

The Increasing Importance of the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)

Süleyman ÖZDEMİR

Associate Professor

Istanbul University, Faculty of Economics

Department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, Turkey

sozdemir@istanbul.edu.tr

Zeki PARLAK

Associate Professor, Marmara University

Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, Turkey

zekiparlak@hotmail.com

Abstract: "Civil Society Organizations" (CSOs), especially by developed societies, are "started to be re-explored" since 1970s in consequences of social welfare states' crisis, domination of neo-liberal philosophy and policies in the world, spreading of democracy, end of the cold war, improvements on information and communication systems etc... The most prominent difference between the last decades of the previous century and the first decade of the current century lies in the role that CSOs undertake in the society. As CSOs have suitable properties which are brought about the economic and political philosophy of globalization, they have got considerable attention of the states and have had a proper environment to develop in the countries where neo-liberal philosophy is being implemented.

However, CSOs are not an alternative to the state, instead, they are supplementary institutions. Since CSOs are very appropriate to the rationale of economical and political philosophy of the last quarter of the twentieth century, which requires minimalization of the state, they are being supported by the state which was directed by liberal philosophy. Hence, they are increasingly developing in terms of quantity and quality.

Keywords: Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Non-Profit Organizations (NPOs), Third Sector, Social Policy, State-CSOs Relationship, Turkey.

Introduction

The post-1980 era has witnessed the widespread transformations in the economic and political realms of the social life at the global level. The expansion of globalization, neo-liberalism and participative democracy has resulted in the increasing importance of the civil society organizations (CSOs) in the last three decades. The state has withdrawn from the economic and social areas. While the economy has been left to the market forces, new actors entered the scene to provide social welfare services. Consequently, the CSOs were re-discovered as the abiding provider of the social aids. Thus, it may not be incorrect to name this century as the century of the civil society.

The CSOs are now considered as extremely significant institutions of the modern society as the new provider of social services. A new division of labour has been advanced among the state, municipals, market and the CSOs. The state has formed partnership with the CSOs and prefers purchasing services from the CSOs rather than producing them. The process has been expanding since the late 1970s and has come to constitute a significant part of welfare mixes in many countries. In many developed nations, particularly the USA and UK, the legal system and the administrative reforms enabled the state to maintain responsible for financing and auditing the social welfare services while transferring the responsibility for the provisions of these services to the CSOs and private sectors.

In contrast to the developed nations, the CSOs are extremely weak in Turkey. Despite the promotion and expansion of their role in the social policy area at the global level, the Turkish CSOs do not seem to have gained any impetus. Neither the state nor the CSOs have any intention to alter their entrenched attitudes. The state has distrusted them and had hostile attitudes towards that civil society organization which are not under its control. The CSOs, on the other hand, have no desire to change and undertake any major responsibilities for social services. However, Turkey's accession to the EU will eventually transform the hostile attitude of the state towards the civil society and give rise to the growth of the civil society in Turkey.

1. The Concept and Description of Civil Society Organizations

A. The Confusion over the Concept of Civil Society Organizations

Civil society organizations (CSOs) are composed of a wide range of different organizations such as small local associations, large professional organizations and foundations. A number of different terms are currently used to indicate the civil society in the literature. Some widely used terms including civil society organizations, non-profit organizations, non-profit sector, non-governmental organizations, non-governmental sectors, philanthropic organizations, charitable organizations, third sector, voluntary organizations, private voluntary organizations, not-for-profit organizations, independent sector, tax-exempt organizations and social movements (*Uslu 1999*). It should be pointed out that there is no widely accepted discretion for none of these terms.

In the Turkish literature on this sort of civil organizations, although there is a disagreement whether some of these organizations could be considered as civil society or not, the term civil society organizations is used to point out followings: foundations, associations, chambers, cooperatives, clubs, and platforms, and non-governmental organizations and third sector. On the other hand, some different terms such as community, society, order, guild and foundations were employed in the past to express the CSOs (*ACOC, 2004*).

The term “non-profit organizations” is preferred in the developed world. This term is extensively used in English literature. Nevertheless, the term civil society organizations will be used in this article. This is because this term has wider in scope, and is also well known and commonly used in the academic circles, the political discussions and in the daily life in Turkey.

B. The Concept of Civil Society Organizations

The concept of CSOs has a wider framework and usually tends to include most of the other terms given above. The CSOs is based on the voluntariness principles and is wrought by philanthropy and social aims. It is independent of the state and constitutes a third sector along with the public and private ones. Although located in the private sector, in terms of its structure it is quite distinct from it.

Lester Salamon (*1999*), who has written widely on the CSOs, describes the CSOs as non-profit organizations and non-profit sector in his book and indicated that they have six basic features in common.

- First all these organizations have managed to become institutionalized one way or another. Informal and temporary gathering of people cannot be regarded within the scope of non-profit establishments.
- Second, these organizations must operate in the “private sector”. Thus, they must be independent of the state. Nevertheless, this point does not mean that these organizations may not receive support from the state.
- Third, they must distribute profits in accordance with the social objectives. That is, these organizations, do not share dividends with their shareholders.
- Fourth, they must have an independent management structure. They plan and implement their own activities. No person or an establishment should interfere in the running of these organizations.
- Fifth, the development of non-profit organizations should be voluntary. In general, the members of the board of trustees are volunteers, yet those who work for the organization do not have to be volunteers.
- Sixth, the non-profit organizations have to operate with purposes declared in their charter.

According to a categorisation, developed by National Centre for Charitable Statistics, massive number activities of non-profit organizations can be discerned.

The centre, divides this activities 26 main areas and functions. Then, it is divided into sub-categories. For example, in the field of education there are 41, on the other hand in the field of arts and culture and humanities 56 activities exist (*Salamon 2003 & Fremont-Smith 2004*).

According to another study, the CSOs are described as “organizations, which are independent from the state, based on voluntary gathering and working for the interests of the society rather than their members, non-profit and operating within the legal system” (*Şahin 2007*).

2. New Categorisation: Civil Society Regimes

In line with Esping-Andersen’s widely known classification, “welfare regimes” (*Esping-Andersen 1999 & Özdemir 2007*), Salamon and Anheier classify the CSOs as “civil society regimes”. For them, the CSOs are developed in different ways under different regimes, and they propose four different types of civil society regimes (*Anheier and List 2005*).

The first is the “*liberal model*”. This model, represented by the USA, is characterized by the low level of public spendings on social welfare and the existence of a large civic sector.

The second regime is “*social democratic model*”. The model is implemented in the small Scandinavian states, mainly in Sweden. This model is geared to a strong welfare state and relatively weaker in voluntary sector. The higher social spending, by the state, leaves no necessity for the civil society.

The third model is called “*corporatist model*”. The model is mainly represented by Germany and is based on the partnership between the state and civil society. The central feature of this model is the high public and civil society spendings. That is both the state and civil society are generous.

The final model is the “*statist regime*”. This model is represented by the countries such as Turkey and Japan. The level of social spendings on social welfare is extremely low and the civil society is not well-developed. While the statist regime restrains from the public welfare spendings, they pressurize the CSOs to trim down their welfare spendings (Moore 2001 & Anheier and List 2005). Nonetheless, this does not mean that the balance between the state and the CSOs will never change. The CSOs are occasionally promoted as in the case of France and Japan (Moore 2001).

3. The Historical Development of the Civil Society Organizations

A. Pre- Industrial Revolution Era: The Increasing Social Responsibility of the Civil Society Organizations

Voluntary organizations that are providing social aids with philanthropic sentiments to those who are in need have always existed throughout the history. In fact, practices which are similar to those social welfare services provided by the welfare state as old as human history, the societies always looked for ways to provide aids and services (accommodation, food, cloths etc...) to those who are disables, ill, poor. It should be indicated that before the establishment of the modern welfare state, society, religious and voluntary organizations provided these services in one way or another (Ersöz 2000).

In the period before the centralized state authority took over the responsibility for social services, CSOs had provided welfare for individuals and families in the face of economic and natural disasters. Social aids were provided by personal relations such as families, relatives, communities, and by economic organizations such as guilds and also by religious organizations such as order, small dervish. In addition to these, it was also observed that the administrative classes of south aimed to develop a protective system for the poor with various concerns. In short, before the Industrial Revolution, it can be argued that the practice of social policy was provided by philanthropic organizations operating on the basis of voluntariness and mutual aid principles. Following the transformation of the economic and social structures by Industrial Revolution, the social welfare providing organizations started to be transformed also (Ersöz 2000).

B. The Period of Industrialisation: The Decreasing Importance of Civil Society Organizations

In consequence of rapid industrialization, the social policy organizations of the previous era such as family, philanthropic organizations and others quickly became insufficient and the new organizations to meet the growing demand were established. This is because, the traditional social aid organizations failed to provide help for rapidly growing working classes in terms of work accident and social care (Koray 2003). The process of urbanization, caused by the Industrial Revolution, resulted in the elimination of some of the social protection organizations or reduced their effectiveness; along with the declining of the size of families, the family ties and protection of the family weakened, thus the state in the industrial societies had to take over those responsibilities (Güloğlu 1998).

After the great depression of the 1929, to overcome the crisis, the Keynesian economic model was adopted. This model was called for the extensive involvement of the state in economic and social realms in order to sustain a high level of domestic demand. The state intervention in the economic and social services, virtually eradicated the need for the CSOs. As a result, a new period, in which the state took over the main responsibility for the provision of the social welfare, was launched. The period between the World War II and 1980, state intervention in social policy reached its apex and welfare states were born and matured.

C. Post-1975 Era: Globalization and Neo-Liberalism and the Re-Discovery of Civil Society Organization

In this century, there is no doubt that the increasing importance of the CSOs is very much associated with the rise of globalization and neo-liberalism and participative democracy. In the post-1980 period, the transformations, taking place in the economic, politic, social and legal areas, resulted in the gradual withdrawal of the state from the social welfare services. As a result, the CSOs started to take over the responsibility from the state for the provision of the social welfare services, and a third sector, in which the CSOs operate, developed after a long period of stagnation (Şahin ve Öztürk 2008). These organizations, providing social welfares for

humanity since the early ages, have performed a very significant role. It seems that they will continue to erg this role in the near future (*Kuhnle ve Alestalo 2000*).

The CSOs, particularly in the western world, have been increasingly seen as an actor of social policy. The central government, local government, and the CSOs have set up partnership for the provision of social services and the state increased its collaboration with the CSOs. The state, rather than producing the same services prefers buying from these organizations. Particularly after 1970s, the process revived and come to constitute a significant part of the welfare mixes (*Uslu 1999*).

The ascendancy of globalization and neo-liberal policies seems to be the main factor behind the current expansion of the CSOs both in qualitative and quantitative terms in the developed countries. While calling for the state to wane and return to the main functions, the CSOs are expected to undertake the responsibilities and duties for the provision of the social welfare along with the private sector (Pierson 2001). Hence, the legal and administrative restructuring in the developed countries particularly in the USA and England has intended to enable the state to maintain the responsibility for fining and auditing while transferring the responsibility for the provision and distribution of the social welfare to the CSOs. Along with the process and policies a discourse and need for supporting the CSOs have come to dominate the political agenda (*Özbek 2002*).

The role of the state in the social area should be that the state should provide services to civil society or the private sector which are reluctant to produce, should provide aid for those priors who cannot afford to buy the services produced by the private sector (*Çalışkan 2001*) or should support, subside the private sector social services that are useful for its citizens, and should promote them (*Çevik 1998*).

The state seeking to cut down the social spendings with the aim of restructuring themselves, particularly stared felling that is insufficient in the area of social aid and social services. The realisation of the shortage by the state, in these issues, resulted in the re-establishment of the ties between the state and civil society.

4. The State–Civil Society Organizations–Market Relations

A. The Relations between State and Civil Society Organizations

Some researches demonstrate that in the development and the qualitative expansion of the CSOs, the attitude of the state towards these organizations is of central importance. If the legal, institutional and financial supports (purchasing social service, aids and tax exemptions, etc.) are provided by the state to these organizations, not on their quantity and scale but also their share in the provision of the social services, will certainly augment (*Luksetich 2008*).

The CSOs have become one of the basic social actors in the local, national and international levels. The CSOs are parts of the private sector, while they are operating on a voluntary basis, and provide services for the public. Thus, CSOs can be regarded as the organizations where the private and public cut across. More than a quarter century, many researchers, mainly economist, have argued that the CSOs provide social services much more effective and cheaper than the state and suggested that the state should set up partnership with the CSOs. In some developed countries such as the USA, France, England and Germany, these suggestions have been implied for a long time. In countries where the State–CSOs relations are developed and strengthened, the number of the CSOs and the coverage of their activities (such as in the USA, Holland and Austria) are much more extensive than in countries (particularly developing countries) where these relations are underdeveloped (*Anheier ve List 2005*).

It is possible to argue that the State–CSOs relations are formed on three bases such as supplementary, complementary and adversarial.

The first form of relation is the *supplementary* relations where the CSOs produce services that are not produced by the state. The failure of these states to meet the demand for services, result in the entrance of the CSOs into the service production. In this case it can be argued that there is reverse relations between the public spendings and CSOs' spendings. That is, if the state produces more services, its spendings will increase, the CSOs' spendings will decrease.

The second form of the State and CSOs relations is the *complementary*. This means that the state and CSOs are partners in the provision of the social services and the role or the CSOs are to carry out the distribution of the services that are financed by the state. At this stage, there is a direct link between the CSOs' spendings and the state spendings. That is, with an increase in the state spendings, its support to the activities of the CSOs will augment.

In the third form of the relationship, CSOs, instead of producing services or helping governments to produce it, are constantly encouraging the government in order to produce services and in this sense to perform the public responsibility. Yet the relation and interaction is very low if compared two others.

It must be pointed out that in hybrid organizations, where the State–CSOs relations merge one with another, the border have become more vague as in the USA, Japan and Israel (Young 2000).

The CSOs can be seen in all civilized societies. Yet each society has specific structure and scale of voluntary sector distincts very much from the others. Currently the high growth in the voluntary sector has occurred in the USA. In the last 30 years, the voluntary sector has become a third sector along with the public and private sectors (*Payton ve Moody 2008*).

B. The Relations between Market and Civil Society Organizations

The CSOs do not always obtain financial resources from the charity, donation and state aids. Some of the CSOs may participate in the economic activities by means of economic enterprises with an intention to make profit. Thus, they can produce and sell goods and services like any other private sector companies. Nevertheless, the profits coming from these economic activities are not shared by the shareholders, but are used in accordance with the social purpose of the organization (*Easterly ve Miesing 2008*).

In the last two decades, it is extensively observed that not only the CSOs have expended rapidly, but also their incomes have risen sharply, particularly in the USA. The central reason for the expansion of the CSOs is the markets. During this period, an ample demand developed for their services and for their increased incomes from charging for these services; they set up trading companies or partnerships with private sector firms and they commenced to use the techniques that are used by the firms, learned to obtain more financial resource from the state and sophisticated marketing strategies and monetary management techniques. They also re-designed their own structures and implemented all these techniques for collecting charities and providing social services. All these denote that the CSOs of the century are very much different than those at time of our fathers due to still continuing process of a massive restructuring (*Salamon 2003*).

5. Civil Society Organizations in the USA and Turkey

A. Civil Society Organizations in the USA

The USA has gone in the way of philanthropy and CSOs more than any other nation did in the history. That is no nation has been based on voluntary activities more than the USA has been. Along with the state and market, as a third sector the CSOs has become very important. The voluntary sector has gone beyond the imagination of people in this country. That is, there exist more that 2 million voluntary organizations, millions of donors and volunteers, millions of employment, billions of dollar income, billions of dollar spending and trillions of dollar assets (*Payton ve Moody 2008*).

One of the important characters of the American society is that, in sharp contrast to many welfare states, the constantly growing state has developed the CSOs rather than emasculating and restricting them in the last fifty years. Because in the USA, societal hostility towards centralized bureaucracy and the presence of large number of voluntary organization in various fields, have increased the supports for the CSOs in the fields such as health, education, social services, art and culture. In the American social welfare system, in many of the basic social welfare areas financing is proved by the state while private organizations and establishment provided most of the services (*Salamon 1999*).

The CSOs and philanthropy has become very important element of the social life in that the number of the registered CSOs reached to 1.4 million according to the Internal Revenue Service in 2004. The figure does not include small religious groups, local communities, and clubs, civil partnerships, and the other voluntary organizations. If these unregistered organizations are included the number of the CSOs, total number reaches to 2 million in the USA. Of these 500,000 are very large and have immense revenues and investments. According to the IRS, the group had 1,36 trillions revenues and 2,97 trillions worth assets in 2004. It means that the economical size of the CSOs in the USA is larger from the whole countries' economies. Incomes and possessions belonging to the CSO's in this country are mostly consumed for education and health services (*Payton ve Moody 2008*).

B. Civil Society Organizatons in Turkey

Looking at the development of the CSOs in Turkey, it is possible to say that the CSOs, which are the important elements of the democratic system, have played a profound role in the development of the society since the early days of the history. Most of these CSOs are organised as foundations (*vakıf*) and associations (*dernek*). They have done pioneering and useful works for the society. It is determined that most of them were established with philanthropic and social aims (*DPT 2001*).

CSOs, organized the form of foundations, have performed countless duties and have undertaken large number of responsibilities within the economic and social lives since the Seljukis time. They thrived greatly

during the Ottoman era. The Ottoman epoch can be considered as the golden age of these organizations in terms of quantity and functions (*Zaim 1997*).

However, it is well-known that the foundations were in decline in the last years of the Ottomans and this process continued well into the republican era. It was not until the amendment made in the Common Law as to foundations in 1967 that the fate of CSOs changed in Turkey (*See Ertem 1998*). Following these amendment, the number of foundation have amplified.

These foundations have carried out extremely important responsibilities in the economic and social lives throughout the centuries in Turkey. This type of organizations contributed to the education, culture, and economy, social and politic lives. It can be said that the Foundation allocated most of their services to social services. Some of the foundations established as educational (for example Dar'üş-Şafaka, which is a secondary school in Istanbul for poor or poor and fatherless children) and health (for example a lot of dar'üş-şifa, which is health care centres) establishments in order to enhance national culture and protection of public and individual health. Some them prefer caring the poor, provide pension for those who work in heavy and weary industries, elderly who cannot work, parentless kids, orphans and widows etc. (*Özdemir 1997*).

Another organising form of the CSOs during the last period of the Ottomans and Republican eras was the associations. Nevertheless neither the foundations nor the associations have managed to serve as CSOs because of the legal restriction on their activities. Thus, the legal amendments have been taken place in Turkey to eliminate these restrictions and give more freedom to the CSOs.

For today, looking at the number of the association and foundations and other CSOs, and their members, are very low when compared to those in the developed countries. As of February 2009, there are 4.966 foundations. The number of total associations operating in Turkey is about 80,706. The figure is very low compared to the number of civil associations in the USA, Germany and France, which are approximately 7 millions, 2.1 and 1.4 millions respectively. According to the calculations; Turkey has to have at least 300 thousand associations in proportion to their size.

In line with Solomon's description of CSOs, one of the elements of the concept is that considering the private and public division, the CSOs are private sector establishments. Looking at the Turkish CSOs, apart from the foundations, associations and trade unions, some chambers and occupational association (chambers of commerce, engineers association, artichoke association, laws etc.), for which membership is compulsory, are considered as CSOs. These aspects of the civil organizations are not compatible Salmon's CSOs description. And they have hybrid characters.

At the same time, in these and other EU countries, the sector employs a sizeable part of their population. In the USA, approximately 9 million, in Germany 1 million, in France 0.8 million, and in Japan 1.4 million people are working for CSOs. However, albeit there is no research conducted in the respects in Turkey, it is estimated that the employment in this sector is negligible.

On the other hand, as noted earlier, the importance of the CSOs are expanding in the world. In many countries, the share of these organizations in the GDP is very large and continues to grow (for example, in the USA is about 6.3 percent, in England and France 4.8 percent, and in Japan 3.5 percent). Unfortunately there is no research which has been carried out in this respect in Turkey (*ACOC 2004*).

In Turkey, the inexistence of sufficiently developed welfare state constitutes the basis of the insufficient development of State-CSOs relations. Thus, this insufficiency dominates the CSOs and there is no sign that there will be significant development in this area. Turkey has not undergone the process of transformation of the western welfare state since the 1970s.

The formation of the relation between the state and CSOs depends of the existence of some conditions. First of all, it is necessary that the state should promote the CSOs, by providing the legal framework enabling the effective operations of the organizations.

In order to develop the CSOs-State relations, those CSOs which have better organizations, performed effective and useful services should be selected and supported and promoted. The Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SHÇEK) leading role and advises will help these organizations to improve the quality of their services (*DPT 2001*).

In Turkey, the profound presence of state dominates the educational, health and social services. The social services provided by the public organizations are controlled by central authority in Ankara. Extreme centralizations tendency prevents planning, producing and distributing the services to those in need. In addition, shortage of financial resources results in the shortage of these services. Therefore, looking from these angles, regarding the fulfilment of social welfare services, both public management and the CSOs are far from the expected levels (*Çevik 1998*).

The results of a survey (*See Özdemir & Başel & Şenocak 2009*), performed by us in Üsküdar District of Istanbul, after exposing the conditions and reasons of CSOs, point out that unfortunately there is not any evidence that this structure will change or transform, like in developed countries, in near future.

In the developed countries, the process of the transformations which give rise to transferring, to a large extent the state responsibility concerning social policy to the CSOs. Not only have not been experienced in

Turkey yet, but also the CSOs are neither aware nor enthusiastic towards such a change that will alter their destiny. Unfortunately some questions in the research demonstrate that the CSOs have accepted their destiny, are extremely reactant to do something to alter their future. This is very much noticeable from the questionnaire. As can be seen from the (Tab. n. 35) that 33.3 percent of the participant CSOs are against the transfer of social responsibility from the state to any other organizations including the CSOs. Only the 11 percent of the CSOs support such initiatives and express willingness to take some responsibility. The rest, (55,6 percent) avoid to reply these questions and do not believe that such transfer can be possible. In some developed countries such as the USA, the majority of the CSOs supports the transfer of the social aids and social services to voluntary organizations. In the countries, where this transfer has taken place, the growth of the CSOs has been observed. It is, therefore, a must for the Turkish CSOs to welcome this development and undertake increasingly responsibility for the provision of the social policy. If the CSOs have still state-centered views and are unaware what is going on in the World, nothing can be done to change their destiny. It is probably that the CSOs are in the opinion that they may not be able to overcome the provision of social policy and thus lack self confidence (Özdemir & Başel & Şenocak 2009).

The view that the state provides social aids and social services better than anyone, dominate not only the CSOs but also the entire society in Turkey. The survey carried out by Çarkoğlu (2006) also confirms this view. According to his results, 38.2 percent of participants believe that social aid is primarily the responsibility of the state in Turkey. 30.9 percent believe that it is also the individual responsibility of wealthy people. Only 5.4 percent indicate that the CSOs should have some responsibility in this respect. Hence, it is possible to argue that in the mind of individuals, there is very small role for the CSOs for providing social services. This means that when people give charity, only few of them take the CSOs into consideration (Özdemir & Başel & Şenocak 2009).

Conclusion

The 1980s have witnessed major transformations in the economic, political and social realms. With the collapse of the Post-War order, the Western capitalism moved to a new stage. With the ascendancy of the neo-liberal economic policies, while the state involvement in the economy was undermined, the expansion of the welfare state came to the end. For the neo-liberals, the state involvement in the economy created market inefficiencies and prevented optimum allocation of resources. Hence, it is more rational for the state to withdraw from the economy and stop providing social welfare services. The social welfare services must be provided by civil society organizations (CSOs) or the private sector (1) (Pierson 2001). This is resulted in the re-discovery of the role of the CSOs as the actors in providing social services in the developed economies. A spectacular expansion of their role and activities of the CSOs in the provision of social services have been observed. The number of the CSOs has also mushroomed.

The post 1929 crisis witnessed a period in which the role of the state in the economy and in the provision of social services was rapidly expanded. Nevertheless, with the crisis of the 1970s the state involvement in those areas came to be questioned. A new area was launched by the adaption of neo-liberal economic policies, demanding minimum state interference in the economic and social realms in the late 1970s (Özdemir 2007). Consequently, the discourse that the CSOs and waning the state have dominated the economic, political and social agendas in the world (Özbek 2002).

The concept and issue of the CSOs, philanthropy, non-profit organizations, and social capital have been disregarded by social scientist and the public officials for a long-time. As social policy and welfare state developed, discussion on markets, state and social policy dominated the agenda in the post war epoch. The CSOs was considered as an insignificant issue. Nevertheless, following the ascendancy of the neo-liberal economic policies, this approach changed in the late 1970s. As the state has withdrawn from the economic and social realms, the CSOs were re-discovered as alternative to the public provision of social services in many developed countries. Thus, the CSOs have, recently, become one of the most important economic and social actors in the developed countries. They are seen as a “middle way” between the state and market and are called as “third sector”. In these countries, the state seeks to generate an environment conducive for the growth of the CSOs. The high quality relations between states and the CSOs constitute the basis for the phenomenal revival of the CSOs

Unfortunately this is not the case in Turkey for the time being. The CSOs have neither mentally nor economically developed to undertake the responsibility for the provision of the social welfare state. There are number of reasons for this insufficient development of the CSOs. One of them is the existence of poor relations between the state and CSOs. In contrast to the developed countries, the state is reluctant to promote the civil society. This may be related to the authoritarian character of the state. The state has always distrusted the civil society and sought to keep any civil organizing attempt, which would challenge the state authority, under stick control. Thus, the growth and expansion of the civil society may be deliberately prevented. The state is reluctant to hand over some of its authority and responsibility to the civil society. This means that CSOs have not obtained

sufficient support from the state to flourish. This also means that the state have no intention to purchase services from the CSOs and does not involve or consult the CSOs in the formulation of social policies.

Thus, it can be legitimately concluded that the state may partially hold responsibility for this apparent insufficient development of the CSOs in Turkey. Our findings provide ample support to this argument. Nevertheless, the process of Turkey's integration to the EU and economic and social development, it may argued that the CSOs will discover their potential as well as get better recognition from the state and society.

One another reason for the dismay of the Turkish CSOs may be themselves. Reviewing the literature and the fieldwork results demonstrate that most of the CSOs are even unable to perform their own duties determined by their charters. Nevertheless, those, with sufficient financial resources, have not changed their mentality at all. They are still disinclined to have any major role in the society. In many developed countries, the responsibility of the state for the provision of social and welfare services is shifting to the CSOs. Most of the Turkish CSOs tend to believe that providing social services have the responsibility of the state and reluctant to undertake any responsibility in this regard. Consequently it is possible to argue that the most striking result of this research is that the most of Turkish CSOs turn a blind eye to the changing international economic and political environment of the CSOs in the world (Özdemir & Başel & Şenocak 2009).

Bibliography

Anheier, H. K. & List, R. A. (2005). NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations). *A Dictionary of Civil Society, Philanthropy and the Non-Profit Sector*. New York: Routledge Publ.

Ankara Chamber of Commerce (ACOC) (2004). *Civil Society Folder While Entering the EU (AB Kapısında Sivil Toplum Dosyası)*. Ankara: ACOC Publ., <http://195.155.145.1/turkce0index10.html>. January 21, 2007.

Aydın, D. & Çizakça, M. & Çarkoğlu, A. & Gökçen, F. (eds.) (2006). *Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and Social Justice (Türkiye'de Hayırseverlik: Vatandaşlar, Vakıflar ve Sosyal Adalet)*. İstanbul: TÜSEV Publ.

Brinkerhoff, J. M. & Smith S. C. & Teegen, H. (2007). Beyond the 'Non': The Strategic Space for NGOs in Development. *NGOs and the Millennium Development Goals: Citizen Action to Reduce Poverty*. (eds: Brinkerhoff, J. M. & Smith S. C. & Teegen, H.), New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publ., pp. 53–80.

Burlingame, D. F. (ed.) (2004). *Philanthropy in America: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*. Vol.: 1, California: ABC-CLIO Publ.

Çalışkan, A. (2001). *The Efficiency of the State in Providing Social Welfare: Case of Turkey*. (Sosyal Refahın Sağlanmasında Devletin Etkinliği ve Türkiye Örneği). (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University, Social Science Institute.

Çarkoğlu, A. (2006). Individual Charity and Tendency in Foundation Implementation. ("Türkiye'de Bireysel Bağışlar ve Vakıf Uygulamalarında Eğilimler"). *Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and Social Justice (Türkiye'de Hayırseverlik: Vatandaşlar, Vakıflar ve Sosyal Adalet)*. (eds.: Aydın, D. & Çizakça, M. & Çarkoğlu, A. & Gökçen, F.), İstanbul: TÜSEV Publ.

Çevik, H. H. (1998). Social Welfare Plurality in Producing and Providing Public Services. (Kamu Hizmetlerinin Üretilmesinde ve Sunulmasında Sosyal Refah Çoğulculuğu). *Türk İdare Dergisi*. Issue: 418.

Didier, F. (2003). *Costs of Non-Social Policy: Towards an Economic Framework of Quality Social Policies—and the Costs of Not Having Them*. Report for the Employment and Social Affairs DG.

DPT (2001). Report of the Special Commission on Social Welfare Services and Social Assistance. (Sosyal Hizmetler ve Yardımlar Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu). *8th Development Plan. (Sekizinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı)*. Ankara: DPT Publ.

Easterly, L. & Miesing, P. (2008). NGOs, Social Venturing, and Community Citizenship Behavior. *Business & Society*. <http://www.albany.edu/~pm157/research/NGOs,%20Social%20Venturing,%20and%20Community%20Citizenship%20Behavior.pdf>. February 18, 2009.

Ersöz, H. Y. (2000). *Local Governments from the Aspect of Social Policy: England, Sweden, and Turkey. (Sosyal Politika Açısından Yerel Yönetimler: İngiltere, İsveç ve Türkiye Örneği)*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), İstanbul: İstanbul University, Social Science Institute.

Ertem, A. (1998). The Foundations as Means of Social Entegration in Ottomans and Republican Era. (Osmanlı ve Cumhuriyet Döneminde Sosyal Bütünleşme Açısından Vakıflar). (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), İstanbul: İstanbul University, Social Science Institute.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Fremont-Smith, M. R. (2004). The Nonprofit Sector in the Twenty-First Century. *Governing Nonprofit Organizations: Federal and State Law and Regulation*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Güloğlu, T. (1998). *Social Security of Aging Population in General, and in Turkey. (Genel Olarak ve Türkiye’de Yaşlı Nüfusun Sosyal Güvenliği)*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), İstanbul: İstanbul University, Social Science Institute.
- Henriksen, L. S. & Boje, T. P. & Ibsen, B. & Koch-Nielsen, I. (2008). Welfare Architecture and Voluntarism: Or Why ‘Changing the Welfare Mix’ Means Different Things in Different Contexts. *The Third Sector in Europe: Prospects and Challenges*. (ed.: Osborne, S. P.), New York: Routledge Publ.
- Jenei, G. & Kuti, E. (2008). The Third Sector and Civil Society. *The Third Sector in Europe: Prospects and Challenges*. (ed. by: Osborne, S. P.), New York: Routledge Publ.
- Koray, M. (2003). Social Welfare State: Hope for Some People, and Also Source of Concern for Others. (Sosyal Refah Devleti: Kimi İçin Umut, Kimi İçin Kaygı Kaynağı). *Social Democratic Approaches. Sosyal Demokrat Yaklaşımlar*. İstanbul: SODEV-TÜSES Publ.
- Kozak, İ. E. (1994). *Foundations as a Social Policy Institution. (Bir Sosyal Siyaset Müessesesi Olarak Vakıf)*. Adapazarı: Sakarya University Publ.
- Kuhnle, S. & Alestalo, M. (2000). Growth, Adjustments and Survival of European Welfare States, *Survival of the European Welfare State*. Routledge Publ.
- Luksetich, W. (2008). Government Funding and Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. Vol.: 37, No: 3, pp. 434–442.
- McCleary, R. M. & Barro, R. J. (2008). Private Voluntary Organizations Engaged in International Assistance, 1934–2004. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. Vol.: 37, No: 3, pp. 512–536.
- Moore, L. (2001). Legitimation Issues in the State–Nonprofit Relations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol.: 30, No: 4, pp. 707–719.
- Özbek, N. (2002). From Ottoman Empire to Day Social State in Turkey. (Osmanlı’dan Günümüze Türkiye’de Sosyal Devlet). *Journal of Toplum ve Bilim*. Issue: 92, pp. 7–33.
- Özdemir, H. (1997). Foundations and Civil Society. (Vakıflar ve Sivil Toplum). *Journal of Yeni Türkiye. Special Issue on Civil Society*. Issue: 18, pp. 309–313.
- Özdemir, S. (2004a). Non-Profit Organizations and Their Increasing Roles in Social Welfare Provision. (Kar Gütmeyen Kuruluşlar (KGK) ve Sosyal Refahın Sağlanmasında Artan Rolü). *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*. Vol.: 48, İstanbul: İstanbul Univ., Faculty of Economics Publ., pp. 129–161.
- Özdemir, S. (2004b). A New Approach on Social Welfare Provision: “Welfare Mix” and Institutions of Welfare. (Sosyal Refah’ın Sağlanmasında Yeni Bir Anlayış: “Refah Karması” ve Refah Sağlayıcı Kurumlar), *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*. Vol.: 48, İstanbul: İstanbul Univ., Faculty of Economics Publ., pp. 98–127.
- Özdemir, S. (2007). *Globalization and Welfare State. (Küreselleşme Sürecinde Refah Devleti)*. Second Edition, İstanbul: İstanbul Chamber of Commerce (ICOC) Publ.
- Özdemir, S. (2009). A Dissertation on the Growing Importance of the NGOs and Some NGOs Operating in Uskudar District, İstanbul. (Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları (STK)’nın Artan Önemi ve Üsküdü’de Faaliyet Gösteren Bazı STK’lar Üzerine Bir Araştırma). *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*. (Co-writer with H. Basel and H. Senocak), Vol.: 56, İstanbul: İstanbul Univ. Faculty of Economics Publ., pp. 151–234.
- Payton, R. L. & Moody, N. P. (2008). *Understanding Philanthropy–Its Meaning and Mission*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Pierson, C. (2001). *Modern State (Modern Devlet)*. (Trans.: Hattatoğlu, D.), İstanbul: Çiviyazıları Publ.
- Pinch, S. (1997). *Worlds of Welfare: Understanding the Changing Geographies of Social Welfare Provision*. London: Routledge Press.
- Şahin, L. & Öztürk, M. (2008). Globalization and the Civil Society Organizations: The Situation in Turkey. (Küreselleşme Sürecinde Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları ve Türkiye’deki Durumu). *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*. Vol.: 54, İstanbul: İstanbul Univ., Faculty of Economics Publ., pp. 3–29.
- Şahin, M. (2007). *Public Economy and Civil Society Organizations. (Kamu Ekonomisi ve Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları)*. Ankara: Seçkin Publ.
- Salamon, L. M. (1999). *America’s Nonprofit Sector: A Primer*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Salamon, L. M. (2003). The Resilient Sector: The State of Nonprofit America. *The State of Nonprofit America*. (ed.: Salamon, L. M.). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, pp. 3–61.
- Salamon, L. M. (2006). *America’s Nonprofit Sector: A Primer*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Uslu, İ. (1999). *Non-Profit Organizations as a Means of Social Policy. (Bir Sosyal Siyaset Vasıtası Olarak Kâr Gütmeyen Kuruluşlar: ABD Örneği)*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), İstanbul: İstanbul University, Social Sciences Institute.

Young, D. R. (2000). Alternative Models of Government–Nonprofit Sector Relations: Theoretical and International Perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. Vol.: 29, No: 1, pp. 149–172.

Zaim, S. (1997). Civil Society Organizations. (Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları). *Journal of Yeni Türkiye. Special Issue on Civil Society*. Issue: 18.