

İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

SOCIAL PROJECTS AND MANAGEMENT OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL
ORGANIZATIONS MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

MIND THE GAP: INTERORGANIZATIONAL TIES AND DYNAMICS OF
COLLABORATION IN SECULAR AND ISLAMIC CIVIL SOCIETY
ORGANIZATIONS IN TURKEY

Bige AKAR

115706004

Assoc. Prof. Dr. İtir ERHART

ISTANBUL
2018

Mind the Gap: Interorganizational Ties and Dynamics of Collaboration in Secular and
Islamic Civil Society Organizations in Turkey

Boşluğa Dikkat Ediniz: Türkiye’de Seküler ve İslami Sivil Toplum Kuruluşlarında
Örgütlerarası Bağlar ve İşbirliği Dinamikleri

Bige Akar

115706004

Thesis Adviser: Assoc. Prof. Dr. İtir Erhart

Istanbul Bilgi University

Member of the Jury: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lütü Sunar

Istanbul Medeniyet University

Member of the Jury: Prof. Dr. Demet Lüküslü

Yeditepe University

Approval Date: 13/06/18

Total Page Counts: 84

Keywords

- 1) Civil Society
- 2) Polarization
- 3) Social Capital
- 4) Homophily
- 5) Secular and Islamic Civil Society

Anahtar Kelimeler

- 1) Sivil Toplum
- 2) Kutuplaşma
- 3) Sosyal Sermaye
- 4) Aynı Türlük
- 5) Seküler ve İslami Sivil Toplum

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to mention everyone and make sure they know how grateful I am for their support, enthusiasm and insight in the process of writing this thesis. Firstly, I would like to thank my Program Coordinator Prof. Nurhan Yentürk. She was always ready to help, and she motivated me to conduct the study. Knowing that she was very reachable and supportive made me feel secure and confident in every step. I would like to thank my thesis adviser Assoc. Prof. Dr. İtir Erhart for her time, generous insights on the the subject and the literature, her motivational support and the network she provided me which were essential for conducting the study. I would like to present my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lütfi Sunar that inspired me with his important contributions to literature and who gave me insights and his network which was essential for this thesis. I would like to thank him for introducing me a lot of organizations and recommending me inspiring literature.

Further I feel extremely lucky to be a part of an organization that inspires me everyday, enables me to look at issues from a wider perspective and motivates me to do so much more for the sake of civil society. I am deeply thankful to Education Reform Initiative and all the people who are part of it, for the perspective and motivation they give me and for their patience during the busy time that I haven't been there sometimes mentally and sometimes physically. Their insights, motivational support and belief carried me through the end of the study. They were always there for me and provided help unquestionably.

All the participants that have speared time for me are very important to mention here. Their faith in academic research, their kindness, the conversations we had during and outside of the interviews, their openness to communication and their valuable works

for the community reminded me why I am very focused on civil society personally and academically intensified my faith. I thank all of them.

It would be wrongfully lacking if I didn't mention my family and my friends. I would like to thank my parents who made sure I have everything I need and who were ready to do any sacrifices during the process. I thank them for their emotional support and patience. I especially would like to mention my sister (my dear friend), my roommate who had to put up with me the most. Her sacrifices and psychological support were beyond words. Also, my close friends who have been with me from the moment when this study was just an idea until the day I wrote my last words nurtured me with insights, networks and a peace of mind. They check on me constantly and made sure I know that they would support me if ever I have needed anything.

Lastly, I would like to thank my dear friend Dilşad who have been by my side from the first day of the master's courses until the day we have submitted our thesis together. Even though we worked in totally different subjects, working together with her during the sleepless nights was a privilege for me. She gave me insights, got me back on my feet everytime I lost my motivation.

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	III
TABLE OF CONTENT	V
LIST OF TABLES	VII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	VIII
ABSTRACT	IX
ÖZET	X
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. RESEARCH CONTEXT.....	3
1.1. What is Polarization?	3
1.2. Secular and Islamic Conflict in Turkey	4
1.3. Antidote of Polarization: Civil Society	7
1.3.1. Civil Society, Public Sphere and Democracy.....	7
1.3.2. Researches on Polarization and Civil Society.....	11
1.3.3. Secular and Islamic Civil Society	13
2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OUTLINE OF THE CONTENT	19
3. THEORETHICAL DISCUSSION ON SOCIAL CAPITAL AND HOMOPHILY	21
3.1. Social Capital.....	21
3.2. Homophily.....	24
3.3. Research Approach.....	28
3.3.1. Qualitative Research.....	28
3.3.2. Thematic Analysis	28

3.4. Research Participants	30
3.5. Limitations	48
4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	50
4.1. Trust	50
4.2. Universality	55
4.2.1. Human Rights	55
4.2.2. Morality	58
4.3. Financial Transparency	60
4.4. Funding	62
4.5. Universities, Institutional Development and Production of Knowledge ..	63
4.6. Conclusion of the Findings	65
CONCLUSION OF THE THESIS	69
APPENDIX – INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	81
EK – MÜLAKAT SORULARI	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Identification of Research Participants.....	31
--	----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKP:	Justice and Development Party
CHP:	Republican People's Party
CSO:	Civil Society Organizations
HDP:	People's Democratic Party
İHD:	Human Rights Association
İHH:	Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief
İKADDER:	Istanbul Women and Women's Organizations Association
İLKE:	Science, Culture and Education Association
KA.DER:	Association for Supporting Women
KYA:	Initiative Management Academy
MAZLUMDER:	Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for Oppressed People
MHP:	Nationalist Movement Party
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organization
STGM:	Civil Society Development Center
TOG:	Community Volunteers Foundation
TÜSEV:	Third Sector Foundation of Turkey
UGED:	International Youth Association
UN:	United Nations

ABSTRACT

The aim in this study was to understand the dynamics of interorganizational ties and collaborations of Islamic and secular civil society organizations through civil society theory, social capital and homophily theory. The study suggests that in this focus group the unbalanced relationship between state and civil society, the differences of values and legitimacy concept of organizations and their relation to funding affects the collaborations of the organizations.

During this study firstly, I have put forward the concept of polarization in general and secular and Islamic conflict in particular. Further I have given a general framework of civil society theoretization and civil society in Turkey and the categorization problem of the institutions. By using in-depth interviews with 10 people from 10 different organizations the study's analysis was conducted with thematic analysis methodology.

In conclusion this study suggests that in this particular focus group trust for universities and organizations that provide institutional support and knowledge in the area can be a mediative force in the dialogue of organizations who have vertical ties, value and institutional homophily.

Key words: Civil Society, Polarization, Social Capital, Homophily, Secular and Islamic Civil Society

ÖZET

Bu çalışma temel olarak, İslami ve seküler sivil toplum kuruluşlarında örgütlerarası bağların ve işbirliklerinin dinamiklerini sivil toplum teorisi, sosyal sermaye ve aynı türlük teorisi ışığında anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Tez bu odak grup özelinde sivil toplum ve devlet arasındaki dengesiz ilişkinin, örgütlerin değer ve meşruluk konseptlerindeki farklılığın ve fonlarla olan ilişkilerinin örgütler arasındaki işbirliklerini etkilediğini öne sürer.

Çalışma boyunca öncelikle genel olarak kutuplaşma konseptinden ve özel olarak da İslami ve seküler çatışmasından bahsedilmiştir. Daha sonra sivil toplum kavramsallaştırmasına ve Türkiye’de sivil topluma dair genel bir çerçeve sunulmuştur. 10 farklı kurumdan 10 farklı kişi ile yapılan derinlemesine mülakatlarla analiz, tematik analiz metoduyla gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak çalışma, bu odak grup özelinde, üniversitelere, kurumsal kapasite desteği veren ve alana dair bilgi üreten ve paylaşan kurumlara olan güven sayesinde, bu kurumların, aralarında dikey bağlar, değer ve kurumsal bağlamda aynı türlük ilişkisi olan kurumlar arasında aracılık sağlayabileceğini savunur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Sivil Toplum, Kutuplaşma, Sosyal Sermaye, Aynı Türlük, Seküler ve İslami Sivil Toplum

INTRODUCTION

While the issue of polarization has been widely discussed when it comes to politics in Turkey, I personally realized that I do not actually hear any opposing views around my close friend circle, work place and my online social networks. As a person who has been involved in civil society organizations as a volunteer and a professional for more than 7 years, I believe civil society organizations valued diversity, plurivocality, democracy and dialogue. And I believed civil society organizations should practice the notions they demand from the political authorities like diversity, equality, transparency etc. Then I also remember, there was a time I have deleted Facebook friends who opposed my views. I did not hear their arguments and I was at ease. Were the organizations I participate in, doing the same thing? Do they hear opposing arguments? Do these civil society organizations that are formed with people who think similarly, have ties with the organizations who oppose their views? What were the dynamics, principles or situations prevent them to collaborate with certain organizations? Do they talk to each other and cooperate with each other even though they did not agree on every principle? Do we have different understandings of the political, social economic realities? Is civil society a homogenous or a heterogeneous unit in Turkey? And further I have realized even though a lot of researches referred to civil society as the cure or antidote of polarization but very few studies focused on how civil society organizations and interorganizational ties are affected from the tendencies toward polarization. These questions and issues have motivated me towards the topic, to read, to study and write about it.

Even though polarization issue has been discussed widely reference to a lot of diversified groups like ‘Kemalists’, ‘Islamists’, ‘Sunnis’, ‘Alevists’, ‘Turkishs’, ‘Kurdishs’ and so on, in this study I preferred to mainly focus on Islamic and secular conflict which in my opinion is more dominant in the recent context.

In the chapter called Research Context, I will briefly explain how polarization will be defined throughout this study. Then I will focus on the particular tension which this study aims to understand that is the conflict between people who define themselves as secular and as Islamic in Turkey. I will try to put this tension into a context by examining it from the early days of the Republic of Turkey to the present discussions. Later on, I aim to narrow the topic down to its reflections in civil society. Important part of the chapter dedicated to the conceptualization of civil society will focus on the civil society-state relation which will be dealt with also in the analysis and the conclusion of the study. Further, I will briefly put forward the relation between civil society, democracy and public sphere. I believe recent studies pointing out the relation between polarization and civil society will contribute to the research question that will be held at the end of this chapter. Before explaining my methodology, research participants and the theoretical discussion I found it useful to discuss the categorization of civil society organizations with reference to international and national literature. My theoretical discussion will include social capital theory and homophily theory. Through these theories I will try to detect the dynamics of interorganizational ties and collaborations between Islamic and secular civil society organizations. After giving brief information about my participants I will carry out the analysis and present my finding.

1. RESEARCH CONTEXT

1.1. What is Polarization?

Whether a society's attitudes and behaviours becoming more polarized or not is an important question for both its members, its future and its political tendencies. Before we get into the discussion about polarization we should be able to define it and discuss how it can be measured. Paul DiMaggio, John Evans and Bethany Bryson (1996) defined polarization as 'both a state and a process' (p.693). It is considered the state that opinions are opposed in relation to a theoretical maximum and it is considered a process in the meaning that it increases over time. If we use it in the latter sense, it is a process in which it needs to be measured over time to be able to be defined ("Bryson, DiMaggio & Evans", 1996).

They claim we can regard two groups as polarized only if between group differences are sufficient and within group differences are minimum. Meaning that two groups can claim a statement that everyone agrees within the group and the groups are claiming opposing ideas ("Bryson, DiMaggio & Evans", 1996).

Aristotle says that when different groups "all come together . . . they may surpass – collectively and as a body, although not individually – the quality of the few best. . . . When there are many who contribute to the process of deliberation, each can bring his share of goodness and moral prudence; . . . some appreciate one part, some another, and all together appreciate all." Others like John Rawls agree with Aristotle and claim that outcomes of group discussions are affected positively if competing opinions are presented. Important question Cass Sunstein (1999) raises is if these statements are naïve or excessively optimistic? He asserts that group polarization occurs when people from the deliberating group becomes more extreme compared to the direction of their predeliberating tendency.

1.2. Secular and Islamic Conflict in Turkey

The conflict between people who define themselves seculars and people who define themselves as Islamic in Turkey has been a topic widely debated in the public and researched in academia regardless of its time period. Mentioned tension has been playing out since the beginning of the Republic which was constituted by Atatürk and his reforms that limit Islam to the private sphere to adapt a new vision of modern and secular Republic of Turkey (Baran, 2010). Ziya and Korkut (2010) defines Turkey's modernization project as a detailed programme aiming to replace religious deities with secular deities. They claim republicanism is a political religion which dignifies modernization (Ziya & Korkut, 2010).

The disagreement on the conception and implications of secularism that has started from the early days of the Republic has left its mark on the 90's by Islamists organizing and gaining power around "National Vision" movement of Erbakan ("Çarkoğlu & Toprak," 2006). After the *coup d'état* happened in 1980 there have been a socio-political and cultural transformation in which along with other liberal movements there has been the rise of Islamic social movement. This era also witnessed lots of discussions about Turkey's integration into European Union (Ayata & Tütüncü, 2008).

Erbakan's Refah Partisi (*Welfare Party*) gained its first success in local governmental elections in 1994 and a year later the party was able to build a national coalition with Doğru Yol Partisi (*True Path Party*) and took its place in the rule. After this success they raised their votes in the next local government elections too. In February 1997, they faced a postmodern, or civilian, coup followed by a statement from the National Security Council making a mention of laicism principle of the Republic. After resignation of the prime minister, Refah Party was abolished in January 1998 by the Constitutional Court based on its "work against the laicism principle of the nation-state." (Kogacioglu, 2004).

In the general elections of 2002 when the coalition government couldn't get enough votes, a newly establish Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi¹ (Justice and Development Party), a party that all of its founders had shaped their political identities within Erbakan's National Vision movement, came into power (Ayata & Tütüncü, 2008; Baran, 2010). AKP, chose not to emphasize their Muslim identity and introduced their policies under the name of 'conservative democracy' program. They underlined democratization with the focus on weakening the role of the military and expanding the political sphere which has been limited in the 1980 military coup. (Ayata & Tütüncü, 2008). After their 2002 victory on July 2007, AKP received 47 percent of the votes and ruled out the difficulties in order to get Abdullah Gül become the president. The same year Abdullah Gül have become the new president and another victory followed in general elections of 2011 and AKP still remains in the power as of May 2018 (Keyman, 2014). Kaya and Sunar (2015) summarizes widespread and ongoing secular opposition to AKP's long-term power with three incidents: seculars going out and protesting, claiming that republic's foundation is being threatened before the 2007 presidential election, tension between opposition and the government in 2010's constitutional amendment referendum and finally Gezi protest took place on May and June 2013 by mostly urban and secular people (Kaya & Sunar, 2015).

Fuat Keyman (2014) claims that since their first victory of 2002, every other election followed by AKP's majority government didn't consolidate the culture of living together in diversity rather it has enhanced polarization with regards to secularism, ethnicity and religion. He indicates that Turkey has become a polarized country with AKP's dominant party position created by electoral hegemony. He claims answer to the problems this has brought are not to be solved with elections. He further continues and asserts "the AKP rule has not resulted in the consolidation or upgrading of

¹ From this point on it will be referred as AKP

democracy. Instead, it has remained limited and partial, falling short in the areas of rights and freedoms, and the separation of powers, especially between the executive and the judiciary.” (Keyman, 2014, p.30).

Regarding this issue Binnaz Toprak and Ali Çarkoğlu has conducted a research on 1999 and conducted a follow-up research on 2006 in parallel with the changes in Turkish society and in political Islam. The key finding of the research was that there are two divided social constructs in Turkey which have different standard of judgement, perception of the world, culture, political preferences. They claimed that Turkey almost bears two different societies within. On the one side, there are urban people, well-educated, earn relatively higher income, not feeling attached to the religion and/or religious values and they are claimed as secular. On the other side, there are people who live in the rural areas, not well-educated, earn relatively lower income and they are claimed to be Islamist and pious (2006).

In another study conducted by Kaya and Sunar (2014) the idea that Turkey is polarized is challenged. In their study, they used the data gathered from 10,837 people in five different times between 1990 and 2011 in order to understand society’s social and political attitudes and the effect of religion and Islamic politics. They measured polarization focusing in four areas: family and sexuality, gender roles, economic and social justice, and democracy. The results of this study did not picture Turkey as divided into two groups in which one group associated themselves with the Islamic World and the other group with the West. They claim it is somehow similar to American debate on polarization that the discourse in mass media does not match with academic evidence (Kaya & Sunar, 2014).

One of the most recent studies Emre Erdoğan has conducted in November-December 2017 that was based on the interviews with 2,004 people representing the population of Turkey focused on the polarization issue from the political party supporter’s

perspective. The parties included in the study were AKP, Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People's Party) Halkların Demokratik Partisi (People's Democratic Party) and Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (Nationalist Movement Party). The study focused on the tendency of the participants to be together with others borrowing Bogardus' social distance term which was taken as an important sign of polarization. They asked questions concerning wanting their daughters to marry, do business, wanting to be neighbors and wanting their children to play with members of the party which the participants feel the most distant. The answers were respectively 75, 74, 70 and 68 percent negative. He concludes based on these results we can indicate an important social distance between party supporters. In addition, majority of the party supporters identified themselves and their party with positive adjectives like generous, open-minded, smart etc. and negative adjectives for the political parties they see most distant like hypocrite, cruel, arrogant, bigoted etc. (Erdoğan, 2017).

1.3. Antidote of Polarization: Civil Society

1.3.1. Civil Society, Public Sphere and Democracy

Before focusing on the relation between civil society and democracy, I find it useful to start the debate on the theoretical background of the term civil society. Since the term is not independent from history there have been a lot of different, sometimes contradicting conceptualizations.

If we use Bobbio's categorization of the term we can look its definitions by relation to 'the state': civil society as pre-state, anti-state and post-state (1989). The first category is about the literature that evaluated civil society as the situation before the state, the precondition of forming a state. The second category is civil society seen as the antithesis of the state, civil society as the alternating the state. The last category

interprets civil society as the condition to dissolution and fading of the state (Bobbio, 1989).

The one categorization I prefer to use for this study from the conception of the civil society by relation to 'the state' will be the non-state. By non-state informal and the activities that are outside the state's activities were inferred. This categorization has been widely used nowadays together with attributing concepts like voluntary, separation from the state, autonomy and self-sufficiency (Tol, Yeğen, Keyman & Çalışkan, 2010).

For the civil society conceptualization Gramsci makes a distinction between political society which is consisted of police forces, army, laws etc. and civil society which is the sphere created with the consent of the people. He claims that political society imposes discipline to people who doesn't have an active or passive consent on it whereas civil society is the sphere that faces the imposition created by the dominant group to the social life. He explains the institutions in civil society as universities, media, religious organizations, political parties and labor unions (Gramsci, 2011).

Whereas civil society for Marx is the ideology that legitimizing the social, political and economic structure built by capitalism and manipulating the society in the direction of the hegemonic culture, becomes the sphere of the clashes where working class can make its own culture the dominant one (Cevizci, 2009).

Some scholars have debated that the conception of civil society was at fault. For example, Thernborn (1998) claimed that civil society term firstly had a predefined, preformed equality assumption between its members. But empirical world bears equalities in so many different levels: class, race, ethnicity, citizenship, gender etc. When we talk about civil society with this equality assumption we put forward the risk of ignoring, even masking the inequalities. His second critique is that civil society term as a normative one is ahistorical and deals with historical institutions and trends very

little which indicates that it is constructed as if it has an essential content. His last critique was that theorizing civil society ignores the specific inner political dynamics by taking society-state contrast only dealt from one point of view (Thernborn, 1998).

Another common opposition is focusing on the fact that if the term is only read from the state-civil contrast then it ignores the specificity of the unions that appeared because of clash of interests within the society (Tol, Yeğen, Keyman & Çalışkan, 2010).

Trentman (2000) acknowledges civil society as organizations that both see its ideals and realities of the society. He claims that these organizations function independently, are open to everyone, have equal members, produce a new group identity, develop the society and establish itself out of the state (Trentman, 2000).

The notion of civil society left its mark in the literature first with the discussions of the North American and Western European democracy and hopes for a transition to democracy in Eastern Europe as a foundation that will enable the acceptance of the differences in the society and the representation of different actors in the political domain, inclusivity (Calhoun 1993; Keyman, 2006). Later on, with the collapse of communist regimes many democrats in Eastern Europe changed their discourse from a civil society as a social organization that makes its own decisions independent from the control of state to the concept of citizenship that missed the fact that democracy is not only related to individuals but social groups too (Calhoun, 1993).

Fuat Keyman, asserts it is mistaken to think that democracy and civil society are directly proportional and adds that if we consider civil society only on the basis of its contribution to democracy and attribute an ethical and political value there appear problems in the civil society- state relation. He claims that civil society's field of study becomes ambiguous under the control of state: while some civil society organizations struggle with the state control (like being shut down by state force) some of them can identify their own mission with the state's or the current political power (like instead

of producing independent objective knowledge producing knowledge that reproduces the state ideology). Another important point he underlines on the issue of state and civil society is financial and legal sphere: closeness to state can really affect the organizations financial status. The struggle on a financial level also create a competition between other civil society organizations (Keyman, 2006).

Nancy Fraser explains the idea of "the public sphere" in Habermas's sense as a theater in a modern sense where people politically participates by talking (Fraser, 1990). Habermas claims there lies a central experience of human life which is communicative rationality, 'the unconstrained, unifying, consensus-bringing force of argumentative speech (Habermas, 1983). And public sphere is an institutionalized place that is distinct from the state, may even be critical of it, for citizens where discursive interactions takes place on the common topics (Fraser, 1990).

Now, are civil society and public sphere equivalent concepts? Craig Calhoun challenges that they are not. He claims that the concept of public sphere is important in the manner that it goes beyond the concept of civil society by explaining the social foundations of democracy and 'of the specific organization within civil society of social and cultural bases for the development of an effective rational-critical discourse aimed at the resolution of political disputes' (p.269)

Nancy Fraser (1990) starts to theorize on relation between public sphere, state and civil society firstly distinguishing two meanings of civil society: one is a privately-ordered, capitalist economy and the other one is a nexus of non-governmental associations that are neither economic nor administrative. If we take the second meaning she claims it equals to "public opinion", critical commentary on authorized decision-making. From this she arrives at her conception of weak publics which practice formation of opinions but not decision making. She drives to the conclusion that the conceptions of public sphere that separates civil society and state can't assume self-management, inter-public

coordination, and political accountability which are the musts of democratic and egalitarian societies (Fraser, 1990).

1.3.2. Researches on Polarization and Civil Society

Even though there is a vast literature inside and outside of Turkey on identity, polarization and alienation there are not so many studies that focuses on its relation to civil society. Köksal, Hortaçsu and Köksal (2009) in their research on identities in Turkey, have conducted in-depth interviews with 65 people that represents diversity of Turkish society. Their main question was how the description of identities were perceived to be ingrained, stable and frozen, or if they are perceived as changeable, intersectional or flexible. The reason of their search around this question was to understand how different identities are open to living together, to engage in a dialogue and to mutually change (Köksal, Hortaçsu & Köksal, 2009).

As one of the results of their research they claim that different ethnic and religious groups have agreed on the superiority of the human relations in Anatolian geography compared to Europe and that lost values and daily practices made people tend to become more engaged in their sub-groups (Erdogan, Önal & Semerci, 2017).

One of the most important argument of the research concerning this study is that when the civil society experiences of the participants increase, their approach to the differences become more inclusive. They find it very important for democracy that civil society organizations acknowledge the differences of groups whilst bring different groups together on a bigger platform. They see the function of civil society as binary: improvement and confirmation of the identities and a platform of reconciliation (Köksal, Hortaçsu & Köksal, 2009).

One recent research conducted by Erdoğan, Önal and Semerci (2017) that focused on identity and alienation in Turkey's youth (ages between 18 - 29) by using both qualitative and quantitative methods suggested that young people who are engaged

with civil society organizations professionally or as volunteers were more likely to understand the ones who are different from them and more likely to avoid biased behaviors. During the research 37 in-depth interviews, 1,224 surveys and 5 focus group that included 31 people were analyzed.

Research concluded that alienating and not alienating occurs as social practices that we sometimes become the object and sometimes become the subject of in our daily lives (Erdogan, Önal & Semerci, 2017). Another shocking finding was that 80% of the people in the study showed significant unwillingness to share a common future (like getting married, letting their kids to become friends with the member of the other group, being neighbors, to hire them for a job) with the group they feel the most distant (Erdogan, Önal & Semerci, 2017).

One of the focus groups was designed to only have people who were engaged with civil society organizations. In the analysis of this particular focus group it is much mentioned that in the quotations collected from this group contained the stories of ‘encountering with the other’, ‘contact with the other’, ‘effort to understand the differences’ and ‘being a group as people who are engaged in civil society and having a common language’ (Erdogan, Önal & Semerci, 2017). These statements and the analysis of the civil society focus group bring questions that some will be further discussed in the thesis: ‘what are we talking exactly when we talk about civil society?’ ‘is civil society homogeneous?’ ‘is being a member of a civil society organization, another group people identify themselves with?’ and ‘which groups are the members of civil society organizations identify themselves with?’.

Although not many studies have searched how the changes in the behaviors of civil society engagement can be evidence for political polarization, Delia Baldassarri (2011) aimed to find out if civil society associational patterns can be used as an indicator for a political polarization in American society. Meaning she looked into the associations

if they have become more partisan and if the inter-organizational relations have changed in a more polarized way in the 30 years period (1974–2004).

Baldassari firstly underlines that many people tend to take for granted that civil society engagement directly effects collectivity and democratic outcomes in a positive way, but she thinks associational membership can't be a guarantee for democracy alone. She says (“Baldassari”, 2011 p.636) ‘In order to understand dynamics of interest representation and democratic deliberation it is necessary to take into account the interplay between associations and the overall web of inter-organizational relations they generate.’

In the study multiple associational membership was used to understand for certain types of associations, it was more possible to share its members with other associations but for certain others they have mutually exclusive members. It was concluded that during the time period the volume of multiple members hasn't declined and the relations between civic networks have stayed almost the same. Another conclusion the study pointed out that group types haven't been more partisan, but the group members have become. Even though the group types have become more heterogeneous based on political identities, group members, especially the ones that have multiple memberships have become more extreme in their political identities (“Baldassari”, 2011).

1.3.3. Secular and Islamic Civil Society

Before specifically focusing the secular and Islamic civil society I would like to briefly show the bigger picture of civil society in Turkey. Sarıbay (1997) firstly claims the reason why civil society and democracy concepts are frequently used in Turkey's society is that the state tradition is historically strong, and this tradition's peek can be seen in the military interventions and this is generated by the nature of state-society relation. He further explains this relationship as a rigid state-society dichotomy that has been shaping our political thought since the Ottoman Empire. After the Republic this

relation hasn't become centrifugal and in the single party system this tradition continued with modern institutions, conceptualizations and rules. (Sarıbay, 1997) For this reason Göle and Toprak even though they have different opinions on so many issues agreed on that civil society in Turkey is fragile. They also thought beside from the strong central state deep cultural disintegration was another reason for this fragility. For both researchers, existence of different cultural groups like 'Kemalists', 'Islamists', 'Sunnis', 'Alevists', 'Turkishs', 'Kurdishs' and their distinguishing demands and actions increased the political tensions (Sufert, 2001).

With the 1980 military coup Turkish society was again pushed out of politics and democracy. Three years after the coup the discussions were around the need the decline in the control of the state over the society (Sarıbay, 1997). The coup that aimed the annihilation of civil society have paradoxically strengthen the commitment to civil policy, building consensus, civil rights and problem focused organizational activities (Toprak, 1996).

Mardin finds the nowadays' state centered political system's roots in the Ottoman social model. He claims that in the West the conflicts between social authorities can finalize with various consensus. By these consensus' the periphery can both protect its autonomy and integrate with the center. So, where the Western political model has a balance between the center and the periphery, in the Ottoman we can't talk about this balance since there is nothing civic outside of the center (Mardin, 2008).

Mardin and a lot of other scholars have pointed out the disconnection between the state and the society in Ottoman Empire. As opposed to these claims Sunar asserts that state and society has a connection in Ottoman Empire and it is not conflicting like in the West but on the contrary it is solidarist. He further claims that there is two social group that is mediative between state and society: ulema and tradesmen. These two groups both have important roles in the management mechanism and also represent social balances to the center. He also claims that there are two civic factors that ensures the

decentralized political structure in the Ottoman Empire: madrasahs that worked for education and vaqfs that worked for the redistribution of welfare (Sunar, 2018)

In the literature on civil society even though there are studies aiming to categorize the organization there is no inclusive, agreed on categorizations for both theoreticians and the people who are working in the field to use. Vakil (1997) explains three main approaches towards the categorization issue: the first rejects all categorizations and chooses the definitions special to the discussion topic, the second one claims to make definitions related to the aim of the discussion that organizations are subjected to and this way organizations are categorized in the certain context and do not refer to any other context. The last one defends that categorization needs to be made independent from the discussions the organizations are subjected to.

Wolch (1990) categorizes organizations based on three dichotomies: advocacy/direct servitization, commercialized/not commercialized, participant/elitist. In the first dichotomy the organizations either aim to have an effect on the beneficiary or they aim to change public decisions. The second dichotomy based on whether the organizations are making financial benefits or provide service. And the last one for Wolch investigates whether the beneficiaries are included in the processes or not (Wolch, 1990)

Yaşama Dair Foundation (YADA Foundation) has offered a unique approach for the categorization problem considering the authenticity, weakness, differences and potentials of the organizations. They defined 13 different categories that I will briefly summarize. ‘Self-Organizations’ which is their first category is defined as the organizations created by the people who have a disadvantaged position in the society themselves. They socialize, build capacity, and aim at claiming their own rights. What differentiates ‘Advocacy’ organizations is that they defend the rights of a certain disadvantaged group, nature, animals and people on a political level. They also may try to mobilize citizens to take the issues on themselves. Another category they offered

was the 'Politically Oriented' organizations that gather people with a specific world view and belief. These organizations generally have a connection with political sphere. The forth category is 'Philanthropist' organizations which provides ocular or financial help to the poor or disadvantaged parts of the community. But when the philanthropist organizations choose to physically strengthen the disadvantaged group they were called 'Protective' organizations.

The study continues with its categorization with the 'Expert' organizations which produce scientific information and knowledge for the other organizations and public. Construction, Survival, Beatification organizations focus on enhancing, building or protecting one place, construction or district for the benefit of the community. As for the 'Countryman or townsman' organizations they gather the people who are coming from a specific geography, city or cultural heritage but are living somewhere else. They aim to remove the longing or enable their members to retroactively contribute the communities they come from. The ninth category they assumed was the 'Socialization' organizations which brings people around a hobby, social networking and they seldom socialize the product they create together. 'The Club' organizations enable people to do certain artistic or sportive activity regularly. In the case of 'Subsidiary' organizations they are created from the need for another organizations to carry its activities that it is not able to for legal, ethical or financial problems. 'Vocational' organizations aim to promote one vocation or sector and protect the rights of that vocation or sector. 'The market oriented' category is actually debatable to be considered as civil society because they aim to make a profit. They are organized as CSO (Civil Society Organizations), to be able to use the legal, ethical or socio-cultural benefits of CSO's.

YADA for some of the categories added conditions like for these organizations to be in that category they should not make political statements and for some of them they added that these organizations show some political tendencies or are in touch with political organizations. With bearing in mind that every social relationship and its

dynamic are political, and politics is not a sphere special to only politicians and bureaucrats and it doesn't exclude all other actors from it we can claim that actually all these categories are somehow political. (Veneklasen & Miller, 2002)

Lütfi Sunar (2018), in his last study based on the changes in the organizational structures and activities of Islamic CSOs, categorizes organizations based on their ideological structure and world vision. He focuses on how an organization is describing their aims of existence and their main goals. From here he categorizes CSO's in Turkey as follows: Kemalist, Left-Secular, Liberal, Solidarist, Nationalist, Conservative and Islamist.

He claims that Kemalist organizations define their main goal to continue Turkey's modernization and their main dynamic to sustain social change in the direction of Westernization that has been started with the Republic. Their historical transformation was summarized from more a solidarist position to a more activist position from 2000's on. He further claims that the organizations he defines as leftist-secular adopt the goal of protecting secularism. These organizations that have been more active with class related issues in the past now actively work on sustaining secularism. He gives Human Rights Association as an example which will further be discussed in the thesis since it is included in the research sample of this study. (Sunar, 2018)

His third category, liberal organizations, claimed to set their perspective in economic life in the direction of market forces, in political life in the constitution and in the social life in the liberalism. The category declared as the most crowded one is the solidarist that get together on any foundation with the aim of acting with solidarity. This group has been said to be the least ideological since a lot of the organizations are formed around being alumni of an institution, occupation, embellishment groups and associations. The nationalist CSO's define themselves with the values and benefits of

a certain ethnicity. They aim at protecting and improving the values, qualifications, history, language, folklore and political rights of a specific ethnicity (Sunar, 2018)

The sixth category which is claimed to be the second largest group is the conservative CSO's was declared as the ones which define themselves around the national and moral values like protecting social values, strengthening the family, to actualize various religious activities. These organizations focus on sustaining the existing social structure and order. The last one which will also be defined as Sunar defines further in the thesis is the Islamic CSO's. He gathers the organizations which explains their goal of existence by giving reference to Islam under this category. These organizations aim to raise awareness in the society on the issues of Islam and to realize Islamic values. He underlines the fact that these organizations can be confused with the conservative ones but main difference that distinguishes two organizations is the references they explain their goal and the goal of their activities. For example, two organizations can both be doing social aid, but one may explain the reason as 'to be beneficial to the community' but the other may explain it 'for the sake of Allah' and to fulfill religious duties. But he adds this distinction doesn't mean one is not doing something principally Islamic and the other one is (Sunar, 2018).

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OUTLINE OF THE CONTENT

The broad research question of the study aims to understand the conception of ‘us’ and ‘the other’ in civil society focusing on the secular and Islamic conflict: Is there a polarization within the civil society organizations that risks the potential power of civil society for a more democratic Turkey? However the broad question will be answered through the subquestions I will mention below:

- Do the secular and Islamic civil society organizations not collaborate because they are functioning in a homophilious way meaning only the organizations which are similar in their value system and political ideology is linked together and develop collaboration? Do the information and actions they produce not travel to each other or do they not choose to collaborate because they already perceive themselves as ‘the other’?
- What are the reasons behind the uncooperative civil society?
- What are other dynamics that affect the organizations ties beside from their value system?
- Based on which principles are they evaluating each other? Are civil society organizations identifying themselves with a group an obstacle for their work to be more inclusive? Is otherwise is possible?
- Is the conception of ‘us’ and ‘the other’ of the organizations and their workers an obstacle for a more powerful civil society?
- What are the missed opportunities and how the cooperation can be possible?

In the next chapters of this study in the light of the information I have given before I will introduce my research approach, research participants and the reasons behind choosing these organizations. While doing that I will briefly give the history and the structure of the organizations. Then I will briefly explain the theories I will read the data around: Social capital theory and homophily in order to understand if the reason

these organizations are uncooperative is that they form their networks in a homophilious way and they have a vertical social capital which might be creating a polarization. Further I will talk about the features of my data and the method I will analyze it which is thematic analysis. In the Findings and Discussion chapter I will put forward my analysis and discuss my findings. Meanwhile I will also present the limitations and trustworthiness of this study and where would this study can be placed in the general discussion and where the next researches can focus on that this study is missing out. And finally, the last title will be the conclusion.

3. THEORETHICAL DISCUSSION ON SOCIAL CAPITAL AND HOMOPHILY

3.1. Social Capital

Robert Putnam (2000) in his search for the change in American society, in his work called *Bowling Alone* theorized that social contacts affects both the individual and collective productivity of individuals and groups, just like physical capital and human capital do. He defines social capital as the connection between individuals and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that is the result of these connections. For him social capital is linked to civic virtue which also includes active participation in public life. For a society to be wealthy in the social capital context, it is not enough for people to be virtuous but isolated from each other. He further divides social capital into two; private social capital which is the individual forms of connection that benefits one's own interests and a public social capital that has an explicit public-regarding purposes benefiting the wider society. For example, while getting a job by using your social network is your private social capital, an organization which mobilizes the local in order to raise scholarship is a public capital. But the ties you create that are socially and business wise beneficial for you while working to raise scholarship can be both private and public social capital. By bearing these in mind he asserts that a well-connected individual in a well-connected society would become more productive than a person well-connected in a poorly connected society (Putnam, 2000)

Putnam underlines another separation in social capital; bridging and bonding social capital or inclusive and exclusive social capital. Bonding social capital forms homogenous groups by choice or by needs and incline to strengthen exclusive identities whereas bridging social capital include diverse people from different social parts. Bonding or inclusive social capital is beneficial for specific reciprocity and solidarity. We can put the ethnic or religious fraternity groups under this category. Bridging or

exclusive social capital are beneficial for linking external gains and distributing information (Putnam, 2000). It has been discussed which is more valuable between these two types of ties. The weak ties that link us to different circles we were not involved before or group loyalty, strong ties with the people whom we are well-connected already? What happens when bonding social capital becomes antagonism for the groups we are not connected? Besser and Miller thinks that when one type of capital expands it can exclude the other type meaning stronger bonding social capital can cause weaker bridging capital. Putnam (2000) says this distinction doesn't mean that they are "either-or" categories and they are theorized to compare different forms of social capital.

In this book the link between volunteerism, philanthropy, civic engagement and social capital was made as well. Putnam claims that "social networks provide channels through which we recruit one another for good deeds, and social networks foster norms of reciprocity that encourage attention to other's welfare. ...volunteering and philanthropy and even spontaneous helping are all strongly predicted by civic engagement" (p.117). From this perspective we can evaluate CSO's work through social networks and civic engagement. When we focus on the relations between social capital and associations it has been said that associations bear possibilities of political participation because they give their members organizational and communications skill that can also be used in political arena (Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995) . When we take the associations active in civic engagement we can also say that these networks within associations promote generalized reciprocity and social trust. Generalized reciprocity is the notion that when somebody does something for someone without expecting something in return immediately but thinking that somebody would return the favor sometime in the future. And social trust here implies the trust in other people which differs from political trust that implies the trust in government and social institutions (Putnam, 2000). Some has seen a potential in social capital to redefine the relations between public and private organizations and for a well-functioning

relationship it has been said that there needs to be trust between citizens and also between citizens and the government (Stolle & Rochon, 2001).

Stolle and Rochon (2001) see people in associations who trust each other and build a shared knowledge and experience. And associations achieve their goals via enhanced trust and cooperation. In their study they have focused on the connection of associations to public social capital. Firstly, they have investigated would associations that have different purposes have a different effect on the social capital and secondly they asked the question if the associations are inclusive would their effect on social capital vary. The indicators for their measurement were categorized in four clusters. First indicators were the associations participation and engagement in politics generally and in their own community, and the second were trust and reciprocity within the community. They also searched for the associations trust toward public officials and institutions as their third cluster. Their final cluster focused on tolerance, approval of free riding and optimism. General tolerance has been defined by Stolle and Rochon (2001) as the acceptance of the one we have almost no contact with additionally to the acceptance we have for the ones we interact. I see the need to clarify what they mean by free riding and optimism as well. Free-riding implies not to do one's own share in collective actions where optimism is the notion that have been seen necessary for the rationality of the cooperation which contains a positive viewpoint for what the future will bring and faith in other people that they will desire to participate in reciprocal action or work (Uslaner, 1999).

Putnam asserts that for stronger social capital associations needs to have horizontal ties rather than vertical ties. But what is to have horizontal and vertical ties? Vertical social capital contains hierarchical relationships whereas horizontal social capital contains egalitarian relationships. Putnam argues that vertical ties bears hierarchy, power relations, dominion, exploitation and reinforce dependency (Rogers & Patricia, 2015).

Vertical ties discourage the horizontal solidarities (Waldner, 2007). He also asserts that horizontal ties are more productive for social capital compared to vertical ties (1995).

Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) talks about extents of social capital which I will mention three of them: structural, relational, and cognitive. If we evaluate structural social capital in terms of interorganizational relationships, we mean the connections and the network ties between these organizations. Relational social capital defines the characteristics of these connection like it detects if there is mutual trust. Cognitive social capital defines to what extend these organizations understand each other's capacities and do they have a common language and goals. (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In their study Tsai and Ghoshal (1998) claimed that these types of social capitals can have interrelationships and asserted that organizations which have a shared vision affected the trust organizations have for each other and trust affected their decisions on exchanging their resources.

3.2. Homophily

The conceptualization of the term homophily, the tendency to select the ones that are similar to oneself to associate with, by taking into account all sorts of network types containing marriage, friendship, work, information transfer etc. indicates that people's personal networks are homogenous in respect to behavioral sociodemographic and intrapersonal composition (Boutyline & Willer, 2017; McPherson, Smith-Lovin & Cook, 2001). Homophily affects people's social worlds, the information they gather, structure their attitudes and interpret their interactions with other people (McPherson, Smith-Lovin & Cook, 2001). In the study called Birds of a Feather it is claimed that in our personal settings the strongest divides in homophily are the ones in race and ethnicity. The divides in age, religion, education, occupation, and gender comes after race and ethnicity respectively. The contexts that enable homophilious relations to form are developed by geographic similarities, family relations, organizations and

isomorphic positions in social systems. Localized positions in social environments are formed also when the ties between people who are different from each other extinguish at a higher rate (McPherson, Smith-Lovin & Cook, 2001)

Mc Pherson and Smith-Lovin (1987) also made the distinction between induced and choice homophily. When the composition of the group imposes that the pairs in the group will be homophilious, the type of the homophily which is produced by this composition is called induced homophily. But when not, any similarity was produced by the group composition and the homophily is produced by the decisions of the individuals than it is called the choice homophily (Pherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987).

Lazarsfeld and Merton (1954) divides homophilious ties into two; status homophily and value homophily. Status homophily arises from the status of people which might be formal, informal or attributed whereas value homophily is directly linked to values, bliefs and attitudes. They claim status homophily contains sociodemographic and ascribed features whereas value homophily contains states of people that affect their tendency in the direction of their future behaviors (Lazarsfeld & Merton, 1954)

On the debate of the role of values in networks it has been claimed frequently that individual's agencies were ingrained in their values but the same was rarely claimed for the relation between values and organizations. Borgatti and Halgin (2011) claims that network theory 'refers to the mechanisms and processes that interact with network structures to yield certain outcomes for individuals and groups' (p.1138). And Bassoli suggests that instead of using network approach by only focusing on the social structure and not the value system we can make use of individual attributions in the networks too. Thus, implementation of network theory and homophily suits well in the case of Islamic and secular traditions in civil society in Turkey and the value system of the people who are the members of these groups.

Another useful term on the subject is the political homophily which is observed when people chose to link with people who have similar political ideologies. Rob Willer and Andrei Boutyline (2017) predicted that different levels of political homophily would occur in different political orientations. They further suggested that when a group shows a larger political homophily would have stronger ties with their members but show less ties with the people who have different political ideologies. From this point they deduce that larger political homophily creates an environment where ideologically similar people's interaction with each other increases and people incline to intensify their views that increases their commitment to their group. This situation also diminishes the possibilities for the politically diverse groups to have a contact and interaction. Boutyline and Willer asserted that these situations most probably increase polarization and encourage people to participate in political collective action.

Mutz (2002) points out another result of political homophily which is political intolerance. She claims that when there are no personal ties between people who have dissimilar political views it affects political tolerance in a harmful way. Therefore, Boutyline and Willer see increased homophily and low cross cutting contact as reasons for polarization. They also claim that political homophily causes strong within-group ties that develop behavioral norms. In this kind of atmosphere groups feel a social pressure when they tend to be involved in risky activities or interactions. (Willer & Boutyline, 2017)

Dandekar, Goel and Lee challenges this claims and asserts that homophily alone is not enough for polarization. They offer to add the indication of biased assimilation. They describe biased assimilation as people arriving at a more extreme opinion compared to their initial position when they are exposed to unconvincing evidence about a complex proposition. In their study they aim to show that in homophilious networks if people are biased enough the biasedly shaped opinions will cause polarization. So, in their claim homophily would not cause polarization alone but if there is also biased

assimilation then the atmosphere would be sufficient enough to be called polarized (Dandekar, Goel & Lee, 2013).

Homophily a notion that have been used in the researches on small group of individuals have also been used in examining interorganizational networks too. Researchers like Shumate, Fulk, Monge and Atouba brought the issue in their researches related to interorganizational networks among NGO's which this study aims to do too. Shumate and Atouba (2015) argue that homophily concept can explain operational, environmental and institutional factors why NGO's collaborate with other NGO's. They mention three different types of homophily in an interorganizational level which are attribute-based homophily, geography-based homophily and institutional homophily. Since they were working with international organizations, geography-based homophily was sufficient for them however I will not mention this category because this study is conducted in a national level (Atouba & Shumate, 2015).

Attribute-based homophily is a homophily that can affect the organizations networking patterns based on their general characteristics and key attributes (age, mission, interests, culture, operating system). Similarities in these aspects create possibilities of collaboration on the basis of compatibility, predictability and trustworthiness.

Institutional homophily is created by selecting partners based on the organizations relation to institutional forces. They have examined institutional homophily under two topics: legitimacy status and common funding relations. Legitimacy status is the position of the organization compared to other organizations, how it is recognized, and it is held in esteem. They further claim if the funding organizations or partners are same for organizations they show high possibility of institutional homophily (Atouba & Shumate, 2015).

3.3. Research Approach

3.3.1. Qualitative Research

Qualitative research method which this study also applies as its method was shaped by the researches done in the discipline of sociology by Chicago School and in the discipline of anthropology by Malinowski in the 1920's. The social realities are constructed by humans and in this context, we can have a knowledge of these realities to a limited extend. When the researches get involved with these realities in the field another reality gets constructed and we can grasp this reality with qualitative research methods. At this point we can evaluate that there two very distinct claims that one considers social science as an impossibility and the other one social realities can totally be measured and generalized (Uyan Semerci, 2013).

Qualitative research goes beyond explaining the relations and knowledge of what is accepted to be the apparent and known truth by searching which independent variable affected the which dependent variables. It aims to get in the picture, touch it, smell it, amplify the apparent and try to show something, some dimension, phenomenon or notion that may not have been seen in it before. It aims to understand the experiences and thus show the problems concerning what is structural (Uyan Semerci, 2013).

3.3.2. Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis is a method for qualitative research where researcher identifies, analyses and reports pattern which are called themes inside the data (Boyatzis, 1998). A theme shows what is important about the data that serves the research question and depicts the patterned responses or meaning from the interviews collected for the research. Thematic analysis helps the researcher to organize and determine the data set

and enable the researcher to comment on different features of the research topic (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

While conducting thematic analysis there are a few decisions the researcher ought to make. Here I will explain the choices that needs to be explicit and the decisions I have made while conducting this study with thematic analysis. The first decision for Braun & Clarke (2006) is whether the researcher will describe all of the themes in the data set or give one or few predominant themes from it. Another decision is to make a theoretical thematic analysis or inductive analysis. Inductive analysis is conducted independent from an already decided coding frame or preconditions whereas theoretical thematic analysis driven by the theoretical or analytic perspective. Since I have chosen to make a theoretical thematic analysis I also chose to give the predominant or important themes rather than a rich thematic description. Because since my analytical interests are focusing me toward specific themes and the analysis will not be data-driven I will only focus on the outstanding themes in detail (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Another decision is stated as whether the researcher will pursue a semantic approach, or will s/he pursue the analysis by going beyond the semantic approach meaning will the decision be toward looking beyond what the interviewee has said, will s/he search for underlying ideas, assumptions and conceptualizations or not. My decision concerning this issue is not to go beyond what has been told during the interviews. The last decision I want to point out here is between essentialist/realist and constructionist approach. I will be conducting the research on a constructionist approach because it claims that meaning and experience are social constructs and aims to focus on sociocultural contexts and structural conditions whereas an essentialist approach would consider motivation, experience and meaning in an explicit way (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

3.4. Research Participants

In order to conduct this study, I preferred to categorize organizations into two groups based on their ideological structure and world vision. Even though we can talk about more diverse groups like Kurdish, Alevite and so on, this study mainly focuses whether cultural cleavage of Islamists and seculars can be detected also in civil society and if it does are interorganizational ties affected from it. The first group, I have picked are the organizations that have explained their aim, mission, vision and activities with reference to Islam. It is important to note that not all the participants identified their organizations as Islamic. My second group is the non-Islamic or secular organizations. Even though it is hard to call all of them secular in their aims, mission, vision and activities, these organizations are the ones that have no reference to Islam in these stated characteristics. In the second group there are organizations that have been called Kemalist, leftist, mainstream or secular in media, other studies or public debate but here in this study for practical reasons they will be called as the secular organizations even though they themselves have not declared that way.

When designing the study my first aim was to reach out the Islamic and secular organizations that have the largest number of members/volunteers, donors/contributors and the largest budget in order to have a sample that have more influential power over society. But unfortunately, there is no data on these issues for a lot of organizations. I have talked to Third Sector Foundation of Turkey (TÜSEV) which supports network of over 100 associations and foundations that share a vision of strengthening the legal, fiscal and operations infrastructure of the third sector in Turkey in order to reach out the stated information (TÜSEV, n, d.). TÜSEV did not have any members from Islamic organizations at all. From the beginning of my research design I have realized the lost in connection between the two groups.

For this reason, I have divided the two groups into 5 more category which were the areas and the subjects the civil society organizations were focusing on their activities and aims on. My categories were human rights, women, youth, organizational capacity development and humanitarian aid. I have picked two organizations from each category: one Islamic and one secular and made interviews with one member of the organizations. Since I couldn't find a data on the sphere of influence, I have created my sample by picking organizations that are the most well-known and mostly older ones in their field. It is important to note that this sampling haven't been based on an objective indicator and might have been affected by my perception. In conclusion my research participants were the organizations as follows: Human Rights Association (İHD), Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for Oppressed People (MAZLUMDER), Community Volunteers Foundation (TOG), Civil Society Development Center (STGM), Initiative Management Academy under Science, Culture and Education Association (İLKE), International Youth Association (UGED), Sen De Gel Association, Istanbul Women and Women's Organizations Association (İKADDER), Association for Supporting Women Candidates (KA.DER) and Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (İHH).

Table 3.1: Identification of Research Participants

Research Participants		
Division	Name of the Organization	Founding Date
Islamic Civil Society Organizations	Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (İHH)	1992
	Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for	1991

	Oppressed People (MAZLUMDER)	
	Initiative Management Academy under Science, Culture and Education Association (İLKE)	2010
	International Youth Association (UGED)	2009
	Istanbul Women and Women's Organizations Association (İKADDER)	2006
Secular Civil Society Organizations	Sen De Gel Association	2012
	Human Rights Association (İHD)	1986
	Civil Society Development Center (STGM)	2004
	Community Volunteers Foundation (TOG)	2002
	Association for Supporting Women Candidates (KA.DER)	1997

Interviewing people who have more than 2 years of experience in the organization for them to have a better understanding of organizational values and practices was important in the process. So, I wanted to interview people who have at least 2 years of experience in the organizations they were a part of and who doesn't have a managing or directory position. The second aim was to be able to reach people who also could

have a critical perspective for their organization and who have less power in the decision-making processes. I was able to achieve my first aim but by the organizations I was always directed to the members who were either in the directory or managing positions. I linked this tendency to organizations' desire to be cautious in their statements in a context where a lot of organizations have been shut-down after the 15th of July's coup attempt and the presidential election that would happen approximately a month after when the interviews were conducted.

When we come to the profile of the interviewees I have conducted the interviews with 3 women and 7 men. Some of them according to the organizational structure were professional workers of the organization but some of them held unpaid positions. Even though some organizations had different offices in different cities most of them were located in Istanbul. Only two of them were located in Ankara. These two interviews were conducted via Skype. The other interviews were conducted in each person's office during work hours.

Here I would like to present the organizations by giving a brief explanation on their history, aims, vision, mission and principles.

Human Rights Association (İHD)

According to the information provided by the associations website Human Rights Association was established by 98 human rights defenders on 17th of July 1986, just a few years after the military coup took place on 12 September 1980. During this problematic period there were a lot of human rights violations occurring. Torturing the prisoners was a common phenomenon among law enforcement officials. The number of people killed were quite high. Moreover, many of the civil and political organizations, such as political parties, CSOs, unions, were unpermitted and their representatives were mostly in jail.

Families and friends of the prisoners intended to build up an association. Fore mentioned 98 human rights defenders; writers, journalist, doctors, engineers etc. managed to sign the petition for the Human Rights Association after one year.

With its 29 branches and 3 representative offices and over 10.000 members, IHD is still working on publishing reports, running campaigns, defending the human rights for 32 years. It is explained that their focus areas are abolishing death penalty and State Security Court, searching for the missing activists, amnesty, peace, human rights violations against prisoners, torture, inequalities against disadvantaged people such as disabled.

IHD reports its observations on the human rights violations to inform public about the incidents. IHD fights against the murders committed by unknown perpetrators, people being forced to leave their towns and problem with unfair judgment processes. It supports peace in every situation. IHD claims that any conflict can be managed with democratic tools. As a core value IHD is against any kind of violence for any problem. They consider Kurdish problem as part of the human rights issues in the country. Moreover, they considered that other issues similar to Kurdish problems about disadvantaged groups based on their ethnicity, belief, mother tongue, can be overcome by using democratic tools.

The principles of IHD are as follows:

- IHD is a non-governmental and voluntary organization.
- IHD is not a body of any States, Governments and political parties.
- IHD upholds the principle that the human rights are universal in nature and indivisible.
- IHD struggles against any kinds of discrimination based on language, religion, color, gender, political thought and etc...
- IHD is against the death penalty at regardless of geographical location and circumstances.

- IHD is against torture regardless of the individual, the geographical location and circumstance.
- IHD upholds right to a fair trial and right of defense for everyone, in everywhere and under any conditions.
- IHD is against war and militarism in everywhere and in all time but defences right to peace.
- IHD defends unconditionally and without any restriction the right to freedom of expression.
- IHD considers freedom of thought and belief as an untouchable right and defends unconditionally and limitless.
- IHD defends right to freedom of association.
- IHD stands up for the oppressed individual, people, nation, sex and class.
- IHD upholds right of nations to self-determination.
- IHD defends humanitarian law.

Human Rights Association accepts and defends personal, political, economic, social and cultural rights and solidarity rights as a whole (Human Rights Association, n, d.).

Civil Society Development Center (STGM)

Within the information gathered from the organizations website it is stated that Civil Society Development Center (STGM) portrays its vision as “Strong and Democratic Civil Society”. While aiming to achieve strong and democratic civil society STGM presents various missions such as advocacy, campaigns, research, education and lobbying within the scope of its priority areas. Those missions are supported by the contribution to enhance the level of participation in civil society as well as democracy, empowering organizational participation and self-reliance and incorporation of civil society in decision making processes.

Fundamental principles and values of STGM are stated as;

- Not to consider itself and acts as a top-level union, in any circumstances
- Not to interfere in internal affairs of civil society organizations, in any circumstances
- To be impartial to and independent of third parties,
- To uphold transparency and accountability at all levels and in all of its activities,
- To respect all rights and freedoms recognized by international conventions,
- To take stand against all forms of discrimination while considering differences and diversity as a source of richness,
- To be sensitive to the integrity of life and ecosystem values in the context of production and consumption patterns,
- To adopt participatory and pluralistic democracy as a mode of life,
- To be an organization embedded in practical life, seeking fast and feasible solutions (Civil Society Development Center, n, d.).

Community Volunteers Foundation (TOG)

Community Volunteers Foundation (TOG) was founded in December 2002 as a youth-based project in order to bring change and transformation to society in regard to achieve peace and solidarity. To target this change and transformation, TOG uses the power of youth and guidance of adults as a primary source. In order to address the identified needs social responsibility projects are conducted by the young Community Volunteers in clubs and societies of their universities. Besides the benefit to the society these projects allow young people who take part in the process to be more responsible and contribute to their personal growth.

The vision of TOG is claimed to be the accomplishment of peace, solidarity, and change in society by means of youth empowerment. Their mission consists of social service projects carried out under the youth leadership and adult supervision; gaining adult volunteers' participation, guidance and support to the youth whom they have faith in and their mental and physical dedication for a social aim. Moreover, TOG aims to increase the number of solution-oriented, self-confident, enterprising and sensitive youth along with creating awareness of social responsibility in the society.

TOG's principles are as follows:

- Respecting differences and cultivating a culture of coexistence in diversity
- Refraining from advocacy or propaganda for a specific religious, ideological, political, ethnic etc. viewpoint
- Striving to enhance the society's education level and quality
- Supporting education programs centered on inquiry, research and knowledge
- Promoting lifelong learning through first-hand experience
- Broadening social awareness on education
- Disclosing all of corporate reports, including financial statements, to the public in a transparent fashion
- Upholding the motto "Altogether, for all of us"
- Creating civic initiatives led by the youth and based on local needs, and carrying out activities with ample participation
- Mobilizing local resources to boost problem-solving capacity
- Taking action and initiative in order to resolve social problems (Community Volunteers Foundation, n, d.).

Association for Supporting Women Candidates (KA.DER)

KA.DER which was established in 1997 is a women's organization focusing its activities on seeking equality of men and women in decision making processes. The organization advocates for equal representation in every aspect of life. They claim that concerning women in Turkey even though there have been achievements on women's presence in social life, the equal representation in top management positions and in politics is still a major issue. The organization believes ensuring the equality between men and women enables equality in all other fields. KA.DER holds its activities in 4 branches and 4 representations in Turkey.

KA.DER carries out lobbying, advocacy, campaigning, organization, solidarity and training activities. They advocate for positive discrimination laws and party by-laws, to have laws that secure women's rights in general, focuses on empowering women, urge them to use, defend and expand their rights, encourage women to become candidates in elections and give them trainings.

KA.DER's principles are as follows:

- To be against all kinds of discrimination.
- To keep equal distance from all legally recognized political parties
- To work together with all the women branches and women parliamentarians of political parties. at an equal distance, and in line with its objectives.
- To reflect and expand the feminist consciousness in all its activities.
- To work to integrate gender equality in all policies and programs.

The characteristics of women that KA.DER supports are as follows:

- One who has a women's perspective.
- One who is determined to end all kinds of discrimination and violence against women.

- One who embraces a secular republic, respect for human rights, full democracy, and the rule of law.
- One who is for the strengthening of civic society.
- One who is against all kinds of fanaticism, bigotry, racism, social pollution, violence and war, and has an environmental consciousness.
- One who has a righteous, principled, and connective language.
- One who enters politics with the purpose of being a true representative of women and the people. (Association for Supporting Women Candidates, n, d.).

The Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (IHH)

IHH was founded in 1992 by people who wanted to raise their voice for the Bosnian War. IHH explains its activities as reaching out the people who are in need and affected from occupied countries, war, natural disasters or people who have become refugees. They also aim to bring permanent improvement to the people not only temporary aid in kind and in cash.

IHH also aims to fight human rights violations, raise public awareness on these issues and inform the public leaders about the oppressions to make a step toward ending the problems. IHH carries out projects like building housings, education center and well-drillings. Even though IHH has a lot of projects in Asia, Africa, the Balkans and Far East Asia, it is also active in Turkey.

IHH declares on its website that they priorities their work in war-zone or war-torn countries and territories, regions struck by natural disasters, poverty-stricken countries and territories without independent from people's religion, language, race and sect of people.

IHH's missions are as follows:

- To give all needy and oppressed people the chance of a dignified life while delivering aid wherever they are with an understanding of universal brotherhood in order to help prevent evil and to let the good and justice prevail
- To work toward stopping the policies and activities persecuting and discriminating people in order to prevent violations of their basic rights and freedoms
- To keep up practicing unchanging values in a changing world
- To let the good will rule everywhere.

IHH's vision is as follows:

- To eliminate the negative effects of wars and natural disasters and to create the circumstances that will allow the individuals and the communities become self-dependent.
- To pioneer the humanitarian work globally and improve the cooperation between the countries and the organizations to pave the way to the formation of a common consciousness.
- To strengthen the individuals and the organizations in impoverished communities.
- To reach out to the regions of crisis immediately to efficiently minimize the damage as much as possible.
- To offer permanent solutions by realizing permanent project.
- To contribute to the elimination of poverty and establishment of justice.
(The Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief, n, d.)

Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for Oppressed People (MAZLUMDER)

MAZLUMDER was established by an intellectuals group contained lawyers, authors, business professionals, journalists. It continues their activities with its 28 branches all over Turkey and a general center in Istanbul positioning as an organization independent from any kind of political party.

MAZLUMDER's historical backgrounds roots to Hilfu'l Fudul (The Alliance of the Virtuous) built by Prophet Mohammed. Acknowledging the texts that are common gains of humankind such as the Ten Commandments, The Laws of Hammurabi, The Alliance of Virtuous, Constitution of Medina, Magna Carta, USA Declaration of Human Rights, Virginia Declaration of Human Rights, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, MAZLUMDER explains its main aim to protect peace and fight against injustice. MAZLUMDER claims that human being's basic human rights are born rights. Those rights cannot be taken away under any circumstances by any power means.

MAZLUMDER stands objective while identifying the suppressions again but support the oppressed part based on its identification. MAZLUMDER briefs to officials about the human rights violations. It also observes the actions taken after the violations. It also informs public opinion about the violation based on their use of right.

It engages in the activities to inform public on the violation such as on-scene investigations, public releases, press meeting, demonstrations and reports. They want to create a human rights sensitive public while publishing books, bulletins, briefing and organizing, panels and conferences.

It promotes engagement of the young people to the civic activities by providing cultural activities like movies, art classes, forums and meetings.

MAZLUMDER organized aid campaign for the oppressed groups such as immigrants and war survivors. Moreover, they took action on the ongoing human right violations. They exchange information with the politicians, researchers, members of the press on the human rights violations. While communicating with them, being empathic and being in line with its mission are its main focus.

MAZLUMDER's core values are as follows:

- MAZLUMDER is determined to maintain its human rights approach under all circumstances.
- MAZLUMDER is a platform which defends the rights of expression and association of all kinds of political opinions.
- MAZLUMDER supports all kinds of activities in the framework of human rights regardless of who organizes it; and opposes any kinds of human rights violations regardless of who does it.
- MAZLUMDER forms all of its national and international dialogues with the goal of improving human rights and freedoms and eliminating violations.
- MAZLUMDER views human rights and freedoms above the states and the pacts.
- MAZLUMDER does not approve the use of universal human rights in relation to the political interests and strives for the elimination of this kind approach to human rights (Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for Oppressed People, n, d.).

Sen De Gel Association

Sen de Gel is by taking UN Development Goals into consideration aims to create projects that ensure sustainable improvement, fight poverty, develop states of women

and youth, create employment and quality in social and economic life in the least developed countries. The association was founded in 2012 by Ibrahim Betil who couldn't ignore the situation and wanted to develop projects that can contribute 1 million people fighting with poverty and lack of water. In 2011 the people who took Ibrahim Betil's attention were two Gambian who visited Community Volunteers Foundation (TOG) to talk about a collaboration option.

Sen De Gel's goals are as follows:

- To create, support and implement similar projects to support social and economic lives of people on local, national and international basis,
- Doing research to improve and develop the work of the association, Preparing the young people and women for life and job market,
- To support educational, social and economic development and cultural projects related to all segments of the society by collaborating with UN and related organizations, ministries, official bodies, international organizations, and CSOs,
- Provide scholarships, training and internship opportunities for young people,
- Implementing micro-credit programs for young people and women to encourage them to become entrepreneurs,

To finance projects with productivity and responsibility approaches. (Sen De Gel Association, n, d.)

Istanbul Women and Women's Organizations Association (İKADDER)

İKADDER, is described as a service journey of a group of volunteer women in 1970s, which set ground for many organizations as Hanımlar İlim ve Kültür Derneği, Şefkat Vakfı, Hanımlar Eğitim ve Kültür Vakfı, Kadın Sağlıkçılar Dayanışma Derneği, Felakette Acil Yardım Derneği, Gökkuşuğu İstanbul Kadın Kuruluşları Platform. These organizations, combine modern methods with their own values, have carried out their work in the field of communication, consultation and cooperation.

The principles of İKADDER, which was established in 2006, are the continuation of the atmosphere created in 1970's. İKADDER was founded by the women, volunteers of women's organizations, presidents, members and volunteers gathering who works in various fields in Istanbul. The association claimed to be a place for volunteer women and organizations who thinks globally and create local, unique solutions to social problems.

The organization explains its vision as acting on the basis of respect for differences, starting from the country, a world where sustainable peace, prosperity and happiness spread, and CSO's that can solve problems through cooperation and solidarity. Their mission is to carry on studies to raise the status of women, family and Volunteer Women Associations and working with CSO's to develop communication, consultation, cooperation models among themselves.

They carry out projects such as Family and Youth Drug Substance and Abuse Protection Project, Core Knowledge on House and Marriage Project, Women Health and Education Program, Going to Future with Youth, Family-Focused Media Monitoring and Evaluation Project (Istanbul Women and Women's Organizations Association, n, d.)

International Youth Association (UGED)

International Young Association was established in April 2009. The association, founded by young people who wants to make sense of existence and make a positive contribution to the affairs of the world and aims to create conditions for education, change and development. In this frame UGED describes itself as a voluntary movement that carries social responsibility and development projects.

The association has three representative offices, one in Üsküdar in Istanbul, one in Adana and one in Ağrı outside of Istanbul. Association aims to become a global sphere where a youth is nourished, developed and is able to discover itself. This youth is described by the association as people who worries about the problems of the oppressed in its own nation and worldwide and who wants to be a pioneer of a global justice which's basis is compassion. The name of the association is claimed to refer to its horizon and its missions sufficiently. International presents, organization's service horizon which covers the whole world. The second presents the focus of the organizations. They explain that they are an association because they mean an area independent from the power of state. This for the organization also means to be not for profit and voluntary. They also declare that this sphere is protected from the alienation of the core values because of the state's possible domination.

Some of the activities they carry out are summer schools for high school students, volunteering, construction and development activities carried out by the young volunteers in Albania, Ivory Coast, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kosovo, Nigeria, Tanzania and Sudan. They carry out panels and conversation sessions, they also carry out a trip to Jerusalem (International Youth Association, n, d.).

Science, Culture and Education Association - Institutional Management Academy (İLKE)

İLKE Association is a roof organization for charity and service organizations that aim to deepen their activities. It was founded in 2010 and carries its activities in the fields of work ethic, entrepreneurship, academic studies and common religion education and aims to develop a strategic perspective in those areas. İLKE becomes a center for developing information policy and strategy in the mentioned areas and develops corporate affairs while represents the organizations to the public (Science, Culture and Education Association, n, d.)

Institutional Management Academy that functions as a department of İLKE association aims at "institutional capacities" of organizations that are non-profit-oriented in the field of civil society and to "increase the competencies of voluntary and professional employees" in these institutions. The goal of the Institutional Management Academy is to contribute to the more organized, productive and continuous work of civil society project without losing the volunteer spirit and motivation. They carry out trainings, talks and academic studies (Institutional Management Academy, n, d.)

Even though this study focuses on values, structures, attributes in organizational level and searches for the dynamics of interorganizational ties I find it useful to give information of people I have interviewed about their education, region, gender and age.

Participant 1: He holds a high (voluntary) position in Human Rights Association (İHD) for a year now but he has been involved with the association since 2006. He has a doctoral degree. He lives in Ankara.

Participant 2: He holds a coordinator position in Community Volunteers Association (TOG) and involved with the organization professionally since 2011, voluntarily since his university years. He has a master's degree. He lives in Istanbul.

Participant 3: She holds a high (voluntary) position in Association for Supporting Women Candidates (KA.DER) and have been involved with the association for several years. She holds a master's degree. She lives in Istanbul.

Participant 4: She holds a project assistant position in Civil Society Development Center (STGM) and she has been involved with the association for four years. She holds a master's degree and is a PhD candidate. She lives in Ankara.

Participant 5: He holds a high position in Sen de Gel Association since 2014. He has been involved with Community Volunteers Association (TOG) before. He holds a bachelor's degree. She lives in İstanbul.

Participant 6: He holds a high position in International Youth Association (UGED) for three years. He has a bachelor's degree and working on his master's degree. He lives in Istanbul.

Participant 7: She holds a high position in Istanbul Women and Women's Organizations Association (IKADDER) and have been involved with the organization since 2006. She holds a bachelor's degree. She lives in Istanbul.

Participant 8: He holds a high position in The Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief (IHH) and have been working in the organization since 2007. He holds a bachelor's degree. He lives in Istanbul.

Participant 9: He holds a high (voluntary) position in Association for Human Rights and Solidarity for Oppressed People (MAZLUMDER) and have been involved with the organizations for 12 years. He holds a bachelor's degree. He lives in Istanbul.

Participant 10: He holds a high (voluntary) position in Science, Culture and Education Association - Institutional Management Academy (İLKE) for 1,5 years. He holds a doctoral degree and teaches in a university in Istanbul. He lives in Istanbul.

3.5. Limitations

Before starting the thematic analysis I would like to present the limitations of this study. Firstly, this study only contains a focus group of 10 civil society organizations which is a small size making it not possible to for an analysis of a nation wide civil society assumptions and claims. Therefore during the analysis my claims will only refer to my focus group. The second limitation the categorizational differentiation which is Islamic and secular division. Especially it is not easy or accurate to claim that an organization is secular, the decision I have made here was a practical one and entails organizations that have no reference to any religion in their aims, mission, vision and activities.

This study contains in-depth interviews with one person from each organization. Data could be more reliable and easy to generalize if the number of participants from each organization was higher. Also, if this study was able to include more organizations from more categories like the ones it is leaving out right now; refugee rights, child's rights, organizations that are focusing on education and think tanks that create knowledge on various topics the data could be powerful in order to show us a bigger picture.

Another limitation for this study is that it could give a more historical perspective with evaluating the collaborations and gather the historical data from organization's annual

reports, declarations, memberships and press reflections alongside with the face to face interviews and present a network map.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I will make thematic analysis of participant interviews and bring out the commonalities, differences and the dynamics behind these attributions. Main purpose of this chapter is to analyze which values, institutional structures and experiences limit or enhance the interorganizational ties and possibilities of collaboration. My analysis will mainly focus the type of the social capital these organizations contain, are their values homophilious and how we can evaluate the institutional homophilies.

4.1. Trust

Civil society organizations since they represent a group of people are obliged to have relations with governmental and private forces and national and international platforms (Tosun, 2006). As I have mentioned before, Fuat Keyman (2006) also focuses on these relations and claims if the state doesn't have a balanced relationship with civil society organizations it can affect democracy negatively and another risk of these relations is undemocratic attempts of civil society organizations to try to confiscate the state.

Since the military coup attempt happened in July 15th of 2016, 15 private (foundation) university were shut down, the status of 3,041 academician is unknown, 5,822 academicians have been issued from 118 public university, 1424 association and 145 foundations were shut down (İnsan Hakları Ortak Platformu, 2018).

During the interviews with the participants from both groups, as an answer to several different questions the theme of fragility on the basis of state and civil society relationship have been raised directly or indirectly mentioning 15th of July's military coup attempt. Some of the participant evaluated the civil society sphere shaped by recent events as negative, fragile, traumatic or to the detriment of civil society:

When asked if there have been any changes in their collaborative ties because some organizations might feel at risk or they auto sensor themselves Participant 1 answered:

“... in this troublesome environment when you look at the level of civil society organizations going out in the streets, the number of events civil society organizations organize, the number of new activist members gaining and losing we can observe that it is a common situation for civil society organizations to protect themselves. Which is also true for us. We do not do more innovative work at this time. We go from where we know best. We continue with the principles we know best. It is normal because the civil society movement is very fragile. Because the civil society movement is made up of civilians, we are very unprotected against violence-oriented people (whoever, say, public authorities, illegal organizations or people it doesn't matter). Therefore, in this kind of polarized environment, in a violent environment there are lots of organizations that became withdrawn. This is very normal.” (Participant 1)

Another participant mentioned coups that happened in Turkey's history in a wider context also with the theme of fragility. Participant 10 when asked about the problems Turkey faces replied as follows:

“I think we are being person-centered and being institution-centered is at the second plan. Especially in Turkey experiencing a coup and similar interventions, is the problem in terms of the development of institutions and the development of democracy as well. When we look at it from this point of view, instead of being an individual-centered being institution-centered, and having a structure where institutionalized structure is stronger, a structure that is closed to external intervention is what I most desire. At this point, I see that Turkey has more fragility. In fact, this fragility is more strong government makes the

individuals and NGOs weaker. On the one hand, these fragilities start to prevent the development of civil society." (Participant 10)

Another participant defined the military coup as a trauma and answered the question of what the problems in Turkey are as follows:

"Of course we have been through 15th of July, the externally assisted coup attempt, which caused a trauma that we face as an association, as managers and employees of the association. Because, when we go outside, when we were sitting in civil society activities around the same table with these people, no one expected such a move. Of course, in recent years there have been polarization and there have been very clear information about support from abroad, but of course a coup is very different, so I can also mention that there is a sense of insecurity and trauma." (Participant 7)

Participant 2 also while answering the question related to the problems of Turkey mentions the fear of people to express themselves:

"On the one hand, in recent years it has become a fact that since people are beginning to suffer more when they try to express themselves, they directly think that they should not express themselves anymore. They say I can keep what I know to myself because when I share there is the possibility it can cause me trouble. So people now prefer to shut up. They no longer prefer to say, to share, to resist. I think this is one of the characteristics that we started to lose as a society." (Participant 2)

Participant 4 explains her dreams and aims for the strengthening the civil society with these words:

“My dreams about the empowerment of civil society are, of course, this political environment to have more suitable conditions, enabling environments for non-governmental organizations. Living without the fear of being shut down, freedom of association. My main objective is for civil society organizations to create this suitable environment.” (Participant 4)

Participant 5 explains the situation of civil society in Turkey as follows:

“Despite the many irregularities in the NGO’s known for their proximity to power even despite the very serious criminal activities, has continued to exist in Turkey, having the support of development agencies. Not only this. We have seen the representatives of the state, the representatives of the political power is also protecting these non-governmental organizations. And while doing this the ones that she/he has a negative attitude toward, the ones that opposes or the ones he/she sees their way of life as contrary to his/her ideological stance, you see that many non-governmental organizations couldn’t get the funds from the social state which needs to distribute funds project-oriented to all non-governmental organizations. When you are like this, you are locking the system, not only that but there is a state of emergency. We also keep track of statistics data from time to time. The number of closed or shut down associations and foundations in Turkey over hundreds even thousands within the past year. This a situation that shows what kind of an atmosphere we are in.” (Participant 5)

What all these statements have in common is the lack of trust. Whereas Participant 8 opposes the declared statements of fear, lack of trust and state’s control or unbalanced behavior over civil society, instead declares that civil society is free in a lot of aspect:

“Even though Turkey is highly criticized about freedoms and democracy in the world, Turkey knows the world with its east and its west. I tell this as a person who have experience with all the civil society organizations. I mean the big

actors. As an organization that has an experience in Turkey I can say we are very free, I do not say this only for my organization but for other organizations too. The statements they make here they cannot make them in the West, they can definitely not make them in the East. The pressure there, the pressure of security is so much more there. I would like to underline that first, that how it is very free in Turkey. If there is anything negative concerning politics, people's lives people's freedoms and needs we have the opportunity in this country to criticise them and affect the decision makers with the campaigns. Or we have serious work to affect the ones out of Turkey.” (Participant 8)

As we have mentioned before trust and trustworthiness are very important components of high social capital. But Putnam also makes it clear that he is talking about social trust and what we have observed from these statements that while the participant 7's statement shows a lack of social trust, the other participants except participant 8 declare a lack of political trust. Participant 8 does not show any lack of trust in governmental institutions in the case of civil society. Therefore, from these data interorganizational trust or trust between groups is not measurable. However, these data offer us the possibility to argue about the relationship between social capital and government institutions.

While Putnam's conception of social capital was a subject to many studies a lot of scholars thought that he had a failure by leaving out the link between governmental institutions and social capital (Levi 1996). Berman (1997) argued social capital cannot be studied out of one's unique political context. Lowndes and Wilson (2001) claimed “Social capital may only become an effective resource for democracy if decision-makers are accessible and responsive to citizens” (p.640).

In this theme we have seen that different participants experience and declare state power in different ways. From this we can conclude that the ones that are declaring

fear, threat, fragility and political distrust and the ones declare the opposite have vertical ties in between. As we have mentioned before vertical social capital is the relationship between groups that interact across power while the groups have different positions in power (Rogers & Patricia, 2015).

4.2. Universality

4.2.1. Human Rights

During the interviews the majority of the participants have used the term of human rights although in different contexts. Human rights issue was raised when participants explained their institutional principles or when they were asked the reason for their decisions for not collaborating with an organization.

“Actually, our main target group is the NGO’s that work on the basis of human rights. Our target group and main aim is the empowerment of human rights, environmental rights, women’s rights, LGBT rights and child rights associations.” (Participant 4)

“We have some red lines. NGOs which we are planning to collaborate should not act on the contrary of IHD’s principles. For example, they should not be discriminatory, they should not make an advocacy on discrimination policies around the ethnic, religious identity, sexual orientation or political view. They should respect the principles of human rights at minimum.” (Participant 1)

While evaluating the participants who define their identity and principles of their organizations with reference to Islam it has been observed that the term of human rights they use is not the same with the claims we have read above:

“As I mentioned before, “Mazlumder” is a human rights association which is facilitated with Islamic references and people who define themselves as Muslims. We have principles that we accepted at the beginning. Even “Declaration of Human Rights” concerns some issues as the matter of human rights, if Islam does not approve, we do not accept them as human rights. Also, we do not collaborate with NGOs which struggles with these issues and declares these issues as human rights violations. For example, in this perspective, we do not collaborate with an NGO which makes an advocacy campaign about abortion. We cannot collaborate due to our principles. Or the issue of homosexuality sometimes appears in our agenda. There are occasionally these kinds of NGOs in Turkey. However, in the sense of our principles, we do not participate in the works that these kinds of NGOs involved and we are not being part of this.” (Participant 9)

“This is a very sensitive topic for us. We find the games being played and things that are wanted to be done about the LGBT topic extremely disturbing. We think that there are plenty of young people who are getting hurt by this. Because we have a hypothesis like this, if a white Turkish person wishes his/her life in a certain way there is nothing to affect that. For example, if the wish is finding love in the gay bar that's very possible and nobody would interfere. However, if a young person coming from Anatolia will find him/herself in this circle there are lots of serious issues to face like health problems, not finding a job, being a victim of prostitution and in the worst case losing his/her life. And there are sectors which are feeded from this such as the porn sector, the prostitution sector, the drugs sector. Thus, we do not want to be part of this picture, that's why we stay away from contact with these groups... A lot of associations who are working on violence against women do not see this agenda that we are talking about, only looking from a human rights perspective but a lot of people's

human rights are violated in this manner and they are being a victim, they don't see this." (Participant 7)

With the claims of "We do not see the issues that are not legitimate through Islam as human rights even though the human rights legal acquis see." and "they look at this issue from human rights perspective but a lot of people's human rights are violated in this sense." we interfere the debate of cultural relativism and universalism. Even though human rights concept is considered to be universal, meaning it would not change based on the culture, region or time, Islamic perspective on the issue have been widely debated (Mahmood, 1998). The cultural relativists in the human rights topic claim that non-of the values and principles are independent from culture and cultures can not be judged through universal standards. They further assert that it is not possible to judge a non-Western culture and its ideas through Western culture (Mayer, 1999).

From these claims of the participants we can see the divide that while former takes into account of universal and international human rights stand the later bases its principles from Islamic perspective of human rights which is described as the privilege of God since Allah has the ultimate authority (Donnelly,1989).

Some scholars evaluate the universality problem asserting that in the history there have been various attempts in different cultures for forming a human rights document and we should investigate the power structure on the issue. Richard Falk claimed that universalism have been used in order to hide Western hegemony and if we want to sustain human rights it should not be based on uniformity but based on coexistence of different cultures. He further claims the values of the Enlightenment should be reevaluated according to time and space (Falk, 2000).

But while participants made the claim that they would not collaborate with organizations focusing on the LGBT or abortion issues they also claimed that they have collaborated in the past or collaborating now with the organizations who support LGBT

or abortion issues or the ones that collaborate with the organizations that are focused mainly on these issues.

Participant 7 said by mentioning some women's organizations that fail to see LGBTI agenda:

“... but if you ask that there are times we sit on the same table with these women's organizationals and we have collaborated with them before. ”

Participant 9 also said concerning the organizations he mentions are working on LGBT rights:

“We have some principles that doesn't coincide with Human Rights Association or with Amnesty International or other organizations but in the past we had worked together with these institutions on the subjects that we think we coincide and fight together.” (Participant 9)

4.2.2. Morality

While the organizations talk about the same term the meaning they attribute, the limits and the scope of the terms are quite different. Other terms which were often mentioned in some of the organizations who have declared to adopt Islamic values but not in the secular ones were the term ethics and morality which is a topic that was the center of a lot of debates on its universality. It was mentioned by two participants when they were asked what are the characteristics of the organizations they collaborate and would like to collaborate their answers are as follows:

“Our red lines not to be crossed regarding immorality. We are against that. What we understand from moral is an important topic, what is morality? ... Our definition of morality is not to act in a disrespectful way, to be a gentleman, to

respect the elderly and to care the youngsters, to have a mercy to other living creatures, to animals, to care people, to touch and listen their problems. In other terms, to have manners. For some people, there could be an ease in women-men relationships in some certain places, like they could be snuggled up. We do not think that this is very appropriate. We think that even this should have a limit... Because we should not misunderstand each other in any way. Even this is a moral line. One shall not forget being modest, loving and respecting people. We should give importance to the affection and mercy we have towards each other. This is what we understand from morality.” (Participant 6)

“We have certain red lines; these red lines are also included in the legislation of İKKADER and they concern moral values or values such as devotion to the nation or like being open to communication and consultation.” (Participant 7)

In here we also face the debate between relativism and universality. Without going too deep in the philosophical debate metaethical moral relativism claims that moral judgements can't be universally true or false, but they can only be relative to traditions or practices of a group of persons, society or culture. Moral universalism on the other hand refers to a system of ethics where it applies universally to all individuals facing similar conditions regardless of their culture, society, race or any different position (Gowans, 2004). There are also theories that base obtaining the moral knowledge through religion. These theories agree that revelation has the main importance in morality. Revelation is the base of determining the moral principles.

Since the organizations with claims written above take religion as their base this principle is not universal for relative. They refuse to collaborate with the organizations that doesn't have their position concerning morality (Kılıç, 2009).

From these two stands about human rights and morality, we can say that these institutions are reading their principles from different stands and practising value homophily which is directly linked to the values, beliefs and attitudes of the organizations. They claim their preference in interorganizational collaborations is based on the values which are different from each other.

4.3. Financial Transparency

Another finding of this study is that most of the organizations practise institutional homophily which is the term used for describing the situations when organizations choose their partners based on how organizations are affected by the institutional forces (Atouba & Shumate, 2015). DiMaggio and Powel (1983) describes the institutional forces as conditions that make organizations be in touch with the ones that have similar standards, practises and behaviours. They point out two sources for this homophily which are the legitimacy status of the organizations and their relations to the fundings (DiMaggio & Powel, 1983).

An important criterion most of the organizations agreed on independent from their described group was financial transparency. They often mentioned financial transparency and what it means for them during the interviews when they were asked which organizations they like the most and what is their criteria and also to the question of their conditions for colloboration:

“There is two very important indispensable condition. First there needs to be trust, what we mean by trust is that we as a matter of fact most of the time carry the deposit of people who are poor and sensible not who are rich and sensible. If we are going to collaborate with someone they need to have the same sensibilities as we do meaning the aid needs to used according to its aim... the

aid should not be stolen, and everything needs to be transparent. There needs to be trust in this meaning.” (Participant 8)

“Without making any comparisons unexceptionally all the members of Açık Açık Platform². We have mentioned before that civil society ensures and demands that governments become transparent. I can say positive things about all of the 52 organizations that has started this transparency with themselves, can practice democratic processes within themselves, shares its budgets with people transparently and recognize the rights of the donator. I can say that they are the civil society organizations that I appreciate their structure and they are the ones that are working to make a change in this community and make a difference in their field.” (Participant 2)

The same participant when asked which organizations would not do any good for the community said:

“... or like the ones that are not transparent, and we don’t know how much donations they get, when we hear that they got millions of dollars at one time and we say how is this possible that is our annual budget, there are organizations like that.” (Participant 2)

“The resources that are already scarce should be made more fertile by people. There should be more transparency. There are 110,000 organizations in Turkey but when you select them, they are not sustainable except a few of them like around 150 or 200. In here the opinions can be different but the cooperations

² Açık Açık is a platform that aims to bring associations and foundations that recognizes the donators, the rights of donators, transparent and accountable together (Açık Açık, n, d.)

should increase, lowering the costs, the productivity and effectiveness should be the focus.” (Participant 10)

“As the Sen De Gel Association, one of the issues we give importance to in this respect is transparency. This is like this in Turkey and in the World, there are only a few indicators that determines your position as an NGO. The most important of them is transparency. One aspect of this is whether your sources and funds are open to inspection. The second aspect is whether it is open to access for the whole population. When you enter the webpage of Sen De Gel Association, it is possible to see the financial reports, the income and expenses tables, and the inspection reports of the international audit organizations that inspects us at our own request... As an instance, there are giant, very rooted organizations with huge amounts of budgets, not necessarily the ones that are affiliated with the government, the ones that we see their commercials on television which advertise SMS donation campaigns etc, I do not want to name them, but it is impossible to say that they are transparent. In fact, this reveals that non-governmental organizations in Turkey are facing very serious problems and the organizations do not match with the standards.” (Participant 5)

Organizational status, is the status that positions an organization compared to others based on its legitimacy, recognition and esteem (Podolny & Phillips). These organizations I have mentioned above considered another organization as legitimate on the basis of their financial transparency first.

4.4. Funding

The majority of the participants declared that (ignoring how much of their funding is coming from these institutions) they do not have a principle of not getting any funds

from government institutions or private companies. In fact, some of them are getting funds from government and some of them are getting funds from private sector and some of them are getting funds from both of them. But there were 2 organizations that declared they would not accept any funding from any government institutions or private sector since it might affect their claims or fight. One of the organizations said even though they accept some sponsorships sometimes they also try to take no contribution from governments or private sector.

“As MAZLUMDER we have a main principle. We do not accept any funds from the state resources or any funds that we might find suspicious or that might be a setback for our work, no matter if they are with or without conditions. Until today we did not only avoid the funds of the Turkish Republican State or other states but also the ones from the European Union or different monarchies or embassies as a principal.” (Participant 9)

Further Participant 9 also asserted that they would not collaborative with an organization that is accepting funds from any governmental or private institutions. We can see the funding issue as a principle, organizations have as a reason for collaborating with each other or not.

4.5. Universities, Institutional Development and Production of Knowledge

All the participant in the interviews without exception have pointed out their collaborations with universities and how important these collaborations for them. Some of them defined universities as the places they can get in touch with youth or the places where information exchange is crucial.

Most of them pointed their wish of establishment of universities that only focused in civil society, they referred to many common universities as the places they exchange both theoretical knowledge and also knowledge about institutional development.

TÜSEV in their Civil Society Monitoring Report of 2011 claimed that universities and civil society organizations have the potential to collaborate by using each others expertise. In this point civil society organizations can have support from the academicians and researches in the design of their program and they can have long or short-term collaborations by being a solution partner to each other in their projects. The report further claims universities can contribute to the development of the field by conducting researches on civil society. In addition, universities are the places for nourishment of individuals that have social awareness and contribute to the development of civil society (TÜSEV, 2011).

Also, apart from the universities a lot of common think tank and CSO's were mentioned too. Most of the organizations in the two groups are gathering their informations from the same think tanks and CSO's, such as STGM, TUSEV and YADA Foundation.

Another point to be made in this theme is that the organizations that talked about contact with the other the most and the ones that made the most effort to help and learn from each other were the two organizations in my focus group working for the institutional empowerment of civil society organizations and the production of knowledge in the field:

“It can be easier to build a relationship with us compared to other organizations. And on the one hand we also believe the contacts should be made between different poles, not poles but different opinions. I can detect my own biases but when we meet we can find out so many different commonalities. .. It is

very important to get in touch and to listen ... Civil society's contacts is the meetings, the training, these contacts are byproducts of empowerment by getting to know each other." (Participant 4)

"Despite the fact that how we deal with things might be different, the religions, and the languages might be different but people in civil society also have so many things in common. We are trying to reach out the good practises. For example, in our event series we are trying to see good NGO practises, here we focus if there is a good practise, how can we bring it in the open how can we implement it and how can it be widespread rather than it is from a organization or b organization... We are following these with curiosity. The identities can differ, this is not a big deal. They want to contribute to humans in the topics that they believe. As the means of a collaboration with the mainstream NGOs, we got in contact with one of the Koç Foundation, we had first round meetings. At least we started these contacts. We are also trying to attend their activities. We think that this should increase even more. This shouldn't stop here, there are things to do collectively in the context of governance." (Participant 10)

4.6. Conclusion of the Findings

Firstly the analysis of the interviews has shown that the theme of trust was very dominant in the responses. Most of the participants felt and point out the unbalanced power of the governmental institutions. While some of them are traumatized by the civil society groups that have tried to demolish the state. Some of them feel threatened and fragile in front of the state. The third participant in this theme even though exhibiting a social distrust rather than a political one can also be read as the outcome of state's protection or lack of control over one group of civil society. The latter can be read as the fear and the sense of being threatened caused by the pressure and oppression

state shows to particular groups. There was also one claim which pointed out the feeling free, able to criticise the government and being democratic concerning the civil society in Turkey. From these 3 points we can point out that the power and control of the state over civil society is being experienced very differently between some organizations. By reference to Thernborn (1998) it is also important to see here that the conceptualization of civil society with a predefined equality assumption is at fault. Therefor we can claim that there are vertical ties between some organizations and it creates distrust between organizations and distrust between organizations and government institutions. For interorganizational ties to be more horizontal the government should provide a balanced position.

Another theme which is also directly linked to the theme of trust is the theme of financial transparency. A lot of organizations from both groups pointed out financial transparency as a must for organizations to be legitimate and prestigious. This stand can also be explained by the lack of social and political trust. Organizations wants to make sure that all the fundings that are provided by government institutions or private sector or by individual donations should be out in the open. Some of the participants from both groups have agreed on their legitimacy and prestige principles and claimed they can collaborate with financially transparent organizations.

Another condition in which they declared to build collaborations with other organizations was their values and principles. Even though a lot of participants gave reference to human rights what they mean by the term and the scope of the term were not the same. Where participants from secular organizations who have mentioned human rights as a universality, participants from Islamic organizations showed a relativist stand. And the same thing was true for the conceptualization of morality. Islamic organizations often made reference to morality as a very crucial condition for them with studying morality through Islam and its revelations. In secular group morality was never been mentioned but since the meaning of the term is not universal

and will depend on the people it will be hard to have a mutual standpoint. Therefore in the case of values and principles the mentioned participants cannot have a common ground and it might affect their collaboration.

The last topic according to which organizations explained their collaboration dynamics was their relationship to funds. Two organizations declared that they would not get any funding from governmental institutions or private sector. One of them made it clear that they would not collaborate with the ones that get any funding from these two. One of the organizations said that they sometimes have sponsorships, but they are trying not to get a lot of funding from governments and private sector.

Lastly during the interviews collaborations with universities and the value of production of knowledge in the area was prominent. All of the participants agreed on the importance and declared they have collaborations with universities. Further the organizations that are focused on producing knowledge in the field and institutional capacity development have been the ones that were outstanding from the group in the topics of contact with the other, collaboration, learning from each other and their efforts to bring two different groups together.

Even though the groups have vertical ties in their social capital, even though they have different values, principles, legitimacy status and relations to funds it is very important to note that not in any subject all the participants think and function in the same way. And there is no category where all of one group's participants agree on and disagree with the other group. Since we have taken the polarization as the situation where everyone agrees within the group and the groups are claiming opposing ideas we can say that there is no polarization within these groups and the participants of these groups ("Bryson, DiMaggio & Evans", 1996).

In conclusion I claim even though these organizations have vertical ties, value and institutional homophily organizations that provide institutional support and knowledge in the area can become the mediative forces in the dialogue of these organizations since they are seen very valuable and trustworthy.

CONCLUSION OF THE THESIS

While the polarization or conflict between people who define themselves as Islamist and people who define themselves as secular have been an issue widely discussed. There have been different findings and studies in academia. For example, where Toprak and Çarkoğlu define Turkey as a country that contains two distinctly different societies, Kaya and Sunar claims that since the opinions of one group on crucial issues don't homogenously contradict the opinions of the other group and the contradiction doesn't increase over time we can not talk about a polarization ("Çarkoğlu & Toprak," 2006; Kaya & Sunar, 2015).

Also, a lot of studies asserted civil society as the antidote of polarization or they claimed that the members of civil society organizations show less otherization tendencies compared to Turkey's society in general (Köksal, Hortaçsu & Köksal, 2009; Erdogan, Önal & Semerci, 2017). Since civil society like Thernborn (1998) criticized is not formed by people who are free of the inequalities in the context of class, race, ethnicity, citizenship, gender and so on, civil society is also not free from social bounds, historical institutions, tendencies and inner political dynamics. Bearing this in mind this study aims to evaluate the reflections of the tendencies of Islamic and secular polarization in Turkey on civil society organizations. In order to do that the study focused on the the dynamics, principles or situations that prevent or encourage the civil society organizations to collaborate with certain organizations, the social and political values of the organizations, the principles they evaluate other organizations through and the accessibility of the knowledge, actions and activities of the other organizations.

The results of the interviews have showed that the power and control of the state over civil society is perceived and experienced differently between some organizations. Some of the participants from both groups have agreed on their legitimacy and prestige

principles that it is very important for an organization to be financially transparent. Another important result was that the participants from secular organizations described human rights as a universality, whereas participants from Islamic organizations had a relativist stand. All of the participants thought universities were crucial for civil society to improve both because they were the places knowledge on social and political issues and also on organizational development is produced and also because they are the places university students who will be eager to take place in civil society organizations are found. Further the organizations that are focused on producing knowledge, documents and reports on civil society and who provide service to other organizations on organizational development were the ones that mentioned contact, collaboration and bringing differences together the most.

Even though the groups have remarkable differences in their value systems and principles it is shown that this is not the only criteria organizations have put forward for collaboration or non-collaboration. While groups having vertical social capital that prevents them to have horizontal and more solidarist relations it also creates an untrustful environment for both parts because where secular organizations feel threatened by government, most Islamic organizations fear one organization might get too powerful enough to threaten the state's power. Also, it is important to mention that in non-of the themes the groups had one homogenous stand which contradicted with the other groups stand completely. Therefore, it is hard to claim that there is polarization between these two groups. And the tendency towards polarization was least observed in the organization that are providing services, tools and knowledge to other organizations for their development.

I think this issue is particularly interesting to search further. Why these particular organizations are eager to have a common ground and learn from each other? Do they need each other's social capital? Would they lose contact if one of the groups become

more powerful on producing and gaining the knowledge and practises in the field or become more financially strong?

In order to expand this study and give a more generalized result it can further be analyzed through a longer time period. By doing that the changes in the dynamic through time can be assessed too. The documents, events, activities and press coverages of the organizations can be deeply evaluated. Even though it is hard to find the data, financial mechanisms and governmental financial supports and the changes in these mechanisms and their dynamics can also give a bigger picture in order to see the relation between state, civil society and social capital. And the changes in the collaborations of the organizations over time can be put in a network map.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atouba, Y. C., & Shumate, M. (2015). International nonprofit collaboration: Examining the role of homophily. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(3), 587-608.
- Ayata, A. G., & Tütüncü, F. (2008). Party politics of the AKP (2002–2007) and the predicaments of women at the intersection of the westernist, islamist and feminist discourses in Turkey. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 35(3), 363-384. doi:10.1080/13530190802525130
- Baldassarri, D. (2011). *Partisan joiners: Associational membership and political polarization in the United States (1974-2004)*. New Jersey: Southwestern Social Science Association.
- Baran, Z. (2010). *Torn country: Turkey between secularism and Islamism*. Stanford, Calif: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University.
- Bassoli, M. (2016). Catholic versus Communist: An ongoing issue: The role of organizational affiliation in accessing the policy arena. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28(3), 1135-1156. doi:10.1007/s11266-016-9708-1
- Berman, S. (1997). Civil Society and Political Institutionalization. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5), 562-574. doi:10.1177/0002764297040005003Biz kimiz? (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://ikadder.org/>

- Bobbio, N. (1989). *Democracy and dictatorship: The nature and limits of state power*. Oxford: Polity.
- Borgatti, S., & Halgin, D. (2011). On Network Theory. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2260993
- Boutyline, A., & Willer, R. (2017). The social structure of political echo chambers: Variation in ideological homophily in online networks. *Political Psychology*, 38(3), 551-569. doi:10.1111/pops.12337
- Boyatzis, R. E. (2009). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2). doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Calhoun, C. (1993). 25. Civil Society and the Public Sphere. *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society*, 311-324. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398571.003.0025
- Cevizci, A. (2009). *Felsefe tarihi*, İstanbul: Say Yayınları
- Çarkoğlu, A., & Toprak, B. (2006, December). *DEĞİŞEN TÜRKİYE'DE DİN, TOPLUM VE SİYASET* (Rep. No. 975-8112-80-5). Retrieved May 4, 2018, from http://tese.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Degisen_Turkiyede_Din_Toplum_Ve_Siyaset.pdf

- Dandekar, P., Goel, A., & Lee, D. T. (2013). Biased assimilation, homophily, and the dynamics of polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(15), 5791-5796.
- Derneği, A. A. (n.d.). Açık Açı. Retrieved from <https://acikacik.org/>
- Dimaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *Advances in Strategic Management Economics Meets Sociology in Strategic Management*, 147-160. doi:10.1016/s0742-3322(00)17011-1
- Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal human rights in theory and practice*. Nex Delhi: Manas publications.
- Erdoğan, E. (n.d.). *Dimensions of Polarization in Turkey*(Rep.). Retrieved May 10, 2018, from https://goc.bilgi.edu.tr/media/uploads/2018/02/06/dimensions-of-polarizationshortfindings_DNzdZml.pdf.
- Eslen-Ziya, H., & Korkut, U. (2010). Political religion and politicized women in Turkey: Hegemonic republicanism revisited. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 11(3-4), 311-326. doi:10.1080/14690764.2010.546088
- Falk, R. A. (2002). *Human rights horizons: the pursuit of justice in a globalizing world*. Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, (25), 56-80. doi:10.2307/466240
- GENÇ Derneği. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.gencdernegi.org/>
- Gowans, C. (2004). Moral relativism.

- Gramsci, A. (2011). *Hapishane defterleri*, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları
- Habermas, J. (1983). *The theory of communicative action*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- İHH İnsani Yardım Vakfı. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.ihh.org.tr/>
- İLKE Derneği | ilke.org.tr sitesine hoşgeldiniz. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://ilke.org.tr/>
- İnsan Hakları Derneği. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ihd.org.tr/>
- KA.DER nedir? (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://ka-der.org.tr/>
- Kaya, Y., & Sunar, L. (2015). The culture wars redux? The polarization of social and political attitudes in Turkey. *Social Currents*,2(4), 393-412. doi:10.1177/2329496515603729
- Keyman, F. E. (2014). The AK Party: Dominant party, new Turkey and polarization. *Insight Turkey*,16(2), 19-31.
- Kılıç, R. (1992). *Ahlakın dini temeli*. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Kogacioglu, D. (2004). Progress, unity, and democracy: Dissolving political parties in Turkey. *Law Society Review*,38(3), 433-462. doi:10.1111/j.0023-9216.2004.00053.x
- Köksal, D., Hortaçsu, N., Köksal, F., *Türkiye’de Sosyal Köken, Değerler ve Kimlik: Türkiye ve Avrupa Kimliği*, TÜBİTAK SOBAG Projesi No. 194K107, 2009.
- Kurumsal Yönetim Akademisi. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.kurumsalyonetim.org/tr/>

- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Merton, R. K. "Friendship as a social process: a substantive and methodological analysis." *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*. Ed. Morroe Berger. New York, NY: Van Nostrand, 1954. 18-66. Print.
- Levi, M. (1996). Social and Unsocial Capital: A Review Essay of Robert Putnam's *Making Democracy Work*. *Politics & Society*, 24(1), 45-55. doi:10.1177/0032329296024001005
- Lowndes, V., & Wilson, D. (2001). Social Capital and Local Governance: Exploring the Institutional Design Variable. *Political Studies*, 49(4), 629-647. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.00334
- Mardin, Ş. (2008). Türkiye’de Din ve Siyaset, (der. Mümtazer Türköne, Tuncay Önder). *İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları*.
- Mayer, A. E. (2013). *Islam and human rights: Tradition and politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- MAZLUMDER Genel Merkez. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.mazlumder.org/>
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27 (415-444). doi: 10.1057/9780230607507_6
- Monshipouri, M. (1998). *Islamism, secularism, and human rights in the Middle East*. Boulder, CO: L. Rienner.
- Mutz, D. C. (2002). Cross-cutting social networks: Testing democratic theory in practice. *American Political Science Review*, 96(01), 111-126. doi:10.1017/s0003055402004264

- Podolny, J. M., & Phillips, D. J. (1996). The Dynamics of Organizational Status. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 5(2), 453-471. doi:10.1093/icc/5.2.453
- Putnam, R. (1995). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 28(4), 664-683. doi:10.2307/420517
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rogers, S. H., & Jarema, P. J. (2015). Brief history of social capital research. In J. M. Halstead & S. C. Deller (Eds.), *Social capital at the community level: An applied interdisciplinary perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sarıbay, A. Y. (1998). Türkiye’de Demokrasi ve Sivil Toplum. *Küreselleşme-Sivil Toplum ve İslâm*.
- Semerci, P. U., & Erdogan, E. (Eds.). (2013). Farklı pencereler, farklı manzaralar. İstanbul: Hiperlink.
- Semerci, P.U., Erdoğan, E., & Önal, E. S. (2017). *“Biz”liğin Aynasından Yansıyanlar*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları
- Sen De Gel. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.sendegel.org.tr/>
- Sivil Toplum İzleme Raporu*(Rep.). (2011). İstanbul: Tüsev Yayınları. Retrieved from http://www.tusev.org.tr/usrfiles/files/Izleme_Raporu_2011.pdf

- Sivil Toplum Geliştirme Merkezi. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.stgm.org.tr/tr>
- Sunar, L. (2018). *Türkiye’de İslami STK’ların Kurumsal Yapı ve Faaliyetlerinin Değişimi* (Rep.). İstanbul: İLKE Yayınları.
- Sunstein, C. R. (1999). *The law of group polarization*. Chicago, IL: Law School, University of Chicago.
- Seufert, G. (2011). Milliyetçi söylemlerin sivil toplum üzerindeki etkisi. In S. Yerasimos (Ed.), *Türkiye’de sivil toplum ve milliyetçilik*. (25). İstanbul: İletişim
- Stolle, D., & Rochon, T. (2001). *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil society and the social capital debate in comparative perspective* (B. Edwards, M. W. Foley, & M. Diani, Eds.). Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Thernborn, G. (1998). Sivil toplum ötesi: demokratik deneyimler ve “ortadoğu”ya uygunlukları. E. Özdalga, Ed.), *Sivil Toplum, Demokrasi ve İslam Dünyası* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Tol, U., Yeğen, M., Keyman, F., & Çalışkan, M. (2010). *Türkiye’de Gönüllü Kuruluşlarda Sivil Toplum Kültürü*(Rep.).
- Toplum Gönüllüleri Vakfı – Toplum Gönüllüleri Vakfı. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.tog.org.tr/>
- Toprak, B. (1996). *Civil society in the Middle East*(A. R. Norton, Ed.). Leiden: Brill.
- Tosun, G. E. (2006). *İzmirde sivil toplum*. Bursa: Alfa Aktüel.

Trentmann, F. (2000). *Paradoxes of civil society: New perspectives on modern German and British history*. New York: Berghahn Books.

TÜSEV. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.tusev.org.tr/tr>

Uslaner, E. M. N.d. Faith, hope, and charity: Social capital, trust, and collective action.

Mimeo

Vakil, A. C. (1997). Confronting the classification problem: Toward a taxonomy of NGOs. *World Development*, 25(12), 2057-2070. doi:10.1016/s0305-750x(97)00098-3

Veneklasen, L., & Miller, V. (2002). Prelims - A New Weave of Power, People & Politics. *A New Weave of Power, People & Politics*, I-Xiv. doi:10.3362/9781780444208.000

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. L. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.: Harvard University Press.

Yeğen, M., Keyman, E. F., Çalışkan, M. A., & Tol, U. U. (2010). Türkiye’de gönüllü kuruluşlarda sivil toplum kültürü. *Yaşama Dair Vakfı.(YADA)* <http://www.yasamadair.org/Adminjkl/1.pdf> adresinden, 25, 2012.

21 Temmuz 2016-20 Mart 2018 Olağanüstü Hal Uygulamaları: Güncellenmiş Durum Rapor (Rep.). (2018). Retrieved from http://www.ihop.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Olağanüstü-Hal_17042018.pdf

Waldner D. (2007). Transforming inferences into explanations: Lessons from the study of mass extinctions. In R. N. Lebow & M. Lichbach (Eds.), *Theory and evidence in comparative politics and international relations*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan

Wolch, J. R., (1990). *Building the the shadow state*, New York, NY: The Foundation Center

APPENDIX – INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Can you please introduce yourself? Where do you live? With whom do you live?
2. What are the problems that Turkey faces nowadays according to your opinion?
3. What are the problems that Turkey suffered from since it's establishment? Which problems are already solved and which not? Are those problems related with the problems that occur today? How?
4. How do you define the concept of "identity"?
5. How do you define your identity?
6. How are you affected by those problems on the individual level? How are the people who have similar identities effected by those problems?
7. What is civil society in your opinion? Why did you preferred to work on an NGO?
8. What are the responsibility that should be fulfilled by civil society? How do they function in terms of solving the mentioned problems? Do they have an impact?
9. What is the connection between civil society and democracy?
10. How did you meet with the organization you are currently working? What is your position? How long have you been working here? Why did you choose to work here?
11. Does it serve to your identity and values to be working here? How do you feel about it?
12. Which institution do you collaborate in organizational level? Why do you work with those institutions?
13. Which reports or publishings do you read in order to improve your experience and expertise? Which institutions' events and publishing do you follow? Why?

14. Are the values of those institutions and its employee overlaps with you and your institution's values?
15. Would you cooperate with an institution whose values conflict with your or your institution's values? Did you cooperate with such institutions before?
16. Are there any institution that you used to cooperate but would not prefer to cooperate any longer?
17. Are there any institution that you would never cooperate? Why do you think the cooperation is not an option?
18. Are you donating any organization individually? Which institution you donate to?
19. How you evaluate whether an institution worth donating?
20. Is there an NGO that you believe do not work for the favor of society? Why?
21. Which criteria and values you focus while referring some institutions as "us"?
22. Are you updated about the events of the institutions that you define as "others"? Why/why not?
23. When compared, are there any institution whose values are inferior compared to yours?
24. Which channels you use to announce your activities? In your opinion which group of people know about your activities?
25. Do you believe that your activities and messages are not heard or misunderstood?
26. Who does not hear you? What is the reason for that?
27. What are your dreams and mission about the empowerment of civil society? What kind of civil society that you desire to work for?

EK – MÜLAKAT SORULARI

1. Kendinizi tanıtabilir misiniz? Nerede yaşıyorsunuz? Kimlerle yaşıyorsunuz?
2. Sizce Türkiye'nin şu anda yaşadığı sorunlar nelerdir?
3. Sizce Türkiye'nin tüm tarihi boyunca yaşadığı sorunlar nelerdir? Hangilerinin aşıldığı hangilerinin aşılamadığını düşünüyorsunuz? Tarih boyunca yaşadığı sorunlar şu anki sorunlarla bağlantılı mı? Nasıl?
4. Sizce kimlik nedir?
5. Kimliğinizi nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?
6. Siz bireysel anlamda bu sorunlardan nasıl etkileniyorsunuz? Kendinizi tanımladığınız kimliğe sahip kişilerin bu sorunlardan nasıl etkilendiğini düşünüyorsunuz?
7. Sizce sivil toplum nedir? Neden sivil toplumda çalışmayı tercih ettiniz?
8. Sizce Türkiye'de sivil toplumun edindiği ve edinmesi gereken sorumluluklar neler? Sivil toplum Türkiye'nin belirttiğiniz sorunlarının aşılması için nasıl bir işlev gösteriyor, gösterebiliyor mu?
9. Sivil toplum ve demokrasi arasında nasıl bir bağ görüyorsunuz?
10. Bu kurumla yollarınız nasıl kesişti? Pozisyonunuz nedir? Ne kadardır burada çalışıyorsunuz? Neden bu kurumda çalışmayı seçtiniz?
11. Burada çalışmak ve bu kurumun değerleri kimliğinizin özellikleriyle ve değerleriyle uyumlu mu? Bu size nasıl hissettiriyor?
12. Kurumsal anlamda işbirliği yaptığınız kurumlar hangileri? Neden bu kurumlarla işbirliği yapıyorsunuz?
13. Kendinizi alandaki yazın, rapor, uzmanlık ve deneyimler açısından nasıl besliyorsunuz? Okuduğunuz, takip ettiğiniz ve etkinliklerine katıldığınız kurumlar hangileri? Neden?
14. Bu kurumlarda çalışan kişiler ve kurumun değerleri sizin ve kurumunuzun değerleriyle örtüşüyor mu?

15. Sizin ve kurumunuzun deęerleriyle örtüşmediğini düşündüğünüz herhangi bir kurumla işbirliği yaptınız mı? Neden yaptınız/yapmadınız?
16. Daha önce işbirliği yaptığınız ancak şimdi yapmayacağınız kurumlar var mı?
17. Asla işbirliği yapmayacağınızı düşündüğünüz kurumlar var mı? Neden işbirliği yapmayacağınızı düşünüyorsunuz?
18. Bireysel anlamda bağış yapıyor musunuz? Hangi kurumlara yapıyorsunuz?
19. Bir kurumun bağış yapmaya deęer olduğunu neye göre karar veriyorsunuz?
20. Toplumun yararına çalışmadığını düşündüğünüz sivil toplum kuruluşları var mı? Neden?
21. Biz dediğiniz kurumları hangi kriterler ve deęerler üzerinden deęerlendirerek biz diyorsunuz?
22. Dięerleri olarak tanımladığınız kurumların etkinliklerinden haberdar oluyor musunuz? Sizce neden oluyorsunuz/olmuyorsunuz?
23. Kendi faaliyetlerinizi daha deęerli gördüğünüz kurumlar var mı?
24. Faaliyetlerinizi hangi kanallardan duyuruyorsunuz? Faaliyetleriniz hakkında bilgi sahibi olanlar sizce kimler?
25. Mesajlarınızın/yaptıklarınızın duyulmadığını, anlaşılmadığını, yanlış anlaşıldığını düşündüğünüz oluyor mu?
26. Kimler sizi duymuyor? Sizce bunun sebebi nedir?
27. Sivil toplumun güçlenmesi için hayalleriniz ve hedefleriniz neler? Nasıl bir sivil toplum için çalışmak istersiniz?