

IMPACT OF POLITICAL CULTURE ON THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND TÜRKİYE

SİYASAL KÜLTÜRÜN POLİTİKA OLUŞTURMA SÜRECİNE ETKİSİ: BİRLEŞİK KRALLIK VE TÜRKİYE’NİN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ANALİZİ

Emre AYDİLEK^{ID}

Abstract

Questioning the codes, sociological tendencies, fields of social conflict/ harmony of a country’s political culture is essential in identifying the problems of that country’s political, social, and human life. All these parameters, such as determining values, symbols, and tendencies in political culture, directly or indirectly affect the policy-making process of countries. This study focuses on the effects of political culture on policy making in the United Kingdom (UK) and Türkiye, trying to understand the differences and similarities in this area and includes extensive comparative analysis. The main problem of this research is whether phenomena can be transferred from the UK to Türkiye in terms of political culture to solve political and social issues in Türkiye. The hypothesis derived from this research question is that Türkiye’s political culture and institutions have been politicized as a historical tradition, especially in recent years. In this context, the study aims to contribute to an under-researched area of comparative political science and literature by providing insights into the political dynamics of Türkiye and the UK. The study’s methodology and explanations of the literature on political culture, integrated with analyses of selected cases, provide a framework for understanding and comparing Türkiye’s

* Kastamonu University, Scientific Research Project (BAP) Coordinatorship, eaydilek@kastamonu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-4767-2424.

How to cite this article/Atıf için: Aydılek, E. (2024). Impact of political culture on the policy-making process: Comparative analysis of the United Kingdom and Türkiye, *Öneri Dergisi*, 19(62), 166-189. DOI: 10.14783/maruoneri.1473246

Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 24.04.2024

Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 02.07.2024



Bu eser Creative Commons Atıf-Gayri Ticari
4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı ile lisanslanmıştır.

political culture with that of the UK. These efforts can be seen as an insufficient but essential step towards solving the problems of Türkiye's political culture.

Keywords: Comparative Politics, Political Culture, Policy-Making, Public Institutions/Bodies, The United Kingdom, Türkiye.

Öz

Bir ülkenin siyasal kültürünün kodlarını, sosyolojik eğilimlerini, çatışma ve uyum alanlarını sorgulamak, o ülkenin siyasal, toplumsal ve beşeri yaşamının sorunlarını tespit etme sürecinde önemli bir adımdır. Siyasal kültürdeki belirleyici değerler, semboller ve eğilimler gibi tüm bu parametreler ülkelerin politika oluşturma sürecine doğrudan ya da dolaylı olarak etki yapar. Bu çalışma, Birleşik Krallık ve Türkiye'de siyasi kültürün politika yapımı üzerindeki etkilerine odaklanmakta, söz konusu alandaki farklılıkları ile benzerliklerini anlamaya çalışmakta ve kapsamlı karşılaştırmalı analizler içermektedir. Türkiye'deki toplumsal, politik ve sosyal sorunların çözümü için Birleşik Krallık'tan Türkiye'ye siyasal kültür açısından aktarılacak olguların var olup olmadığı sorusu bu araştırmanın temel sorunsalıdır. Bu araştırma sorusundan türetilen hipotez, Türkiye'nin siyasi kültürünün ve siyasi kurumlarının tarihsel bir gelenek olarak – özellikle son yıllarda – siyasallaştığı yönündedir. Bu bağlamda çalışma, Türkiye ve Birleşik Krallık'ın siyasi dinamiklerine dair içgörüler sunarak, karşılaştırmalı siyaset bilimi ve literatürünün az araştırılmış bir alanına katkıda bulunmayı hedeflemektedir. Çalışmanın metodolojisi ve siyasi kültürle ilgili literatür açıklamaları, seçilen örneklerin analizleri ile entegre biçimde, Türkiye'nin siyasal kültürünü anlamak ve Birleşik Krallık ile karşılaştırmak için bir çerçeve sunulmaktadır. Bu çabalar, Türkiye'nin siyasal kültürüne yönelik sorunların çözümü için yetersiz ama önemli bir adım olarak görülebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karşılaştırmalı Siyaset, Siyasal Kültür, Politika Oluşturma, Kamu Kurumları, Birleşik Krallık, Türkiye.

1. Introduction

Comparative politics is both a scientific method and one of the sub-branches of the discipline of political science. After the second half of the 20th century, on the one hand, it started to be institutionalized as an essential field of study in the discipline of Political Science in the world's respected universities; on the other hand, many significant and qualified studies¹ have been carried out at the international level in this field. Even though comparative politics has been included as main science branches in the political science and public administration departments of a few universities in Türkiye, it has not received sufficient attention as a methodological field of study.

A preliminary review of the literature reveals that no comprehensive, methodological, and analytical study compares “the impact of political culture on the policymaking process in Türkiye and the UK,” which is the subject of this study. When we move away from the specific research topic and turn to the literature from a more macro perspective, it is observed that the Turkish literature on how political culture affects the policymaking process is quite limited and indirect. The few existing

1 Under the leadership of notable political scientists such as Gabriel Almond, Kenneth Newton, John McCormick, Ruth Lane, Hwa Yol Jung, Daniele Caramani, William Roberts Clark, and Michael G. Roskin.

publications do not include detailed analyses and seem methodologically inadequate. This is in line with the fact that there is a significant gap in this field, at least at the theoretical level. For this reason, this study was inspired by the determination that there is a need for qualified studies and reports that will guide policymakers by analyzing Turkish political culture in a comparative method with ideal examples. The effort to create conditions in which we can live in more prosperity, freedom, and peace by solving our problems related to political culture, or at least to contribute to this and deal with this problem, should stand out among the primary tasks of researchers. I believe that this study will contribute to this deficiency.

The hypothesis of this study is the following: Türkiye's political culture and political institutions have been politicized as a historical tradition, especially in recent years. The research question of this study is: Given that both Türkiye and the UK have similar populations, similar deep-rooted historical backgrounds, and both are major regional powers, what are the political cultures' similarities and differences? The answer to this research question is also the aim of the study: Are there phenomena that can be transferred to Türkiye in terms of political culture from the UK, which is known as a relatively stable and well-functioning society? The aims and objectives of the research in a more comprehensive way can be listed as follows:

(1) The experiences while solving the fundamental structural problems of different political systems can be an essential alternative for other political systems. In this context, as stated in modernization theories, taking as an example (though not all aspects), the development processes of developed countries can help us identify and solve the problems of Turkish political culture.

(2) As Peter Mair points out (1998, p.319), generalizable results can be obtained by applying generalizable models in countries identified by region or status. Taking inspiration from Sodaro (2008, pp.28-29), While exploring the advantages and disadvantages of our political system, we may also develop them by using examples from other countries. Specifically, we can look to the UK as an example, where values like welfare, democracy, and fundamental rights are standardized and used less contentiously to find an answer to the question of what can be positively transferred to Türkiye. Thus, we can develop a more stable politico-social understanding of politics generally, the relationships between governments and people, and other concepts and processes.

This paper is structured as follows: The theoretical literature on political culture and its relationship with the policy-making process is briefly summarized. Next, the methodology of the research is described. Then, qualitative and quantitative descriptions of the two countries selected as the sample within the framework of the two topics/cases determined as the sample are presented. Finally, the findings are discussed, including the study's hypothesis, purpose, and methodology.

2. Literature Review

Policymaking takes place in a context that is significantly influenced by politics. Politics is central to determining what policies are pursued and how they are implemented. It is logical to start with politics when understanding the impact of culture and values on policymaking (Muers, 2018, p.15).

Sociocultural factors that influence the functioning of a democratic system can lead to the differentiation of democratic practices. Due to the characteristics of its nature, each society interprets its understanding, attitudes, and behaviors towards its system of governance in a different way and creates a unique governance practice. The concept of political culture has functional importance in understanding where these different political practices originate (Yarçı, 2018, p.31).

Focusing on the outputs of political processes and political institutions, even only on their results, and therefore looking at politics as an independent variable rather than a dependent variable (Mair, 1998, p.321) is not the right approach. We arrive at the concept of political culture by focusing on the network of relations, as Foucault does, in questioning politics. Political culture is one of the most fundamental determinants of political processes. The role of the concept of political culture is crucial when examining how the relationship between individuals and society with the political system is established, the extent to which people from different segments adopt the legitimacy of the political system, and the internalized patterns of behavior concerning public events (Durdu, 2018, p.575). Political culture is critical as a historical source of differences in habits, perspectives, and attitudes that influence political life in different societies. A particular society's conceptions of the use of power and the nature of justice are also essential aspects of its political culture (Elazar, 1972, pp.85,91).

Members of society's values can influence legislators' opinions, the execution of power, and the implementation of policy (Neal, 2019, p.112). Focusing on political culture makes it easier to analyze multidimensional social relations, such as the functions of political institutions, their unique characteristics, and the ties of these institutions with society at many different scales. It offers a deeper understanding of how and why individuals or organizations behave as they do and provides significant insights for the design and evaluation of policy interventions. Cultural analysis can help identify patterns of cultural ensembles across a population. It makes conceptual contributions to the formulation of policy by suggesting the assessment of both immediate and long-term effects (Stephenson, 2023, pp.157,185).

Political culture can be defined as the whole of dominant behaviors, beliefs, and values that show the functioning of a political system in society (Canan Sokullu, 2013, p.104). Political culture is the character of political systems, reflected in the values and rules that color different systems and the patterns of political behavior characterized as normal or abnormal (McCormick, 2000, p.23). As an extension of social culture, political culture represents society as a whole with the rulers and the ruled (Gencer, 2003, p.100).

To accurately analyze the concept of political culture, one of the most critical determinants of the political system, one must also comprehend societal, political trends, be aware of people's beliefs, expectations, and perceptions of the political system, and be able to assess the influence of prevailing social opinion or tendency on the political system (Canan Sokullu, 2013, p.103). It also requires a willingness to participate in intercultural inquiry (Dallmayr, 2013, p.105).

There is a close relationship between the political culture and values of a country and the political institutions of that country. For example, the more democratic the political culture and values are, the more democratic the political institutions and their functioning will be (Yılmaz, 2013, p.1334). According to another proposition, political culture facilitates the functioning of the political process through the communication of norms, and it provides legitimacy and reproduction of the order (Turan, 1996, p.33). Undoubtedly, political culture cannot be analyzed solely on parameters such as democracy, institutions or the functioning of the system. It is necessary to question and discuss this relationship over other factors such as social welfare, fundamental rights, internal peace, tranquility, stability, and security. A more detailed analysis of political culture is necessary to engage in this discussion.

Political culture influences the creation of the political structure and process and is reinforced by those same political structures and processes (Seavey et al., 2023, p.111). Culture and values are crucial for understanding public policy, as they play a central role in determining policy outcomes. In a democratic polity, it is essential that a policy is accepted as legitimate, and legitimacy is closely tied to the values held by the population. This includes considerations such as what policy development processes are acceptable, how individuals interacting with the state are treated, and what distributional consequences are perceived as fair. A policy that fails to consider these underlying values risks being seen as illegitimate, and a policy perceived as illegitimate is less likely to achieve its objectives (Muers, 2018, pp.7-8).

Recognizing that culture and values are at the core of policy processes can significantly enhance these processes. Understanding that values influence how citizens interpret politicians' statements, the purpose of policy decisions, and the actual outcomes has profound implications for the behavior of policy actors. Cultural elements such as stories, symbols, assumptions, beliefs, and prejudices influence government policy as much as economics, science, options assessments, and strategies (Muers, 2018, p.26). Scientific studies show that cultural variables affect the performance of laws, policies, political institutions (Bednar & Page, 2018, p.82), policy-making processes, and the wealth of nations (Alesina & Giuliano, 2015, p.898).

Meanwhile, some critical questions arise: What are the main features of a country's political culture? Does individualism or collectivism predominate in political culture? How do citizens accept the state: as a servant or a benefactor? To what extent does the state intervene in citizens' life through regulation? In which sectors are the subsidies, and how intense are they? How much is the government involved in daily life? To what extent is the state active in the production of value? Does

the state accept citizens as they are and treat them as equal citizens, or does it try to make them ideal citizens? Briefly, what political understanding constitutes the core of the country's dominant political culture? (Yayla, 2014, pp.79-80). It is necessary to seek answers to these questions on a concrete level, in the global context, and through geographical differences.

For example, Anglo-American political culture is mainly stable, homogeneous, secular, rational, and deliberative. The majority of the actors in the political system accept some combination of the values of freedom, mass welfare, and security as the purpose of the state's existence. Different views and values are respected. Each actor – official government agencies, political parties, pressure groups, other voluntary associations, the communication media, and public institutions – pursues specific goals and performs specialized functions in these areas. Each of these actors is interdependent but at the same time autonomous. Governmental institutions (such as the army, parliament, and bureaucracy) do not extend beyond their designated roles (Almond, 1956, pp.398-400).

Un-industrialized or partially industrialized political systems contain mixed political cultures. Parliaments, institutions, parties, and pressure groups act unconventionally in such countries, and bureaucracies-armies often dominate the political system. There is an atmosphere of unpredictability and potential conflict surrounding the political system. A typical indicator of the conflict between political cultures is that political culture has a two-layered structure, as evidenced by movements to accept revised political behavior norms partly or to reaffirm the old tradition. Political views often tend to be secretive, and politics often takes the form of violent action/conflict. Political parties are unstable; they disintegrate and merge, appear and disappear. There may be only partial development of the bureaucratic structure and democratic political mechanisms that are the legacy of Western colonial power. Thus, bureaucracies or armies can take over legislative or power functions, and they often do. A crowd may emerge and be at the center of the policy-making phase for a short time. There may be a parliament formally based on a set of legal norms and regulations; however, a powerful family may operate within it, a religious sect, a group of chieftains, or a combination of these. In other words, unlike Anglo-American political systems, mixed political cultures that unindustrialized society do not have a stable division of labor and structure (Almond, 1956, pp.400-402).

Continental European political culture is more fragmented² and differentiated. It has a common historical heritage and roots in which all three elements of the Catholic, aristocratic, and bourgeoisie exist. As a natural consequence of this, opponents of secularism and modernizers, conservatives, and socialists, a political culture has emerged in which the owners of the means of production and the working class are all active. A multicultural, multi-religious heritage with a high level of political participation forms the basis for a political culture that focuses on positions of conflict rather than negotiation and differences. The organization of political culture is concentrated on social movements and sects rather than political parties. In sum, the political culture of Continental Europe

2 This is a different fragmentation from non-Western systems. Therefore, it would be more accurate to call them distinct political subcultures rather than fragmented (Almond, 1956, p.406).

is not fully reflected in the political system. All actors come to the public arena to preach, negotiate, and transform the political system, not to compromise and adapt. Unlike Anglo-American culture, political roles are embedded in subsets rather than individual or formal-legal role structures³. For this reason, political power is more inactive in the policy-making process, while bureaucracy is more dominant (Almond, 1956, pp.406-408).

3. Research Method

To understand the basic features of a country's political system, initially, the distinctive features of its political system, its institutions, the country's system formed by the constitution, and other relevant legislation are examined. On the other hand, to analyze the country's political model and political culture, it is necessary to look at how it works in practice and how it was established on paper (Yayla, 2014, p.77-78). However, that is still not enough. It is essential that the analysis is carried out using a comparative method and that specific problems are discussed.

Meanwhile, the question arises as to why it is not enough to study countries in isolation. The vast majority of modern states have a set of administrative institutions and legal-judicial systems with similar powers and functions. On the surface, most institutions and processes may seem the same. However, when we go into the details, we see that power and authority are defined, established, and limited in different ways. But without the context that comparison provides, we fall short of fully understanding these constructs. We can never know whether a country's political and cultural characteristics are typical or exceptional. We cannot fully comprehend its place in the global system. We cannot create universal rules regarding administration and politics; we have difficulty making predictions (McCormick, 2000, p.18). In sum, comparative politics helps countries and societies to understand better their position in other political systems in the world, to be aware of their differences from other countries, and to determine what kind of solutions other countries have developed against the problems they face (Yilmaz, 2013, pp.1336-1337).

Comparative politics, as a field of study and method, focuses on understanding and explaining political phenomena within a state, society, country, or political system. Stated differently, comparative politics, whether national, regional, local or even supranational, builds on the diversity (similarities and differences) between political systems, internal political structures (such as parliaments and rulers), actors (voters, parties, interest groups), focuses on processes (policy making, communication, political culture) and analyses them empirically by describing, explaining and predicting (Caramani, 2011, p.2). It deals with the functions of the institutions that govern society, how they interact with

3 The Catholic subculture has the Church itself, Catholic schools, propaganda organizations such as Catholic Action, Catholic unions or workers' organizations, a Catholic party or parties, and a Catholic press. The communist subculture – the subculture of the political “outsiders” – likewise has a complete and separate system of roles. Socialist and “liberal” subcultures tend in the same direction, but they are less fully organized and less exclusive (Almond, 1956, p.407).

their populations, and how political decisions are influenced by which actors (Krupavičius et al., 2013, p.7). In this way, we can identify the similarities and differences in the political world; using these definitions, we can produce a range of analytical tools such as concepts, classifications, and typologies; we can explain these similarities and differences, which are defined and classified; we can analyze the causal links between these relationships; we can predict future political outcomes (Eldem, 2020, pp.44-45).

Finding empirical correlations between variables is aided by the comparative technique (Lijphart, 1971, p.683). Finding and explaining “significant regularities, similarities, and differences” is the core of the comparative method (Roberts, 1972, p.51). Beyond the formal institutions of government, it focuses on political processes, functions, and culture (Verba, 1967, p.111). This kind of inquiry allows us to make detailed and in-depth observations about many parameters related to politics. In addition, it allows for distinguishing features specific to different political phenomena. It also shows that even nation-states, which are supposed to have very similar political cultures, have very different political structures and phenomena. Thus, it plays an essential role in observing the differences in similar political phenomena and similarities in different political phenomena and distinguishing the conditions and causes that reveal them (Kalaycıoğlu, 2012, p.3).

In this study, comparative politics was preferred as the macro-analysis method, and qualitative research as the micro-analysis method. Over similarities and differences in a reasonable number of identified cases in both sample countries, the identified political, institutional, and social facts are systematically compared. The ‘cases’⁴ to be compared’ selected as the sample was determined as follows:

- (1) Level of commitment to the roles of executive, legislative and judicial powers,
- (2) The capacity of society, individuals, and other civil actors to influence public policy, opportunities for negotiation and debate in the public sphere, and other parameters that shape public and legitimate politics.

The comparison will be carried out separately within the framework of the abovementioned cases/topics for each of the two chosen countries, the UK and Türkiye samples. The selected cases were determined and titled according to the preliminary literature review. Data collection on the cases will be done through document/textual analysis. National-international reports and public opinion polls obtained from reliable and shared document databases; official public policy documents; scientific studies; archives of media-press organizations will be used. Qualitative and quantitative data in the relevant field will be collected, compiled, and classified. Data sets from both countries will be analyzed, discussed, and interpreted comparatively. It will try to determine whether similar or different results are obtained, whether they cause similar or different phenomena and whether the causes influence

4 Hypothesis-generating case studies begin with a more or less specific idea of possible hypotheses and then attempt to formulate definitive hypotheses to be tested among a more significant number of cases (Lijphart, 1971, p.692).

them. Hence, the independent factors that determine the political culture as a dependent variable in the UK and Türkiye will be questioned, and whether these factors are positive or negative in their effects on parameters such as democracy, stability, and prosperity will be investigated. As a result of this, an answer will be sought to the question, “What can we take as an example from the political culture of the UK to Türkiye?”

4. Case Study: Türkiye and the United Kingdom

4.1. Level of Commitment to the Roles of Executive, Legislative and Judicial Powers

Because each society has its own culture, political practices are influenced by these values. A country’s political system is inextricably linked to its political culture, including broad structural factors ranging from political dynamics, political structure, institutions, individuals’ political attitudes and tendencies, and democratic maturity (Sahnagil, 2021, p.523). Legislators, bureaucracy, and political parties play different roles in Western and non-Western political systems. In Western homogeneous political cultures, defined roles predominate; in mixed political cultures, ambiguous role structures predominate.

4.1.1. The United Kingdom

The UK’s political and public institutions are highly dependent on their roles and have significant autonomy; there are no revolutions or coups in political life, and deep crises are infrequent. There is barely any debate on fundamental issues such as justice, merit, freedom of expression, and democracy.

The UK is a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary democracy. While the UK is described by some commentators as a “centralized state” (for example Lewer, 2021), others call it a “decentralized and devolved” state (such as Elliot et al., 2022, p.108). The UK consists of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Many domestic policy matters such as health, education, culture, the environment, and transportation are handled by devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, and their parliaments/assemblies have the authority to enact laws in those regions (GOV.UK [How government works], 2024).

To understand the main structure of the UK system, it is necessary to focus on the roles and functions of the legislative, executive and judicial powers.

The country’s unwritten constitution, defines the structure of power, its powers, and citizens’ rights. The constitution comprises documents (such as the Magna Carta of 1215, the Bill of Rights of 1689, and the Acts of Parliament of 1911 and 1949), common law principles, customs, and practices. The parliament is the supreme or final authority on constitutional amendment and interpretation (Lijphart, 2012, pp.18-19). The fact that the UK Constitution is not a single document but rather a collection of documents adds flexibility to the political system (Roskin, 2007, p.37).

According to Forman & Baldwin (1999, p.8), it is difficult to understand British politics without understanding the role of organized, centralized, disciplined political parties. The political parties of the country are not ideological or class parties. They are programme parties (Gürbüz, 1980, pp.51-53). Two major parties have long dominated British politics. In the past, the Tory (Conservatives) and Whing (Liberals) parties dominated British politics; today, the Conservative Party and the Labor Party. Other parties run in elections and gain seats in the House of Commons. However, their numbers are insufficient to becoming a ruler (Lijphart, 2012, p.13). Although there are differences between the two parties in theory, in practice this difference is not so sharp (Roskin, 2007, p.52). The methods for electing party leaders are democratic (Eroğul, 2016, p.71).

Parliament is the supreme rule-making body of the country. The Speaker of Parliament acts with impartiality. Strong laws protect the powers of the legislature. So much so that the prime minister has no veto power over the legislature, while the The Sovereign (the king/or queen), although in theory he has this power, is not usually seen to exercise it. Parliament's power to legislate is almost unlimited. Parliament has two houses: the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The House of Lords, which is not popularly elected, has a role in the legislative process, but this role is limited. It can scrutinize and delay legislation but has no direct legislative power. The House of Commons, which the people elect, has broader legislative powers (UK Parliament, 2024).

There are differing opinions in the country regarding the balance of power between the legislature and the government. One perspective views the UK as having a political system characterized by parliamentary sovereignty (see also Özbudun, 1968). This approach defends the argument that parliament is the main determinant in British politics. According to other view, while the legislature theoretically holds significant power, there is no effective separation of powers in practice. Although the House of Commons appears to control the cabinet by having the power to dismiss the government, the reality is different. The cabinet has clearly established supremacy over the legislature (Lijphart, 2012, p.12). The government effectively controls parliament, often through informal agreements with the opposition. It is nearly impossible to pass legislation against the government's wishes unless there is a substantial insurgent group (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.285). Deputies are only expected to obey their parties. Prime Ministers administer and control The House of Commons (Roskin, 2007, pp.47-48). However, according to a current study published in 2024, data emerging after the Brexit referendum show that both the number and rate of examples showing the parliament as strong increased significantly during this period (Russel & James, 2024). Therefore, there is no consensus on this issue. As a result, it can be said that the role and power of the UK legislature is (relatively) high by world standards.

The Sovereign and the government share executive power. The royal position as head of state is symbolic⁵. It is an honorific duty with no real political clout. Because there is no political competition

5 Some opinions contend that the royal authority controls all powers and institutions, including the parliament and the prime minister, and is the ultimate actor behind the scenes in the administration of the UK.

for this office, royalty is a psychological glue that holds the country together (Roskin, 2007, pp.37-38). The government obtains the royal authorization as a formality in its affairs and transactions. The government must also answer to the House of Commons (Gürbüz, 1980, pp.66-68; Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.463).

Three interconnected boards carry out the government function: the special counsel, the cabinet (government), and the cabinet. The cabinet, the most petite body, determines the country's overall policy. In other words, the cabinet held most of the power (Gürbüz, 1980, pp.69-70). As can be seen, the UK's government is both extensive and complex (Eroğul, 2016, p.31).

The prime minister, the head of the government and leads his party in elections, is the most influential representative of UK politics. In theory, the prime minister's powers are pretty extensive. The Prime Minister appoints and controls the cabinet, leads the largest party in parliament, and has the authority to enact most legal and administrative regulations. The Prime Minister develops public policies with a small personal staff and then communicates them to his cabinet. He tries to keep his party together in parliament and power by balancing (Roskin, 2007, pp.38-42). As a result, the prime minister has the final say in government business. Except in the rare case of a coalition government, it is rare to find a cabinet member who disagrees with the prime minister (Eroğul, 2016, p.31). Despite such significant executive power, the prime minister's office is like a tightrope walker. The Prime Minister's metaphor is "it is like a castle built on sand: it may appear impregnable, but a surge in the tide can destroy it" (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.316).

Cabinet ministers are appointed for political reasons rather than specific expertise in running their ministries. The minister is the head of the ministries; he represents his ministry in cabinet meetings and defends it in the House of Commons. However, the most influential actors in the ministries are also senior civil servants (called permanent secretaries). Ministers theoretically command their ministries, but in practice, they lack sufficient knowledge of how the ministry operates. They instead rely on administrative personnel. Permanent secretaries on permanent duty are so powerful in the bureaucracy that they earn salary more than the minister, sometimes nearly twice as much. They are more specialized and well-versed in their ministry's personnel, problems, interests, and budget (Roskin, 2007, pp.79-81). To summarize, there is an interdependent working relationship in the ministry hierarchy. Officials expect ministers to be clear about the policy goals they want to pursue, to listen to advice about possible outcomes and implementation methods, and to present compelling arguments for public policy to parliament, the media, and the public. As a result, it is reasonable to conclude that civil servants wield significant power and influence in the UK government. Nonetheless, the realities of British politics support the conclusion that civil servants rarely question ministers' political rights, and that civil servants must serve every government with the same loyalty, regardless of political affiliation. Public officials' impartiality is highly valued⁶. The Civil Service

⁶ Let us cite research demonstrating the merit-based nature of the UK public personnel and service system: For instance, a February 2021 survey found that the majority of British citizens feel that hard work and perseverance

Commission, appointed through public competition and independent of the government and the civil service, ensures that civil servants are selected on merit through fair and open competition. It also plays a role in maintaining the impartiality of the civil service. The administrative continuity and political impartiality that distinguishes the UK civil service act as a check on both partisanship and political bias (Eroğul, 2016, p.33; Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.336; CSC, 2024).

The UK's system of government is characterized by its complexity and multi-layered structure. The various institutions and organizations in this system perform their functions and services at different levels and in various ways. There are 605 public organizations in the country. These include 24 ministerial departments, 20 non-ministerial public departments, 426 agencies and other public bodies, 112 high-profile groups, 19 public corporations and 3 devolved administrations. According to March 2024 data from the UK Office for National Statistics (ONS, 2024), there are approximately 5.95 million employees in the public sector. 3.76 million of these are employed in central government and 1.99 million in local government. This data demonstrates the size of the public sector in the UK (GOV.UK [Departments, agencies and public bodies], 2024).

Responsibilities for the provision of public services are distributed between public, private and voluntary/community organizations. The public body system has become more complex and fragmented in service delivery in recent years. To understand UK public administration, it is necessary to focus on the key themes of fragmentation and fragmentation. This is because the UK has historically been made up of different countries, principalities and provinces. New Public Management (NPM) and New Public Governance theories can help to understand public body system. The multi-level governance, networks and complex interdependencies of this structure provide a “natural laboratory” for international scholars and public administration practitioners (Elliot et al., 2022, pp.99-109).

Local government structures are also highly complex. There are around 12.000 local councils in the country, ranging from small village and community boards to large combined authority areas covering the most populous cities in the country (Stowers, 2024). This diversity is due to the fact that each of the four different countries (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) has a different system of local government. According to the Local Autonomy Index 2.0, the UK is ranked among the countries with a lower-middle level of local autonomy with a score of 45.65. In the context of local government, the impact of centralization is felt most strongly in the home counties of England and Northern Ireland (for different reasons), and to a lesser extent in Scotland and Wales (Local Autonomy Index 2.0, nd). The range of services provided by local authorities is wide, but central

are the keys to success in life, with fewer holding the view that background matters. The vast majority of individuals (76%) believe that success is mostly or entirely determined by one's ability to work hard. Knowing the proper people or coming from an affluent family are examples of social capital and financial resources that are viewed as less significant, whereas demographic characteristics like color, gender, and religion are viewed as least significant (Duffy et al., 2021, p.32).

funding is decreasing year by year. This has a negative impact on the financial sustainability and independence of local government services. Discussions on this issue have intensified recently.

The Sovereign is the head of the Armed Forces. The army is officially known as “His Majesty’s Armed Forces” (The Cabinet Manual, 2011, p.5). There are no examples of the UK Army interfering in the internal affairs of the government or making political statements.

Unlike the Continental Europe, the ‘Anglo-Saxon Legal System’ is applied. The judiciary in the UK is independent. The Constitutional Reform Act of 2005, in particular, established a new Supreme Court and an independent Judicial Appointments Commission, strengthening the judiciary and reinforcing the separation of powers (Turenne, 2022).

Other actors in the political process, aside from political parties, powers, and bureaucracy, include pressure groups, the media, markets, the UK’s European partners, and the general public. All of these are significant players in the Prime Minister’s and Cabinet’s decision-making processes (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.316).

4.1.2. Türkiye

In Türkiye, there is a low level of commitment to the roles of powers and institutions. Coups and crises have occurred frequently in political life throughout the Republic’s history (and even before), and legitimate democracy has been disrupted numerous times by military interventions. Bureaucratic and judicial oversight has been effective in political life until recently. Debates on fundamental issues such as justice, merit, freedom of expression, and democracy frequently occupy the public agenda.

Türkiye, a centralized and unitary republic, has been governed by a presidential system since 2008. The President holds both executive power and the position of head of state. The President wields enormous power. It chooses and appoints ministers, senior public officials, ambassadors, and many Supreme Court justices (T.C. Anayasası, m.104). The cabinet, which provides public services, serves as a secretariat and is entirely under the President’s control. Institutions have little independence. Judicial independence is a contentious issue. Army forces have recently become more committed to their roles.

Since 1876, the Turkish Constitution has served as the supreme legal standard. The Founding Constitution was created five times and frequently (19 times) amended. The 1982 constitution is still in effect today. The legislation includes laws, presidential decrees and decisions, regulations, and other regulatory acts in addition to the Constitution.

From Türkiye’s inception in 1923 until 2007, executive power was balanced in a tripartite structure represented by the President, Prime Minister, and Council of Ministers. Since implementing the new management model in 2008, the Presidency, directly elected by the people, has shifted this balance in its favor.

Between 1923 and 1960, the government task was carried out by single-party coalitions. However, between 1961 and 2002, there was a reversal in this trend, with approximately 20 different coalition governments being established. Since 2002, the country has been governed by the same party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi), which has consistently dominated elections.

Although the new system has the potential to stabilize politics, which is currently disrupted by short-term coalitions, it is still being debated due to risks such as impeding executive flexibility, excluding common sense, and over-centralization (see also Yıldırım, 2020).

In recent years, alliances between parties have determined election results in Turkish politics. Even though many parties run in the elections, the party or alliance with the most votes (50%+1) controls the executive and the legislature. M.P.s and the opposition have almost no political influence or role. Officials, employees, and public administrators essentially have little direct power or influence in the executive. The public merit level is low. Despite their legal autonomy, the government effectively controls The Central Bank and independent regulatory agencies.

Some studies have found that partisan attitudes and ideology are the factors that influence voting preferences in Türkiye (Tek, 2023). The differences between alliances are profound, fueled by ideological and religious arguments rather than welfare and social policy promises. The ruling Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi and its ally, the Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi, and some minor political parties form a “people’s alliance” with conservative (neo-Ottomanist), Islamist, and nationalist policies. The opposition wing is represented by the Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi, symbolised on the basis of the ideology of Kemalism and the founding values of the Republic, as well as 5-6 different parties, large and small, with different political views. There are also a few tiny parties with little chance of obtaining votes and a political movement that often changes its name and represents Kurdish ethnic politics.

The parliament holds the power to enact laws in Türkiye. Furthermore, the President has the authority to issue decrees and decisions that govern the executive branch. This situation raises the possibility of conflict of authority and pacification of the parliament occurring occasionally. According to a report submitted by a member of parliament and a constitutional lawyer named *Ibrahim Kaboglu* on the process involving the 27th legislative period – from the 2018 general elections to 2022-, an equal number of (89) Presidential Decrees and (89) law proposals were enacted during this period (Demirkaya, 2022).

For much of the Republic’s history, the military bureaucracy was the power that exerted pressure on the political powers. Two times in the Republic’s history, with direct military coups (1960 and 1980) and twice with memorandums forcing the government to resign (1971 and 1997), governments were forced to resign. Furthermore, the “2007 e-memorandum” and the “2016 FETÖ coup attempt” (there are a few small initiatives that we cannot count here) can be considered illegitimate interventions against legitimate governments. Military tutelage over political power has been removed in recent years.

In theory, Türkiye's judiciary is independent, and constitutional principles protect this situation. However, various international and national reports, particularly the EU's Turkey Progress Reports, highlight several concerns regarding the functioning of the judiciary. These concerns include political criticism directed towards higher judicial bodies, the appointment of judges lacking merit-based criteria, allegations of judicial instructions, frequent replacement of court members in critical cases, and debates surrounding the independence and impartiality of the judiciary (see Reports on Turkey Prepared by the European Commission; World Justice Project, 2024).

Public service delivery in Türkiye is organized in a dual structure as central administration and local governments. The central administration is institutionalized as capital and provincial organizations. On the other hand, local administrations are institutionalized as local administrations and service institutions. According to the information in the State Organization Central Registration System (DETSIS, 2024) database, there are 1.949 institutions and 345.325 units in Türkiye.

Local governments have constitutional guarantees and legal administrative-financial autonomy. However, due to the new system's centralist nature, the organization of central government at the local level, and the government's attitude, there are conflicts of authority and tutelage debates regarding center-local relations.

The debate on merit is intense. Non-merit-based hiring and promotion criteria, such as partisanship and political favoritism in the public sector, are frequently on the public agenda. According to the recent Ipsos Equalities Index 2024, a comprehensive and up-to-date survey of 29 countries, Türkiye was the country with the highest level of agreement with the statement "people's chances of success in your country are often dependent on factors beyond their control" at 48%.

4.2. The Ability of Society, Individuals, and Other Civil Actors to Influence Public Policy; Opportunities for Public Negotiation and Debate; and Other Parameters that Shape Public and Legitimate Politics

There are certain cultural phenomena that, from a macro perspective, determine state-society relations and, from a micro perspective, the public policy-making process: such as the extent of opportunities for public debate and deliberation, the language of politics, tolerance, the strength and intensity of civil society pressure/interest groups, the responsiveness of governments to public demands, public interest and trust in politics, the neutral and watchdog role of the media.

4.2.1. The United Kingdom

Governments frequently face pressure to make choices that conform to public expectations. One of the main characteristics of British politics is the constant exchange of information between individuals and politicians. Government parties have traditionally acted broadly responsible and moderately. Thus, it is indisputable that public opinion has a significant role in determining the course of the British political system (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, pp.124,205; Gürbüz, 1980, p.47).

Prime Ministers are frequently cautious about introducing regulations that may enrage the public. Prime ministers generally implement moderate, gradual policies to avoid offending a sizable portion of the electorate (Roskin, 2007, p.43).

Mainstream media outlets have been subject to criticism for predominantly reflecting right-leaning ideologies and occasionally exhibiting partisan inclinations (Smith 2017; Britpolitics, nd.). Nevertheless, the media has a significant impact on British politics, particularly during election campaigns. The media's role is undeniably to make it more difficult for governments to manage, by criticizing flaws and shortcomings in public policy and the politicians responsible for them, and by raising public expectations to levels that no government can meet. Eventually it can be argued that mainstream media outlets remain committed to their constructive role, which includes raising public awareness and safeguarding democracy (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, pp.123,177,178).

In politics, pressure and interest groups are common. They are unaffected by the state or power. Before deciding, the government usually consults with pressure groups (Gürbüz, 1980, p.63). A sizable proportion of the British electorate is affiliated with at least one of the powerful interest groups representing industry, commerce, professions, and labor (Roskin, 2007, p.77). Support for pressure and interest groups has grown over the last 40 years, owing to the public's growing disillusionment with established political parties. While active participation in party politics has been declining for some time, it has been accompanied by an equally impressive increase in pressure group participation (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.147).

The UK has a rich history of civic participation and non-governmental organizations. The civil society sector includes, in addition to legally registered organizations such as charities, funds, and foundations, informal communities, volunteer groups, citizens participating in social actions, and social enterprises working on social issues and using entrepreneurial models. The country has over 400,000 registered non-governmental charities organizations. Non-governmental organizations employ approximately 930,000 people. This represents 3% of the UK workforce (Find that Charity, 2024; NCVO, 2023).

Elitism and class structure predominate in the economy, politics, and bureaucracy. The role of elite educational institutions in this is significant (Ozdemir & Kanat, 2020, p.2339). The true path to status and power in the UK is studying (and networking) at elite universities (such as Oxford and Cambridge). Class differences also influence individuals' lives. Working-class people, for example, live, dress, and speak differently than middle-class people. The British value and protect their differences (Roskin, 2007, pp.55-57). Although class differences in the country provided advantages in areas such as career and enrichment, they did not give rise to a caste system, as in India, nor did they lead to class conflicts, as in France. Although the class structure of British society has negative aspects, it has a distinct richness.

The British people are relatively detached from the party political process and place a high value on maintaining political stability. This rhetoric implies that British people prefer 'quiet living' and

‘growing their garden’ and spend most of their time in social institutions ranging from pubs to fishing clubs. As a result, many people have concluded that having high expectations of the government or other public institutions makes no sense, and this has led them to be skeptical of promises made by politicians, particularly during election season (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.14). The data support the low level of political interest among UK citizens. The number of party members has decreased from over 3 million at the end of WWII to around 800,000 today. The average age of party members is over 50, and young people are scarce. The 2019 general election witnessed a turnout of 67% (The House of Commons Library, 2022).

Class voting was common in the UK until recently. The fact that the majority of the working class supports left-wing policies (Labour Party) while the majority of the middle class supports right-wing policies (Conservative Party) demonstrates this. Although class differences are prevalent in British politics, they no longer correspond directly to voter preference. Class dynamics explain only a portion of British voting patterns (Roskin, 2007, pp.58-59). Furthermore, in the UK, citizens’ voting behavior is influenced by subjective factors such as political heritage, self-interest, and party performance, as well as objective factors such as job prospects, level of housing/car purchase, educational attainment, and geographic location. debates and sessions by politicians and the media that last weeks/months can be included in these parameters. As a result, there needs to be more certainty in voting behavior in the UK (Forman & Baldwin, 1999, p.85). Particularly during the neoliberal era, voting preferences of social classes have become blurred, and class-based voting preferences have decreased significantly (Özdemir & Kanat, 2020, p.2338). As a result, British political culture can be described broadly as pragmatic and a dash of ideologic (Roskin, 2007, pp.61-62).

4.2.2. Türkiye

Governments in Türkiye generally communicate poorly with the public. Governments generally consider the people’s demands for reasons such as populism and their vote base. The fact that the state is regarded as an absolute power and sacred, above all else, plays a significant role. However, under intense public pressure, they may revise their policies in certain circumstances.

Hurting, bitter, and deep ideological debates or conflicts are encountered in Turkish political culture. Politicians are not kind to one another; they can use insulting and derogatory language about one another (see also Türkiye Raporu – [Siyasetin Dili Nasıl?], 2021).

According to the 2024 World Press Freedom report, Türkiye ranks 158th among 180 countries (RSF, 2024). According to some authors, the media environment in Türkiye has become a structure in which partisanship has increased, and freedom of the press has significantly disappeared (Aydın Düzgüt, 2023, p.239). The Turkish media has lost its impartiality and primary function and has been divided into two wings (see Kızılkaya & Ütücü, 2021). While the mainstream media focused on legitimizing the government, an oppositional media based on government criticism emerged on the other side.

A dual structure and a cultural divide stand out when explaining the basic structure of Turkish society. One part of the society can be characterized as Western/modern, and the other as traditional/conservative and close to religious values. Some various studies and approaches support this determination.

According to Konda Research Company's interactive data titled "If Turkey were 100 People" (2021), Turkish society's lifestyle is 30% modern, 45% traditional conservative, and 24% religious conservative. Furthermore, according to the Turkey Trends – 2022 Quantitative Research Report, in the parameter "Turkish People's Place in the Political Spectrum," in response to the question "How would you define yourself in terms of your political view?," 27.4% responded as "conservative," 16.6% as "Kemalist," 15% as "nationalist," 12.9% as "political Islamist," 9.9% as "social democrat" and 5.5% as "ulusalcı" (Aydın et al., 2023, p.13).

Certain scholarly investigations also make this clear. According to Kemal Karpat's "Türk Demokrasi Tarihi," two main factions developed following the Republic's proclamation: the secular and conservative ones (2010, p.130). Doğan Avcıoğlu highlights the two opposing poles of society in his book "Türkiye'nin Düzeni," wrote, "the middle class in the agricultural regions favors the liberalization of religion, while the urban upper class – partly because it is cosmopolitan – favors secularism" (Avcıoğlu, 1976, p.575). Şerif Mardin (2014, p.145), İdris Küçükömer (2009, p.112), and numerous other sociologists and political scientists highlight this distinction in their paper.

Recent research shows the existence of intense polarization in Turkish society (see V-Dem 2022, p.34; Somer, 2018). There is a widespread view that political elites primarily fuel the root causes of this polarization. This argument argues that deep ethnic, sectarian, and value-based divisions stemming from Türkiye's history formed the basis of various partisan affiliations at the societal level (Aydın Düzgüt, 2023, p.240). Perhaps as a natural consequence, politics garners significant interest among the populace, with political discussions occupying a central role in individual socialization. According to T.C. Yargıtay Başkanlığı (Supreme Court) data, the AKP has 11 million members, CHP has 1.4 million members, and the total number of party members is approximately 15 million. Notably, the participation rate in the most recent general election, held in 2023, reached an impressive 84% (T.C. Yargıtay Cumhuriyet Başsavcılığı, 2024).

Türkiye's civil society is underdeveloped and under pressure. The Human Rights Foundation of Türkiye's 2021 report, named 'Shifting Lines in the Struggle for Human Rights in Türkiye' states that "the scope of action of non-governmental organizations has also narrowed, all kinds of oppositional subjects and discourses have been criminalized, associated with terrorism, and punished, and after the declaration of the State of Emergency, civil society organizations were closed, and heavy control was imposed on civil society." According to the Democracy Report 2024 (2024, p.16), the organization V-Dem lists Türkiye among the countries where civil society conditions have significantly deteriorated in the last decade. "Turkey lacks a strong civil society or civil space in general that can withstand the pressure of a very powerful state," according to a recent analysis

published in the think tank Chatham House (Dalay & Toremark, 2024). Foundations, associations, unions, associations, and other non-state entities are reluctant to confront the government on their behalf. Only a few professional associations appear to be independent of the government, such as the Turkish Medical Association (TTB), the Union of Turkish Bar Associations (TBB), and the Turkish Industry and Business Association (TÜSİAD).

5. Conclusions and Discussion

M. Sandel makes an essential point about what constitutes a just social order: “To inquire as to whether a society is just, one must inquire how the income we deserve, responsibilities and rights, powers and opportunities, positions and ranks are distributed. These values are distributed correctly in a just society. Given each person what he deserves” (Sandel, 2017, p.41). Then we should revisit the following questions: What are the salient problems in Türkiye’s social order when compared to the example of the UK? How can we improve these problem areas?

This study compares the impact of the political cultures of the United Kingdom and Türkiye on the policy-making process within the framework of selected cases. In this comparison, academic approaches/theories and practical situations are supported by data from reliable research and reports. Initially, it should be noted that, according to Almond’s typological classification, the United Kingdom state broadly shows the general characteristics of Anglo-American political culture. In contrast, Türkiye shows the general characteristics of a mixed political culture. This assumption serves as an essential source of reference for the findings and analysis.

The political culture of the UK is stable, secular, rational, and deliberative. Fundamental rights, freedom, and mass welfare are essential values. Powers and institutions are devoted to their respective roles. The media is independent and relatively objective. Pressure groups are autonomous and effective. Tolerance for different lifestyles is acceptable. There is no pressure or dominance on various points of view and values. As a result, social polarization is low in the country, while welfare and stability are high.

While UK has tolerance-intensive cultural values, it can be said that there are significant deficiencies in this field in Türkiye. As *Tekeli* emphasizes (2002, p.78), “there is a major crisis of trust between the political arena and society.” However, according to Almond and Verba, there must be a balance between the political structure and culture. Otherwise, insecurity and legitimacy issues may arise (Almond & Verba, 1963, pp.22,34). For example, even though the UK had a strong prime minister, the system did not produce authoritarianism. In Türkiye, on the contrary, the atmosphere is quite different.

Religion, historical values, belief systems, nationalism, nepotism, and utilitarianism plays hegemonic role in societies’ understanding of mixed culture. For example, *culture* can be defined as honor/chastity by rejecting incompatible behaviors. Those who do not think in parallel may be

labeled as traitors if culture is defined in terms of the sacred past, customs, and race. The pragmatist acceptance of culture can lead us to consider it reasonable or ignore it when we can condemn and criticize another person's behavior or discourse but do the same ourselves. Alternatively, we can prefer to remain silent or say 'oh well' when this happens to someone else while we scream in the face of an injustice done to us. Culture can be viewed as the source of discrimination, favoritism, and torpedoing. People with different religious tendencies or atheists are marginalized as infidels/non-religious when culture can be defined through religion. These attitudes contribute to societal polarization and harm the dynamic of coexistence. Therefore, culture should not be seen as an authoritarian tool that forces people to adopt imposed patterns of behavior.

Based on the conclusions and information gathered during the investigation, we validate the initial hypothesis: Political culture in Türkiye has been politicized (needless to say, this is a big problem), particularly in recent years. As a result of the analysis in this study, several recommendations can be drawn from the UK example to address the problems related to Türkiye's political culture. First, merit should be restored in public service institutions, ensuring that they are depoliticized and restructured depending on their roles. Strengthening the separation of powers and freeing autonomous and independent authorities from external interference is vital. Enhancing the legislature's function and securing the judiciary's independence are other necessary steps. Limiting the power of the executive/political power and providing flexibility to the system through effective oversight mechanisms can bring significant gains. Furthermore, the media should be encouraged to return to its proper role as a non-partisan check on the government. It is also vital that pressure and interest groups and civil society organizations are urged to become more autonomous and effective, with legal and practical arrangements to protect freedom of expression. Finally, developing a political language and attitude that reduces social polarization and allows citizens to focus on their daily lives rather than political bickering is essential.

All this policy recommendations require comprehensive and structural reforms. Consequently, it is critical to rebuild Turkish political culture at the legal, political, and social levels with a new understanding of freedom, justice, morality, and especially depolitization.

References

- Alesina, A., & Giuliano, P. (2015). Culture and institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 53(4), 898-944. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jel.53.4.898>
- Almond, G.A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: attitudes and democracy in five nations*. USA: Princeton University.
- Almond, G.A. (1956). Comparative political systems. *The Journal of Politics*, 18(3), 391-409. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2127255>
- Avcıoğlu, D. (1976). *Türkiye'nin düzeni-birinci kitap*. İstanbul: Tekin.
- Aydın Düzigit, S. (2023). Dünyadaki örnekler ışığında Türkiye'de kutuplaşma. Çarkoğlu, A. v.d. (Ed.). *Türkiye siyasetinin sınırları: Siyasal davranış, kurumlar ve kültür*. (ss.235-250). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi.

- Aydın, M. et al. (2023). *Quantitative research report: Türkiye political social trends survey 2022*. İstanbul: Akademetre and Global Academy.
- Bednar, J., & Page, S. E. (2018). When order affects performance: Culture, behavioral spillovers, and institutional path dependence. *American Political Science Review*, 112(1), 82-98. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000.305.5417000466>
- Britpolitics. (nd) *Characteristics of the British press since 1945 – highly partisan*. Retrieved June 10, 2024, from <https://www.britpolitics.co.uk/university-british-politics-and-the-media-partisan/>
- Canan Sokullu, E.S. (2013). Siyasal kültür. Sayari, S., & Bilgin, H.D. (Ed). *Karşılaştırmalı siyaset-temel konular ve yaklaşımlar*. (ss.102-121). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Caramani, D. (2011). *Comparative politics*. UK: Oxford University.
- CSC (Civil Service Commission) Official Website. *About the commission*. Retrieved June 27, 2024, from <https://civilservicecommission.independent.gov.uk/about-the-commission/>
- Dalay, G., & Toremark, L. (2024, May 23). Democracy in Turkey. *Chatham House*. Retrieved June 30, 2024, from <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2024/05/democracy-turkey>
- Dallmayr, F. (2013). Monoloğun ötesinde: Karşılaştırmalı bir siyaset teorisine doğru. (F. Yılmaz, Çev.). *Divan Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 18(35), 87-107. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/divan/issue/25964/273539>
- Demirkaya, N. (2022, 8 Ocak). Kaboğlu 3.5 yılı raporladı: Kurumsal yapı çökerken tek kişi büyüyor. *Gazete Duvar*. Retrieved 5 May, 2024, from <https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/kaboglu-35-yili-raporladi-kurumsal-yapi-cokerken-tek-kisi-buyuygu-haber-1548441>
- Devlet Teşkilatı Merkezi Kayıt Sistemi (DETSİS). Retrieved 27 June, 2024, from <https://detsis.gov.tr/>
- Duffy, B., et al. (2021). *Unequal Britain: Attitudes to inequalities after Covid-19*. UK: King's College London.
- Durdu, Z. (2018). Siyasal kültür, modern devlet ve demokrasinin demokratikleştirilmesi, *International Journal of Social Studies*, 11(61), 574-582. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2018.2948>
- Elazar, D. J. (1972). *American federalism: A view from the states*. NY: Crowell.
- Eldem, T. (2020). Bir alt-alan ve yöntem olarak karşılaştırmalı siyaset. *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi*, 25(100), 37-68. <https://doi.org/10.36484/liberal.818214>
- Elliot, I.C. et al. (2022). The fragmentation of public administration: Differentiated and decentred governance in the (Dis)United Kingdom. *Public Administration*, 100(1) Special Issue, 98-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12803>
- Eroğul, C. (2016). *Çağdaş devlet düzenleri*. Ankara: İmaj.
- EU. *Reports on Turkey prepared by the European Commission*. Retrieved 10 June, 2024, from https://www.ab.gov.tr/ilerleme-raporlari_46224.html
- Find that Charity. Retrieved 28 June, 2024, from <https://findthatcharity.uk/orgid/type/registered-charity>
- Forman, F.N., & Baldwin, J. (1999). *Mastering British politics*. NY: Macmillan.
- Gencer, B. (2003). Türk siyasi kültürü: Analitik bir çerçeveye doğru. *Liberal Düşünce*, 8(32), 97-118.
- Government's Official Website (GOV.UK). *Departments, agencies and public bodies*. Retrieved 26 June, 2024, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations>
- Government's Official Website (GOV.UK). *How government works*. Retrieved 28 June, 2024, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/how-government-works>
- Gürbüz, Y. (1980). *Siyasal sistemler*. İstanbul: May.

- Human Rights Foundation of Türkiye (2021). *Shifting lines in the struggle for human rights in Türkiye*. Ankara: TİHV.
- IPSOS. (2024, May). *Equalities index 2024*. Retrieved 28 June, 2024, from https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2024-05/IEL_2024_Global%20Charts.pdf
- Kalaycıoğlu, E., & Kağnıcıoğlu, D. (Ed). (2018). *Karşılaştırmalı siyasal sistemler*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Karpat, K. (2010). *Türk demokrasi tarihi*. İstanbul: Timaş.
- Kızılkaya, E., & Ütücü, B. (2021). *IPI Türkiye dijital medya raporu: Türkiye’de ‘yeni ana akım’ yükseliyor*. Viyana: International Press Institute.
- Konda Araştırma (2021). *Türkiye 100 kişi olsaydı*. Retrieved 8 June, 2024, from <https://interaktif.konda.com.tr/rapor/turkiye-100-kisi-olsa/1>
- Krupavičius, A., & Isoda, V. & Vaišnoras, T. (2013). *Introduction to comparative politics: Didactic guidelines*. Kaunas: Aktaja.
- Küçükömer, İ. (2009). *Sivil toplum yazıları*. İstanbul: Profil.
- Lewer, A. (2021, May 5). The UK is one of the most centralised advanced democracies – it’s time that changed. *New Statesman*. Retrieved 29 June, 2024, from <https://www.newstatesman.com/spotlight/2021/05/the-uk-is-one-of-the-most-centralised-advanced-democracies-its-time-that-changed>
- Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative politics and the comparative method, *The American Political Science Review*, 65(3), 682-693. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1955513>
- Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patterns of democracy: government forms and performance in thirty-six countries*. USA: Yale University.
- Local Autonomy Index 2.0: *United Kingdom (2015-2020)*. Retrieved 16 June, 2024, from <http://local-autonomy.andreasladner.ch/downloads/>
- Mair, P. (1998). Comparative politics: An overview. Goodin, R.E., & Klingemann, H.D. (Eds). *A new handbook of politics science*. (pp.309-335). UK: Oxford University.
- Mardin, Ş. (2014). *Din ve ideoloji*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- McCormick, J. (2020). *Karşılaştırmalı siyaset ve yönetim sistemleri*. (Ceylan, M. Çev.). Ankara: Felix.
- Muers, S. (2018). *Culture, values and public policy*. (IPR Report). UK: University of Bath.
- NCVO. (2023, October 12). *UK civil society almanac 2023: Data. trends. insights*. Retrieved 22 June, 2024, from <https://www.ncvo.org.uk/news-and-insights/news-index/uk-civil-society-almanac-2023/workforce/>
- Neal, H. L. (2019). *Political culture and policy: The impact of culture and values on school choice legislation* (Doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University). <https://doi.org/10.25777/d6tz-0z43>
- Office for National Statistics. (2024). *Public sector employment, UK: March 2024*. Retrieved 26 June, 2024, from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/publicsectorpersonnel/bulletins/publicsectoremployment/march2024>
- Özbudun, E. (1968). İngiltere’de parlamento egemenliği teorisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1). https://doi.org/10.1501/Hukfak_000.000.1334
- Özdemir, H., & Kanat C. (2020). On the change in British political culture in neo-liberal period. *Turkish Studies-Economics, Finance, Politics*, 15(4), 2337-2359. <http://dx.doi.org/10.47644/TurkishStudies.46589>
- RSF-Reporters Without Borders. (2024). *World press freedom index 2024*. Retrieved 23 June, 2024, from <https://rsf.org/en/2024-world-press-freedom-index-journalism-under-political-pressure>

- Roberts, G.K. (1972). Comparative politics today. *Government and Opposition*, 7(1), 38-55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.1972.tb00832.x>
- Roskin, M.G. (2007). *Çağdaş devlet sistemleri-siyaset, coğrafya, kültür*. Ankara: Adres.
- Russell, M., & James, L. (2024). Representation of the UK Parliament's power in the national media: Too weak, or too strong? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 20, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gxae005>
- Sahnagil, S. (2021). Türk siyasal kültürü kapsamında bir sistem arayışı: Cumhurbaşkanlığı hükümet sistemi, *Ekev Academi Dergisi*, 25(88), 523-540. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sosekev/issue/71386/1147788>
- Sandel, M.J. (2017). *Adalet: yapılması gereken doğru şey nedir?* (Kocaoğlu, M. Çev.). Ankara: Eski Kitaplar.
- Seavey, J. W., Aytur, S. A., & McGrath, R. J. (2023). Political culture. Seavey, J. (Ed.). *Health policy analysis*. (pp. 111-126). NY: Springer.
- Smith, M. (2017, March 7). How left or right-wing are the UK's newspapers? *YouGov*. Retrieved 29 March, 2024, from <https://yougov.co.uk/politics/articles/17715-how-left-or-right-wing-are-uks-newspapers>
- Sodaro, M.J. (2008). *Comparative politics: A global introduction*. NY: McGraw.
- Somer, M. (2019). Turkey: The Slippery slope from reformist to revolutionary polarization and democratic breakdown. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 681(1), 42-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000.271.6218818056>
- Stephenson, J. (2023). *Culture and sustainability*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Stowers, S. (2024, April 2). Local government in England, Scotland and Wales. *UK in a changing Europe*. Retrieved 20 May, 2024, from <https://ukandeu.ac.uk/explainers/local-government-in-england-scotland-and-wales/>
- T.C. Anayasası 1982. Resmi Gazete. Tarih: 9/11/1982, Sayı: 17863
- T.C. Yargıtay Cumhuriyet Başsavcılığı Resmi Web Sayfası, *Political parties and statutes*. Retrieved 21 June, 2024, from <https://www.gpo.gov.tr/kategori/38/political-parties-and-statutes>
- Tek, Ö.B. (2023, 16 Eylül). Türkiye'de seçmen davranışı analizleri. *Perspektif*. Retrieved 9 February, 2024, from <https://www.perspektif.online/turkiyede-secmen-davranisi-analizleri/>
- Tekeli, I. (2002). *Türkiye'de yeni bir siyasal kültürün gerekliliği ve gerçekleştirilebilirliği üzerine düşünceler*. İstanbul: Sodev.
- The Cabinet Manual, 2011. Retrieved 6 April, 2024, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cabinet-manual>
- The Constitutional Reform Act 2005, Retrieved 7 April, 2024, from <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/4/contents>
- The House of Commons Library. (2022, August 30). *Membership of political parties in Great Britain. (Research Briefing)*. Retrieved 16 June, 2024, from <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk>
- Turan, I. (1996). *Siyasal sistem siyasal davranış*. İstanbul: Der.
- Turenne, S. (2022). The 'good chap' and a 'new type of judge': the UK constitution under stress. *Teoría Y Realidad Constitucional*, 50, 613-628. <https://doi.org/10.5944/trc.50.2022.36386>
- Türkiye Raporu (2021, Şubat 14). *Siyasetin dili nasıl?* Retrieved 24 February, 2024, from <https://turkiyeraporu.com/arastirma/siyasetin-dili-nasil-1982/>
- UK Parliament *Official Website*. *How Parliament works*. Retrieved 29 June, 2024, from <https://www.parliament.uk/>

- V-Dem Institute. (2022). *Democracy Report 2022: Autocratization changing nature?* Retrieved 18 February, 2024, from https://v-dem.net/democracy_
- V-Dem Institute. (2024). *Democracy Report 2024: Democracy winning and losing at the ballot.* Retrieved 18 February, 2024, from <https://www.v-dem.net/publications/democracy-reports/>
- Verba, S. (1967). Some dilemmas in comparative research. *World Politics*, 20(1), 111-127. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009730>
- World Justice Project. *Rule of law index 2022 and 2023*, Retrieved 24 June, 2024, from <https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/global>
- Yarcı, S. (2018). Türk toplumunun tarz-ı siyaseti. Batal, S. (ed.). *Sosyal bilimlerde alternatif yorumlar.* (ss. 29-51). Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı.
- Yayla, A. (2014). *Karşılaştırmalı siyasal sistemler.* Ankara: Liberte.
- Yıldırım, U.T. (2020). Cumhurbaşkanlığı hükümet sisteminin eleştirileri: Türkiye'de muhalefet partileri üzerinden bir inceleme. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 13(79), 509-524. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/JASSS.39936>
- Yılmaz, N. (2013). Karşılaştırmalı siyaset biliminin konusu ve seçme eserler bibliyografyası. *The Journal of Academics Social Science Studies*, 6(6), 1323-1340. <http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS1692>