Organizational Culture and the Turkish Military
Örgüt Kültürü ve Türk Ordusu

R. Dilek KOÇAK* & Sertif DEMİR**

Abstract

This paper examines the evolution of the organizational culture of Turkish military, and how underlying variables and dynamics have influenced its development. The main finding is that the Turkish military's organizational culture includes shared basic norms, rules, values, and beliefs, and that they are taught to create a common identity to entrants. Turkish military organizational culture makes employees feel part of an exclusive organization where adherence to heroism, honor, patriotism, and loyalty represent a common identity. This paper includes three main sections: a brief theoretical overview of culture and organizational culture; analysis of the evolution of Turkish military culture; examination of the variables and dynamics influencing its evolution.
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Introduction

The Turkish Armed Forces (TAF) (Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri – TSK) is one of a few key organizations in the Republic of Turkey. Several essential dynamics have given TAF this prominent position. First, it played a founding role in establishing the Republic before playing a pioneering role in the modernization and Westernization of Turkish society. It has also acted as a guardian of the Republic.1 Given these critical roles, TAF has generally had an outstanding status for Turkish citizens.

As an organization, TAF has a unique character and culture, which has been key to attaining its outstanding status. This paper analyzes this organizational culture and the dynamics that contributed to its evolution. TAF’s organizational structure, and its public image, is characterized by certain gradually evolving values, principles, rules, and practices. This study takes a qualitative approach of examining scientific data to examine TAF as an organizational culture to shed light on which dynamics have played important roles in its evolution.

This paper has three main sections followed by the conclusion: a theoretical overview of culture and organizational culture; discussion of the evolution of Turkish military culture; examination of the dynamics underlying this evolution.

A Brief Literature Review: Culture and Organizational Cultures

As a key component explaining human attitudes, values, and life patterns, culture is an important subject of sociological, psychological, and civilizational scholarly discussion. Regarding its dictionary definition, Webster defines culture as “the combination of shared behaviors, values, goals, and practices that defines an institution or organization”. The important element is that culture can be related to many groups, such as “nations, organizations, occupations, professions, religious groups, ethnic groups etc.”. Culture can provide these groups with the basic features that emphasize their core values.

Turning to scholarly definitions, Schein describes culture as combinations of structures, routines, rules, and norms that guide and limit behavior. It is a dynamic phenomenon that always surrounds us, and that is persistently reenacted and recreated by our contacts with others, and shaped by leadership attitudes. It includes a set of values, beliefs, communications, and simplification of attitudes that give direction to peoples. According to Schein, culture is a collection of miscellaneous values and attitudes that can provide a guide to success. For Kotter and Heskett, culture is an assembly of beliefs, behaviors, and values that normally characterize societies. The essential idea of culture involves sharing learning processes based on the appropriate allocas-
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Anthropologists use it to refer to the traditions and rituals that societies develop during their history. Hofstede defined culture as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another.”

For the first modern Turkish sociologist, Ziya Gökalp, culture is a harmonious integration of the religious, moral, legal, mental, aesthetic, linguistic, economic, and scientific life of a nation. He viewed culture as an essential component for nation building because he believed it could enable the harmonious integrity of the nation’s social life.

The term culture is complemented by several other critical elements associated with sharing: structural stability, depth, breadth, and patterning or integration.

Culture at the organizational level has become a focus of scientific research since the Pettigrew’s 1979 article “Studying Organizational Culture”. Likewise, Kotter and Heskett have proposed using the concept of culture to describe organizations.

Schein argues that organizational culture may contain two key elements of social groups: structural stability of a set of people and assimilation of an individual to certain values. Stewart argues that organizational norms and values have a huge effect on those who are fully dedicated to the organization. Although these norms may be tacit, organizations that wish to increase profits through the efficiency of their employees should prioritize such norms.

Furthermore, Hofstede further relates culture to ethnicities, local groups, organizations, profession, subcultural groups, political systems and legal guidelines. Sinha suggests that culture is the chief factor that differentiates one individual from another as well as one organization from others.

---

8 Schein, op. cit., p. 7.
9 Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, p. 5 cited in Hofstede, “Management scientists are human”, p. 4.
As these definitions suggest, organizational culture is a critical element for creating organizational identity through shared values. Pettigrew, for example, strongly argues that human mental skills of thinking and decision-making depend on that culture.¹⁷

Siğri et al. contend that dynamics such as human sentiments and behaviors, as well as technological and sociological forces originating outside organizations have gained greater importance in applying organizational behavior analysis to the military.¹⁸ Finally, Schein defines organizational culture as the shared essential assumptions, values, and beliefs that characterize a setting, and which are taught to new members as the appropriate ways to think and feel about the organization, its progress, and its methods to solve problems related to external adaptation and internal integration.¹⁹

**Evolution of Turkish Military Culture**

Because Turkish military culture has evolved through a series of social, political, military, economic, and security events, an historical survey of Turkish culture is required to understand this development.

Turkish culture developed from the life patterns of former Turkic tribes living in Asia before they migrated West in the middle of the 8th century due to negative natural events and the need for new grazing areas. The life patterns of these old tribes were very simple and nomadic, focused on horse herding and the aim of expanding into unoccupied areas. Women had equality and a role in the decision-making system. These tribes experienced persistent war conditions in which both men and women had to be ready for fighting within a strict military command structure.

These old Turkish life patterns had a huge impact on the cultural development of Turkish society and its military culture in that always being in or being prepared for war created a culture that attached great importance to the military. It had some implications for creating the “soldier nation (asker millet)” approach that is still alive among Turks. Besides, the nomadic life under harsh conditions forced society to live under a central authority to survive.

---


This centralized governance created a culture of obedience in both society and the military. Traces of the life patterns of early Turkish societies can still be seen in modern Turkish society’s culture of deep respect for authority.

The early life patterns also created a culture that attached great importance to women in social life and in military. Thus, women sometimes held power alongside male kin. This demonstrates that women’s role in Turkish society was based on equality and ability.

Turkey’s military culture was also established based on these norms, values, rules, and principles. The unsettled nomadic life, the need for grazing areas and food, and necessity of survival led early tribes to compete with neighboring tribes or group. This had also help to create a strong military understanding. For example, Mete Han was the first Turkish leader to develop an organizational culture by institutionalizing a military structure based on a system of multiples of ten in around Second Century.

As this history outlines, the life patterns of old Turkish tribes or empires created a culture in line with the definitions cited above, such as Schein’s culture is a collection of different values and attitudes assessed as a guide to success; or as outlined by Kotter and Heskett culture is gathering of beliefs, behaviors and values that society includes.

After Turks accepted Islam in the 7-8th centuries, its values were incorporated into the military culture. Islam’s major cultural contribution was the “gaza” culture of conquering on behalf of religion. By encouraging Turks to conquer new western territory, it led to founding the Ottoman Empire.

During the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish military significantly influenced every aspect of society in that “soldiering has always played a central role in Turkish culture”. This culture was cultivated over centuries as the military led the Turkish community. As earlier nomadic Turkish tribes migrated westwards from Central Asia, they required strong unity, leading to obedience of power after they later adopted a settled life. These tribes also had to be fierce fighters to survive, which significantly influenced Turkish people’s view of themselves as military in character. The last era of the Turkish empire, the Ottomans, expressed this particular structure in statements like “[t]he Ottoman Empire, too, was ‘n army” before it was anything else’, created and sustained through conquest and designed for territorial expansion’. Consequently, “the Otto-

20 Schein, op.cit.
21 Kotter - Heskett, op. cit.
man state was born as a ‘warrior state’ and the military continued to be part of integral part of oligarchic center that ruled the Empire”. This particular cultural and sociological evolution also determined its military recruitment system.

The other important historical factor was the pioneering characteristics of the Ottoman military. In the 18th century, as the Ottoman Empire weakened and lost territory, several modernization and Westernization efforts were initiated during the reigns of two reformist Sultans, Selim III (1792-1808) and Mahmud II (1818-1839). These projects continued through the Tanzimat Era (1839-1866), during Sultan Abdulhamit II’s reign (1876-1908), and the Young Turk era (1908-1918). Since the military was the leading component of the Empire, modernization initiatives focused on this field, including creating new armies, founding new schools, bringing in foreign teachers and advisors from Europe, and introducing a new conscription system. Through the adoption of new European technology, information and philosophy in the mid-19th century, the Ottoman military became a pioneer of modernization, Westernization, and technological innovation. That is, “the military was the first institution of the Ottoman Empire to modernize, adopting Western military strategy, weapons, as well as science and education methods”. These efforts enabled military officers and Ottoman intellectuals to become acquainted with the latest Western technology, ideologies, and social ideas. In particular, the Empire’s civil and military elites were significantly influenced by nationalism, liberalism, and secularism, which were subsequently incorporated into the new Turkish Republic.

Several other factors enabled the Turkish military to develop such dominance. First, Turkish people have, historically, usually accepted the ruling power without revolting against the power holders. Indeed, it is difficult to find

27 Lewis, op. cit., p. 75-128; Zurcher, op. cit., p. 22-53.
30 For more detailed information, see Lewis, op. cit. and Berkes, op. cit., and Sertif Demir - Oktay Bingöl, “From military tutelage to civilian control: an analysis of the evolution of Turkish civil-military relations”, British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 2018, DOI: 10.1080/13530194.2018.1491291.
a single historical example of domestic social unrest that did not have foreign support. This mainly resulted from a centuries-old state-centric ruling system. As Gareth Jenkins puts it regarding this peculiar patriarchal structure, “Turks do not have a tradition of tolerating pluralism on a social level and almost invariably bow to authority rather than challenge [it]”.31

The other factor is that the late Ottoman State was involved in a series of wars, including the Tripoli War of 1911, the Balkan War of 1912, and World War I (WWI). The Mudros Armistice between the Allies and the Ottoman State on October 30, 1918, ended both WWI and the 600-hundred-year-old Ottoman Empire.32 Subsequently, England, France, and Italy attempted to partition the Ottoman Empire’s territory, including much of the Empire’s Anatolian homeland, and occupy its capital, Istanbul. These violent developments “shattered, impoverished and demoralized”33 the country. In this catastrophic situation, the Turkish Army was the main social force able to resist the foreign troops invading Anatolia, organizing both civilian and military resistance. Eventually, after successfully driving out all the invaders, they were able to establish the Turkish Republic from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire by the massive efforts of the Republic’s first leader, Mustafa Kemal, later Atatürk, and his colleagues.

Several scholars have commented positively about the legacy of this military dominance. According to Capezza, since the days of the Ottoman Empire and throughout the Turkish Republic, “the military has been the one institution that has repeatedly checked civilian autocratic tendencies, maintained moderation, and ensured the preservation of the state”,34 while for Jenkin, “amid the volatility of pluralism, the military became regarded as a stable and stabilizing factor; the guardian not only of the state but also of Atatürk’s ideological legacy of Kemalism”.35 Lenze claims that “the military is seen as the ultimate guarantor of the nation by Turkish society”.36

In short, by holding a dominant position historically, acting as the first adopter of modernization and Westernization, and by protecting Turkish territory to find the Turkish Republic, the Turkish military gained its highly prestigious social status. Turkey’s modern military culture has developed from these historical understandings and perceptions. It has been transformed into a distinctive and persistent historically influenced organizational culture. As Sığrı et al. describe it,

32 More detailed information see Lewis op. cit., p. 238-268.
35 Jenkins, op. cit., p. 341.
Values like loyalty to the nation, obedience, determination and endurance, courage and bravery, self-sacrifice, getting along with peers, ethical behavior, honesty, altruism, professionalism, accountability, and competence are written into Turkish military culture.\textsuperscript{37}

Organizational Culture of the Turkish Military

Organizational culture reflects the norms, values, preferences, and principles that an organization employs for its members to create organizational identity. Stewart argues that an organization’s norms and values have a huge effect on those members fully dedicated to the organization. From a business perspective, if organizations wish to raise profits and the efficiency of their employees, then they must prioritize these norms.\textsuperscript{38} Without an appropriate organizational culture, employees will be unlikely to work towards the goals of the organization. Organizational culture encourages loyalty to the firms’ values and adherence to its group identity.

Hofstede’s cultural value dimensions have been the major analytical tool to examine organizational culture or behavior. He claims that value differences depend on nationality differences,\textsuperscript{39} which he classified as follows: individualism–collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity–femininity.\textsuperscript{40}

Over time, organizations develop distinctive and persistent organizational cultures.\textsuperscript{41} From a national perspective, national culture can be employed like organizational culture to create and enhance national identity,

\textsuperscript{37} Siğri-Varoğlu - Ercil, op. cit., p. 9.
\textsuperscript{38} Stewart, op. Cit.
\textsuperscript{40} ‘Individualism–collectivism, defined as “the degree to which people in a country prefer to act as individuals rather than as members of groups”. Power distance, defined as “the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally”. Uncertainty avoidance, defined as “the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations. The fourth dimension is masculinity–femininity, with masculinity defined as “the extent to which the dominant values in society are ‘masculine’—that is, assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things” and femininity defined as the opposite of masculinity, that is, dominance of feminine values such as preference for “friendly atmosphere, position security, physical conditions, [and] cooperation”. All these information was gathered at G. Hofstede, \textit{Culture’s consequences: International differences}, Beverly Hills, CA: Sagel 1980; G. Hofstede, Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad?, \textit{Organizational Dynamics}, 9, 1980, 42–63; 45; G. Hofstede, ‘Management scientists are human’, \textit{Management Science}, 40, 1994, 4–14, p. 5-6. All of them are also cited in Vas Taras, Bradley L. Kirkman, Piers Steel, “Examining the Impact of Culture’s Consequences: A Three-Decade, Multilevel, Meta-Analytic Review of Hofstede’s Cultural Value Dimensions”, \textit{Journal of Applied Psychology}, XCV., No. 3, 2010, 405–439.
\textsuperscript{41} Siğri - Varoğlu - Ercil, op. cit., p., 3.
Organizational Culture and the Turkish Military

boost national unity, and increase national solidarity. Like any other organization, the military can be affected by the surrounding cultural environment.\textsuperscript{42} From this perspective, national culture is a significant environment for military organizational culture: “Military culture as an element of national culture is influenced, on the one hand, by national characteristics, on the other by military skills, training and experience.” \textsuperscript{43}

Turkey’s military has developed an organizational culture that mostly gains its personnel’s obedience, loyalty, and adherence. This a distinctive feature that needs to be examined. The tools or dynamics that the Turkish military uses include legislative regulations, historical values and nationalism, education, social benefits, and alliances. While other factors have influenced its organizational culture, these are the most significant dynamics influencing the evolution of Turkish military organizational culture.

**Legislative Regulations**

The organizational structure of Turkey’s military was established by several laws approved by Turkey’s Grand National Assembly. Governments then published directives to implement these laws while the military command itself issues the necessary orders to implement them. These legislative arrangements can dictate certain responsibilities and punishments while conducting military tasks. They also clarify the roles, functions, responsibilities, rewards, and punishments for all military personnel. These clear and well-written rules based on equality and transparency encourage the organizational loyalty of personnel, which strengthens the organizational culture. This is a good example of successfully assimilating individuals to organizational goals, as suggested by Schein.\textsuperscript{44} That is, military personnel understand and appreciate being a member of a well-running organization.

**Historical values and nationalism (national culture)**

The military can employ Turkish historical values and nationalism feeling as a tool to merge all individual toward group identity. Being a member of one of the oldest military establishments full of many heroic stories can make individuals proud of their history. As part of the national culture with its associated historical emotions, nationalism can increase commitment to the military and assist in forming its social culture. This relates to Gokalp’s cultural concept of culture as the harmonious integration of the religious, moral, legal, mental, aesthetic, linguistic, economic, and scientific life of a nation.\textsuperscript{45} Historical values and nationalism can also enhance collectivism at the expense

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44} Schein, Organizational culture, 1995.
\textsuperscript{45} Yildirim, op. cit., p. 12-13.
of individualism. As Daniel Bar-Tal argues, these factors can augment social values, togetherness, sense of belonging to a certain identity, and patriotic feelings. Three beliefs of devotion, loyalty, and pride as universal patriotic expressions make individuals feel that they are members of a group in the country they reside in.46

**Education and the conscription system**

Education and the conscription system are further instruments for creating a military organizational culture in Turkey. By exposing young recruits and serving soldiers to the Turkish military’s goals, these tools have been used effectively to build an organizational identity, a sense of belonging to the military, and an organizational culture. To do so, the curricula of both military schools and normal state schools have been designed to promote nationalism, respect for the military, appreciation of heroic stories, and adoption of military values, norms, and rules. The military schools themselves play a critical role in assimilating individuals to the organizational culture.

**Conscription**

The early Turkish Republic used its compulsory recruitment system effectively to create a sacred bond between the people and the military. Thus, it was a tool of social engineering to reshape society, with military service viewed as a way to create a new link between state and citizens, and an opportunity to teach the new Republican philosophy to the youth to consolidate its founding principles among the masses. This was influenced by the Ottoman army’s early 20th-century Prussian trainers, who saw conscription as a link between the ‘holy state and citizen’. Conscription was a tool to indoctrinate the youth with the concept of a holy state and a mechanism to link state and citizen.47 After the foundation of the Republic, Atatürk and his colleagues, who were mostly military officers, “were determined to westernize and secularize Turkey’s government, laws, education system, and even its clothes and alphabet .”48 Atatürk also wanted to take advantage of the military and its institutions to develop the nation. In this, he appears to have been influenced by the ideas of General Colmar Freiherr von der Goltz (1843–1916), the German general assigned to restructure and revitalize the Ottoman Army in the nineteenth century,49 who

---


49 Jenkins, op. Cit., p. 341.
had argued that a military educational system was the best, and that the barrack should become the “school of the people”.\textsuperscript{50} Atatürk also referred to this idea, once stating for example: “A barracks is not just the place for teaching of war, but also a cultural hearth and an art school. By being this, its service to country is immeasurable”.\textsuperscript{51} In short, compulsory conscription was regarded as the main tool to create both an organizational and societal culture, and as instrument for nation-building.\textsuperscript{52}

This obligatory military system had social and cultural implications for society. In accordance with the historical military character of the Turkish nation, being a soldier was considered an important duty. Most Turks refer to military service as ‘vatani görev’, meaning ‘duty for the motherland’, rather than compulsory service, conscription, or other term that implies involuntariness. The family send off for sons going to do their military service is like a wedding ceremony, which is unique to Turks. A young man cannot be considered mature until completing military service, and many fathers are unwilling to allow their daughters to marry a man who has not completed his military service.\textsuperscript{53} This tool best fits Shein’s approach, which that describes how organizational culture as the shared basic assumptions, values, and beliefs that define a setting for newcomers.\textsuperscript{54}

**Social benefits**

Social benefits can also help create a social and organization culture. Being a member of the Turkish military can provide more social benefits than other similar jobs, such as higher salary, officer clubs, summer vacation camps, membership of the Turkish Armed Forces Assistance and Pension Fund (OYAK), earlier retirement possibilities, and higher quality education. These can also boost the social culture, group identity, and organizational behavior and culture since losing them means many more losses. Therefore, military members willingly accept and internalize the organizational culture.

**Alliance culture**

Generally, when militaries have alliance relations, it can create an alliance culture emphasizing the alliance’s objectives, goals, principle, norms, and values. Alliance culture and behavior require obedience to certain rules and norms.

\textsuperscript{50} M. Sukru Hanioglu, “Civil-Military Relations in the Second Constitutional Period, 1908–1918”, Turkish Studies, XII/177-189; David Pion-Berlin, “Turkish Civil-Military Relations: A Latin American Comparison”, Turkish Studies, XII/2, 293–304, June 2011, p. 298.


\textsuperscript{52} For more information, see Demir & Bingöl, op. Cit.

\textsuperscript{53} Demir- Eminoglu, op. cit., p. 15.

\textsuperscript{54} Schein, Organizational Culture and Leadership 2010; Trice-Beyer, op. cit., Zohar-Hofmann op. cit. All of them are cited in Schneider et. al., op cit., 361–88.
Turkey has been a NATO member since 1952 and has alliance relations with Western bloc. Being of this alliance requires that all members comply with freedom, democratic life, and liberal economic policies. Although military culture is influenced by the national culture, it also interacts with international environment, with significant internal impacts. 55 There should also be shared values between the national military organization and international organizations. As Stewart notes, the organization’s norms and values have a huge effect over the members who are fully devoted to the organization. 56 Therefore, as long as the Turkish military or civilian power desire to continue NATO and UN membership, this certainly promotes an alliance culture that influences the national military organizational culture.

**Leadership Role**

Honorable and respectable leaders can also enhance group identity in the military. Generally, Turkish military commanders are well educated and set an example for their units. These acts play an important role in creating the organizational culture that fosters a societal identity.

The organizational culture of the Turkish military can also be probed using Hofstede’s four variables. Uncertainty avoidance would encourage minimizing uncertainty and ambiguity in the military through clear legislative regulations. Turkish military culture reflects a mostly strong power distance culture through central planning, strong leadership, and legislative restrictions. Finally, the military culture is heavily masculine, although there has been some improvement for females. 57

**Conclusion**

This paper has examined how Turkish military culture has evolved along with its military’s organizational culture. As an organization, TAF has a unique character and culture, which has played a key role in its outstanding social status in Turkey. TAF has a set of gradually evolving values, principles, norms, rules, and practices that characterize its organizational culture. Overall, without forgetting the influence of national culture, Turkish military culture was nourished through the early tribes’ culture, the military’s historically dominant social position, its pioneering of modernization and Westernization, and its role as founder and sole protector of the Republic. Turkish military culture has been transformed through history into a distinctive and resilient organizational culture.
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The Turkish military has formed an organizational culture that mostly earns its personnel’s obedience, loyalty, and adherence. The tools, instruments, or dynamics that the Turkish military has utilized include legislative regulations, historical values and nationalism, education and the conscription system, social benefits, leadership, and alliances. These dynamics direct all members towards the military’s goals while encouraging individual members to adopt the group identity. Besides, its organizational culture fosters patriotic and heroic feelings, strengthens loyalty, and unites all members within the organization. Its members feel the sense of togetherness as taught to them by the organization.

The organizational culture of the Turkish military comprises the shared basic norms, rules, values, and beliefs taught to create a common identity to entrants. This organizational culture makes its personnel feel part of an exclusive organization where heroism, honor, patriotism, loyalty, and adherence characterize a common identity.
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