



A Sociological Dimension of the Ombudsman on Structuralism: Impressions from the Turkish Ombudsman

Kadir Caner DOĞAN

Doç. Dr. Gümüşhane Üniversitesi, İİBF SBKY Bölümü

kadircanerdogan@gumushane.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3476-8865>

Makale Başvuru Tarihi : 07.09.2022

Makale Yayın Tarihi : 25.10.2022

Makale Türü : Araştırma Makalesi

Abstract

Keywords:

Structuralism,
Sociology,
Schools,
Ombudsman
Turkey.

Sociology, the source of social science at the intellectual stage of the period, has reached the present day with certain schools. In this study, the importance and location of sociology for ombudsman paradigm are wanted to be discussed, focusing more on the size of structuralism. It is thought that modern and post-modern approaches on structuralism contribute to the ombudsman literature, primarily with the fact that the subject is based on Marxist literature, its French focus, and its holistic evaluation of the theory of knowledge. In the modern sense, sociological theories are also determinant in the ombudsman literature. In fact, ombudsman is associated with many different sociology schools, especially with structuralism. The developments in sociology discipline are powering ombudsman literature in certain aspects. In the study, the Turkish ombudsman was also evaluated in terms of the subject. The method of the study is an analysis based on literature reviewing.

Ombudsmanın Yapısalcılık Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Boyutu: Türk Ombudsmanından İzlenimler

Özet

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Yapısalcılık,
Sosyoloji,
Okullar,
Ombudsman,
Türkiye.

Dönemin düşünsel aşamasında sosyal bilimlerin kaynağı olan sosyoloji, belirli ekollerle günümüze kadar gelmiştir. Bu çalışmada ombudsman paradigması için sosyolojinin önemi ve yeri daha çok yapısalcılığın boyutuna odaklanılarak tartışılmak istenmektedir. Yapısalcılık konusundaki modern ve post-modern yaklaşımların, öncelikle konunun Marksist literatüre dayanması, Fransız odaklı olması ve bilgi teorisini bütüncül değerlendirmesi ile ombudsman literatürüne katkı sağladığı düşünülmektedir. Modern anlamda ombudsman literatüründe sosyolojik teoriler de belirleyicidir. Aslında ombudsmanlık pek çok farklı sosyoloji ekollerıyla, özellikle yapısalcılıkla ilişkilendirilir. Sosyoloji disiplinindeki gelişmeler, ombudsman literatürünü belirli açılardan güçlendirmektedir. Çalışmada Türk ombudsmanı da konu açısından değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışmanın yöntemi, literatür taramasına dayalı bir analizdir.

INTRODUCTION

The Ombudsman is a public body that receives grievance complaints from the public regarding the public administration in a state or administrative unit and examines them within the framework of a certain procedure and resolves them. Among its basic features; strengthen democracy, rule of law and human rights.

Structuralism, as a method of sociological thinking, is an intellectual field of discussion that emerged in the 20th century, although its roots go back to ancient times. As a matter of fact, in the 20th century, depending on the conjuncture of the period, structuralism has been at the centre of modern philosophy and sociology discussions.

The hypothesis of this study is that the periodic discussions of structuralism have a positive contribution to the development of the ombudsman literature. In this study, by establishing a relationship between the structuralism and the ombudsman paradigm, an analysis has been made on how structuralism strengthens the ombudsman and increases its spread throughout the world. As an example to the theoretical part of the subject, the Turkish ombudsman has been expressed in general. In the realization of this analysis; in the first part, structuralism is explained, in the second part, the main thinkers and schools related to structuralism are expressed, in the third part, the effect of structuralism on social sciences and post-structuralist transformation are stated, in the fourth part, the relationship between structuralism and ombudsman is explained, in the fifth part, structuralism and ombudsman paradigm are stated, and in the sixth chapter Turkish ombudsman, governance and post-structuralism are evaluated.

STRUCTURALISM

Definition, Characteristics and Causes of Occurrence

The word "structure" was used in different branches of science in the periods when structuralism was not so widespread (Can, 1988: 36). Structuralism is a science theory based on structure as a fundamental reality, developed especially in France (Erçel, 2014: 73). Structuralism; from linguistics to cultural studies, folk tales and literary texts, in short, to all narrative genres, we see the application of the approach, which tries to explain the philosophical and social problems, which, although different meanings are attributed, generally moves from the determinant of "structure", based on this determinant structure concept is the name (Çevikbaş, 2002: 137).

Structuralism, in the second half of the 20th century, it has been the most used approach in the analysis of language, culture, philosophy and society. Although there is no very distinctive school of structuralism Ferdinand de Saussure's work is often considered a starting point. The founder of modern structuralism is Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). The most important work of Swiss linguist Saussure, who taught in Paris between 1881 and 1891, is a text based on the lectures he gave at the University of Geneva in 1906-1911, and this text was published after his death (Bayrakdar, 2008: 1).

It is clear that there are a number of reasons for the emergence of the structuralism approach. These reasons are very briefly; the stifled possibilities of the existentialist philosophy widely used in post-war Europe; the inability of existing philosophical traditions to explain the course of humanity, the order of the world; A little break with Eurocentric worldviews that the gap created by the shifting of interests to other non-Eurocentric areas can be filled to some extent by the spiritual-mental values of other cultures, and finally, the pursuit of a new human being, are movements for the practical liberation of human possibilities and powers. The conclusion we can draw from this is that Structuralism did not emerge in a random vacuum, but under the influence of a wide variety of overlapping factors. Among these factors, "neo-Kantianism", "neo-positivism" includes the rational tendencies of modern western philosophy, which includes logical positivism, Marxism, and occasionally phenomenology, and is dominated by the problem of realization of knowledge (Çevikbaş, 2002: 138; Manning, 1982). In this context, structuralism can be read as a tradition of philosophical-sociological thinking of the 20th century, influenced by different philosophical schools.

Basic Orientations

These tendencies, which we can easily identify in the works of all famous structuralism thinkers from Saussure to Greimas, can be summarized as follows (Yücel, 2015: 16):

- Examination of the object under consideration, in and of itself,
- Treating the object as a string of links between its elements,

- As a result of the necessity to always consider the function in the said system and to base every phenomenon on the system to which it is connected, the object should be handled not in diachronic, but in synchronicity,
- As a result of this, origin, development, interaction, etc. dealing with diachronic problems of the kind only after a complete analysis of the object has been made,
- As a result of examining the object on its own and for itself, following a materialist attitude, not nature/transcendent,
- The fact that this approach tends to be a coherent analysis, not a philosophical, political or artistic teaching, and therefore has nothing to do with the intellectual approach.

BASIC SCHOOLS, THINKERS AND STRUCTURALISM

Structuralism although it was mostly influential in the fields of anthropology and linguistics, it was also applied in a wide variety of fields such as psychology, psychoanalysis, literary criticism, philosophy of history and semiotics. Especially in the works of Roland Barthes, a text analysis approach that differed from the traditional literary criticism emerged, with the concept of "author" on the agenda of criticism. Structuralism apart from this, semiotics like A. J. Greimas, Jacques Lacan, who applied the principles of structural linguistics to psychoanalysis; It also formed the starting point of Louis Althusser, who represented a structuralism line in Marxism with his criticisms of humanism and historicism, and thinkers such as Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, who were mostly evaluated within the post-structuralism French thought (Baloğlu, 2013: 60).

The impact of structuralism on sociology came from the following channels (Marshall, 1999: 808): Claude Levi-Strauss's structural anthropology and semiotic analysis of cultural phenomena in general, Michel Foucault's studies on the history of ideas, Jacques Lacan's psychoanalysis and Louis Althusser's structural Marxism.

Levi-Strauss brought a different understanding to the structuralism approach and adapted this theory to anthropology and benefited from the applications of linguistics and psychoanalysis in this regard. According to structuralism, the individual can be an element of the structure, and this relationship finds meaning/value with the unconscious. The subject is pushed into the background and the main determinant is the structure itself. In this sense, Levi-Strauss emphasized the necessity of going deep into the human mind in order to analyse the cultural structure, and based this analysis on the unconscious activities of the mind, the contrasts in the structure of the language, and the string of words that emerged from it. According to this analysis, the unconscious structure of the mind corresponds to a theme, content, and this situation can be applied to the social, economic and cultural characteristics of the community (Nar, 2014: 37-38).

Foucault believes that examining the history of thought and ideas from a chronological or evolutionary point of view cannot offer a solution to these problems. Instead, Foucault adopts a periodization-oriented approach, which is a product of the archaeological method. Foucault concentrates on a specific historical period, instead of following the thoughts and themes expressed in historical documents or trying to find the origin of these themes, as the historians of thought do. The aim here is not only to describe the determinations that each of the different fields of knowing take with the emergence of new objects, but to understand how these fields of knowing are in a consistent formation or isomorphism with each other when viewed from a deep level. What enables this isomorphism or coherence is what Foucault calls the "episteme" (Revel, 2005: 80).

Lacan's theoretical reference point is the structural linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure (Elliott, 2021: 148). We see the concern of reaching and representing the unchanging structure behind the singular, starting from the singular, which is the basic tendency in structuralism, in Lacan as well. The best proof of this is Lacan's typology. For example, III. in his seminar, this is seen in his effort to reach the structure behind a psychological phenomenon that manifests itself in a wide spectrum such as psychosis (Birlik, 2019: 533).

Structural Marxism is sometimes referred to as 'French structuralism', as it is often associated with a group of French thinkers (such as Louis Althusser, Nicos Poulantzas, and Maurice Godelier). But since this approach has

had many followers outside of France, it is possible to call it structural Marxism. As the name suggests, structural Marxism represents the merging of two schools (Ritzer, 1992): Marxism and structuralism. Structural Marxists tend to explore the hidden, fundamental structures of capitalist society. Although they are not really interested in 'real structures', they believe that there are real structures in the world that determine and constrain the behaviour and thoughts of actors. Structural Marxists recognize the importance of economics, but they also look at other different institutions. Moreover, even if they accept the idea of economy as a decisive force in the last case, they do not see other structures as simple reflections of it. Indeed, structural Marxists not only recognize the importance of politics and ideology, but also consider them to be 'relatively autonomous'. These structures can follow more independent lines of development and become dominant forces in society at a given moment (Ritzer, 1992).

As can be seen, modern structuralism has had the opportunity to develop within a very deep philosophical thinking logic, with the contribution of different schools and thinkers. It can be said that the foundations of this tradition of thinking were put forward to respond to the events and phenomena in methods, theory of knowledge and current developments in social sciences. As a matter of fact, intellectual debates on structuralism are transforming the social sciences as a higher system.

SOCIAL SCIENCES, METHODOLOGY AND POST-STRUCTURALISM

Basic schools of thought in sociology; it can be divided into different classifications such as utilitarianism, Durkheimian tradition, Marxism, structuralist and functionalist approaches (Collins, 2015; Swingewood, 2010). Of these, structuralism is mostly based on the founding Continental European and French sociology. However, it is also related to German and American sociology (Parlak and Doğan, 2021). The modern structuralist approach gives more importance to the society, that is, to the structure, in the society-individual discussions (Başak, 2003: 142), but now it also acts on value discourses such as language, culture and discourse in the analysis of this structure.

With the gradual emergence of the humanities and social sciences in the 19th century, the issue of what could be the appropriate method for the sciences in question has also been at the center of the discussions. The approaches that try to establish the human sciences in a way similar to the natural sciences and on its method have brought objections with it. These objections can be expressed as that human sciences should have a unique method in general. The objections in question were expressed as the research object of the natural sciences and the research object of the human sciences differ in nature. The failure of life philosophies, which ultimately opened the door to relativism due to its emphasis on historicity and life, brought about the search for different methods. As a result of these searches, It can be said that structuralism, based on Saussure's semiotics, emerged as a method that, on the one hand, tries to decentralize the subject, and on the other hand, tries not to fall into the relativism driven by historicism. Structuralism appears as a method that claims to get rid of both subject centrism and relativism by trying to realize all kinds of human and social phenomena by applying to structures that are thought to be outside of human beings, similar to Saussure's understanding of language on the axis of a structural analysis that transcends the subject (Keskin, 2011: 65). Starting from the second half of the 20th century, after the 1970s, the epistemology established on modernism in the discipline of sociology was shaken, and postmodern social theories emerged (Kala, 2019: 435). Social sciences methodology, which was shaped on the Enlightenment, modernity and rationalization in Western Europe, is another branch of the process of breaking away from the positivist paradigm on which it rose in the 20th century. In fact, modern structuralists are a step towards adapting the modern social science paradigm to the era. Structural thinkers in France began to put forward the concrete/consistent thoughts of the openings against the Anglo-American and liberal democracy culture of the period.

In this context, it is necessary to mention structural functionalist theories here. As a matter of fact, this approach is an effort to fuse the mentioned Continental European and Anglo-American values in the sociological context. Structural functionalism is one of the most important theoretical approaches in social sciences, especially in sociology and anthropology. When the question of how a society survives as a living organism is asked, the

most comprehensive answer to this question comes from the structural-functionalist school. The most important pioneers of modern functionalism are Comte, Spencer, Pareto and Durkheim (Aydın, 2014: 214). As a matter of fact, structuralism debates, as it can be seen, were integrated with different approaches and methods and passed into the stage of evolution, and post-structuralism was spoken after the postmodernism discourses.

Post-structuralism, the 'language'/'word' distinction from Saussure, the founder of structuralism linguistics, 'perspectives' ('perspectivism') from Nietzsche, in which the relativity of values is taken to the end, and Foucault's all kinds of speeches that are said to be made in the name of rationality or truth. It can be seen as a multi-storey philosophical structure, built on the idea that what lies behind it is in reality nothing more than a rhetoric of power and knowledge. Structuralism, which became widespread in the human sciences in the 1960s (especially in France), started to be criticized from various perspectives by many scientists, especially semiotics, in the 1970s. Therefore, especially XX. Post-structuralism, which is defined as the philosophical position, understanding or attitude that gained great momentum in the context of Continental Philosophy in the second half of the 20th, found a large application area and a large fan base in almost every field of social sciences in the 1970s, based on the problematization of the previous period structuralism in all respects (Kotlu, 2007: 69-70).

The post-structuralists say that there is not really a single central structure in society. According to them, there are only multiple relations. The thesis is that there are real micro-organizations in the nature of social organizations. In this way of thinking, in which relativity turns into absolute knowledge, the approach to how social relations should be helps the autonomy of micro-organizations, as it concludes that each knowledge is not superior to the other. In this state, post-structuralism, which sees every group in a community as equal to each other, reveals a type of society in which every group is assumed to have equal truth as an ideal motif. In this framework, it is seen that what post-structuralists actually do is to first take the structuralist relations analysis as a data and then try to show the correctness of their own discourse by revealing their mistakes (Say, 2013: 345).

Contrary to the scientific claims of structuralism, post-structuralists suggest prioritizing the emotional and wilful over the logical and rational in the analysis of cultural, social and societal phenomena. The method in question aims to contribute to the solution of the meaning problem of cultural systems by prioritizing desire, entertainment, body and play as observable dimensions of culture. Post-structuralism, which emphasizes the play and plurality of meanings, provides a dynamic contribution to social science thought (Keskin, 2011: 86).

In this way, post-structuralist ideas reveal an intense process in efforts to harmonize the Continental European thinking tradition with Anglo-American values beyond structuralism (Türküne, 2008; Örs, 2016). At this point, especially in the process of spreading liberal democratic values to the world that started after the second half of the 20th century, the discussions of structuralism and post-structuralism in the strengthening of participation and democracy are the political debates of Plato, Rousseau, Strauss, Foucault on republicanism in this period. In these discussions, structuralism should be evaluated as the answer given by socialist literature to liberal democracy.

STRUCTURALISM AND THE OMBUDSMAN PARADIGMS

It is thought that the issues of ombudsman, restructuring of social sciences and governance have moved to new stages in the 20th century with many discussions of politics, sociology and philosophy. As a matter of fact, the ombudsman has become a paradigm shift in public administration and is being developed in the intellectual field and theory. At this point, structuralism is one of the intellectual framework sociology theories.

The Ombudsman, as a public institution, is a complaints agency that works to eliminate bad management practices in the bureaucracy and to minimize human rights violations (Uğur and Doğan, 2019). Although the ombudsman is a public institution, there is also a field of practice in the private sector. Throughout history, the ombudsman was first practiced in Sweden in the 18th century. A hundred years after it emerged in Sweden, after the Second World War, it has spread to all continents and different states at different public levels (Doğan, 2016: 8).

The main features of the Ombudsman are as follows (Doğan and Uğur, 2018: 181):

- Independent and impartial,

- Objective and fast,
- Complaint authority,
- Mediator,
- Parliamentary membership,
- Its decisions are advisory,
- Mobilizing the public.

After the 1950s, the Ombudsman has increased the degree of acceptability due to reasons and approaches such as the rule of law in the world, aspirations for democracy, institutionalization efforts in newly independent states, excessive growth of the state/bureaucracy, social welfare state, globalization, new right, new public administration. In this context, dynamics such as science, ideology, transformation in social structure, economic conjuncture and national/global politics have an impact on the academic and practical development and dissemination of the ombudsman (Doğan, 2019: 315).

The Ombudsman is an Anglo-Saxon invention. There is political liberalism in its yeast. In addition, the ombudsman is a postmodern auditing paradigm (Doğan, 2021: 5189). Although the ombudsman is a concept that emerged in Sweden in the 19th century during the modernity period, it is understood that it was the second half of the 20th century when its spread in the world is considered. This situation cannot be explained by chance. The mass spread of the Ombudsman in the world has been affected by many dynamics such as the conjuncture of the period and developments in the field of science and culture. The Ombudsman found his true identity in the postmodern period. Accordingly, the ombudsman is a postmodern auditing paradigm (Doğan, 2022: 1199). Parlak and Doğan (2021: 47-48) evaluated structuralism as an important sociological development in the theoretical development of the ombudsman in the second half of the 20th century.

In this framework, the ombudsman, in the transition from structuralism to post-structuralism, as a paradigm in social sciences, from republican discussions in political philosophy to liberal democracy; in sociology from classical sociology to American sociology; it also shows an important concept in the transformation from positivism to hermeneutics in philosophy of science (Doğan, 2021).

One of the other related topics of the development of the Ombudsman in the 20th century is the restructuring of social sciences and governance, which is the contemporary public administration theory.

“...the rise of ombudsman paradigm is the field of intellectual knowledge which emerges along with the argument of restructuring of social sciences. Different theoretical concepts related to governance, in particular ombudsman paradigm, are also the indicators of this accumulation. Therefore, the argument of restructuring of social sciences in the 20th century triggered the development of ombudsman...” (Parlak and Doğan, 2021: 53).

“By combining the concepts of ombudsman and governance, it is desired that the concept called “...ombudsmanance” takes its place in the literature. As a matter of fact, the relationship between the perspective of Habermas, the views of other schools and thinkers, periodical developments and the discourse of postmodern public administration confirms that the two concepts complement each other and are fed from the same source. The concept of ombudsman will make great contributions to social sciences and public administration in researching the ombudsman in a clearer method and further strengthening the theoretical ground established on it. This new concept will not prevent their independent development, provided that the essence of both concepts is preserved. As a matter of fact, it is thought that the concept of ombudsman will ignite a new intellectual debate in public administration through its concept set, theory and approaches...” (Doğan, 2022: 1200).

The relationship between the restructuring of social sciences, governance and the ombudsman contributes to the structuralism debate by making the theory of knowledge interdisciplinary and summative. As a matter of fact, the ombudsman gets stronger by feeding on both right and left literature. In this context, these issues develop the core values of the ombudsman. Structuralism, as an inclusive and deep contemporary sociological theory and method, constitutes an academic field that determines the direction of many concepts.

Although modern structuralism brought vitality to the ombudsman in the beginning of the second half of the 20th century, with the concepts such as participation, democracy and negotiation that emerged with postmodernism and post-structuralism, the ombudsman found its true identity and strengthened its capacity for acceptability in the world. Structuralism intellectually complements the ombudsman as a project of liberal

democracy by contributing to the ombudsman literature in terms of social policy, ethics and responsibility in the context of integrating right and left writing (Doğan, 2022). As a matter of fact, while the ombudsman is integrating with American capitalism, it also overlaps with the main Continental values of state culture, ethics and responsibility. The spread of the Ombudsman throughout the world, regardless of the political regime, can be explained in this way.

TURKISH OMBUDSMAN, GOVERNANCE AND POST-STRUCTURALISM

The ombudsman institution was established in 2012 with the public administration reforms carried out within the framework of the "Restructuring of Public Administration" process that started in 2003 in Turkey (Şengül, 2013: 85). The ombudsman institution, which was established under the name of "Institution of Public Auditing" in Turkey, was enacted with the "Law No. 6328 on the Ombudsman Institution" dated 14.06.2012. As a matter of fact, as stated in this law, the main duty of the Ombudsman Institution of Turkey is; "all kinds of actions and transactions, attitudes and behaviours of the administration, upon a complaint about the functioning of the administration; to examine, research and make suggestions to the administration in terms of compliance with the law and fairness within the understanding of justice based on human rights". It can be said that the main emphasis in the Turkish Ombudsman Institution is focused on the examination of the complaints of the citizens who are victims of the actions, transactions and behaviors of the public administrations. Applications to the ombudsman institution in Turkey can be made by citizens and legal entities even with a simple petition. However, the Turkish Ombudsman Institution does not have the authority to act *ex officio* on a complaint. The ombudsman institution in Turkey "examines the complaints issues throughout the year, monitors how these issues are decided and how public administrations act in line with the decisions and recommendations of the ombudsman institution". It submits an official annual report containing the issues to the Parliamentary Joint Committee. The ombudsman institution in Turkey does not have the authority to make a final judgment or impose sanctions on a decision regarding the complaint. It can be said that the ombudsman institution in Turkey presents its decisions and reports to the public, and in this way, it has an intense relationship with the media. In addition, the ombudsman institution in Turkey detects the malpractices of the state organs or the defects in the faulty laws or the gaps in the laws regulating the structure of the public administration. It is possible to propose a law amendment reform to the Parliament to remedy this situation. In short, the ombudsman has a unique structure within the framework of his qualifications and characteristics. It is an important symbol of the paradigm field that emerged in the understanding of control depending on the transformation of postmodern public administration. In addition to these, the ombudsman is identified with the new public administration principles with its stated authorities and responsibilities, and "total quality management, strategic management, performance management, reengineering and management according to objectives, etc." integrates with understanding and techniques. As a matter of fact, in the essence of all these understandings and techniques; there are "participation, flexibility, democratization, transparency, accountability, efficiency and quality" (Doğan, 2014: 88).

In Turkey, a major restructuring process has begun in order to overcome the political and cultural-oriented public administration problems such as centralism and bureaucratic management tradition in public administration, which started after the 1980s. In this period, Turkish public administration was reshaped with new public administration reforms within the framework of democratization as a result of political, economic and cultural transformations. The democratization reforms and efforts of the Turkish public administration continued in the 1990s and reached its peak with the EU membership process in the 2000s. In this respect, city councils, independent administrative authorities, ethics committee, ombudsman and development agents, which are considered as governance practices, which are also a product of the democratization project of public administration of neo-liberalism in Turkey, have been established. "Ombudsman Institution", which is one of the governance practices in Turkey and established in 2012, is based on locality, citizen orientation, human rights, ethics-morality and rules, participation, flexibility, accountability in the context of its structural-institutional and functional aspects. It integrates with principles and features such as mediation, rule of law, and

governance principles generally accepted in the literature. In this way, the ombudsman institution in Turkey intersects with the concept of governance historically and culturally (Doğan, 2017: 281).

The ombudsman in Turkey has started to be implemented with reforms such as the restructuring of social sciences and governance in the world. It is important for the study to associate the Turkish ombudsman with concepts such as ethics, responsibility and localization in terms of post-structuralism. On the basis of theoretical debates from structuralism to post-structuralism, the characteristics of the Turkish ombudsman both in terms of Turkish political culture and social and democratic reforms confirm this view. As a matter of fact, the Turkish ombudsman has been the product of a reform process in public administration focused on both liberal and social democracy.

Turkey's political culture is based on centralism (Yılmaz and Doğan, 2014). It is possible to see the ombudsman as an important democracy reform in Turkey, where there is a strong state tradition (Doğan, 2014). As a matter of fact, the ombudsman, which is a view of the new public administration process in Turkey in the 2000s, is also an important application of the governance theory (Doğan, 2017: 276). On the other hand, an ethics commission in the context of social responsibility and ethics operates within the body of the ombudsman in Turkey, and carries out its duties and services within the framework of the ethical legislation in the country (<https://www.ombudsman.gov.tr/EtikUyeler>). Although the Turkish ombudsman is a requirement of the governance reforms that took place after the 2000s and an extension of the EU membership process, it also has duties in ethics, social responsibility and negotiation issues. The ombudsman in Turkey is an important administrative reform subject of the theoretical richness of structuralism.

The basic ethical principles that the ombudsman cares about in Turkey, namely the principles of good management; “justice, equality, honesty, openness, impartiality, responsibility, human rights, humanism, loyalty, rule of law, love, tolerance, accountability, respect, frugality, democracy, positive human relations, rights and freedoms, giving the right to labor, illegal orders referred to as “resistance”. All these principles are concepts that modern society and the modern state, which is a reflection of it, attach more importance day by day. The establishment and operation of these principles, which can also be described as a set of suggestions for the institutional memory of the state, in order for individuals to be stronger and freer against the state and bureaucracy, is undoubtedly important for human life (Çılıgın and Özkara, 2020: 135).

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

The Ombudsman is an Anglo-Saxon invention that emerged in Sweden in the 18th century and was connected to the values of the Western European Enlightenment. This structure, which maintains its importance in the field of theory and practice with liberal democracy until today, should be read as a postmodern auditing paradigm.

The structuralism approach, which is one of the pillars of modern sociology discussions in the 20th century, starting with classical sociology, has been decisive in the ombudsman's gaining importance. As a matter of fact, structuralism has tended to combine American capitalism and Continental European philosophy by bringing Continental Europe/France-based positivist and fact-based sociology discussions to value discussions such as language, culture and discourse. At this very point, the ombudsman gained great power in the intellectual sense, especially with post-structuralism, which is also associated with postmodernism, and spread everywhere in the world without listening to ideology, political regime and culture. In this respect, the ombudsman, by becoming the common mind of humanity, is a structure that solves many social problems and strengthens the moral structures of people in societies.

As a result, the ombudsman paradigm has become one of the most important concepts and theories of social sciences in the 20th century, gaining strength in the focus of the structuralism/post-structuralism debates in sociology and the values of right and left literature, namely republicanism and liberal democracy. Structuralism should be considered as one of the sociological thinking methods that is decisive in the formation of the ombudsman with an interdisciplinary character, considering many different areas such as structure, language, phenomenon, value, culture, participation, democracy, ethics and responsibility. One of the concrete

manifestations of social sciences gaining an interdisciplinary structure in the 20th century can be followed by the development of the ombudsman. The restructuring of social sciences and the issue of governance are decisive here. It provides the ombudsman to be fed from different literature.

The ombudsman in Turkey provides an important example in terms of the structuralist debate. Because one of the important public administration reforms of the statism-social policy culture in the Turkish political system and the Anglo-American liberal transformation that started after the 1980s is the ombudsman. The ombudsman in Turkey should be considered as a structure that tries to find solutions to all the problems of the society such as decentralization, rigidity, ethics and responsibility and increases the quality of public administration.

To summarize, the ombudsman is a public body that emerged in Sweden in the 18th century in Western Europe. After 100 years of practice in Sweden, especially in the world after World War II, it showed great improvement. In this study, it is desired to establish a connection between the ombudsman and structuralism, which is one of the sociological thinking methods. Indeed, the ombudsman can be seen as an important reform on the road to the Enlightenment in Western Europe and parliamentary democracy in Sweden. The Ombudsman is an Anglo-American invention and is based on a deep literature as an interdisciplinary concept/theory. There are different approaches in sociological theories depending on different periods and schools. Although structuralism, which is one of them, has deep roots dating back to the political climate of Ancient Greece, it consists of debates that entered a clear pattern especially in the 20th century. Structuralism is at the center of a wide range of debates, which are fed from a deep intellectual field and right-left literature. Here, the methods of thinking fed from different schools such as liberalism and republicanism can be explained under a certain roof with structuralism. It is possible to draw deep inferences from these very comprehensive discussions in areas such as democracy, participation, ethics, responsibility and politics. In this study, it is thought that the ombudsman is influenced by the structuralism debate and this field contributes to the ombudsman from the left and right literature. Because, in addition to being a liberal democracy project, the ombudsman is a social policy tool that highlights principles such as ethics and social responsibility. It is argued here that both modern structuralists and post-structuralists add value to these aspects of the ombudsman.

REFERENCES

- Aydın, K. (2014). "Yapısal İşlevselci Teori ve Toplumsal Tabakalaşma." *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8, Nisan-Ekim: 213-239.
- Baloğlu, U. (2013). "William Shakespeare'ın Hamlet Yapıtının A. J. Greimas'ın Eyleyensel Örnekçesine Göre Çözümlemesi." *The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication-TOJDAC*, January, 3(1): 58-65.
- Başak, S. (2003). "Kuramsal Yaklaşımlarda Yapıya İlişkin İkilemler." *Gazi Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 3: 133-160.
- Bayrakdar S. (2008). "Yapısalcılığa Saussure İle Dilsel İletişim Açısından Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım." *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Erzurum*.
- Birlik, N. (2019). "Jacques Lacan'ın Yapısalcılık İle Karmaşık İlişkisi." *DTCF Dergisi*, 59(1): 529-542.
- Can, C. (1988). "Yapısalcılık-Hukuk İlişkileri Üzerine Deneme." *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(1): 33-62.
- Collins, R. (2015). *Sosyolojide Dört Ana Gelenek*. Çev. Ümit Tatlıcan, Sentez Yayıncılık, Bursa.
- Çılgın, H. ve Özkartal, M. (2020). "Kamu Denetçiliği Kurumu İyi Yönetim İlkeleri Bağlamında Yönetimde Etik Paradigmasının Yerleşmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma." *Ombudsman Akademik*, 12, Ocak-Haziran: 129-154.
- Çevikbaş, S. (2002). "Yapısalcılık Üzerine." *Felsefe Dünyası*, 35: 137-150.

- Doğan, K. C. (2014). "Postmodern Kamu Yönetimi Anlayışı Çerçevesinde Bir Denetim Paradigması: Ombudsman." *Sayıştay Dergisi*, Temmuz-Eylül, 94: 73-96.
- Doğan, K. C. (2016). "Health Ombudsman in The United Kingdom: Establishment, Functions, and Efficiency." *Journal of International Health Sciences and Management*, 2(2), October: 7-15.
- Doğan, K. C. (2017). "Yönetişim Kavramı ve Türkiye’de Demokratikleşme Reformları: Kamu Denetçiliği Kurumu (Ombudsman) Örneği." *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 47, Haziran: 267-287.
- Doğan, K. C. (2019). "Modernizmden Postmodernizme: Kamu Yönetiminde Yönetişim Kuramı Bağlamında Ombudsman Paradigması." *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 5(29): 312-317.
- Doğan, K. C. (2021). "Ombudsman Teorisi: İnterdisipliner Bir Analiz." *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 7(91): 5182-5190.
- Doğan, K. C. (2022). "Jürgen Habermas’ta Katılım, Demokrasi ve Meşruiyet Kavramları: Ombudsman Yönetişimi Üzerine Düşünmek." *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 8(96): 1190-1203.
- Doğan, K. C. ve Uğur, Ö. (2018). "The Effectiveness of Ombudsman in Improving Good Administration in the European Union (EU)." (Eds.) Marin Rusev, Eric Straus, Cevdet Avcıkurt, Abdullah Soykan, Bekir Parlak, *Social Sciences Researches in the Globalizing World*, St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, Sofia, pp.180-192.
- Elliott, A. (2021). "Psychoanalytic social theory." (Ed.) Anthony Elliott, *Routledge Handbook of Social and Cultural Theory*, Routledge, New York, pp.140-160.
- Erçel, G. (2014). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. Kefekültür Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Kala, A. (2019). *Sosyoloji Öncesi ve Sonrası Toplum Teorileri*. Doğu Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- Keskin, İ. (2011). "Sosyolojik Teoriler Bağlamında Yapısalcı Analizin İmkânı ve Sınırlılıkları." *Beytulhikme An International Journal of Philosophy*, 1(2), December: 63-88.
- Kotlu, E. (2007). "Yapısalcı ve Post-Yapısalcı Sosyal Teoride Dil (Sosyal Teoride Bir Model Ola-rak Dil)." *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Aydın.
- Manning, P. K. (1982). "Structuralism and the Sociology of Knowledge." *Knowledge*, 4(1), September: 51-72.
- Marshall, G. (1999). *Sosyoloji Sözlüğü*. Çev. Osman Akınhay, Derya Kömürcü, *Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları*, Ankara.
- Nar, M. Ş. (2014). "Yapısalcılık Kavramına Antropolojik Bir Yaklaşım: Levi-Strauss ve Yapısalcılık." *Antropoloji*, 27: 29-46.
- Örs, B. (Der.) (2016). *19. Yüzyıldan 20.Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Parlak, B. and Doğan, K. C. (2021). "A Methodological Analysis on The Restructuring of Social Sciences in The Context of Ombudsman Paradigm, Liberal Democracy and The Annales School." *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 7(76): 40-58.
- Revel, J. (2005). *Foucault: Güncelliğin Bir Ontolojisi*. Çev. Kemal Atakay, *Otonom Yayınları*, İstanbul.
- Ritzer, G. (1992). *Sociological Theory*. McGraw-Hill, USA.
- Say, Ö. (2013). "Yapısalcılıktan Post-Yapısalcılığa Çoğulculuğun İnşası." *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 8(2): 331-346.
- Swingewood, A. (2010). *Sosyolojik Düşüncenin Kısa Tarihi*. Çev. Osman Akınhay, *Agora Kitaplığı*, İstanbul.
- Şengül, R. (2013). "Kamu Yönetimi ile Birey İlişkilerinin Dönüşümüne Ombudsman Kurumunun Etkisi." *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(3): 71-88.

Türküne, M. (Ed.) (2008). Siyaset. Lotus Yayınları, Ankara.

Uğur, Ö. and Doğan, K. C. (Eds.) (2019). Contemporary Debates on Politics and Public Administration in the Postmodern Era. Peter Lang, Berlin.

Yılmaz, N. ve Doğan, K. C. (2014). Siyaset Bilimi Açısından Bürokrasi. (Ed.) Önder Kutlu, Siyaset Bilimine Giriş, Lisans Yayıncılık, Ankara, ss.240-258.

Yücel, T. (2015). Yapısalcılık. Can Yayınları, İstanbul.

<https://www.ombudsman.gov.tr/EtikUyeler> (Erişim Tarihi: 10.04.2022).