

This article was downloaded by: [TÜBİTAK EKUAL]

On: 22 June 2011

Access details: Access Details: [subscription number 772815468]

Publisher Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Democratization

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713634863>

On the relationship between democratic institutionalization and civil society involvement: new evidence from Turkey

Ali Çarkoğlu^a; Cerem I. Cenkler^b

^a College of Administrative Sciences & Economics, International Relations Department, Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey ^b Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Sabancı University, Istanbul, Turkey

Online publication date: 25 May 2011

To cite this Article Çarkoğlu, Ali and Cenkler, Cerem I.(2011) 'On the relationship between democratic institutionalization and civil society involvement: new evidence from Turkey', *Democratization*, 18: 3, 751 – 773

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/13510347.2011.563112

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2011.563112>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

On the relationship between democratic institutionalization and civil society involvement: new evidence from Turkey

Ali Çarkoğlu^{a*} and Cerem I. Cenker^b

^a*College of Administrative Sciences & Economics, International Relations Department, Koç University, Rumelifeneri Yolu, 34450 Sariyer, Istanbul, Turkey;* ^b*Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Sabancı University, Orhanlı, Tuzla 34956, Istanbul, Turkey*

(Received 29 April 2010; final version received 12 November 2010)

This study uses a nation-wide representative survey from 2004 to explore the link between civil society involvement and civic attitudes in Turkey. The article argues that, besides civic attitudes, political attitudes are also significant in explaining membership in ‘Olson type’ institutions, while membership in ‘Putnam type’ institutions does not depend on attitudinal variables. The article concludes that low civil society participation with a gender gap and intolerance of rural participants raises significant questions about the democratic potential of civil society in Turkey.

Keywords: democratic institutionalization; civil society; Turkey

Introduction

Civil society institutions, which provide interest communication by aggregating and framing individuals’ interests, are regarded as a necessary condition for democratic institutionalization.¹ Civil society institutions are also related to democratic quality because their interactions with political society bring accountability and responsiveness to political institutions.²

Although the literature discusses the potential benefits of civil society participation extensively, making generalizations about individual determinants of civil society participation remains a difficult task. A series of challenges lie ahead for studies on civil society. The first challenge concerns the relationship established between mass level civic attitudes, such as trust and tolerance, and the extent of civil society involvement in democratization. The second challenge is about membership to different types of civil society institutions: Is membership in potentially rent-seeking, more materialist, professional institutions induced by similar factors concerning membership in post-materialist, charity, leisure, identity, and rights-based institutions? The third challenge is about different types of civil society

*Corresponding author. Email: acarkoglu@ku.edu.tr

involvement, such as becoming a member, volunteering, participating in meetings and making donations. Do civic attitudes differentiate among these different types of involvement?

We aim at answering these questions with data from Turkey. Turkish democratization has a long history.³ Over the last decade the expectations and incentives shaped within the framework of relations with the European Union (EU) became the primary factor that shaped democratization efforts in Turkey. The economic re-structuring that Turkey underwent since the market reforms of the early 1980s also resulted in increased economic well-being for many Turks. Over time, social dynamism has grown substantially in both political and economic areas. How much of this dynamism is directed towards civil society activism in a society of significant transitions is however rarely discussed. Yet, a thorough analysis of different types of institutions wherein the citizens participate is crucial for gaining insights about the institutional potential of civil society as a source of control on Turkish political elites' ability to undertake long delayed democratic reforms. Similarly, analysis of different types of civil society involvement such as membership, volunteering, meeting participation, and making donations may also help to reveal the degree to which such democratic involvement potential exists in the Turkish civic landscape. Lastly, the focus on an under-institutionalized democracy such as Turkey may also be useful in a comparative framework with similar studies conducted in other 'new' democracies.

Individual determinants of civil society involvement: the challenges ahead

The importance accorded to civil society has risen since the advent of the third wave of democracy in the last two decades of the twentieth century.⁴ First among the reasons for this development was the earlier neglect of civil society arguments within the analyses of the Cold War authoritarian regimes. The emphasis prior to the fall of communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe remained mainly on institutional design at the political level of analysis, while the social bases of a well functioning democracy were neglected. Second was the acknowledgement of the active role both the citizens and the civil society institutions played in regime changes of the ex-communist states.⁵

Focusing more on the complex of elite bargains and economic conditions, the democratic transition literature only marginally accounts for the influence of civil society on the political processes as well as outcomes.⁶ Studies of civil society, on the other hand, put emphasis more on professional organizations which reflect divisions along class lines such as the business associations and trade unions than those representing rights-based grass roots organizations like youth clubs, community action groups, recreational and/or cultural associations.⁷

In contrast to the transition literature, the democratic consolidation literature brings civil society more to the centre of analysis. Primarily focusing on an abstract and idealized conceptualization of civil society, this literature adopts a prescriptive tone in its argumentation and ignores the specific mechanisms through which civil

society functions in a modern democracy. Regarding civil society more as a catch-all-category which lies outside the political sphere, this literature does not differentiate among different types of civil society institutions.⁸ 'Civil society' is understood as necessarily a public good that benefits the whole society in more or less equal terms. Consequently the term civil society is used uncritically and constituent behaviours and institutions of civil society are under-explored.

In line with earlier democratization literature, Putnam and his collaborators acknowledge the viability of civil society as a fundamental feature of democracies, while regarding civil society activism as a public good.⁹ However, with its empirical approach, their book, *Making Democracy Work*, also poses a challenge to this literature. This is because it operationalizes civil society in terms of mass individual attitudes and perceptions as well as different types of civil society institutions. *Making Democracy Work* has been criticized not least because it regards all types of civil society institutions as benign. In addition, it accords an apolitical stance to both the citizens and the civil society institutions, while reducing the political institutions to apolitical bureaucracies.¹⁰ These debates on the empirical study of civil society eventually resulted in a major re-consideration of the analysis of civil society which forms the ground for addressing the challenges about making generalizations on civil society's role in democratic regimes.

The first challenge to the study of civil society concerns the relationship established between mass level civic attitudes and the extent of civil society involvement. Generalized trust frequently stands out among these attitudes. Putnam and his collaborators rely on the assumption that when anonymous individuals reveal solidarity with unknown individuals, then the possibility of co-operation would increase compared to instances when no such solidarity is present.¹¹ A conducive environment for co-operation, in return, would also facilitate more civic activism. Thus trust in fellow citizens provides a good breeding ground for a healthy democracy, since it tends to 'promote variety and admits criticism. ... Trust makes us more comfortable with strangers and more willing to put our trust where we might otherwise not tread'.¹²

However the empirical results of the Putnam hypothesis are mixed at best. Keefer and Knack, for instance, argue for a weak relationship between civil society involvement and generalized trust and civic norms.¹³ Alternatively, Stolle and Rochon identify members of civil society institutions in Germany, Sweden and the USA as more trusting citizens compared to non-members. Yet these 'trusting' citizens of the civil society are also found to be politically more active and efficacious.¹⁴ Hence, besides the civic attitudes, civil society involvement seems to relate to political attitudes as well. Similarly, Bekkers finds interest in politics as a significant feature of members of civil society institutions in the Netherlands.¹⁵ Moreover, in their cross-country analysis of the Central and Eastern European states and the ex-Soviet Republics, Raiser et al. find that generalized trust is unrelated to civil society involvement and mention the significant relationship between civil society involvement and confidence in public

institutions. This finding adds citizens' perceptions about the political institutions as another significant determinant of civil society involvement.¹⁶

Besides trust, the aforementioned studies also tested the relationship between a host of other civic attitudes and civil society involvement. Stolle and Rochon report no link between tolerance, optimism, and disapproval of free-riding to civil society involvement.¹⁷ Bekkers finds post-materialistic value orientation and emphatic concern for others significant traits to differentiate members from non-members to civil society institutions.¹⁸ Besides these civic attitudes, both Uslander and Bekkers found religiosity to be significant, increasing the likelihood of civil society involvement.¹⁹ It should be noted that religiosity is frequently treated as a parochial attitude by 'grand' theories of the democratization school and these findings run against these expectations by emphasizing the positive influence of religiosity on civil society involvement.

It should be noted here that not all civic attitudes relate civil society involvement in similar ways. Trust is likely to be more significant determinant of civil society involvement than other civic attitudes such as tolerance and optimism. Also findings as to the significant influence of political attitudes such as interest in politics and political activism as well as citizens' perceptions about the political institutions on civil society involvement bring in a regard for political institutional underpinnings of the civil society involvement besides the cultural explanations.²⁰ Moreover the magnitudes of the effects of these variables are likely to vary according to the level of democratic institutionalization of a given polity. Political and civic attitudes as well as perceptions all prove significant in more institutionalized democracies examined by Stolle and Rochon and Bekkers.²¹ Only political perceptions proved significant in Raiser et al.'s study which was of the under-institutionalized new democracies of the Central and Eastern European states as well as the ex-Soviet Republics.²²

The second challenge posed to the study of civil society is the account for the influence of different types of civil society institutions on democratic performance. One of the criticisms directed at Putnam et al. was their regard of civil society involvement as *necessarily* beneficial to political institutional performance.²³ In his discussion of social capital, however, Coleman warns that the associational activity with beneficial returns to certain group members may be against the interests of other groups, individuals, or society as a whole.²⁴ This assertion is close to the argument of Mancur Olson, who argues for the possibility of rent-seeking behaviour displayed by horizontal associations.²⁵ In their analysis, Knack and Keefer differentiate between the Olson and Putnam types of civil society institutions.²⁶ The former refers to institutions with a likelihood of entering into 'distributional coalitions', including: professional groups, trade unions and political parties. The latter type of institutions refers to those which are least likely to enter into these types of coalition, including: religious and church organizations, education, arts, music or cultural groups and those engaged in youth work.

Despite these observations, there is still no consensus about specific institutions to be labelled as Putnam or Olson groups. Farole, Rodriguez-Pose and Storper for

instance do not include religious organizations from the Putnam group on the basis that religious membership may be motivated for different reasons than Putnam's assertion of civicness.²⁷ Raiser et al. make a similar differentiation between civil society institutions, yet they rename these two groups as Type I (for Putnam groups) and Type II (for Olson groups).²⁸ The point is the recognition in the literature, contrary to Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti's assertion, that the behaviour of civil society institutions may diverge due to respective interests as well as available resources to materialize these interests. This assertion is also supported by the empirical evidence. This is because civil society involvement weakly relates to either democratic or economic performance at best, explained as a possible neutralizing effect of associations with either positive or negative influence(s).²⁹

The third challenge posed to the study of civil society is related to different types of civil society involvement. One can participate in civil society institutions in different ways such as becoming a member, volunteering, participating in meetings, making donations, or some combination of these. The literature on civil society does not explicitly differentiate among different types of civil society involvement; hence, the relationship between types of civil society involvement and the civic attitudes is under-explored. Membership and/or volunteering are frequently included in the analyses followed by participation in meetings.³⁰ Donations are less frequently included in the analyses largely because this form of civil society involvement does not require devotion of time to civic activities; hence, it is more a passive type of civic participation. Nevertheless, differentiation among different types of civil society involvement seems viable. This is because the relative frequencies of different types of involvement as well as the inquiry of the relationship between these different involvement types and the civic attitudes may prove instrumental to further clarify details of civil society participation in modern democracies.

Civil society activity in Turkey: a description

Studies of Turkey's democratization, with an emphasis on civil society, have increased in the last three decades. Toprak argues that the history of civil society based on such concepts as 'public opinion, freedom of association, and freedom of the press' in Turkey can be traced back to the late Ottoman period of the nineteenth century.³¹ Although the legalization of associations goes back to that period, the religious and philanthropic foundations, or the *waqfs*, had already been essential features of Ottoman civic life.³² Besides the ever present tradition of philanthropy and the latter legalization of associational life, however, Turkey also inherited a heavy-handed state tradition from the Ottomans. Bestowing on itself the right to define the state interest independent from its citizenry, the state in Turkey has been suspicious of particularistic interests voiced in the civic arena.³³

Given this state tradition, it is hardly surprising that the bulk of research on civil society in Turkey focuses more on the political side of civil society participation with particular emphasis on the heavy hand of the state and the intolerant and conflicting attitudes displayed by the political elite as impediments to a free and lively

civil society in Turkey.³⁴ Only a handful of studies on civil society in Turkey have been able to analyse empirical data at the individual level.³⁵ This, in turn, means that country-level trends in civil society involvement as well as the related civic and political attitudes that shape these dynamics are frequently unaccounted for. Short of a general picture against which the in-depth studies based on a few influential civil society organizations can be contested, many studies on civil society in Turkey seem to generalize on the basis of a limited number of observations concerning civil society organizations.³⁶

An account of the general trends of civil society involvement in Turkey, then, is invaluable not only for the aforementioned comparisons this type of analysis would provide with other democracies, but also for providing a detailed background information about the particular features of the civil society involvement in Turkey against which different hypotheses can further be tested.

Basic features of the data and methods

Our data comes from a nation-wide representative sample of face-to-face interviews with 1536 people in Turkey conducted in February and March 2004. The survey was part of a larger study of philanthropy in Turkey carried out by the Third Sector Foundation of Turkey (Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı – TÜSEV) with financial support from the Ford Foundation.³⁷ Since the urban settlers were over-sampled the results reported below are all weighted to reveal nation-wide trends.³⁸

An important module in the questionnaire was devoted to detailed questions concerning the respondents' membership of various institutions.³⁹ Twenty-two institutions were mentioned. Seventeen of these had umbrella names without a specific name being mentioned while five were specifically mentioned by name. Table 1 presents the results in the order used in the questionnaire. The first question is whether the respondent had been involved in any way in any of the indicated civil society institutions – be they associations, foundations, charities, labour unions, or sport clubs – over the last year. Involvement could take the form of membership, voluntary activity, meeting participation or making donations. If the respondent's reaction was positive, the name of the institution was taken and the type of involvement was noted. If a donation had been made the amount was taken. Lastly, the amount of time spent in the institution's activities over the last month was noted. The next institution – umbrella or specific name – in line was read and if relevant, the same information was noted.

Table 1 shows the four different forms of institutional involvement in our sample. The most frequently observed involvement in our list of institutions is through donations. While about 18% of our sample reports making a donation, only about 7% report being members of the institutions listed. Attending a meeting is by far the rarest form of involvement with only about 4% of respondents reporting to have attended a meeting. Even voluntary activity appears to be more frequently observed. However, the questionnaire did not specify the type of voluntary activity.

Table 1. Institutional activity in Turkey: membership, voluntary work, participation in meetings, and giving donations.

	Member	Voluntary activity	Attendance of meetings	Donations
P Sports clubs	12	10	8	13
P Youth organizations	2	2	0	1
P Environmental organizations	0	1	0	2
P Human rights organizations	2	1	1	1
P Charitable organizations	3	6	4	15
P Religious organizations (mosque building associations, etc.)	9	30	16	123
O Trade unions	9	3	2	5
P Urban development and solidarity associations	7	4	3	11
O Chambers of commerce	10	2	3	8
P Art, culture and folklore organizations	2	2	1	2
P Townsmanship/fellow countrymen associations	4	1	1	6
P Community/congregation organizations	0	6	5	7
P Philanthropic groups for schools	9	5	10	34
P Philanthropic groups for hospitals	0	1	1	8
O Political parties	31	15	12	6
P Women's associations	2	1	2	0
P Development cooperatives	1	2	1	1
O <i>Türk Hava Kurumu (THK)*</i>	0	0	0	72
O <i>Kızılay**</i>	2	0	0	27
P TEMA***	1	4	2	5
O <i>Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu (ÇEK)****</i>	0	0	2	7
AKUT*****	0	0	0	0
Other	9	9	5	19
Total number of activities	115	105	79	373
Number of individuals involved	102	95	67	282
Percentage of individuals involved in the sample (%)	6.6	6.2	4.4	18.4

Notes: * *Türk Hava Kurumu* (THK – Turkish Aeronautical Association), founded in 1925, aims to ‘increase awareness in Turkey on the military, economic, social and political importance of aviation; to support the development of military, civil, sporting and touring aviation in Turkey; to prepare all the necessary material and equipment for these activities; to train personnel; and finally, create a “flying Turkish youth”’, <http://www.thk.org.tr/yeni/indexeng.htm> (accessed March 24, 2011). THK collects donations, including an important proportion of sacrificial lamb skins in Turkey; ** The Red Crescent: the Turkish equivalent of the Red Cross was founded during the Ottoman era in 1868 and as the largest humanitarian organization in the country, continues to attract significant donations in Turkey. See <http://www.kizilay.org.tr> (accessed March 24, 2011); *** The Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, Forestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats (TEMA) is one of the most influential and well known environmental organizations in Turkey (<http://www.tema.org.tr> (accessed March 24, 2011)); **** Social Services and the Child Protection Agency (*Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu*) can also be traced back to the pre-Republican era and continues to be active in child-related philanthropic activities attracting significant resources (<http://www.shcek.gov.tr/> (accessed March 24, 2011)); ***** AKUT is the best known search/rescue organization in Turkey whose activities in aftermath of the 1999 earthquake earned it a nation-wide reputation (see <http://www.akut.org.tr> (accessed March 24, 2011)).

About 7% of our sample claimed to be members of different institutions. By far the most frequently reported membership is of political parties followed by sports clubs and chambers of commerce. Reported voluntary activity, however, appears most frequently in religious organizations such as mosque building associations followed by political parties and sports clubs. Meeting attendance appears most frequently for religious organizations followed by political parties and philanthropic groups for schools. Religious organizations also reportedly attract most of the donations followed by the *THK* and *Kızılay* which both have a direct link to the state apparatus in the country. Although political parties seem to have the power to mobilize people via membership, voluntary activity and meeting attendance, their ability to raise financial support appears quite limited. Different types of religious organizations, and in particular mosque building associations, appear to attract little membership but are able to gain time, effort and financial commitment from many ordinary people.

What is also striking is the lack of involvement in youth, environmental, arts, human or women's rights organizations in Turkey. State run or protected associations like *Kızılay*, *THK*, *ÇEK*, appear to attract almost solely donations and no other type of involvement. About 78% of our sample appears uninvolved in any type of civil society involvement. However, from an optimistic perspective, this also means that more than one in every five individuals in Turkey (approximately 22%) appears to have some kind of involvement in civil society institutions. Yet, formal membership involvement remains less than one in every 10 voting age individuals (approximately 7%).

Having identified different types of civil society involvement in Turkey, we next focus on the analytical differentiation made between different types of civil society institutions. As we already noted, it is difficult to argue for a consensus in the literature about the viable categories of different types of civil society institutions. However following the footsteps of Knack and Keefer, we choose the categories of the Putnam and the Olson type institutions which differentiate between potentially rent-seeking, more materialist, professional institutions on the one hand, and post-materialist, charity, leisure, identity, and rights-based institutions on the other.⁴⁰ Accordingly, trade unions, chambers of commerce and political parties are categorized as Olson type institutions. The other three institutions (*THK*, *Kızılay*, and *ÇEK*) are also included in this category simply due to the fact that they are all state run institutions. Putnam type institutions, then, are the rest of institutions of Table 1 which are of charity, leisure, identity and rights-based groups. The Olson (O) as opposed to Putnam (P) groupings of civil society institutions in Turkey are noted in Table 1. The distributional picture according to these two categories is shown in Table 2 below.

The Putnam group appears to attract more involvement both by the aggregate as well as by each of the four types of involvement than the Olson group. Only in the membership category is the gap between the Putnam group and the Olson group closed. This is primarily due to the high rates of reported membership in political parties.⁴¹ Membership in chambers of commerce is regulated by law and involves

Table 2. Institutional activity in Turkey: Olson and Putnam groups.

Group totals	Putnam group (P)	Olson group (O)	Total number of activities
Membership	54	52	106
Voluntary activity	76	20	96
Meetings participation	55	19	74
Donations	229	125	354
Group totals	414	216	630

very little, if any, civic initiative. The weakest showing for the Olson group appears in voluntary involvement and meeting participation. These criteria are nearly three times more often observed amongst the Putnam group institutions. The donation performance of the Olson group associations are dominated by *THK* which traditionally gathers sacrificial lamb skins as a way of competing for religious donations.⁴² Nearly twice as many respondents in the Putnam group than in the Olson group make donations. Nevertheless, even when both groups are combined, less than one in five individuals seems to make donations to any type of association in Turkey.

These observations on the simple descriptive nature of civil society involvement are indicative of the weak institutional foundations of grassroots civic organizations in Turkey. Especially noteworthy in our sample is the low level of institutional membership (7%). This low figure is further reduced when membership to more than one institution is considered. Only 10 people in the sample expressed membership to more than one institution; nine of them are members of two institutions, and one is a member of three institutions.

Another finding of the present analysis is more of a hands-off rather than a hands-on approach which Turkish citizens appear to adopt in relation to civil society involvement. Almost one in five respondents assert that they make donations rather than become involved in the running of civil society organizations as members, or by volunteering their time or participating in meetings. Clearly, a hands-off approach does not help to create any type of socialization in a cooperative environment, nor build experience in communal teamwork or create a common goal for a civil initiative. As such, understanding differences that may exist within any community and striving to overcome these differences, which should promote tolerance among activists, is not likely to take place. Thus, civic socialization and its expected result of burgeoning general trust among community members, which in turn spills over to the larger society, may be a futile expectation. Turkish citizens' hands-off approach to civil society involvement is further analysed below as a function of opportunities and predispositions individuals face in modern Turkish society.

Who participates in civil society institutions?

In this section we explore whether the civic attitudes play a significant role in citizens' civil society involvement in both Putnam and Olson type institutions in Turkey. If the cultural explanations of democratic theory are viable, then the mass civic attitudes of trust, tolerance and the like should display explanatory

power for civil society involvement in democracies, both for the under-institutionalized and better-institutionalized types. However the empirical evidence so far suggests that civic attitudes have little part – if any – in explaining civil society involvement in under-institutionalized democracies, whereas political attitudes and perceptions relate more significantly to civic activism.

This finding is also in line with research conducted on civil society in Turkey which primarily argues for adverse influence of incomplete institutionalization of freedom of expression and association, on the one hand, and intolerant and polarizing attitudes of political elite on civil society involvement, on the other. For example, Kalaycıoğlu focuses more on the structural reasons of low associational membership than behavioural reasons for the Turkish case. In his words:

it is not the strength but the relative weakness of the Turkish state that impedes the full development of civil society. The weakness leads to a lack of regulatory, extractive and distributive capacity on the part of the state, which renders the elite (center) vulnerable and fearful about the discontent of the masses (periphery). There is also a relatively long history of mutual suspicion between the center and periphery in Turkey that further complicates and corroborates this perspective.⁴³

Given the emphasis in the democratic consolidation literature on civic attitudes, then the relevance of the empirical findings as to the influence of political attitudes and perceptions on civil society involvement especially for the cases of under-institutionalized democracies in the present analysis will test the extent of influence of both the civic and the political attitudes on civil society involvement in both Putnam and Olson type institutions in Turkey. The analysis will also account for different types of civil society involvement and it differentiates between membership and non-membership (volunteering, meeting participation and making donations) types of civil society involvement. The rationale for this differentiation is straightforward. Membership type of involvement is more formal and institutionalized than non-membership types of involvement.

Accordingly a host of civic and political attitudes as well as demographic variables are regressed over six different operationalizations of civil society involvement. These are: (1) membership of civil society institutions; (2) Putnam group membership; (3) Olson group membership; (4) non-membership type involvement in civil society institutions; (5) Putnam group non-membership type of involvement; and (6) Olson group non-membership type involvement. The last model of Olson group non-membership type involvement is estimated with and without the inclusion of *THK* donations.⁴⁴ Hence in total we present seven models. These models and the independent variables are presented below.

As a consequence of few membership and other types of associational involvement in our data, we employ Rare-event Logit (ReLogit). ReLogit is appropriate for cases such as ours where in a binary dependent variable one of the two outcomes dominates the other which remains rare.⁴⁵ While this method is the most appropriate for estimating the coefficients of the independent variables and we report ReLogit estimates in our ensuing analyses, it is worthy of note that given our data a standard

logit estimator with heteroskedasticity-consistent standard error (which is used in ReLogit by default) produce very comparable results as well.

The independent variables

Civic attitude variables

Trustworthiness. An additive index is formed from responses to five statements which asked for either agreement or disagreement with each statement: (1) 'People say the truth most of the time, even when they know they would be better off if they lie'; (2) 'People say they have high standards about honesty and good morals, yet they forget these when they are in trouble'; (3) 'If people would know that they would not get caught, they would avoid using tickets on buses'; (4) 'Most people's honesty is not about their good morals, but about their fear of getting caught and punished'; (5) 'Most people would not refrain from cheating in order not to pay their taxes'.⁴⁶

Tolerance. An additive index is formed from responses to five statements which asked for either agreement or disagreement to each statement: (1) 'Ideas which are against the majority's stance should not be voiced in society'; (2) 'Newspapers should not be closed even when they write items contrary to national interests'; (3) 'Radical and marginal ideological groups should not be given demonstration rights even when they are peaceful'; (4) 'Whatever their ideas, all people have the right to free expression'; (5) 'In cases when national interest is threatened, human rights may be violated'.⁴⁷

Belief in the efficacy of civil society. An additive index is formed from responses to three questions: (1) 'How effective do you think you are at solving current problems for a better society?'; (2) 'How effective do you think civil society associations are at solving current problems for a better society?'; (3) 'How effective do you think the philanthropic donations are on solving current problems for a better society?'.⁴⁸

Local civic initiative takers. A dummy variable that separates those individuals (by taking a value of (1)) who, over the last three years, claim to have got together with neighbours or friends sometimes or frequently for the purpose of discussing a solution to neighbourhood difficulties, such as a local school's heating problems, traffic accidents at a local crossroads, or the need to asphalt local roads.

Political attitude and perception variables

Confidence in the political system lack of confidence in the economic system; political inefficacy. Agreement scores for nine items were factor analysed and three factor dimensions were obtained. The first factor has high loadings for the following three items and is thus labelled confidence in the political system: 'the basic

rights and freedoms of Turkish citizens are guaranteed in Turkey'; 'the political system in Turkey is very representative of ordinary citizens'; and, 'the legal system in Turkey offers a fair court trial to ordinary citizens'. The second factor has the highest loadings for the following items and is thus labelled lack of confidence in the economic system: 'public officials look after their own interests'; 'despite all my efforts I do not think I can improve significantly upon my present condition'; and, 'honest people cannot become rich in this country'. The third factor observes the following three items and is thus labelled political inefficacy: 'I'm worthless in this society'; 'simple citizens in Turkey have no power to change political decisions to their own advantage'; and, 'this country is run by a small and powerful group'.

Interest in politics. An ordinal four-point scale is used to measure political interest: 'how interested are you in politics?' One corresponds to 'no interest at all', and four corresponds to 'very interested'.

Religious attitudes

Six evaluation items concerning religious attitudes were factor analysed and factor scores from this analysis were used for this variable. Items included in this principle components analysis are as follows: (1) 'Throughout the Ramadan month restaurants and coffeehouses should be closed during the daytime fast'; (2) 'I would not consider sending my child to an Imam Hatip Lisesi (High School for Prayer Leaders)'; (3) 'Girls should be allowed to cover their heads if they wish'; (4) 'A religious person is more trustworthy in commercial life than someone who is not religious'; (5) 'I would not object to my daughter getting married to a non-Muslim'; (6) 'I approve of girls and boys being educated in the same classroom at high school'. Items 2, 3 and 4 were recoded for the uniform interpretation of increasing religiosity with increasing scores of agreement on a 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree) scale.⁴⁹

Demographics

Income, age, gender and two dummy variables for urban settlement type, and Kurdish speakers are included amongst the demographic background variables.

Results

The results, which are presented in Tables 3 and 4, first support the viability of differentiation made about different types of civil society involvement. Accordingly, the characteristics of citizens who become members of civil society institutions are different than those who are involved in these institutions through non-member activities such as volunteering, meeting participation, and making donations. Secondly, participation in different types of civil society institutions of Putnam and Olson types reveals significant differences.

Table 3. Rare events Logit investigations of institutional activity-membership.

	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Associational membership		Putnam group membership		Olson group membership	
	B	P > z	B	P > z	B	P > z
Religious attitudes	-0,10	0,32	0,00	0,97	-0,14	0,33
Tolerance	0,04	0,68	0,11	0,35	-0,01	0,93
Trustworthiness	0,13	0,15	0,07	0,59	0,27	0,04
Belief in the efficacy of civil society	0,18	0,11	0,23	0,12	0,09	0,57
Confidence in political system	-0,36	0,00	<i>-0,32</i>	<i>0,06</i>	-0,45	0,01
Lack of confidence in economic system	0,28	0,02	0,11	0,49	0,29	0,05
Political inefficacy	0,07	0,56	-0,04	0,82	0,17	0,32
Interest in politics	0,91	0,00	0,46	0,15	1,24	0,00
Local civic initiative takers	0,34	0,16	-0,14	0,69	0,73	0,04
Gender (Male = 1)	1,45	0,00	1,33	0,00	1,98	0,00
Income	0,00	0,12	0,00	0,62	<i>0,00</i>	<i>0,07</i>
Settlement (Rural = 1)	0,04	0,89	-0,14	0,70	0,47	0,19
Age	0,02	0,02	<i>0,01</i>	<i>0,10</i>	0,01	0,12
Kurdish speakers	-1,42	0,03	-1,54	0,14	-1,12	0,15
Constant	-5,32	0,00	-5,50	0,00	-7,03	0,00
Proportion of membership/other institutional activity	0,07		0,03		0,03	
Total observations	1357		1357		1357	

Focusing first on citizens' membership in civil society institutions Model I to III of Table 3 shows differences between determinants of membership in Putnam and Olson type institutions. Citizens' perceptions of the political and economic system are significant only for membership in Olson type institutions. Negative rather than positive perceptions of both the political and economic systems induce civil society participation.

This finding merits the re-visiting of democratic consolidation literature which regards civil society as the natural extension of a well-functioning political order. A mutually complementary relationship between the two is expected to bring about responsiveness and accountability in politics. Yet our finding exemplifies that this expectation may not always be met. Indeed, we show that citizens' negative perceptions of the political and economic system induce membership in Olson type institutions which is composed of institutions such as political parties, trade unions and chambers of commerce. In the Turkish context as well as in many others, these institutions are quite vulnerable to political manipulation through patronage benefits. Citizens who are sceptical of the political and economic systems' capacity to generate the expected returns appear to be more likely to utilize the Olson type institutions for particularistic interests.

Table 4. Rare events Logit investigations of institutional activity-non-membership type activities.

	Model IV		Model V		Model VI		Model VII	
	All types of associational activity except membership		Putnam group. All types of associational activity except membership		Olson group. All types of associational activity except membership		Olson group without THK. All types of associational activity except membership	
	B	P > z	B	P > z	B	P > z	B	P > z
Religious attitudes	0,19	0,01	0,28	0,00	-0,13	0,24	-0,13	0,34
Tolerance	-0,09	0,13	- 0,13	0,05	-0,03	0,72	0,03	0,83
Trustworthiness	0,13	0,02	0,19	0,00	0,13	0,15	0,08	0,52
Belief in the efficacy of civil society	0,05	0,49	0,00	0,96	<i>0,17</i>	<i>0,09</i>	0,10	0,42
Confidence in political system	<i>- 0,12</i>	<i>0,10</i>	-0,10	0,24	-0,03	0,73	-0,11	0,39
Lack of confidence in economic system	0,04	0,59	-0,05	0,52	0,15	0,16	0,35	0,02
Political inefficacy	0,09	0,22	0,07	0,38	0,06	0,61	0,08	0,61
Interest in politics	0,40	0,01	0,52	0,01	0,02	0,92	0,26	0,40
Local civic initiative takers	0,43	0,01	0,26	0,16	0,54	0,02	<i>0,51</i>	<i>0,09</i>
Gender (Male = 1)	0,70	0,00	0,74	0,00	0,87	0,00	1,38	0,00
Income	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,02	0,00	0,01
Settlement (Rural = 1)	0,49	0,00	0,43	0,02	0,57	0,01	0,43	0,16
Age	0,02	0,00	0,02	0,00	0,01	0,25	0,00	0,61
Kurdish speakers	0,14	0,52	-0,28	0,35	0,44	0,13	-0,19	0,69
Constant	- 0,33	0,00	- 3,61	0,00	- 4,29	0,00	- 5,18	0,00
Proportion of membership/other institutional activity	0,22		0,14		0,08		0,04	
Total observations	1357		1357		1357		1357	

Yet such a system would bring about neither responsiveness nor accountability since the pursuit of particularistic interests impedes development of institutionalized civil society.

Among the civic attitudes, trustworthiness proves significant and positive for both membership in Olson type institutions and non-membership type involvement in Putnam type institutions. However, the implications of this variable for these two respective groups are quite different. For the former case, the significance of trustworthiness is important together with citizens' negative perceptions of the political and economic system. Hence it reveals members' positive regard of the individual agency even when they are sceptical of the ways both politics and economics are run in the country.

Yet for non-membership type involvement in Putnam type of institutions, political and economic perception variables are not significant. The interesting finding of Model V in Table 4 is the significance of the rural settlement. This rural character suggests that the grassroots activities associated with this group are highly likely to be local in their scope. Also given the diffused participatory style of the non-membership involvement types, the Putnam type charities, cooperatives and philanthropic activities are also likely to be temporary. Hence it is likely that trustworthiness in rural settings is more related to familiarity with the already well-known local associates.

Another significant civic attitude for non-membership type involvement in Putnam type of institutions is tolerance, yet its sign is negative. This finding – of the intolerant attitude – was unexpected and reveals the fact that, contrary to assumptions of the democratic consolidation literature, civic attitudes do not indeed come in a neat package. Trustworthiness may help people to co-operate in order to get things done at the local level; however, repeated interaction does not always result in tolerance especially in rural settings where appreciation of diversity is not necessarily the norm. Nevertheless, an optimistic researcher may see viable potential at the rural, community-level civic activities in Turkey for citizens' mobilization for the public good. A pessimistic researcher, on the other hand, may regard this likelihood rather meagre on the basis of the current power structures accompanied with a rather discouraging finding of the intolerant attitude. As to power structures, Model V reveals that being male, old age and high income increase the likelihood of participating in charity and philanthropy through non-membership types of involvement.

Our findings concerning non-membership type involvement in Olson group dominated by donations to the *THK* reveals a different character when the *THK* donations are kept aside. Comparison of Model VI and Model VII shows that *THK* donations, which are likely to be in the form of in-kind sacrificial skin donations, are more likely in the rural areas. Also they are significantly sensitive to local initiative taking. When we keep donations to *THK* separate, the total numbers of non-membership activities in Olson group substantially decrease. Lack of confidence in the economic system proves to be a differentiating factor of this group. These findings indicate either limited civic initiatives at the local

level or civic involvement for particularistic motivations. As a result, democratic implications of this group of activities can well be questioned.

Lastly, the clear gender gap in civil society involvement in all possible types of involvement and in all possible types of institutions should be underlined. Indeed it is the only variable which proves significant in all of the analyses. Accordingly, civil society in Turkey is also highly likely to be a male society. This finding raises questions of the democratic potential of civil society given the lack of female involvement.

Conclusion

The study has revealed the viability of disaggregating civil society involvement in terms of mass civic and political attitudes as well as different types of civil society involvement in different types of institutions. Our evidence from Turkey can be used as a basis for further tests in similar settings where different types of civil society involvement such as membership, volunteering, meeting participation and making donations are likely to be induced by different political as well as civic attitudes. Moreover the significant influence as well as the magnitude of this influence diverges for involvement in either more materialist, professional organizations of the hierarchical Olson type institutions or more horizontally organized post-materialist and self-expressive Putnam type institutions. Given the divergence of attitudes, involvement types and institutions of civil society, the uniform and benign regard of democratic consolidation literature of the civil society whereby the civic attitudes progressively induce ever more participation for better working democratic institutions remains questionable.

Our analysis shows that among a host of civic attitudes only trustworthiness proved to be a significant variable shaping civil society involvement. Yet its implications for democratic institutionalization remain suspect for the Turkish case. Trustworthiness is significant together with citizens' negative political and economic perceptions for membership type involvement in Olson type institutions. Hence trustworthiness may well be mobilized for in-group benefits but it may not 'spill over' to the larger public. Similarly, trustworthiness proved also significant for non-membership type involvement in Putnam type institutions. Yet this variable is significant together with the intolerant attitude of rural settlements. Once again, it is highly unlikely that trustworthiness in question is a generalized type of optimism about the individual agency, which would facilitate societal co-operation.

Besides the relationship between civic attitudes and civil society involvement, to account for different types of civil society institutions also proved viable. First, activities in Putnam type institutions are populated with religious philanthropy and charity and participation in rights-based groups is quite limited. Secondly, neither civic nor political and economic variables predict membership in Putnam type of institutions; hence the institutional basis of this group is weak. Rights-based groups and self-expressive demands are as important for democratic regimes as are interest-based, professional groups. Indeed the presence of the former can

well be regarded as a determinant of the institutionalization of individual rights. The Turkish case proved poor on this front and citizens' lack of interest in rights-based groups invites further inquiry. This finding also questions a series of research on civil society in Turkey, which celebrates the increase in aggregate numbers of civil society institutions since the 1980 coup.

Lastly the examination of different types of civil society involvement also sheds light on different aspects of civil society in Turkey. The most important among these aspects was Turkish citizens' hands-off approach to civic involvement. Volunteering, meeting participation and making donations are more popular types of civil society involvement than membership. Also membership and non-membership activities are predicted with different variables. For the Turkish case, the ease and convenience of non-membership type involvement within the localized, rural and rather parochial context may well create a milieu where generalized trust and tolerance, which would contribute to democratic institutionalization, cannot easily flourish.

In sum, the relationship between attitudes and civil society involvement is not as straightforward as suggested by the democratic consolidation literature. It seems likely that in addition civic attitudes, citizens' perceptions of the political and economic system are also significant determinants of civil society involvement. Finally, disaggregation of different types of civil society institutions and different types of civil society involvement is likely to shed further light on democratic potential of civil society in a given polity.

Acknowledgements

Ali Çarakoğlu was a fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS) when this article was written and is thankful for the support provided at NIAS.

Cerem I. Cenger is thankful for the doctoral study support from The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK).

Notes

1. Dahl, *Polyarchy*; Diamond, 'Toward Democratic Consolidation'.
2. Diamond and Morlino, 'The Quality of Democracy: An Overview'; O'Donnell, 'Why the Rule of Law Matters'; Schmitter, 'The Ambiguous Virtues of Accountability'.
3. See Zurcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*; and McLaren, *Constructing Democracy in Southern Europe*, for a historical and comparative review of democratization dynamics in modern Turkey.
4. Diamond, 'Toward Democratic Consolidation'; O'Donnell, 'Why the Rule of Law Matters'; Schedler, 'What is Democratic Consolidation?'; Carothers, 'The End of the Transition Paradigm'.
5. Hagopian, 'Political Development Revisited'.
6. Karl, 'Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America'; Przeworski and Limongi, 'Political Regimes and Economic Growth'; Boix and Stokes, 'Endogenous Democratization'.

7. Huber, Rueschemeyer, and Stephens, 'The Impact of Economic Development on Democracy'; Haggard and Kaufman, 'The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions'; Collier and Mahoney, 'Adding Collective Actors to Collective Outcomes'.
8. Diamond, *Developing Democracy*; O'Donnell, 'Why the Rule of Law Matters'.
9. Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti, *Making Democracy Work*.
10. Tarrow, 'Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time'; Harris and De Renzio, 'Missing Link'; Edwards and Foley, 'Civil Society'; Fine, 'The Developmental State'.
11. Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti, *Making Democracy Work*.
12. Uslaner, 'Democracy and Social Capital', 141.
13. Knack and Keefer, 'Does Social Capital Have an Economic Pay-off?'
14. Stolle and Rochon, 'Are All Associations Alike?'
15. Bekkers, 'Participation in Voluntary Associations'.
16. Raiser et al., 'Social Capital in Transition'.
17. Stolle and Rochon, 'Are All Associations Alike?'
18. Bekkers, 'Participation in Voluntary Associations'.
19. Uslaner, 'Religion and Civic Engagement in Canada and the United States'; and Bekkers, 'Participation in Voluntary Associations'.
20. Edwards and Foley, 'Civil Society and Social Capital Beyond Putnam'; Edwards, Foley, Mario, 'Beyond Tocqueville'; Prakash and Selle, *Investigating Social Capital*.
21. Stolle and Rochon, 'Are All Associations Alike?'; and Bekkers, 'Participation in Voluntary Associations'.
22. Raiser et al., 'Social Capital in Transition'.
23. Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti, *Making Democracy Work*.
24. Coleman, 'Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital'.
25. Olson, *The Rise and Decline of Nations*.
26. Knack and Keefer, 'Does Social Capital Have an Economic Pay-off?'
27. Farole, Rodriguez-Pose, and Storper, 'Social Capital, Rules, and Institutions'.
28. Raiser et al., 'Social Capital in Transition'.
29. Knack and Keefer, 'Does Social Capital Have an Economic Pay-off?'; Raiser et al., 'Social Capital in Transition'; Knack, 'Social Capital and the Quality of Government'; Knack, 'Groups, Growth, and Trust'; Coates and Heckelman, 'Interest Groups and Investment'; Farole, Rodriguez-Pose, and Storper, 'Social Capital, Rules, and Institutions'.
30. Knack and Keefer, 'Does Social Capital Have an Economic Pay-off?'; Stolle and Rochon, 'Are All Associations Alike?'; Knack, 'Social Capital and the Quality of Government'; Uslaner, 'Democracy and Social Capital'; Bekkers, 'Participation in Voluntary Associations'.
31. Toprak, 'Civil Society in Turkey', 90.
32. Bianchi, *Interest Groups and Political Development in Turkey*; Çizakça, *A History of Philanthropic Foundations*; Çizakça, 'Economic Dimensions of Foundations in the Ottoman Era'.
33. Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey*; Kalaycıoğlu and Sarıbay, *Türkiye'de Politik Değişim ve Modernleşme*; Özbudun, *Contemporary Turkish Politics*; Mardin, *Religion, Society, and Modernity in Turkey*; Sunar, 'A Preliminary Note on the Politics of Civil Society Formation in Turkey'; Sunar, 'Civil Society and Islam'.
34. Kalaycıoğlu, 'Turkish Governance'; Keyman and İçduygu, 'Globalization'; Şimşek, 'Transformation'.
35. Esmer, *Devrim, Evrim, Statüko*; Kalaycıoğlu, 'Turkish Governance'; Tessler and Altınoğlu, 'Political Culture in Turkey'; Bikmen and Zincir, *Philanthropy in Turkey*; Karaman and Aras, 'The Crisis of Civil Society in Turkey'; Keyman and İçduygu, 'Globalization'; and Şimşek, 'Transformation', all provide numbers of active civil society organizations in Turkey at the time of their articles. Kalaycıoğlu ('Turkish

- Governance') compares the level of associational activity in Turkey to the levels in middle and high income countries. He relies on descriptive data, and notes that the level of associational activity in Turkey is similar to Southern European countries such as Spain and Portugal. The analysis of the Third Sector Foundation (TÜSEV) in Turkey (2006) provides a comprehensive study on civil society in Turkey (see <http://www.tusev.org.tr/content/detail.aspx?cn=236&c=73> (accessed March 24, 2011)). Kalaycıoğlu ('State and Civil Society in Turkey') examines state-civil society relations in Turkey in a detailed fashion and provides a detailed estimate of the total number of civil society organizations in Turkey which lags far behind the selected cases of consolidated democracies. Kalaycıoğlu reports that associational membership in Turkey based on a World Values Survey of 1997 is about 7% of the voting age population; a figure reminiscent of findings in the present study. Based on descriptive data he asserts that low interpersonal trust and social tolerance levels in the country appear responsible for this low figure.
36. Keyman and İçduygu, 'Globalization'; Kadioğlu, 'Civil Society'.
 37. For descriptive details of the study see Bikmen and Zincir's edited volume (Bikmen and Zincir, *Philanthropy in Turkey*). The contribution by Çarkoğlu ('Trends in Individual Giving') therein replicates our Table 1 and provides the measurement details of some of our independent variables in the ensuing analyses.
 38. The sampling procedure adopted for the data collection is summarized in Appendix 1 of Çarkoğlu, 'Trends in Individual Giving'.
 39. We use the term institution (*kuruluş* in Turkish) rather than association (*dernek* in Turkish) since the questionnaire adopted this terminology to denote the umbrella categories of civic organizations such as clubs, foundations, charitable organizations, unions and the like. Since the list of institutions given in Table 1 includes categories such as political parties, labour unions, various religious organizations, for example for mosque building, as well as specific well-known foundations such as the Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, Forestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats (TEMA), the Search and Rescue Organization (AKUT) and the Red Crescent (*Kızılay*), we believe the word institution is a better terminology for our purposes.
 40. Knack and Keefer, 'Does Social Capital Have an Economic Pay-off?'
 41. This relatively high participation reported for political parties may in fact be reflective of the patronage benefits associated with such involvement. See Sayarı, 'Political Patronage'; and Ayata, 'Patronage', on political patronage in Turkey.
 42. Our data does not unfortunately distinguish between in-kind sacrificial lamb skin donations and other in-cash donations to *THK*. However, most likely, those who report donations to *THK* in our sample predominantly refer to skin donations. Our choice of including donations to *THK* within philanthropic donations of Olson type may be questioned on the basis of the claim that people may not have much use for lamb skins other than just donating or giving them away. We tend to think that even for such cases of skin donors the option to donate these to other competing institutions exists. *THK* no longer holds a near monopoly in collection of sacrificial lamb skins. However, counting on the viability of this alternative view, we present regression results of non-membership type of involvements in Olson type institutions with and without inclusion of *THK* donations. Please see Table 4 models VI and VII for these regressions.
 43. Kalaycıoğlu, 'State and Civil Society in Turkey', 260–1.
 44. Citizens participate to *THK* only through donations. Hence *THK* donations are relevant for two models. These are the aggregate non-membership type activities and non-membership activities in Olson type institutions. These models are run with and without the inclusion of *THK* donations. There was no substantial difference

for the model of the aggregate non-membership activities. Yet there were some significant differences for the model of non-membership activities in Olson type institutions. Hence we reported these two models and discussed their implications in the results section.

45. Our dependent variables in the ensuing analyses are binary variables, differentiating those who are members in different types of civil society organizations or are engaged in such organizations in various different ways from those who remain inactive in civil society. Such binary dependent variables necessitate a logistic regression. For an accessible explanation of the logistic regression analysis, see Long, *Regression Models*. In cases where one of the two outcomes remains rare, logistic regression yields biased coefficients which sometimes are as large as the uncorrected estimates from the standard logistic regression. See King and Zeng, 'Explaining Rare Events'; and 'Logistic'.
46. Cronbach alpha = 0,6.
47. Cronbach alpha = 0,4.
48. Cronbach alpha = 0,6.
49. The fact that these evaluations load together in a factor analysis is taken as evidence of a latent religious attitudes dimension in our dataset. A latent religious attitudes dimension is revealed in the way these evaluations load, or are related to the latent factor. Although these relations are empirically relevant, on face value it is not impossible to think of a highly religious individual who would not necessarily find religious people as more trustworthy in commercial life. Similarly, an individual whose religiosity is comparatively of lower intensity, or in the parlance of Turkish politics a secular liberal individual, might also agree with the statement that 'girls should be allowed to cover their heads if they wish'. Such occurrences that oppose our expectations reflected in the structure of the dimension revealed by the factor analysis is only to be expected since this dimension only captures 32.8% of the variance in all six variables included in the analysis. Nevertheless, within the captured percentage of the total variance our respondents are expected to become more religious in their attitudes as their factor scores increase.

Notes on contributors

Ali Çarkoğlu is Professor of Political Science at Koç University, International Relations Department. His studies focus on elections, voting behavior and quantitative research methods. Dr. Çarkoğlu's publications appeared in journals such as *European Journal of Political Research*, *Electoral Studies*, *Turkish Studies*, *Political Studies* and in edited volumes.

Cerem I. Cenker is currently a Ph.D. Student in Political Science at Sabancı University, Istanbul. Her research areas are the social network analysis, democratization and civic attitudes with particular emphasis on generalized trust and Turkey.

Bibliography

- Ayata, Sencer. 'Patronage, Party and State – The Politicization of Islam in Turkey'. *Middle East Journal* 50 (1996): 40–56.
- Bekkers, René. 'Participation in Voluntary Associations: Relations with Resources, Personality, and Political Values'. *Political Psychology* 26 (2005): 439–54.
- Bianchi, Robert. *Interest Groups and Political Development in Turkey*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.

- Bikmen, F., and R. Zincir, eds. *Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and the Pursuit of Social Justice*. Istanbul: Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı (TÜSEV) Publications, 2006. <http://www.tusev.org.tr/content/detail.aspx?cn=236&c=73> (accessed March 24, 2011).
- Boix, Charles and Susan Stokes. 'Endogenous Democratization'. *World Politics* 55 (2003): 517–49.
- Carothers, Thomas. 'The End of the Transition Paradigm'. *Journal of Democracy* 13 (2002): 5–21.
- Coates, Dennis, and Jac C. Heckelman. 'Interest Groups and Investment: A Further Test of Olson Hypothesis'. *Public Choice* 117 (2003): 333–40.
- Coleman, James S. 'Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital'. In *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*, ed. P. Dasgupta and I. Serageldin, 13–40. Washington, DC: The World Bank, 2000.
- Collier, Ruth Berins, and James Mahoney. 'Adding Collective Actors to Collective Outcomes: Labor and Recent Democratization in South America and Southern Europe'. *Comparative Politics* 29 (1997): 285–303.
- Çarkoğlu, Ali. 'Trends in Individual Giving and Foundation Practices'. In *Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and the Pursuit of Social Justice*, ed. F. Bikmen and R. Zincir, 142–76. Istanbul: Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı (TÜSEV) Publications, 2006.
- Çizakça, M. *A History of Philanthropic Foundations: The Islamic World from the Seventh Century to the Present*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 2000.
- Çizakça, Murat. 'Economic Dimensions of Foundations in the Ottoman Era'. In *Philanthropy in Turkey: Citizens, Foundations and the Pursuit of Social Justice*, ed. F. Bikmen and R. Zincir, 28–42. Istanbul: Türkiye Üçüncü Sektör Vakfı (TÜSEV) Publications, 2006.
- Dahl, Robert A. *Polyarchy*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Diamond, Larry. 'Toward Democratic Consolidation'. In *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*, ed. L. Diamond and M. Plattner, 227–41. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Diamond Larry. *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Diamond, Larry and Leonardo Morlino. 'The Quality of Democracy: An Overview'. *Journal of Democracy* 15 (2004): 20–31.
- Edwards, Bob, and Michael W. Foley. 'Civil Society and Social Capital Beyond Putnam'. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42 (1998): 124–39.
- Edwards, Bob, Michael W. Foley, and Diani Mario. *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2001.
- Esmer, Yılmaz. *Devrim, Evrim, Statüko: Türkiye'de Sosyal, Siyasal ve Ekonomik Değerler [Revolution, Evolution and Status Quo: Social, Political and Economic Values in Turkey]* [in Turkish]. Istanbul: TESEV, 1999.
- Farole, Thomas, Andres Rodriguez-Pose, and Micheal Storper. 'Social Capital, Rules, and Institutions: A Cross-Country Investigation', Working Paper, No. 12. Instituto Madrileño de Estudios Avanzados (IMDEA) Ciencias Sociales, 2007.
- Fine, Ben. 'The Developmental State is Dead – Long Live Social Capital?'. *Development and Change* 30 (1999): 1–19.
- Haggard, Stephan, and Robert Kaufman. 'The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions'. *Comparative Politics* 29 (1997): 263–83.
- Hagopian, Frances. 'Political Development Revisited'. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (2000): 880–911.
- Harris, John, and Paolo DeRenzi. "'Missing Link" or Analytically Missing?: The Concept of Social Capital. An Introductory Bibliographic Essay'. *Journal of International Development* 9 (1997): 919–37.

- Heper, Metin. *The State Tradition in Turkey*, Beverly: Eothen, 1985.
- Huber, Evelyne, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and John D. Stephens. 'The Impact of Economic Development on Democracy'. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 7 (1993): 71–86.
- Kadioğlu, Ayşe. 'Civil Society, Islam and Democracy in Turkey'. *The Muslim World* 95 (2005): 23–41.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin. 2001. 'Turkish Governance: Patronage versus Governance'. *Turkish Studies* 2 (2001): 54–70.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin. 'State and Civil Society in Turkey: Democracy, Development and Protest'. In *Civil Society in the Muslim World: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Aryn B. Sajoo, 247–72. London, New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers in association with The Institute of Islamic Studies, 2002.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin, and Ali Yaşar Sarıbay. *Türkiye'de Politik Değişim ve Modernleşme [Political Change and Modernization in Turkey]* [in Turkish]. Istanbul:Alfa Yayınları, 2000.
- Karaman, Lütfullah M., and Aras Bülent. 'The Crisis of Civil Society in Turkey'. *Journal of Economic and Social Research* 2 (2000): 39–58.
- Karl, Terry Lynn. 'Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America'. *Comparative Politics* 23 (1990): 120.
- Keyman, Fuat E., and Ahmet İçduygu. 'Globalization, Civil Society and Citizenship in Turkey: Actors, Boundaries, and Discourses'. *Citizenship Studies* 7 (2003): 219–34.
- King, Gary, and Lanche Zeng. 'Explaining Rare Events in International Relations'. *International Organization* 55 (2001): 693–715.
- King, Gary, and Lanche Zeng. 'Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data'. *Political Analysis* 9 (2001): 137–63, <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v08/i02/paper> (accessed March 24, 2011).
- Knack, Stephen. 'Social Capital and the Quality of Government: Evidence from States'. *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (2002): 772–85.
- Knack, Stephan. 'Groups, Growth, and Trust: Cross-country Evidence for Olson and Putnam Hypotheses'. *Public Choice* 117 (2003): 341–55.
- Knack, Stephan, and Philip Keefer. 'Does Social Capital Have an Economic Pay-off? A Cross-Country Investigation'. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112 (1997): 1251–88.
- Long, S.J. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA, London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Mardin, Şerif. *Religion, Society, and Modernity in Turkey*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2006.
- McLaren, Lauren. *Constructing Democracy in Southern Europe: A comparative analysis of Italy, Spain, and Turkey*. London, New York: Routledge, 2008.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo. 'Why the Rule of Law Matters'. *Journal of Democracy* 15 (2004): 32–46.
- Olson, Mancur. *The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Social Rigidities*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Özbudun, Ergun. *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2000.
- Prakash, Sanjeev, and Per Selle. *Investigating Social Capital*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2004.
- Przeworski, Adam, and Fernando Limongi. 'Political Regimes and Economic Growth'. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 7, no. 3 (Summer 1993): 51–69.
- Putnam, Robert, D., Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Nanetti. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: University Press, 1993.
- Raiser, Martin, Christian Haerpfer, Thomas Nowotny, and Claire Wallace. 'Social Capital in Transition: A First Look at the Evidence', Working Paper No. 61. European Bank for

- Reconstruction and Development, 2001, <http://www.ebrd.com/downloads/research/economics/workingpapers/wp0061.pdf> (accessed March 24, 2011).
- Sayarı, Sabri. *Political Patronage*. London: Duckworth, 1977.
- Schedler, Andreas. 'What is Democratic Consolidation?'. *Journal of Democracy* 9 (1998): 91–107.
- Schmitter, Philip C. 'The Ambiguous Virtues of Accountability'. *Journal of Democracy* 15 (2004): 47–60.
- Sunar, İlkey. 'A Preliminary Note on the Politics of Civil Society Formation in Turkey'. *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* XXVII, nos 3/4 (1975): 57–81.
- Sunar, İlkey. 'Civil Society and Islam'. In *Civil Society, Democracy and the Muslim World, Swedish Research Institute Transactions*, Vol. 7, ed. Elizabeth Özdalga and Sune Persson, 11–21. Richmond: Curzon Press, 1997.
- Şimşek, Sefa. 'Transformation of Civil Society in Turkey: From Quantity to Quality'. *Turkish Studies* 5 (2004): 46–74.
- Stolle, Dietlind, and Thomas R. Rochon. 'Are All Associations Alike? Member Diversity, Associational Type, and the Creation of Social Capital'. *The American Behavioral Scientist* 42 (1998): 47–65.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 'Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time: A Critical Reflection On Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work'. *American Political Science Review* 90 (1996): 389–97.
- Tessler, Mark, and Ebru Altınoğlu. 'Political Culture in Turkey: Connections among Attitudes toward Democracy, the Military, and Islam'. *Democratization* 11 (2004): 21–50.
- Toprak, Binnaz. 'Civil Society in Turkey'. In *Civil Society in the Middle East*, ed. A.R. Norton, 79–81. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1996.
- Uslaner, Eric M. 'Democracy and Social Capital'. In *Democracy and Trust*, ed. M. Warren, 121–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Uslaner, Eric M. 'Religion and Civic Engagement in Canada and the United States'. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 21 (2002): 239–54.
- Zurcher, Erik J. *Turkey: A Modern History*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.