when a need arises. As Martindale said, a new institution should be able to offer "standard solutions to collective problems". From this point of view, it can be seen how many NGOs are far from collective problems when the situation is assessed. Of course, we do not get the result that NGOs are unnecessary here. On the contrary, it can perform a social function as an auxiliary power beside the existing foundation institutions. In fact, the community is the closest unit or organization to the capillary vessels.

Durkheim defines social truth as "laws, morals, beliefs, customs, and fashions that generally exist in society as a whole, independent of the images of its individuals." Thus, Durkheim later elaborated on the meaning of social realities and used the concept of "institution" which means "beliefs and behaviors established by association". He defined sociology as "the science of the creation and functioning of institutions and institutions" (Wallace & Wolf, 2004: 27).

From a sociological point of view, an institution is neither a person nor a group. The institution is a part of culture and an important part of people's lives that is patterned; social relationships and roles also constitute the basic elements of the institution. The institution is a combination of behavioral patterns shared by the majority and aimed at meeting some basic group needs (Fichter, 2006,139). On the other hand, the institution is also the main key to the infusion of living in a society. According to Soyer (1996: 54), the basic element that determines the institutions and gives them their introductory characteristics is the objective conditions of the society they live in. Institutions are shaped by society in order to reinforce and strengthen these conditions.

Adler (2000: 135) also states that the grouping and integration of statuses and such

stereotyped behaviors around some basic needs is called “social institution” in the language of sociology.

The concept of social institution, according to Ozankaya (1986: 139), with the thoughts, beliefs, traditions, customs and behaviors that form a relative whole coordinated and organized; Expresses the continuous arrangements consisting of material elements (structures, goods, documents, symbols). For example, the state, law, family, education, divorce are social institutions.

According to Marshall (1999: 438), the use of the concept of institution, which reflects the established aspects of society, especially in sociology, has a meaning very close to its common use in English. Again, there have been some changes in the full conceptualization of the concept of institution over time, and differences in analytical precision have been observed. In some respects, an institution can be viewed as behavioral patterns, folklore, custom, and a kind of “top-custom” that encompass certain social interests (such as law, economy, and family). In this framework, the social institution meets all the structural components of a society that regulate the basic concerns and activities and meet social needs (such as order, belief and reproductive needs).

It is socially important for an organization to be institutionalized. While the benefit of NGOs to gain an institutional identity and feature to society increases significantly, it is obvious that non-institutionalized NGOs cannot go beyond being the focus of individual gains rather than social benefit. Civil society, which enables the emergence of NGOs or creates the ground, is also an indicator of the relationship of societies with democracy.

The Emergence of Civil Society and NGOs

The concept of civil society was born and developed within the development process and political tradition of Western societies. The concept, which reaches up to the ancient Greek sites and has a historical past, has been defined by thinkers and political scientists with different meanings (Özer, 2008: 87). It is not accidental that interest in civil society first emerged in the West. It is related to the history or experience of the West’s approach to man and man. With the discussion of Giambattista Vico, that man is an agent who forms himself and his culture in society, it has created the agenda.

The idea of civil society has become one of the most talked about and debated topics all over the world, especially since the 1980s. In discussions about civil society, the identity, characteristics, functions etc. of civil society. problems are handled and resolved. However, a complete consensus on this issue has not been reached yet. Because civil society is associated with different problems by different circles and various contents are loaded in this context (Ercan, 2002: 69). The fact that civil society is discussed and associated with different fields shows that it is important for modern societies.

According to Karakurt Tosun (2007: 2), in the Middle Ages, civil society began to be seen as the opposite of the concept of religious society. The characteristic of civil society as a symbol of secularism and modernity has started to take hold since this period. From Aristotle to the end of the Middle Ages, the concepts of state and civil society are in an inseparable union. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, radical changes took place in the definition of civil society and civil society started to be used as a “transition from a state of nature to a state of civilization”, as well as as a concept expressing freedom, rights and obligations as an urban citizen requirement. With the phenomenon of civil society, citizen or citizen has come to the fore as a key concept, and the individual defined as a citizen has been seen as the basic defining element of civil society.

According to Saribay (2001: 1 34; cite Karakurt Tosun, 2007: 2), John Keane states that the traditional understanding of civil society based on Aristotle and Cicero began to collapse in the middle of the 18th century, and the process of change, especially in England, France and Germany. Explains with the four stages experienced in. The first stage involves the breaking point of the traditional concept of civil society. Second stage; The understanding that it is legitimate for independent ‘societies’ within civil society to defend themselves against the state has become widespread. Although the discrimination was preserved in the third stage, the trust of the ancients in a free and independent civil society began to be reversed in favor of sovereign state activity. So much so that the freedom included in civil society was seen as the source of conflicts in social life; state intervention has been deemed a conflict prevention factor. Finally, the fourth stage emerged in response to the third: the stage in which it began to fear that state intervention would gradually strangle civil society.

Çulhaoğlu (2001: 32-33; cite Talas, 2011: 390) divided the approaches about civil society into three groups. The first is the view of Larry Diamond that explains civil society as an order established by the free will of the citizen, separate from the state. The second is Ernest Gellner’s approach. This view is an understanding that encompasses a wider area. According to this thesis, civil society is a structure that fills the gap existing between the family or individual and the state. According to this view, civil society is a system consisting mostly of intermediate institutions such as trade unions, political parties, religious organizations, pressure groups and associations. The third example is John Keane’s approach from the left liberal segment. Accordingly, they are organizations that protect and transform their identities by applying pressure and control over state institutions through non-state activities formed by civil society members.

In fact, the concept of civil society is generally defined as a self-regulating autonomous sphere, which characterizes the economic and social sphere outside the state and state authority and operates according to its own principles and rules. Civil society is an autonomous area outside the state and its authority, but it is not completely detached

from the state. Civil society is a model of society with legal values, based on the rule of law. Civil society means society that is a member of the state, abides by its laws and is obliged to act that does not harm other members. Therefore, the relationship between civil society and state expresses an important part of the definition of the concept of civil society (Karakuş, 2006: 15). Another reality is that the state or political authority is seen as an obstacle to the realization of civil society.

The contemporary understanding of civil society is at the center of the questions about how this process can be continued and reproduced once a formal level of democracy is reached in any society. In addition, civil society is also associated with current concerns regarding the provision of preconditions for democratization in societies with authoritarian state structures. In addition, although the understanding of civil society meets a historical concept, in recent years, groups defined as “New Social Movements” such as feminists, environmentalists, greeners and alternative lifers have become stronger and occupy the agenda, the revival of ethnic and religious identities, especially within the framework of postmodernism discussions, and Eastern Europe. It has become an area where many people from different circles say different things in line with developments such as the emergence of [civil] groups that have accelerated the winds of political change in the Bloc (Beckman, 1998: 1; Göle, 1998: 115; Usul, 1997: 78- 79; Walzer, 1992: 33-41; cite Ercan, 2002: 70). Civil society continues to be the focus of discussions with different perspectives and approaches.

One of those who try to define civil society is Yıldırım (2003: 228). According to him, the common name of developed and democratic societies is “civil society”. With this dimension, civil society is a group of individuals and organizations that can direct and make sense of their own development, possess the necessary dynamics for this, autonomous from the state, and are in a continuous development without reference to any upper identity and reality.

From another perspective, Karakuş (2006: 4) accepts civil society and non-governmental organizations as ‘structures’ between the state and the individual. Therefore, it defines a very large area. For this reason, sometimes, when defining civil society, the emphasis is not on what civil society is but what it is not. Civil society today is above all the opposite of political society. It is against sovereign authority and monopoly. However, its most basic task is to influence the sovereign authority in line with its own interests. The means of this is to organize. Civil society represents itself through many means. Today, NGOs are the most important means by which civil society expresses itself.

Undoubtedly, the basic foundation of non-governmental organizations is the idea of civil society, the development of this idea in societies and its finding a social ground. NGOs that have an important role in the expression of individuals, groups or groups in the

social structure also; They are “organizations that provide public services in public life, in matters that concern everyone, in order to contribute to the realization of a set of valuable goals, with knowledge and knowledge on the subject” (Kuçuradi & Çakmak, 2003: 8; cite Güleç & Sancak, 2009). It is quite difficult to define non-governmental organizations and to reveal the structures that fall within this definition or not. NGOs play a vital role (sometimes more than the state and government) in terms of establishing and maintaining participatory democracy by directly contributing to the social and economic development and civil society order of the country where organized citizens live. The European Economic and Social Committee (ESC) ‘recognizes as NGOs all organizational structures that take responsibility for the benefit of society and act as an intermediary between public authorities and citizens. This definition specifically covers all economic, social and professional organizations that are the basic elements of an organized civil society and administration (Güleç & Sancak, 2009). Non-governmental organizations can be considered and evaluated in terms of whether they have formed their corporate identity or not. Corporate identity is an indicator of how seriously the work is taken or not.

In summary, when defining non-governmental organizations, it is necessary to define the environment in which they live and develop, namely the civil society. Otherwise, the definition of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) may be a little incomplete. There are many different, sometimes complementary and sometimes conflicting theories that define civil society. In addition, changes in the world system have caused different values to be attributed to the definition of civil society (Marshall, 1999: 662). The existing socio-cultural structure should not be ignored in both the development and therefore the definition of the civil society. Because civil society has come to this day by going through different stages of development in each society. For example, the development course of civil society in the West and the course of development in the east have been very different from each other.

Emergence of Civil Society and NGOs in Turkey

Civil society organizations in Turkey (NGO) said that the concept of a very short history. Rio Summit on Environment and Development in 1992 had passed without much influence in Turkey. However, this summit was one of the most important turning points that NGOs were accepted by the administrations. In 1996, the UN Summit to be held in Istanbul in Turkey was enlivened by the NGO environment in a few years ago. At the time of the decision regarding this conference in Istanbul, no committee was formed to ensure communication between non-governmental organizations. In 1994, members of some non-governmental organizations came together and formed a host committee with their own means. They took an active role in the communication between non-governmental organizations. However, there was no public space definition for NGOs yet. Before the

UN Summit, a response to the concept of “non governmental organizations (NGO)”, which is one of the participating parties according to international standards, was sought. In those days, there were those who used concepts such as “non-state organizations “, “non-governmental organizations”. Although another group introduced the concept of ‘voluntary organizations’, this concept was far from defining this new need. However, ‘establishment’ was added to the concept of ‘civil society’ in some translation publications on these dates and thus the NGO was accepted as the equivalent of the NGO concept (Gümüş, 2004: 12). The approach that the NGO name is the exact equivalent of NGO is still approached with suspicion. Because the full experience of NGOs in Turkey, “non-governmental organizations -NGO-” is understood that the application does not have the function of which I have.

Indeed, the number of non-governmental organizations, whose existence or absence did not attract much attention before 1980, has increased significantly during this period and as a result of the restrictions on rights and freedoms in the society, the laws imposed by the 12 September Constitution, different segments of society can express their demands with political and cultural content. They have turned to non-governmental organizations as a place. As a natural consequence of this situation, the concept of “civil society”, which has not attracted the attention of almost anyone in our country except for a small number of social scientists, has suddenly started to attract the attention of many people from different circles in recent years. However, the use of non-governmental organizations, which are quite numerous today, by various interest groups outside of their main purposes has led to serious debates on the issue. However, what is the civil society, intellectuals, civil society organizations of the functions of which should be what a civil society which properties owned and being able to achieve any consensus on issues such as where there is to what extent the conditions in Turkey can be built on these features, discussion of dimensions one more time. So much so that almost every segment put forward a civil society understanding specific to their political climate and argues that this is the most realistic approach (Ercan, 2002: 70). NGOs, which have become an extension of these civil society conceptions, have remained quite inconsistent in their behaviors and goals. This situation has made NGOs the focus of uncertainty, selfishness, selfishness and therefore confusion.

The root cause of the background of this turmoil experienced in civil society in Turkey, mostly in Turkey to be Eastern type-centralized with a state tradition and since the Enlightenment in the West, socio-economic, inadequate monitoring the developments occurring in the political and cultural fields and waste is that it cannot act. Debates continue on the same issue in the Western intellectual field. However, civil society concept that can be traced back to Aristotle in the West, thinkers working on this issue, especially developed from the 17th and 18th centuries, laid down the theoretical

foundations and that the bourgeois class found that was created in the framework of historical forms of development in Western European countries, the debate Turkey It displays a quite different view from the ones. In this context, the theoretical foundations and civil society, a relationship that can not be imitated in the West who have already created the perception in Turkey that is missing is integrity. The fact that some important studies have been carried out in order to eliminate the theoretical deficiency in our country and the attempts to create a Western type society model that has been continuing since the foundation of the Republic were not sufficient in solving the problem. On the other hand, the fact that almost everyone who was adversely affected by the military coup of September 12, regardless of their political environment, became a supporter of civil society and emerged a positive view towards the concept of civil society, however, it made the situation more complex (Ercan, 2002: 71). So become a member for a large part of what they see as political interests or otherwise to obtain a political tool to oppose men who want to participate in activities as a member of a civil society organization in Turkey.

In addition, civil society in Turkey, size, objectives, activities, political stances, exhibits a heterogeneous structure which differs in terms of audience and member profiles. However, there are basically two main categories that reflect NGOs in legal terms. These are associations and foundations. In quantitative terms Balk up roughly 150 thousand in Turkey is known to be non-governmental organizations. 60 thousand of them are seen as fellow countrymen associations, 80 thousand as NGOs (today this number is around 120 thousand), around 5000 professional associations and around 3000 as foundations (Güleç & Sancak, 2009). On the other hand, Keyman (2004; cite Güleç & Sancak, 2009) NGOs in terms of their main fields of activity are donation and charity organizations, socialization and cultural activity organizations, local citizen solidarity organizations, organizations for working life and professional organization, environment, wildlife and organizations aiming to protect and develop nature, organizations aiming at research and educational activities, organizations aimed at promoting and spreading a certain ideology, service organizations for the realization of religious services, organizations aiming to defend individual freedoms and human rights, health services oriented organizations, social service oriented organizations, organizations for development and housing, sports-oriented organizations, think-tank organizations, international activity organizations.

After the 1983 elections by the end of the period of military rule in Turkey, civil society organizations, is considered as mechanisms that will protect individuals across the state. Thus, the concept of civil society was given a magical meaning and started to be used in daily language to name the “form of society free from military rule”. As a result, a political attitude has emerged that we can define as “civil societyism” and is cared for rather than

the social political reality expressed by the concept of civil society. Therefore, today with an understanding of civility, depending on the historical origins of the concept of civil society in Turkey, in a very important area exceeds theme or philosophy of history is no longer interested in the social history of Western Europe with an argument. So much so that the concept of civil society serves to express some symbols and moves away from its original meaning (Mardin, 1997: 9-10; Belge, 1989: 71; Sarıbay, 1994; cite Ercan, 2002: 71). The main reason for non-governmental organizations to move away from the functions assigned to them is their politicization. However, the most general function of CSOs was to provide a tool to establish relations between state institutions and civil society.

On Institutionalization Problems of NGOs

In a society, “the absence of free political institutions prevents the formation of social actors and facilitates the repressive control of the wheel of the state over social demands and mobilizations,” says Tourain (1997: 142). He is also uncomfortable with the dominance of political parties in civil society. Because both political institutions and other social institutions inevitably fulfill an important function in the functioning of the system (Tourain, 1997: 143). Therefore, institutions and institutionalization should be considered in social dimensions. Because, the institutionalization of NGOs or their failure to institutionalize will show their level of importance in their relations with the state or individuals. NGOs that have gained a corporate identity will have an important place both at the state level and in the eyes of individuals.

Institutions are in a normative order and functioning. This order can be based not only on official norms such as laws and regulations, but also on unofficial norms such as customs, ethics and religious rules. In addition, like every social group, there are positions and behavioral patterns such as status, role patterns that determine the place and authority of each member in social institutions (Soyer, 1996: 55). Institutions have an indispensable importance especially in the formation of modern societies. The functionality of institutions is a precondition for societies to function as a whole. Can NGOs, which arise with the claim that it will be beneficial in maintaining the functionality of the society, fulfill the roles assumed by institutions with an institutional seriousness? In fact, it is necessary to look at how NGOs emerged to meet what needs.

According to Talas (2011: 392), the frequently expressed expression “developed society is” organized society “is a situation that can be explained by having strong non-governmental organizations or not. Given the impossibility of societies to cope with today’s competitive world societies alone with state facilities and energy, it will be easier to understand how important non-governmental organizations have become.

Institutionalization should be handled from different perspectives such as organizational,

sociological, political and economic. Evaluating institutionalization in terms of environmental compliance, March defined it as “ensuring organizational change with environmental change and standardization in line with this change”. In this definition, the following three points (Karpuzoğlu, 2001: 17; Cite Güleç & Sancak, 2009) draw attention:

- a-Change with environmental change,
- b-Learning this change,
- c-Developing standards suitable for the new situation.

According to Selznick, who looks at institutionalization from a different perspective; It is the process of the organization gaining a distinct identity and the social needs and pressures becoming a sensitive and flexible organism as a natural product. Therefore, institutionalization; The fact that organizations have rules, standards, procedures, a bureaucratic structure, their own way of greeting, methods and methods of doing business rather than individuals, thus it is the process of becoming public by having a distinctive and distinctive identity from other organizations (Karpuzoğlu, 2001: 17; Cite Güleç & Sancak, 2009). There are some internal dynamics that enable institutionalization. The institution is to reach the corporate identity to the extent that it realizes these dynamics. From this point of view, some non-governmental organizations may face problems.

In addition to these, some institutionalized non-governmental organizations have a highly developed communication network. In these NGOs, communication between subordinates is easily established, and scheduled and unscheduled group meetings are held among employees at all levels. This intensive communication environment in institutionalized organizations emerges as a result of informing people, keeping the innovative process alive and increasing loyalty to the organization. Another feature seen in the organizational structures of institutionalized NGOs is that the decision-making authority is not gathered at the upper level but spread to the lower levels. Distributing responsibilities along with authority and informing individuals through an intensive communication network enables employees to fulfill their responsibilities to their institutions with full commitment (Akat & Atılgan, 1992: 39-40; cite Güleç & Sancak, 2009). Completing the institutionalization process will be beneficial in overcoming various difficulties that may arise in the process.

The fact that non-governmental organizations can have a long life line, increase their effectiveness and reach a position that gives confidence to the public for the future varies in proportion to their level of institutionalization. The fact that non-governmental organizations create only a strong structure and systems open to innovation is not enough, given the increasing tendency of organizations to grow and spread. Because,

with institutionalization, non-governmental organizations will fulfill their management functions effectively, increase autonomy and entrepreneurship in management, and will target the society and its employees (Güleç & Sancak, 2009). With institutionalization, meeting the expectations of NGO members begins with more specific rules.

In summary, the dominance or weakness of democratic elements at the level of political institutionalization of the state will greatly affect the institutionalization of civil society. In the words of Tosun (2001); “If political institutions are weak and the current political regime is deemed ineffective and illegitimate, civil society activity can become an alternative to politics by satisfying their basic needs for unsatisfied citizens and increasing their energies. In such cases, coexistence will likely undermine political stability and have negative consequences for democracy by deepening divisions, increasing dissatisfaction and providing rich resources for opposition movements. A civil society that develops under these conditions signals administrative and institutional collapse and portends abuse for political stability and democracy. With this understanding, the development of civil society is a precondition for NGOs to settle in a society.

In short, the existence of NGOs can only be possible with a democratic environment. However, he is expected to comply with the rules of functioning of a democratic society. NGOs that have acquired a corporate identity can act more skillfully in fully fulfilling their social functions. Otherwise, NGOs become in the hands of certain interests to serve their interests.

NGOs and Social Integration

The effects of NGOs on social integration have been discussed. This effect can be considered in two dimensions. The first of these is the positive or positive effect on social cohesion, the second is the negative or negative effect. It is known that NGOs are called pressure and interest group before this name. Pressure is the current system, and interest is to gain material or moral benefits from the current system. In this process, in order to get rid of the negativity associated with the name of pressure and interest, it turned into its name, which is today a “Non-Governmental Organization” (NGO). In order to have an important place in social integration, NGOs are very important, especially in Western countries, and are supported financially and morally. Germany allocates a significant budget for NGOs. This budget is used by NGOs under state control. The expected benefit here is that the state wants to get rid of the hump on its back, wants to organize and control the public through these NGOs, and perhaps most importantly, it is to prevent NGOs from resorting to illegal means or illegal thoughts / ideologies from realizing their goals through NGOs.

According to Karaca, (2012), the harmony between the concept of integration in the sociological sense and the elements that make up a society is explained. In other words,

social integration is used as the integration, functional union or harmonious functioning between individuals, groups, institutions and organizations that make up the society.

Arslantürk and Amman (2008: 348-354) treat the integration processes as socialization processes. Socialization refers to the process of mutual interaction between certain individuals, which enables the transfer of targeted and purposeful examples of internal and external behaviors to ensure group integration. Thus, the individual has the opportunity to learn and adopt the processes of cooperation, competition, conflict and adaptation in the socialization process and integrate with the society. Therefore, social integration is also the case where the functional relations between the structures and institutions of the social group form an integrity. In short, social integration enables the functional relationship between the parts of a society to form a whole. In other words, the institution, group, tradition and custom etc. that make up the society. The harmony of socio-cultural elements such as maintaining their coexistence may be through social integration.

In short, according to Karaca (2012), social integration efforts, which are tried to be formed as a mortar in order to strengthen the social structure, increase the harmony between the parts of the same whole, as well as the risk of deepening the gap between the different ones and opening the social distance and creating a front is always in question. However, it should not be overlooked that if marginalization starts to become a common disease, segregation, alienation and conflicts based on various differences between members of the same society may become inevitable. Therefore, it can be said that emphasizing the minimum commons and trying to create an encompassing culture of coexistence that corresponds to a wide area of coexistence would be a healthier integration effort, instead of constantly emphasizing differences in the effort to ensure integration.

Conclusion

Although every organization active in the field of civil society is seen as a non-governmental organization, in modern societies, it does not pursue an economic purpose and works on the basis of collective benefit; Organizations acting on a voluntary basis to enlighten and direct the public are seen as non-governmental organizations. The most distinctive features of non-governmental organizations are that they do not only serve their own purposes and values, are independent from governments, public authorities, political parties, do not pursue commercial interests, do not seek profit, and mediate between the central authority and the citizen. Non-governmental organizations act within these criteria and fulfill the requirements of being a non-governmental organization in a sense. Thus, they ensure that the whole society takes action towards the solution of social problems (Özer, 2008: 91). NGOs must have acquired a corporate identity in order to fulfill these functions. The most important factor in the acquisition of corporate

identity is closely related to how much the current society has internalized civil society. Because NGOs can exist based on civil society. The stronger the understanding of civil society, the stronger the NGOs.

On the other hand, Güleç-Sancak (2009) stated that in today's changing conditions, the idea that everything will be done by human beings again for human beings has forced institutions to adopt an attitude towards people, and it is revealed that valuing the human factor is very important for people to be effective and productive in the organization. Cooperation and opinion of employees at all levels are important in achieving organizational goals in human-oriented management systems. To convince people that they are doing a meaningful job, to appreciate their work, to make them love their work, and to see them as partners / participants, examining, researching and thinking individuals in order to reach the goal, not a tool to achieve the goals, will lead both leaders and organizations to achieve their goals.

According to Talas (2011: 398), people have struggled to meet their economic, social, cultural and political needs in an organized and organized manner. In this sense, association, foundation, interest union, pressure group, chamber, initiative group, union of forces, etc. They are organized by name. In the face of many problems that cannot be overcome alone, there has been an obligation to act together. Especially in the last 20-30 years, the societies equipped with such organizations are called non-governmental organizations and the organizations themselves are called non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Mainly due to the inability to precisely fulfill the requirements of modernity in Turkey, the Western source description of the civil society, NGOs present in the country were insufficient to express the concept. For this reason, apart from the necessity of civil society for our country, it is necessary to make a realistic assessment in the light of current conditions, regarding the definition, justification of this, what its features and functions are / should be. The realization of the expectations regarding civil society depends primarily on reaching a consensus on what the concept of civil society means. To do this, understanding the basics of civil society must be questioned seriously and they should be evaluated in the context of Turkey's unique conditions. Such an approach will greatly clarify what the basic requirements for the formation of civil society are fulfilled and how it can be improved. The clear presentation of these issues will bring along what the functions of civil society should be. Approaching the problem from such a perspective will help solve the problem. However, it does not seem possible to overcome the problem of civil society only if certain circles produce theories on this issue. For this, all social institutions should be mobilized and the society should be re-conscious about the civil and political sphere (Ercan, 2002: 76-77). This is because it does not seem possible to consider and examine the phenomenon of civil society independently from other institutions. On the contrary, it is particularly relevant to all institutions. On

the contrary, it has a very close relationship with civil society, especially the legal and political institution.

According to Tosun (2001), in the relationship between the state and civil society, the duties of civil society such as controlling the state power expected from it, ensuring participation, establishing democratic attitudes, shaping social needs and demands, softening polarization, raising new political leaders, and increasing the level of social responsibility of the system. In order for it to be implemented, the democratization process must work in both directions. Structuring the relationship between the state and civil society over democratic values does not weaken the state, on the contrary, by enabling citizen participation by strong and organized NGOs, the crisis of representation and legitimacy experienced by the system can be overcome and the ethical values of politics that are considered to be contaminated can be reproduced. Citizens will be taken from the passive participation level where they remain only voting voters, and they will be activated as individuals who form associations, ask, consult and make decisions, thanks to NGOs. Therefore, for shifting to overcome the consolidation process of transition to democracy in Turkey, “state versus civil society” or “state versus civil society” abandoned the approach in many areas, it is necessary to implementation of joint projects.

The contribution of civil society to democracy is possible with the number and diversity of organizations in the field of civil society, as well as the democratic relations that these organizations will come together and establish with each other and assimilate democratic values in their internal relations. Otherwise, it is clear that such formations cannot go beyond being a civilian extension of authoritarian or totalitarian policies (Aslan, 2010). What determines the level of relations between CSOs in various societies is whether or not they acquire a corporate identity.

Non-governmental organizations have a particularly important place in terms of the integration of societies. For modern societies, NGOs are the duty of NGOs in society what the vessels are in the human body.

References

- Adler, A. (2000). *Bireysel psikolojisi. sosyal roller ve kişilik*. (Çev.: Turhan Yörükkan). Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Aslan, S. (2010). Sivil Toplum ve Demokrasi. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 357-374.
- Ercan, H. (2002). Türkiye’de Sivil Toplum Tartışmaları Üzerine. *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 26(1), 69-79.
- Fichter, J. (2006). *Sosyoloji nedir? (8.Baskı)*, (Çev.: Nilgün Çelebi), Anı Yayınları.

-
- Güleç S. & Sancak, H. Ö. (2009). Türkiye’de Sivil Toplum Kuruluşlarında Kurumsallaşma ve Stratejik Yönetim. VI. Uluslararası Sivil Toplum Kongresi. Çanakkale.
- Gümüş, K. (2004). Yakın Tarihimizde STK Hareketinin Gelişimi ve Kamu Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları İlişkisi. Savunuculuk ve Politikaları Etkileme Konferans Yazıları No 3, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Karakurt Tosun, E. (2007). Avrupa Birliğine Üyelik Sürecinde Türkiye’de Yerel Yönetimler ve Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları. *PARADOKS, Ekonomi, Sosyoloji ve Politika Dergisi, (e-dergi)*,3(2), <http://www.paradoks.org>
- Marshall, G. (1999). *Sosyoloji sözlüğü*. (Çev.: Osman Akınhay-Derya Kömürcü), Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Ozankaya, Ö. (1986). *Toplumbilim (6. Baskı)*, Tekin Yayınları.
- Özer, M. H. (2008). Günümüz İtibariyle Sivil Toplum Kuruluşlarının İktisadi ve Sosyal Fonksiyonları. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. Güz, 7(26)*, 086-097.
- Soyer, S. (1996). *Endüstri sosyolojisine giriş*. Saray Yayınları.
- Talas, M. (2011). Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları ve Türkiye Perspektifi. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları. (XXIX)*.
- Tosun, G. (2001). Türkiye’de Devlet-Sivil Toplum İlişkisi Bağlamında Demokrasinin Pekişmesinin Önündeki Engellere İlişkin Kuramsal ve Pratik Bir Yaklaşım. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi, 17(4)*, <http://www.onlinedergi.com/eab/Giris.aspx> (Erişim Tarihi:11.09.2017).
- Tourain, A. (1997). *Demokrasi nedir? (4. Baskı)*. (Çev.: Olcay Kunal), Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Wallace, R. A. & Wolf, A. (2004). Çağdaş sosyoloji kuramları. (Çev.: Leyla Elburuz, M. Rami Ayas), Punto Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, M. (2003). Sivil Toplum ve Devlet. *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. Aralık, 27(2)*, 226–242.
- Karaca, M. (2012). Farklılaşma, Bütünleşme ve Birlikte Yaşama Üzerine. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. (18)*.
- Arslantürk, Z. & Amman, M.T. (2009). *Sosyoloji/Kavramlar-Kurumlar-Süreçler-Teoriler (5. Baskı)*. Çamlıca Yayınları.