

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322703188>

Development of Militaristic Attitudes Scale and Its Associations With Turkish Identity and Uninational Ideology

Article in *Peace and Conflict Journal of Peace Psychology* · January 2018

DOI: 10.1037/pac0000296

CITATIONS

0

READS

109

2 authors:



Fatih Özdemir

Middle East Technical University

8 PUBLICATIONS 2 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Nuray Sakalli Ugurlu

Middle East Technical University

55 PUBLICATIONS 2,000 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Gender stereotypes in Turkish culture [View project](#)

Development of Militaristic Attitudes Scale and Its Associations With Turkish Identity and Uninational Ideology

Fatih Özdemir and Nuray Sakallı Uğurlu
Middle East Technical University

It is worthwhile to search the associations among militaristic attitudes, national identity, and uninational ideology empirically because they may be highly relevant to various issues such as support for military actions, using military to solve intergroup conflicts, and the willingness to join the army. The main purpose of the article was to empirically examine the associations among militaristic attitudes, national identity, and uninational ideology. To pursue this aim, we first developed a militaristic attitudes scale, covering attitudes toward military, militarization, and militarism (Study 1); and then explored the predictive powers of Turkish identity and uninational ideology on the militaristic attitudes (Study 2). University students ($N = 339$; 215 women and 124 men; $Mdn_{age} = 23$, $M_{age} = 23.84$, $SD = 4.44$) completed an item pool of Militaristic Attitudes Scale and demographic information form in Study 1. Factor analyses of the scale resulted in 5 factors (attitudes toward followings issues: existence of the military [$\alpha = .95$], value of the military [$\alpha = .89$], militaristic system [$\alpha = .81$], political position of military [$\alpha = .75$], and compulsory military service [$\alpha = .87$]). In Study 2, 583 university students (318 women and 265 men; $Mdn_{age} = 22$, $M_{age} = 22.09$, $SD = 2.32$) completed the scales of militaristic attitudes, social identity, and uninational ideology as well as demographic information form. People who strongly identified with Turkish nationalism and supported uninational ideology had higher positive militaristic attitudes after controlling for demographic variables. These studies resulted in a reliable and valid scale to test militaristic attitudes at various levels such as institutional, system based, and ideological. Both studies provided some possible answers about who would support militaristic attitudes more within a society. These results may be useful for researchers who study militarism, militarization, identity, and nationalism.

Public Significance Statement

The current research provided a reliable and valid measure to test militaristic attitudes at various levels such as institutional, system based, and ideological. The study also presented some possible answers for who support militaristic attitudes more within the Turkish society, and what are the existing reasons behind militaristic attitudes. These answers may be important for social scientists, politicians, and lawmakers who desire to understand the nature of Turkish society.

Keywords: militaristic attitudes, military, militarization, militarism, Turkish identity

Nationalistic, militaristic, and uninational ideologies are observed in almost every culture. These ideologies may be important variables to any increase in hostile behaviors toward minority groups or other nations, and an increased willingness to join the army in a specific country (e.g., Reiter, 2013). When spirit of the

time is ready, these ideologies may gain importance in some cultures and lead to hostility toward other nations. Therefore, it is valuable to search these significant social concepts empirically in the field of social psychology. Although there are many nonempirical publications about the association between militarism and

Editor's Note. Continue the conversation by submitting your comments and questions about this article/book review to PeacePsychology.org/peaceconflict. (The Editor of PeacePsychology.org reserves the right to exclude material that fails to contribute to constructive discussion.)

theory; relative deprivation theory; extreme pro-group actions; national and ethnic identities; intergroup relations; and attitudes and attitude change.

NURAY SAKALLI UĞURLU is a faculty member in the psychology department at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. She received her PhD from the University of Kansas, Kansas, US. Her areas of research interests include social influence; minority influence; attitudes and attitude change; stereotyping and sexism; and women issues.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THIS ARTICLE should be addressed to Fatih Özdemir, Psychology Department (Psikoloji Bölümü), Middle East Technical University (Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi), 06531, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: psyfatihozdemir@gmail.com

This article was published Online First January 25, 2018.

FATİH ÖZDEMİR received his master's degree in psychology in 2013 from Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. He is currently a PhD student in psychology at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey; and a visiting researcher at the University of Texas at Austin, Texas, US. His research interests include identity fusion theory; social identity

nationalism (e.g., Danson, 2004; Reiter, 2013), few studies have empirically examined the issues in social psychology literature (e.g., Kimhi & Kashner, 2015). There are also some attempts to measure attitudes toward the military, and attitudes toward war (e.g., Braun-Lewensohn, Abu-Kaf, & Sagy, 2015; Nelson, 1995); but no study has attempted to cover various relevant levels of militaristic attitudes such as supporting existence of the military, value of the military, militaristic system, political position of military, and compulsory military service.

Similar to researchers from other countries, Turkish researchers from different disciplines have also argued that there might be a strong association among militarism, national identity, sociocultural structure, and compulsory military service (Altnay, 2004; Sünbuloğlu, 2013). However, there is no empirical study covering the issues in Turkey. Recently, Sakallı-Uğurlu and Özdemir (2017) examined the association among Turkish identification, ambivalent sexism, and attitudes toward the masculine structure of military in Turkey but they did not focus on militaristic attitudes. The present study aims to fill the gap by focusing on the development of a militaristic attitudes scale and its association with Turkish identity and uninational ideology. We aim to develop a militaristic attitudes scale in Study 1 to use it in Study 2, which examines the association among militaristic attitudes, Turkish identification, and uninational ideology. Study 2, in return, also provides some evidence for validity of the developed scale in Study 1. Both Study 1 and 2 contribute the literature on militarism, militarization, and nationalism issues, by providing researchers with a new scale to study militaristic attitudes and with an empirical proof to show its association with identification and uninational ideology in the case of the Turkish nation. This article may also present general information about the structure of Turkish society that may be important for social scientists, politicians, and lawmakers who desire to understand the nature of Turkish society.

Militaristic Attitudes

Several aspects of militaristic attitudes have been studied in Western countries. For example, Eckhardt and Newcombe (1969) examined the associations among militaristic attitudes, rigidity, conservatism, religiosity, and dogmatism. Festl, Scharnow, and Quandt (2013) explored the association between use of digital games and militaristic attitudes covering three subfactors as soldier admiration, army necessity, and terrorist threat. Further, most militaristic attitudes (or militarism) scales, in Western cultures, include attitudes toward war and peace (e.g., Braun-Lewensohn et al., 2015) or attitudes toward military responses to international conflicts (e.g., Nelson, 1995). The attitude object of the article is different from concepts of militaristic attitudes in other research in Western countries. The main purpose of the article is to cover the conceptualization of military, militarization, and militarism (Altnay, 2004; Cheney, 1998; Enloe, 1993).

In the social sciences, some researchers have argued that there are three levels of militaristic issues to focus on such as the military (institutional), militarization (process), and militarism (ideology) that are intercorrelated (Adelman, 2003; Altnay, 2004; Cheney, 1998; Enloe, 1993). At the institutional level, the military is defined as a social institution (Cheney, 1998; Enloe, 1993), and as “groups of people united by common interest, endowed with material equipment, following rules of their tradition or agreement,

and contributing towards the work of the culture as a whole” (Malinowski, 1945/2013, p. 50). Similarly, Turkish scholars have argued that Turkish people value the military, and perceive it as natural and cultural to protect the Turkish nation (Sünbuloğlu, 2013). Therefore, understanding attitudes toward military at the institutional level can be important to see how individuals perceive the military. Institutional level militaristic attitudes may include institution-based evaluations including value, necessity, and respectability of military as a social institution. People who support militaristic attitudes may support the existence of the military institution in their countries, may evaluate military as a valuable and respectable sociocultural institution of society. They may perceive it as a necessary social institution which benefits society.

Second, militarization issues can be examined in terms of attitudes because researchers have covered the ways in which societies become militarized. According to Enloe (2000) militarization is a step-by-step social process by which individuals are gradually controlled by the military. The transformation of individuals may create the perception that the military is normal, valuable, and needed. The militarization of society may occur because of the naturalization of militarism. The process requires a complex relationship among the army, politics, and society (Ben-Eliezer, 1998). Following these arguments, Turkish researchers have argued that a successful militarization process exists in Turkey. Militarization exerts influence on civilian life, diplomacy, and the economy in Turkish culture. Because of the militarization process, militarism and military may be perceived as natural and cultural. The borders between military and sociocultural and political life may disappear in societies where militarism is important (Sünbuloğlu, 2013). The association between military and politics are clearly observed throughout Turkish political and military history. Politicians used Turkish army to achieve their goals. Turkish army overthrew several elected governments (e.g., 1960, 1971, and 1980 coup *d'états*) to impose its own brand of political correctness. For example, in the 1970s there were right-wing/left-wing conflicts in Turkey. The September 12, 1980 Turkish coup *d'état* was headed by Chief of the General Staff General Kenan Evren to eliminate the political and financial conflict in Turkey (Karacan, 2015). In fact, recently in 2016, Turkey experienced July 15 military coup attempt (unsuccessful one), reflecting some religious and political conflict (Shaheen, 2016). Consequently, considering these effects of militarization, attitude object was assumed to be related whether or not individuals approve current militaristic system and evaluate it as fair, cultural, natural, and reliable; and whether they even support authority of and active role of the military in the regime and political issues such as supporting military coups.

Third, militarism can be considered in measuring militaristic attitudes. Militarism is an ideology and defined as “a set of ideas and structures that glorify practices and norms associated with militaries” (Cheney, 1998, p. 101). Militarism can be also defined as an ideology that claims that the military is the most important aspect of a society. The ideology may lead to militarization and create a strong military in the society. This ideology promotes militaristic skills of the nation and supports the idea that the national interests should be defended aggressively by the military. In Turkey, the ideological part of militaristic attitudes has been strengthened via discourses of “every Turkish man is born soldier,” “Turkish-nation is a military-nation,” and “military service

is a sacred duty” (Altınay, 2004). According to military law of government no 1,111 (Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Defense, 1927), military service is compulsory for each Turkish man who is in age range from 20 to 41 (http://www.msb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Docs/askeralma/1111_As.Kanunu.pdf). Militarism and compulsory military service are justified and supported through the ideal citizen discourses that are attached with perceived ideal man characteristics (Feinman, 2000) such as self-sacrificing, brave, honorable, patriotic, and obedient to authority and warrior. Also, ideal man keeps his nation safe from enemies and fights for the interests of the nation (National Security Knowledge, 1998). Considering the issues mentioned above, militaristic attitudes may cover how Turkish people perceive the military and compulsory military service, volunteerism in military service, and the possibility to complete the compulsory military service with a large payment (rarely government may excuse some men from the compulsory military service with an exchange of a high amount of money in Turkey).

In short, measuring militaristic attitudes may require examining various issues relevant to the military, militarization, and militarism. In Turkish literature, militaristic attitudes have not been studied empirically. There are some studies on militarism in the field of social sciences such as anthropology (Karacagil, 2014), and history (Balkan-Tec, 2015), but social psychologists have not examined the issues extensively. As social psychologists, we believe that it is important to explore the militaristic attitudes and their associates. To our knowledge, Sakallı-Uğurlu and Özdemir (2017) searched attitudes toward the masculine structure of the military, and their association with ambivalent sexism in Turkey. There was also an attempt to construct a scale focusing on the militarism in terms of political, civic, international and institutional issues in Turkey (Kışloğlu & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2009). However, they presented their work at a conference as an in-progress study. They did not work on it further. Therefore, first, it is important to extend these studies from Turkey by developing a new valid and reliable militaristic attitudes scale, covering various issues such as approval of existence of the military, perceived value of the military, its interference in politics, acceptance as a valuable system, and support for the compulsory military service. Second, we aim to examine the predictors of these militaristic attitudes as Turkish identification and uninational ideology. The second study serves two different purposes as (a) showing the association among militaristic attitudes, national identity, and uninational ideology, and (b) providing validity for the developed scale that was needed for the main study.

Predictors of Militaristic Attitudes as Identification and Uninational Ideology

As mentioned earlier, militaristic attitudes may be highly correlated with identification with Turkishness and uninational ideology. In the militarism literature, researchers have presented a positive correlation between nationalism and militarism (Bliss, Oh, & Williams, 2007; Eckhardt, 1969; Eckhardt, Manning, Morgan, Subotnik, & Tinker, 1967). It seems that people who believe that one’s nation is the best and should do whatever is necessary to maintain its international superiority and to protect its existence seems to be related to militarism. Further, past research (e.g., Eckhardt & Newcombe, 1969; McCleary & Williams, 2009) has

suggested that militarism is not only correlated with nationalism but also associated with religiosity, authoritarianism, conservatism, blind patriotism, dominance-power, ethnocentrism, and masculinity.

In terms of identity, researchers have argued that national identity can be defined as a larger form of social identity (Cingöz-Ulu, 2008), and people may define themselves by using their nationality (Guibernau, 2007). In the case of Turkey, historical documents suggest that Turkish national identity carries militaristic characteristics (Ilhan, 1989; İnalçık, 1964a, 1964b). Similarly, some national expressions emphasize the importance of militaristic parts of Turkish national identity such as “we - self-sacrificing and warrior Turks.” Turkish researchers have also presented that Turkish nationalist trusted more in the military (Gürsoy, 2012), and Turkish identification predicted attitudes toward the masculine structure of the military (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Özdemir, 2017).

Furthermore, how people define themselves in terms of their nationality may influence the ethnic group relations within a nation. As indicated in social psychological theories of intergroup relations, people have a tendency to have an “us-and-them” distinction (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Relevant to the social identification, within a multiethnic structure, ethnic group differentiation may lead to in-group favoritism and out-group discrimination (Sherif, 1966; Tajfel, 1981). Similarly, researchers have suggested that in many cultures some people have a tendency to have exclusive negative attitudes toward ethnic/cultural minority groups in a country. They are not tolerant to the diversity in a country to protect the unity of the nation. They may argue that emphasizing different identities in a country may harm the unity of the country. A country should not have linguistic differences because the difference may divide the country. These beliefs may strengthen ethnic conflict and dominative attitudes of the majority over the minority that is called uninational ideology (Cingöz-Ulu, 2008).

Turkey is a country in which various nations live together. According to the report of Turkey National Security Council (2008), more than 20-million people are from different ethnic or cultural groups such as Kurds (12.6-million), Circassians (2.5-million), Bosniaks (2-million), Albanians, Arabs, Armenians, Laz, Jews, Greeks, and so forth in Turkey. In addition, recently the number of ethnic groups has increased with the migration of about 3-million Syrian people from Syria to Turkey (The UN Refugee Agency, 2017). Uninational ideology may be very salient in Turkey. Individuals who are highly identified with Turkishness may indicate more commitment to group characteristics (e.g., militaristic characteristics for Turkey) and greater tendency to favor their own group (Brewer, 1999; Mummendey, Klink, & Brown, 2001; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Consequently, uninational ideology can be also included in the equation to understand the militaristic attitudes further because, as well as Turkey, many countries consist of more than one nation. Therefore, we expect that uninational ideology may be strongly associated with militaristic attitudes.

Demographic Variables

The literature on militarism has presented that it is important to cover some demographic variables such as gender difference, age, education level, political view, and military affiliation while study-

ing militaristic attitudes. In terms of gender difference, past researches have shown that men express more supportive militaristic attitudes than women do (Burris, 2008; Droba, 1931; Holsti & Rosenau, 1995; Moore & Dolan, 2012; Page & Bouton, 2006). In Turkish sample, however, Gürsoy (2012) found that trust in the military was higher in women than men. Further, Sakallı-Uğurlu and Özdemir (2017) showed that both men and women from Turkey tended to support the superiority of men in the military and its masculine characteristics. Because of the inconsistent results on gender difference, we want to explore the association between gender difference and militaristic attitudes.

For age and education level, some earlier studies (e.g., Eckhardt & Newcombe, 1969) could not find any correlation between age, education, and militarism. Recent studies have shown that people with a higher age and lower education presented stronger militaristic attitudes in Germany (Festl et al., 2013), and higher trust in the military in Turkey (Gürsoy, 2012). Consistently, we expect that especially education may predict militaristic attitudes in Turkey. Lower education may lead to stronger approval for existence of the military, the compulsory military service, and stronger acceptance of the military, and its interference in politics.

In terms of political view, political attitudes were also connected to military service (Canetti-Nisim, Halperin, Sharvit, & Hobfoll, 2009; Kimhi & Kasher, 2015). Being on left or right side of the political spectrum may influence militaristic attitudes of people. Rightists are defined as more conservative, more nationalist, and more militarist than leftists (Moore & Dolan, 2012; Wilson, 1973). They tend to protect traditional and national social values, current social institutions, authority, social hierarchy, and status quo (Dalmış & İmamoğlu, 2000). A study conducted in Turkey (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Özdemir, 2017) presented that the more participants gravitated toward the conservative right of the political spectrum, the more strongly they supported the male-based structure or privileged position of men in the military. Accordingly, we predict that political view may predict militaristic attitudes in Turkey.

Finally, Young and Nauta (2013) documented that military-affiliated students had less approving attitudes toward women in combat. Sakallı-Uğurlu and Özdemir (2017) presented that the participants who were in the military or had relatives in the military were more likely to support the masculine structure of the military in Turkey. Relying on these previous studies, we expect that military affiliation predicts militaristic attitudes.

Aims of the Present Studies

In summary, the current article has two studies. The purpose of Study 1 is to develop a militaristic attitudes scale covering different aspects of militarism issues such as attitudes toward existence of the military, value of the military, militaristic system, political position of military, and compulsory military service. Study 2 aims at exploring the predictive powers of Turkish identification and uninational ideology on militaristic attitudes by controlling the effects of demographic variables such as gender difference, age, education level, political affiliation, and military affiliation.

Study 1

Method

Participants. There were 339 university students ($N_{\text{women}} = 215$ [63.4%] and $N_{\text{men}} = 124$ [36.6%]) who participated in Study 1. The age range of participants changed from 18 to 36 ($M_{\text{age}} = 23.84$; $SD = 4.44$). There were 260 (76.7%) undergraduate and 79 (23.3%) graduate students.

Instruments.

Militaristic Attitudes Scale–Item Pool. To create an item pool for measuring militaristic attitudes, we first reviewed the literature on militarism (e.g., Ray, 1972). Further, we examined existing scales about militarism and military (e.g., Kışlıoğlu & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2009). Then, we conducted brief interviews with graduate students in social sciences ($N_{\text{women}} = 8$ and $N_{\text{men}} = 4$) to provide some information about individuals' perception and attitudes about militarization, militarism, and the military. We asked the following questions: "What do you think about Turkish military and its function," "Can you evaluate the relationship between Turkish military and Turkish society," "Can you share your opinions about current militaristic system in Turkey," "How do you interpret the compulsory military service." Each interview lasted about 15 min and main thematic units were taken into consideration. People mostly specified the culturalized relations among Turkish military, Turkish society, and Turkish national identity. They highlighted the naturalized aspects of the current militaristic system. The interviews were only used to get some ideas about the attitude object to write Likert type of items. With the help of the literature review and the brief unstructured interviews, we wrote 96 items for our item pool. The items were about supporting existence of the military to protect the country from external threat; how people feel comfortable and confident because of the existence of the military; importance of military; whether existing militaristic system should be accepted/approved or restructured; and whether military should play active roles in politics or not; and perceiving compulsory military service as a necessary and important duty for men.

Then, items were evaluated in terms of their unambiguity, irrelevance, extreme resemblance, and neutrality. Also, items were checked for grammatical correctness, sentence smoothness—length, content integrity, the certainty of an item having either positive or negative direction to decide the last version of the item pool. Items that are double-barreled, bidirectional, metaphors, and incoherent words were removed whereas active and clear items were preferred. After the evaluation process, there were 82 Likert-type items (44 reverse) in the final item pool which was given to participants in Study 1. We used a 7-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes toward militaristic issues covered in the scale.

Demographic Information Form. Participants were asked to give information about their gender, age, education level, and political affiliation (from radical left to radical right on a 7-point scale). In addition, participants specified the type of their military affiliation such as "I am an active part of the military;" "I am a soldier"; "I am a cadet, I am working for the military"; "I am a soldier relative"; "I am a martyr/ghazi relative"; "I am a ghazi (ghazi is a given title to Muslim soldiers who got injured during military service or battle)"; or "I do not have any relation with the

military.” Based on their answers, participants were categorized into two groups as military affiliated or not military affiliated individuals.

Procedure. We applied the ethical review board of Middle East Technical University to get an approval. After receiving the research ethics committee approval, data was collected from non-psychology students who are taking an elective course from psychology departments from various universities in Ankara. Some participants earned extra credit for their participations, the rest voluntarily joined our study. First of all, they signed the informed consent form and then filled out the paper-based questionnaire package in the classroom environment. Each data collection session lasted in about 20 min.

Results

Factor structure. Exploratory factor analysis, namely principal component analysis, was conducted to test factor structure of the item pool. We eliminated items that failed to exceed .30 loading value; and that cross-loaded on many factors with similar loading values. In addition, we calculated item-total correlations and reliability. If an item showed low correlation with the total score of a factor, it was eliminated. After sequences of the analyses, we eliminated 39 items. Then, we conducted another factor analysis on the rest of the items we had (43 items). Results presented five-factor structure ($KMO = .96$, $\chi^2(903) = 9757.18$, $p < .001$) by using eigenvalue criteria (>1 as the cutoff point), and scree plot. Table 1 includes the factors, eigenvalue, explained variance, and α scores of the factors, item loadings, item-total correlations, and item-excluded α values.

The first factor was called as “*attitude toward existence of the military*” (9-reverse, in total 12-item). As presented in Table 1, the first factor explained 41.17% of total variance with 17.70 eigenvalue. Item loadings changed from .40 to .98, and item-total correlations were between .67 and .85. The first factor included items about the necessity of military and positive effect of the military on society, reflecting military as a social institution.

The second factor was called as “*attitude toward value of the military*” (10-item). As seen in Table 1, the second factor explained 6.36% of the variance with 2.74 eigenvalue. Item loadings changed from .40 to .84, and item-total correlations were between .48 and .72. The second factor was about respectability of the military and its action and decisions. This factor also evaluated the military as a social institution, and measured militaristic attitudes at the institutional level.

The third factor was named as “*attitude toward militaristic system*” (6-reverse, in total 9-item). The factor explained 3.96% of total variance with 1.70 eigenvalue. Item loadings ranged from .31 to .74. Item-total correlations were between .32 and .65. The third factor included items about justification of the current militaristic system, and evaluation of the system as fair, cultural, natural, reliable, and egalitarian. In short, the third factor may reflect militaristic attitudes in process level.

The fourth factor was named as “*attitude toward political position of military*” (3-reverse, in total 5-item). The fourth factor explained 3.47% of the variance with 1.49 eigenvalue. Item loadings ranged from .30 to .72. Item-total correlations were between .35 and .65. The fourth factor was relevant to process (militariza-

tion) including items about acceptance of the active political position of military and its authority on the regime.

The last factor was called as “*attitude toward compulsory military service*” (2-reverse, in total 7-item). The factor explained 3.69% of total variance with 1.59 eigenvalue. Item loadings changed from .34 to .83, and item-total correlations were between .40 and .84. The factor reflected the power of militarism, covering items about compulsory military service, conscientious objection, and military service by payment. They evaluate military service as a sacred duty of each male Turkish citizen.

As seen in Table 2, all subscales were significantly and positively associated with each other ($ps < .001$). These significant and positive associations among each other may suggest that they are about the same social construct, militaristic attitudes. Each factor touched on related subconstructs of militaristic attitudes.

As well as factor structure, to evaluate the construct validity further, the scale was tested with demographic variables. Except for the attitude toward value of the military, the rest of the subfactors were negatively correlated with gender of the participants ($rs \leq -.19$, $ps < .05$). All the factors were negatively correlated with age ($rs \leq -.25$, $ps < .01$) and education level ($rs \leq -.37$, $ps < .01$). The factors were also positively associated with political affiliation (coded as 1 = leftist, 2 = neutral, 3 = rightist; $rs \leq .34$, $ps < .01$; except for attitude toward political position of military) and military affiliation (coded as 1 = not related with the military, 2 = related with the military; $rs \leq .23$, $ps < .05$). Correlational results indicated that female, younger, lower educated, rightist, and military affiliated participants tended to have stronger militaristic attitudes. These findings were consistent with the literature and may support the construct validity of measure (see Table 2).

Internal consistency reliability. Internal consistency was tested with Cronbach α value. Alpha value for the whole scale was .96 (N of participants = 339; N of items = 43). The Cronbach’s α for the subfactors were .95, .89, .81, .75, and .87, respectively, showing satisfactory internal consistency.

Discussion

The first study demonstrated that Militaristic Attitudes Scale with its five subfactors is valid and reliable. In terms of reliability, internal consistency scores were acceptable and satisfactory because researchers have suggested that Cronbach’s α value should be at least .70 for a scale to be accepted as reliable (e.g., Kline, 2000; Schmitt, 1996). Further, following the argument of Aiken (1994) suggesting that item-total correlations should be higher than .20 for reliable scales, item-total correlations tended to support the reliability of the scale because they were higher than .30.

For the content validity issues, the items were written by following the literature on military, militarization, and militarism. Items were written in a way that they cover attitudes about various issues such as acceptance of its value and existence as an institution, its relations with politics, and supporting compulsory military service. Further, construct validity of measure was tested with factor structure and demographic variables. The findings relevant to demographic variables were consistent with the literature (e.g., Droba, 1931; Moore & Dolan, 2012; Roccas, 2005; Schwartz,

Table 1
Psychometric Characteristics of Militaristic Attitudes Scale

Militaristic attitudes scale	Item loading	Item total <i>r</i>	Item excluded α value
Factor 1: Attitude toward existence of the military eigenvalue = 17.70; explained variance (%) = 41.17; alpha value (α) = .95			
1. Eliminating military would bring peace. ^a	.98	.84	.94
2. Military should be completely eliminated. ^a	.97	.81	.95
3. Armed forces are redundant. ^a	.94	.75	.95
4. The existence of the military is a threat to peace. ^a	.89	.77	.95
5. Military should always be kept strong.	.83	.83	.95
6. It relieves me that military is a dissuasive force against the external threats.	.80	.77	.95
7. Military encourages people to use a gun. ^a	.78	.75	.95
8. Feeling the presence of military comforts me.	.71	.85	.94
9. The presence of military prevents the development of democracy. ^a	.60	.78	.95
10. I think that military limits the society. ^a	.54	.67	.95
11. Military ceremonies are a waste of time. ^a	.51	.75	.95
12. The presence of military hinders individual freedom. ^a	.40	.67	.95
Factor 2: Attitude toward value of the military eigenvalue = 2.74; explained variance (%) = 6.36; alpha value (α) = .89			
1. Military has a major role in the formation of Turkish identity.	.84	.55	.88
2. Military should be held above all other institutions.	.76	.71	.87
3. There is a strong relationship between military and the Turkish culture.	.72	.54	.88
4. Military is a result of long-term accumulation.	.69	.48	.88
5. All actions done by military are to the benefit of the society.	.66	.69	.87
6. Military holds the Turkish society together.	.61	.72	.87
7. News that depicts military in a negative light should not be featured in the media.	.60	.63	.88
8. Military should be approved without question.	.54	.50	.88
9. Overall, military is better than a lot of civil institutions.	.54	.67	.87
10. Military is an institution worthy of respect.	.40	.72	.87
Factor 3: Attitude toward militaristic system eigenvalue = 1.70; explained variance (%) = 3.96; alpha value (α) = .81			
1. The military system deteriorates every year. ^a	.74	.32	.81
2. The military system does not care about personal characteristics and individual thought. ^a	.73	.58	.78
3. Expressions such as every Turk is born a soldier have been constructed to protect the military system. ^a	.72	.46	.80
4. The existing military system is closed to criticism. ^a	.69	.53	.79
5. In the existing military system, everybody gets what they deserve.	.63	.50	.80
6. The military system should be restructured. ^a	.55	.42	.80
7. Everybody has equal and fair rights in the military system.	.52	.61	.78
8. Military is an artificial system that has been constructed to protect the existing order. ^a	.32	.50	.79
9. I believe that the military system is reliable and healthy.	.31	.65	.77
Factor 4: Attitude toward political position of military eigenvalue = 1.49; explained variance (%) = 3.47; alpha value (α) = .75			
1. Military coups carry the country back. ^a	.72	.52	.70
2. Military should be impartial in political matters. ^a	.70	.35	.75
3. Military should play an active role in politics.	.68	.49	.71
4. The effect of military on the state should be reduced. ^a	.52	.65	.65
5. The capabilities and power of military on the ruling should be increased.	.30	.56	.69
Factor 5: Attitude toward compulsory military service eigenvalue = 1.59; explained variance (%) = 3.69; alpha value (α) = .87			
1. Conscientious objection hurts the military system.	.83	.55	.86
2. Military service by payment is not suitable for the Turkish society.	.79	.52	.87
3. Military service should be based on the principles of conscience and volunteerism. ^a	.76	.40	.87
4. Every Turkish (man) citizen should fulfill their military service duty.	.50	.84	.82
5. Military service is a sacred duty.	.43	.83	.82
6. Doing military service is a waste of time. ^a	.39	.72	.84
7. I would not hesitate to sacrifice my life for the country.	.34	.66	.85

Note. Promax rotation. Factor 1 and Factor 2 measure militaristic attitude in institution level; Factor 3 and Factor 4 measure militaristic attitude in process level; Factor 5 measures militaristic attitude in ideology level. Factors of the scale have been re-ordered according to thematic criteria rather than eigenvalue score.

^aReverse item.

Table 2
Mean, SD, and Correlation Values of Factors and Demographic Variables

Factors and demographic variables	Descriptives <i>M (SD)</i>	Institution level		Process level		Ideology level
		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Factor 1	5.31 (1.49)	—	—	—	—	—
Factor 2	4.22 (1.23)	.76**	—	—	—	—
Factor 3	3.46 (1.11)	.69**	.68**	—	—	—
Factor 4	3.03 (1.29)	.58**	.61**	.54**	—	—
Factor 5	4.25 (1.61)	.76**	.65**	.59**	.43**	—
Sex	1.37 (.48)	-.12*	-.07	-.11*	-.19**	-.15**
Age	23.84 (4.44)	-.21**	-.17**	-.18**	-.18**	-.25**
Education level	1.23 (.42)	-.33**	-.32**	-.25**	-.31**	-.37**
Political affiliation	1.76 (.80)	.27**	.16**	.26**	.09	.34**
Military affiliation	1.15 (.36)	.18**	.23**	.21**	.11*	.14**
		Sex	Age	Edu	Pol.aff.	Mil.aff.
Sex	1.37 (.48)	—	—	—	—	—
Age	23.84 (4.44)	.48**	—	—	—	—
Education level	1.23 (.42)	.07	.37**	—	—	—
Political affiliation	1.76 (.80)	.09	-.02	-.20**	—	—
Military affiliation	1.15 (.36)	.07	.28**	.02	.04	—

Note. Factor 1 = attitude toward existence of the military; Factor 2 = attitude toward value of the military; Factor 3 = attitude toward militaristic system; Factor 4 = attitude toward political position of military; Factor 5 = attitude toward compulsory military service; Edu = education; Pol.aff. = political affiliation; Mil.aff. = military affiliation. Factors were measured using 7-point scale. Age range of participants was between 18 and 36, and they were coded on sex variable as 1 = female, 2 = male; on education level variable as 1 = undergraduate, 2 = graduate; on political affiliation variable as 1 = leftist, 2 = neutral, 3 = rightist; and on military affiliation variable as 1 = not related with military, 2 = related with military.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

1992; Wilson, 1973). Younger, low educated, rightist, and military affiliated participants tended to indicate more supportive militaristic attitudes at all levels.

Study 2

We examined the association among each subfactor of the militaristic attitudes, national identification, and uninationality in Study 2. Relying on the review given in the introduction, we had the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Turkish identification and uninationality ideology would positively predict each subfactor of the militaristic attitudes. Thus, higher identification with Turkishness and higher uninationality ideology would be positively correlated with each subfactor of the militaristic attitudes scale.

Hypothesis 2: Further, demographic variables such as gender difference, age, education level, political view, and military affiliation would be associated with each subscale of the militaristic attitudes. Specifically, female, younger, low educated, rightist, and military affiliated participants would have higher scores on militaristic attitudes scale.

Participants

There were 583 university students ($N_{\text{women}} = 318$ [54.5%] and $N_{\text{men}} = 265$ [45.5%]) who participated in Study 2. The age of participants changed from 18 to 28, with a mean age of 22.09 ($SD = 2.32$). There were 528 (90.6%) undergraduate and 55 (9.4%) graduate students.

Instruments

Militaristic Attitudes Scale. The scale developed in Study 1 was used to measure militaristic attitudes. According to the confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS, the proposed five-factor model indicated an adequate fit to the current data without any modification ($\chi^2(850, N = 583) = 2552.653, p = .000, \chi^2/df = 3$, goodness of fit index (GFI) = 81, adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) = .78, normed fit index (NFI) = .82, comparative fit index [CFI] = .87, root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .05, 90% confidence interval [CI; .056, .061]). All scores were acceptable levels based on the acceptable thresholds of fit indices. As a rule of thumb, χ^2/df should be less than 5 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993) and RMSEA should be less than .08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1992). GFI and AGFI should be higher than .85, but they can be tolerated because of large sample size (Sharma, Mukherjee, Kumar, & Dillon, 2005). Internal consistencies for five factors were .93, .88, .72, .71, and .87, respectively.

In the present study, participants rated items by using a 7-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Higher scores indicate greater support for each factor.

Social Identity Scale. The scale was developed by Cinnirella (1998) to measure in-group identification and collective identity. The scale was translated into Turkish by Hüsni (2006). Few examples of the scale are "I feel Turkish," "I feel strong ties with Turkish society," "I feel pleased to be a part of Turkish society," and "I perceive criticisms toward Turkish society as personal and feel uncomfortable."

In the present study, a 7-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* was used. Higher scores indicate stron-

ger identification and greater emotional and cognitive bonds with Turkish national identity. Cronbach's α was .93.

Uninational Ideology Scale. The scale was developed by Cingöz-Ulu (2008) to assess uninational views. Few examples of the scale are "I prefer Turkish citizens to be defining themselves only as Turkish, no matter what their origins may be," "Those who want to emphasize different identities are harming the unity of Turkey," and "Groups who highlight their ethnic or linguistic differences are actually motivated to divide the country."

Participants responded the scale by using a 7-point scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Higher scores indicate greater support for superiority and dominant position of Turkish national identity over other ethnic and cultural group identities. Cronbach's α was .93 for the scale.

Demographic information form. Similar to Study 1, participants were asked to indicate their gender, age, education level, political affiliation (from radical left to radical right on 7-point scale), and military affiliation in the demographic form.

Procedure

After getting ethic approval, data for Study 2 was collected from various universities in Ankara. Students who were taking an elective course from psychology department filled out paper-based questionnaire package in the classroom environment. Some of the participants earned course credit for their participation. The rest voluntary participated in the study. Each data collection session lasted about 25 min.

Results

Predictors of militaristic attitudes. We conducted separate hierarchical regression analyses for each of the subfactors of the militaristic attitudes scale. First of all, we calculated Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) to check for potential multicollinearity among the predictors. As a rule of thumb, multicollinearity is

not a threat to multiple regressions if the VIF is less than 10 (O'Brien, 2007) or, more conservatively, less than 5 (Alauddin & Son Ngheim, 2010). VIF values were found to be between 1.01 and 2.28, and so no multicollinearity problem was detected.

In the first step, control variables (including gender difference, age, education level, political view, and military affiliation) were entered into the equation. Then, the main independent variables, national identity, and uninationality, were entered into the equation. As seen in Table 3, the education level and military affiliation was a significant variable for all subfactors. The political view was a significant predictor for attitudes toward existence of the military, value of the military, militaristic system, and compulsory military service, but not for political position of military. The gender difference was a predictor for political position of military and compulsory military service, but not for attitudes toward existence of the military, value of the military, and militaristic system. Finally, age was not a significant predictor for all subfactors of the militaristic attitudes.

Further, it was found that identification with Turkish identity and uninational ideology significantly predicted attitudes toward existence of the military ($\beta = .49, t = 11.81, p < .001$; $\beta = .31, t = 7.60, p < .001$; $F(7, 575) = 106.08, p < .001$), value of the military ($\beta = .41, t = 9.68, p < .001$; $\beta = .41, t = 9.92, p < .001$; $F(7, 575) = 101.15, p < .001$), militaristic system ($\beta = .30, t = 5.95, p < .001$; $\beta = .29, t = 5.78, p < .001$; $F(7, 575) = 42.48, p < .001$), political position of military ($\beta = .12, t = 2.06, p = .040$; $\beta = .36, t = 6.55, p < .001$; $F(7, 575) = 18.92, p < .001$), and compulsory military service ($\beta = .48, t = 11.86, p < .001$; $\beta = .22, t = 5.65, p < .001$; $F(7, 575) = 115.48, p < .001$), respectively (see Table 3). These results supported the first hypothesis. In addition, the descriptive statistics (including mean, *SD*, and correlation values) of the variables which were used in the Study 2 were presented in Table 4 (see Appendix).

Table 3
Predictors of Militaristic Attitude

Predictors	Institution level				Process level				Ideology level	
	Factor 1		Factor 2		Factor 3		Factor 4		Factor 5	
	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.17**		.14**		.12**		.04**		.27**	
Sex		-.07		-.06		-.08		-.11**		-.14**
Age		-.05		-.02		-.02		.04		-.07
Edu		-.09*		-.10*		-.12**		-.12**		-.12**
Pol.aff.		.32**		.29**		.24**		-.01		.43**
Mil.aff.		.20**		.19**		.20**		.10*		.17**
Step 2	.40**		.41**		.22**		.15**		.31**	
Iden.Ti		.49**		.41**		.30**		.12*		.48**
Uni.ide		.31**		.41**		.29**		.36**		.22**
Total R^2	.57**		.55**		.34**		.19**		.58**	
<i>F</i>		106.08**		101.15**		42.48**		18.92**		115.48**
<i>N</i>		583		583		583		583		583

Note. Factor 1 = attitude toward existence of the military; Factor 2 = attitude toward value of the military; Factor 3 = attitude toward militaristic system; Factor 4 = attitude toward political position of military; Factor 5 = attitude toward compulsory military service; Edu = education; Pol.aff. = political affiliation; Mil.aff. = military affiliation; Iden.Ti = identification with Turkish identity; Uni.ide = uninational ideology.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4
Mean, SD, and Correlation Values of the Variables of the Study 2

Variables	Descriptives	Institution level		Process level		Ideology level	
	M (SD)	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	
Factor 1	5.48 (1.26)	—					
Factor 2	4.48 (1.17)	.75**	—				
Factor 3	3.73 (1.03)	.66**	.66**	—			
Factor 4	3.05 (1.20)	.40**	.52**	.45**	—		
Factor 5	4.51 (1.55)	.73**	.73**	.61**	.37**	—	
Sex	1.45 (.50)	-.08*	-.07	-.09*	-.12**	-.16**	
Age	22.09 (2.32)	-.15**	-.12**	-.13**	-.04	-.22**	
Education level	1.09 (.29)	-.15**	-.15**	-.16**	-.11*	-.21**	
Political affiliation	1.92 (.85)	.33**	.30**	.25**	-.01	.44**	
Military affiliation	1.15 (.36)	.17**	.16**	.17**	.09*	.12**	
Iden.Ti	5.50 (1.52)	.71**	.68**	.53**	.29**	.73**	
Uni.ide	4.86 (1.82)	.66**	.68**	.53**	.37**	.65**	
	Sex	Age	Edu	Pol.aff.	Mil.aff.	Iden.Ti	Uni.ide
Sex	—						
Age	.21**	—					
Education level	.09*	.49**	—				
Political affiliation	.01	-.16**	-.16**	—			
Military affiliation	.01	.03	.10*	-.08	—		
Iden.Ti	-.12**	-.17**	-.19**	.47**	.09*	—	
Uni.ide	-.09*	-.24**	-.22**	.39**	.10*	.72**	—

Note. Factor 1 = attitude toward existence of the military; Factor 2 = attitude toward value of the military; Factor 3 = attitude toward militaristic system; Factor 4 = attitude toward political position of military; Factor 5 = attitude toward compulsory military service; Edu = education; Pol.aff. = political affiliation; Mil.aff. = military affiliation; Iden.Ti = identification with Turkish identity; Uni.ide = uninationality ideology. Factors, identification with Turkish identity and uninationality ideology were measured using 7-point scale. Age range of participants was between 18 and 28, and they were coded on sex variable as 1 = female, 2 = male; on education level variable as 1 = undergraduate, 2 = graduate; on political affiliation variable as 1 = leftist, 2 = neutral, 3 = rightist; and on military affiliation variable as 1 = not related with military, 2 = related with military.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Discussion

Discussion on Hypothesis 1: Turkish identification and uninationality ideology would positively predict each subsfactor of the militaristic attitudes after controlling demographic variables. Participants with higher Turkish identification and having higher uninationality ideology promoted existence, necessity and respectability of the military as a social institution. In terms of identity issues, the findings from Turkey support Western studies (Bliss et al., 2007; Eckhardt et al., 1967). People with higher national identification may believe in the need for the military to protect their nation. The findings also supported the historical documents (İlhan, 1989) that military characteristics are part of the Turkish nation. Similarly, people with higher uninationality ideology scored higher on the necessity and respectability of the military. The findings might result from the perception that the unity of Turkey can be only protected and defended by the Turkish military.

Further, people who had Turkish identification and uninationality ideology approved the current militaristic system and evaluated it as fair, equitable, natural, and reliable. They also supported the authority of and active role of the military in a political regime. These findings may support the argument of some Turkish researchers (Altınay, 2004; Sünbuloğlu, 2013) that militarization process is successful in Turkey. Further, these findings may show permeability among militaristic system, civilian life, and political atmosphere. When people highly identified with their nation, they may easily accept military as a social system.

For the final subscale, attitudes toward compulsory military service, participants with higher Turkish identification and uninationality ideology perceived military service as a duty of each (male) citizen, supported compulsory military service and rejected conscientious objection and/or military service by payment. People who strongly identified with Turkishness and emphasized unity of Turkey may also value militaristic ideology through accepting any rules about military services. They may reject conscientious objectives of the military service in Turkey, and military service by payment. They may believe that every Turkish man should complete their military service duty. The results may support the correctness of Turkish saying "Every Turk is born as soldier." Consequently, these attitudes may reflect the ideological part of militaristic attitudes (Altınay, 2004). Further, they may even have prejudicial attitudes toward men who do not pursue compulsory military service to the country. For example, the last military service by payment to exempt from military service was offered by Turkish government in 2014. Men who were 30 years old and had not fulfilled their compulsory military service yet paid money (30.000 TL) to Turkish government to be exempted from his military service. These men were judged to be traitors, or not masculine enough for some Turkish people.

Discussion on Hypothesis 2: Demographic variables such as gender difference, age, education level, political affiliation, and military affiliation would be associated with each subsfactor of the militaristic attitudes. First, military affiliation significantly predicted each subsfactor of militaristic attitudes. Military affilia-

tion seems to be a very critical variable to predict various issues about militaristic attitudes. People who were affiliated with military tended to value the military, to support existence of the military, and a militaristic system, and to accept compulsory military service. These findings were consistent with the existing literature suggesting the association between military affiliation and the masculine structure of the military (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Özdemir, 2017; Young & Nauta, 2013). Affiliation with the military may help people to build schemas about the military. With these schemas in their mind, people may feel comfortable with militaristic system and ideology, leading them to have positive militaristic attitudes.

Education level also significantly predicted every subfactors of the militaristic attitudes scale. Participants who had lower education presented stronger militaristic attitudes, consistent with earlier studies (Festl et al., 2013). Increasing knowledge and awareness may lead people to criticize the functionality of traditional institutions and systems because education is positively correlated with political tolerance (Bobo & Licari, 1989). Similarly, educated people may be tolerant to divergent views about military and militarization. They may lower their agreement with militaristic attitudes. In our data we only had undergraduate and graduate students. One may argue that the sample may not provide enough variations. However, as earlier studies (e.g., Newcomb, 1943) presented, college students change their attitudes through their college education. Newcomb (1943) examined the attitudes of students attending Bennington College from 1935 to 1939, and found that conservative college students exposed to liberal university staffs changed their attitudes from conservative to liberal during their 4 years education. It seems that getting university education in Turkey too may influence college students' militaristic attitudes. Further, depending on our observations and news on TV or newspapers, we expect that people with lower education would show more support for militaristic attitudes. Future studies may consider collecting data from nonstudents sample.

Political view significantly predicted attitudes toward existence of the military, value of the military, militaristic system, and compulsory military service. People who had right political view tended to approve militaristic attitudes. These findings were consistent with earlier studies showing that people following rightist view have a tendency to protect current social institutions, and social hierarchy (e.g., Kimhi & Kasher, 2015; Moore & Dolan, 2012). Political view only did not predict the political position of military. They had a tendency to reject the active role of military in politics. People from different political views may be against political participations of the military because past experiences about the interference of military to politics might have created lots of social, economic, and political problems for both rightist and leftist people in democratic societies (Meyersson, 2016). For example, after the military coup in 1980, political parties did not only define their party programs based on the rules of military authorities in Turkey, but also the election threshold to be presented as a party in Turkish Grand National Assembly was increased to 10%. The percentage is higher than all countries of European Union (Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index, 2016). It means that political parties have to pass 10% voting rate to enter into Turkish national parliament.

The gender difference was a significant predictor of attitudes toward political position of military and compulsory military service.

Female participants were more likely to support political position of military and compulsory military service than male participants. These findings may be similar to Gürsoy's (2012) findings that women show higher trust in the military than men. Further, the findings may be because of the direct relevance of the compulsory military service to men but not women because Turkish women do not have compulsory military service. The educated men sample who are supposed to fulfill the compulsory military service may not be eager to fulfill the service. However, the gender difference was not a significant predictor of the other subfactors. Results showed that both men and women from Turkey tended to present similar attitudes toward existence of the military, value of the military, and the militaristic system.

Finally, age was not a significant predictor for all subfactors of the militaristic attitudes. The reason for the insignificance of age may be relevant to sample of the study. The range of age was from 18 to 30. The sample was homogenous and was not able to show any age difference. Future study should include more participants from various ages so that the effects of age are examined thoroughly.

Limitations and Future Directions

The present study may have some limitations. First, research was conducted in various universities only in Ankara which is the capital city of Turkey. The participants of these two studies were university students and so they reflect educated Turkish college students. It would be better to reach different participant profiles. Second, most of these participants did not have any interaction with the military, and almost all of the male participants delayed their compulsory military service. Thus, they do not have direct experience with the military. Future studies should cover data from outside of college or from military school students and soldiers to provide better representative data from Turkey. Further, current sociopolitical conditions of Turkey may affect the findings of two studies. There is a disagreement between the Turkish military and ruling party of Turkey. When the data were collected (in the year of 2013), the military was usually defined as a protector of Kemalist ideology (including republicanism, nationalism, populism, statism, laicism, and revolutionism) against the ruling party of Turkey, Justice and Development Party (AKP). Even if AKP defines itself as a conservative democrat party, it has organic bonds with other conservative and pro-Islamist parties. Because of this perception, some individuals' responses may have changed. In addition, considering new political events in Turkey, especially 15th of July 2016 coup attempt in Turkey, the perception about military may have changed after we collected the data. Trust to military and perception of militarism may not be the same as when the data was collected for Study 1 and 2. Future studies should explore the effects of July 15, 2016 on the perception of the Turkish military. In addition, the present study focused on the cognitive and emotional identification of the Republic of Turkey citizens with Turkish identity rather than asking their actual ethnic identity. Future studies may be conducted using actual ethnic identity of individuals to test the reliability of the measure and explore the majority-minority relation. Lastly, because of correlational nature of the study, readers should avoid reaching any causal conclusions about the relationships among the examined variables in these studies.

Conclusion

Study 1 presented that the new scale measuring militaristic attitudes was valid and reliable. Study 2 demonstrated that each of the subfactors of the militaristic attitudes were predicted by Turkish identification and uninational ideology after controlling demographic variables in Turkey. The findings of the Study 2 did not only indicate the significant associations among militaristic attitudes, Turkish identification and uninational ideology but also contributed to the validation of the new scale with a new data set.

Findings of the present study may provide significant contributions. First, the study provided a reliable and valid measure to test militaristic attitudes at various levels such as institutional, ideological, and system based. Researchers who work on the similar issues may be able to use the scale. Second, because of successful militarization process and culturalized and naturalized aspects of militarism in Turkey, militaristic characteristics of Turkish nation are doubtlessly accepted by most of the researchers as the reality of Turkish society (e.g., Sünbuloğlu, 2013). The present study, further, empirically tested the militaristic attitudes of Turkish society with its possible predictors in the sample of university students. It provided some possible answers for who support militaristic attitudes more within the Turkish society, and what are the existing reasons behind militaristic attitudes. These studies may also present general information about the structure of Turkish society which may be important for social scientists, politicians, and lawmakers who desire to understand the nature of Turkish society.

References

- Adelman, M. (2003). The military, militarism, and the militarization of domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 9, 1118–1152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801203255292>
- Aiken, L. R. (1994). *Psychological testing and assessment* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Alauddin, M., & Son Ngheim, H. (2010). Do instructional attributes pose multicollinearity problems? An empirical exploration. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 40, 351–361. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0313-5926\(10\)50034-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0313-5926(10)50034-1)
- Altunay, A. G. (2004). *The myth of the military-nation: Militarism, gender and education in Turkey*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9781403979360>
- Balkan-Tec, H. (2015). *Non-Muslims and military service in the late Ottoman Empire* (Master's thesis). Sabancı University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Ben-Eliezer, U. (1998). *The making of Israeli militarism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index, B. T. I. (2016). *BTI 2016, Turkey country report*. Retrieved from http://www.bti-project.org/fileadmin/files/BTI/Downloads/Reports/2016/pdf/BTI_2016_Turkey.pdf
- Bliss, S. L., OH, E. J., & Williams, R. L. (2007). Militarism and sociopolitical perspectives among college students in the U.S. and South Korea. *Journal of Peace and Conflict*, 13, 175–199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10781910701271218>
- Bobo, L., & Licari, F. C. (1989). Education and political tolerance testing the effects of cognitive sophistication and target group affect. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 53, 285–308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/269154>
- Braun-Lewensohn, O., Abu-Kaf, S., & Sagy, S. (2015). Attitudes toward war and peace and their relations with anxiety reactions among adolescents living in a conflictual area. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18, 68–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2014.933193>
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: In-group love or out-group hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 429–444. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126>
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 21, 230–258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005>
- Burris, V. (2008). From Vietnam to Iraq: Continuity and change in between-group differences in support for military action. *Social Problems*, 55, 443–479.
- Canetti-Nisim, D., Halperin, E., Sharvit, K., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2009). A new stress-based model of political extremism: Personal exposure to terrorism, psychological distress, and exclusionist political attitudes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53, 363–389. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022002709333296>
- Chenoy, A. M. (1998). Militarization, conflict and women in South Asia. In L. A. Lorentzen & J. Turpin (Eds.), *The women war reader* (pp. 101–110). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Cingöz-Ulu, B. (2008). *Structure of Turkish national identity and attitudes towards ethno-cultural groups in Turkey* (Doctoral Dissertation). York University, York, England.
- Cinnirella, M. (1998). Manipulating stereotype rating tasks: Understanding questionnaire context effects on measures of attitudes, social identity and stereotypes. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 8, 345–362. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1298\(199809\)8:5<345::AID-CASP441>3.0.CO;2-F](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199809)8:5<345::AID-CASP441>3.0.CO;2-F)
- Dalmiş, İ., & İmamoğlu, E. O. (2000). Yetişkinlerin ve üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyo-politik kimlik algıları [The perceived socio-political identity domains of Turkish adults and university students]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15, 1–14.
- Danson, A. (2004). Models for young nationalist and militarists: German youth literature in the First World War. *German Studies Review*, 27, 579–598. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4140984>
- Droba, D. D. (1931). Effects of various factors on militarism-pacifism. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 22, 96–111.
- Eckhardt, W. (1969). The factor of militarism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6, 123–132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600204>
- Eckhardt, W., Manning, M., Morgan, C., Subotnik, L., & Tinker, L. J. (1967). Militarism in our culture today. *Journal of Human Relations*, 15, 532–537.
- Eckhardt, W., & Newcombe, A. G. (1969). Militarism, personality, and other social attitudes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 13, 210–219. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002200276901300204>
- Enloe, C. (1993). *The morning after: Sexual politics at the end of the cold war*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. (2000). *Maneuvers: The international politics of militarizing women's lives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Feinman, I. R. (2000). *Citizenship rites: Feminist soldiers and feminist antimilitarists*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Festl, R., Scharrow, M., & Quandt, T. (2013). Militaristic attitudes and the use of digital games. *Games and Culture*, 8, 392–407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1555412013493498>
- Guibernau, M. (2007). *The identity of nations*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Gürsoy, Y. (2012). *Turkish public attitudes toward the military and Ergenekon: Consequences for the consideration of democracy* (Working paper no: 5 EU/5/2012). Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Holsti, O. R., & Rosenau, J. N. (1995). Gender and the political beliefs of American opinion leaders. In F. D'Amico & P. Beckman (Eds.), *Women and world politics* (pp. 113–142). Amherst, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Hüsni, Ş. (2006). *National stereotypes, in-group identification, intergroup bias, social categorization and in/out-group attitudes: The case of Cyprus* (Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

- İlhan, S. (1989). Askerliğin kültürümüzdeki yeri [Military's place in our culture]. *Erdem*, 14, 349–363.
- İnalçık, H. (1964a). The nature of traditional society: Turkey. In R. E. Ward & D. A. Rostow (Eds.), *Political modernization in Japan and Turkey* (pp. 42–63). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- İnalçık, H. (1964b). Osmanlı devrinde Türk ordusu [Turkish Army during Ottomans]. *Türk Kültürü*, 22, 49–56.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *Lisrel 8: Structural equations modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Karacagil, Z. (2014). *Erkek olma yolunda “askerlik durağı”* [“Military stop” at the road of becoming man] (Master's thesis). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara, Turkey.
- Karacan, E. (2015). *Remembering the 1980 Turkish military coup d'etat: Memory, violence, and trauma*. Wiesbaden, Hesse: Springer VS. Retrieved from <http://www.springer.com/978-3-658-11319-3>
- Kimhi, S., & Kasher, A. (2015). Moral dilemmas in military situations: Proportionality principle, religiosity, political attitudes, and authoritarian personality. *Military Psychology*, 27, 169–184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mil0000072>
- Kışhoğlu, R., & Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2009). *Militarist attitudes scale: Construction of the scale*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the ISPP 32nd Annual Scientific Meeting, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Kline, P. (2000). *Handbook of psychological testing (2. baskı)*. London, England: Routledge.
- Malinowski, B. (2013). *The dynamics of culture change an inquiry into race relations in Africa*. London, England: Forgotten Books. (Original work published 1945)
- McCleary, D. F., & Williams, R. L. (2009). Sociopolitical and personality correlates of militarism in Democratic societies. *Peace and Conflict*, 15, 161–187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10781910902837248>
- Meyersson, E. (2016). *Political man on horseback: Coups and development*. New York, NY: Mimeo.
- Moore, G., & Dolan, S. (2012). U.S. elite and public views on anti-terrorist military action: Are women less militaristic? *Historical Social Research*, 37, 223–242. Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-372661>
- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., & Brown, R. (2001). Nationalism and patriotism: National identification and out-group rejection. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 159–172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466601164740>
- National Security Knowledge* [Milli Güvenlik Bilgisi]. (1998). Istanbul, Turkey: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Nelson, L. L. (1995). *Militaristic attitudes in college students: Developmental antecedents and personality correlates*. In L. L. Nelson (Chair), *Militaristic and nationalistic attitudes: Assessment, development, and personality dynamics*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Newcomb, T. (1943). *Personality and social change: Attitude formation in a student community*. New York, NY: Dryden.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rule of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, 41, 673–690. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6>
- Page, B. I., & Bouton, M. M. (2006). *The foreign policy disconnect: What Americans want from our leaders but don't get*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226644592.001.0001>
- Ray, J. J. (1972). Militarism, authoritarianism, neuroticism, and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 16, 319–340. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002200277201600302>
- Reiter, D. (2013). Nationalism and military effectiveness: Post-Meiji Japan. In R. A. Brooks & E. A. Stanley (Eds.), *Creating military power: The sources of military effectiveness*. Stanford Scholarship Online.
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Defense. (1927). *Military law* [Askerlik kanunu]. Retrieved from http://www.msb.gov.tr/Content/Upload/Docs/askeralma/1111_As.Kanunu.pdf
- Roccas, S. (2005). Religion and value systems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61, 747–759. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00430.x>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Özdemir, F. (2017). Predicting attitudes toward the masculine structure of the military with Turkish identification and ambivalent sexism. *Sex Roles*, 76, 511–519. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0676-0>
- Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment*, 8, 350–353. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.8.4.350>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1–65). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Shaheen, K. (2016, July 18). Military coup was well planned and very nearly succeeded, say Turkish officials. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jul/18/military-coup-was-well-planned-and-very-nearly-succeeded-say-turkish-officials>
- Sharma, S., Mukherjee, S., Kumar, A., & Dillon, W. R. (2005). A simulation study to investigate the use of cutoff values for assessing model fit in covariance structure models. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 935–943. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.10.007>
- Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and co-operation: Their social psychology*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sünbuloğlu, N. Y. (2013). *Erkek millet asker millet: Türkiye’de militarizm, milliyetçilik, erkek(lik)ler* [Men nation soldier nation: Militarism, nationalism and manhood in Turkey]. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayıncılık.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London, England: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- The UN Refugee Agency. (2017, April 27). *Syria regional refugee response: Inter-agency information sharing portal*. Retrieved from <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/country.php?%20id=224>
- Wilson, G. D. (1973). *The psychology of conservatism: The concept of conservatism*. London, England: Academic Press.
- Young, M. L., & Nauta, M. M. (2013). Sexism as a predictor of attitudes toward women in the military and combat. *Military Psychology*, 25, 166–171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0094958>

Appendix

Cross-Loading Values of Militaristic Attitudes Scale

Militaristic attitudes scale	F.1	F.2	F.3	F.4	F.5
Factor 1: Attitude toward existence of the military eigenvalue = 17.70; explained variance (%) = 41.17; alpha value (α) = .95					
1. Eliminating military would bring peace. ^a	.98				
2. Military should be completely eliminated. ^a	.97				
3. Armed forces are redundant. ^a	.94				
4. The existence of the military is a threat to peace. ^a	.89				
5. Military should always be kept strong.	.83	.22			
6. It relieves me that military is a dissuasive force against the external threats.	.80				
7. Military encourages people to use a gun. ^a	.78				
8. Feeling the presence of military comforts me.	.71	.25			
9. The presence of military prevents the development of democracy. ^a	.60			.20	
10. I think that military limits the society. ^a	.54			.22	
11. Military ceremonies are a waste of time. ^a	.51	.21			
12. The presence of military hinders individual freedom. ^a	.40		.31		
Factor 2: Attitude toward value of the military eigenvalue = 2.74; explained variance (%) = 6.36; alpha value (α) = .89					
1. Military has a major role in the formation of Turkish identity.		.84			
2. Military should be held above all other institutions.		.76			
3. There is a strong relationship between military and the Turkish culture.	.20	.72		-.31	
4. Military is a result of long-term accumulation.	.27	.69		-.22	
5. All actions done by military are to the benefit of the society.	-.21	.66	.26		
6. Military holds the Turkish society together.		.61			
7. News that depicts military in a negative light should not be featured in the media.		.60			
8. Military should be approved without question.	-.24	.54		.26	
9. Overall, military is better than a lot of civil institutions.	.26	.54			
10. Military is an institution worthy of respect.	.27	.40			
Factor 3: Attitude toward militaristic system eigenvalue = 1.70; explained variance (%) = 3.96; alpha value (α) = .81					
1. The military system deteriorates every year. ^a			.74	-.44	
2. The military system does not care about personal characteristics and individual thought. ^a			.73		
3. Expressions such as every Turk is born a soldier have been constructed to protect the military system. ^a		-.27	.72		
4. The existing military system is closed to criticism. ^a			.69		
5. In the existing military system, everybody gets what they deserve.		.30	.63		
6. The military system should be restructured. ^a			.55		
7. Everybody has equal and fair rights in the military system.		.37	.52		
8. Military is an artificial system that has been constructed to protect the existing order. ^a	.24		.32		
9. I believe that the military system is reliable and healthy.	.20	.24	.31		
Factor 4: Attitude toward political position of military eigenvalue = 1.49; explained variance (%) = 3.47; alpha value (α) = .75					
1. Military coups carry the country back. ^a				.72	
2. Military should be impartial in political matters. ^a		-.32		.70	
3. Military should play an active role in politics.			-.23	.68	
4. The effect of military on the state should be reduced. ^a		.30		.52	
5. The capabilities and power of military on the ruling should be increased.		.22		.30	
Factor 5: Attitude toward compulsory military service eigenvalue = 1.59; explained variance (%) = 3.69; alpha value (α) = .87					
1. Conscientious objection hurts the military system.			-.22		.83
2. Military service by payment is not suitable for the Turkish society.					.79
3. Military service should be based on the principles of conscience and volunteerism. ^a		-.34			.76
4. Every Turkish (man) citizen should fulfill their military service duty.	-.24				.50
5. Military service is a sacred duty.	.33	.22			.43
6. Doing military service is a waste of time. ^a	.28				.39
7. I would not hesitate to sacrifice my life for the country.	.29				.34

Note. Promax rotation. As shown, .20 was defined as a cutoff point for item loadings, and lower loading values were not indicated on the table. F.1 = Factor 1; F.2 = Factor 2; F.3 = Factor 3; F.4 = Factor 4; F.5 = Factor 5. Factor 1 and Factor 2 measure militaristic attitude in institution level; Factor 3 and Factor 4 measure militaristic attitude in process level; Factor 5 measures militaristic attitude in ideology level. Factors of the scale have been re-ordered according to thematic criteria rather than eigenvalue score.

^a Reverse item.