

POLITICAL CULTURE - ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PARALYSIS IN LIGHT OF HOFSTEDE'S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS

Assoc. Prof. Yesim Sirakaya^{1*}, Dr. Serhat Erdur²

^{*1-2} St Clements University UK

Corresponding Author Assoc. Prof.
Yesim Sirakaya

St Clements University UK

Article History

Received: 30 / 07 / 2025

Accepted: 17 / 08 / 2025

Published: 21 / 08 / 2025

Abstract: This study examines the relationships between political culture and organizational culture within the framework of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Hofstede's dimensions of power distance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term-short-term orientation, and tolerance-restriction offer a systematic approach to understanding both societal and organizational behavior. The research reveals that political culture and organizational culture are parallel structures. In societies with high power distance, political systems are generally hierarchical and centralized, while authoritarian and vertical structures are also observed in organizations. Collectivist societies prioritize group solidarity and loyalty in both political participation and the workplace, while individualistic societies prioritize individual achievement and autonomy. Evaluations conducted on the Turkish sample clearly demonstrate these dynamics. According to Hofstede Insights data, Turkey has high power distance and uncertainty avoidance scores and exhibits collectivist tendencies. These characteristics are reflected in the political system as centralized decision-making and a strong state structure, and in organizations as hierarchical structures, adherence to rules, and group cohesion. The study demonstrates that political and organizational culture are mutually reinforcing in Turkey. The findings offer important implications for practice in both political and organizational spheres. Reducing power distance, encouraging participatory leadership models, fostering a culture open to innovation and entrepreneurship, and balancing collectivist and individualist values can enhance democratic governance and organizational effectiveness. This study contributes to the literature by systematically linking Hofstede's cultural dimensions to political and organizational behavior, and cross-cultural studies offer important guidance for policymakers and managers.

Keywords: Hofstede, cultural dimensions, political culture, organizational culture, Turkey, power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance.

How to Cite in APA format: Sirakaya, Y. & Erdur, S. & (2025). POLITICAL CULTURE - ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PARALYSIS IN LIGHT OF HOFSTEDE'S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS. *IRASS Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(8),48-54.

Introduction

Culture is one of the most fundamental social elements that shapes the way individuals think, feel, and behave. Culture plays a decisive role not only in individuals' daily life practices but also in the functioning of political systems, organizational management styles, and forms of interaction between institutions (Hofstede, 2001). Due to the multidimensional nature of culture, sub-concepts such as political culture and organizational culture stand out as critical concepts in understanding social order. Comparative cultural studies conducted since the second half of the 20th century have demonstrated that the fundamental differences underlying political behavior patterns and organizational structures across different societies can be largely explained by cultural codes (Almond & Verba, 1963; Hofstede et al., 2010). In this context, Geert Hofstede's theory of cultural dimensions offers an important theoretical framework for both political science and organizational studies because it reveals measurable and comparable aspects of culture. The concept of political culture is an analytical tool used to explain individuals' relationships with the state, their attitudes toward authority, their commitment to democracy, and their forms of political participation. Organizational culture, on the other hand, determines the values, norms, management approach, and behavioral patterns of employees in institutions (Schein, 2017). Both concepts represent the reflections of culture at the societal

and institutional levels. Therefore, it is possible to draw direct parallels between political culture and organizational culture. For example, in a society with a high power distance, citizens' loyalty to the state increases, while in organizations, the authority of managers is unquestionably accepted. Similarly, in individualistic societies, democratic culture strengthens, and individual performance comes to the fore in organizations. Such parallels demonstrate the holistic impact of culture that shapes both the political and organizational spheres (Hofstede, 2001). The primary objective of this study is to examine the parallels between political culture and organizational culture in light of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The research will seek to answer the following questions:

- How do Hofstede's cultural dimensions influence political culture?
- How are these same dimensions reflected in organizational culture?
- What are the similarities and differences between political culture and organizational culture?
- When Turkey's cultural characteristics are taken into account, how do these parallels appear?

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license



To this end, this study aims to provide both a theoretical and applied framework. While cultural factors are often overlooked, they play a decisive role in the functioning of political and institutional structures. Just as political culture impacts democratization processes, organizational culture is also known to influence the efficiency, employee satisfaction, and innovation capacity of institutions (Schein, 2017). Therefore, understanding the parallels between these two cultures is crucial not only for theoretical knowledge generation but also for political and institutional reform processes. Especially in societies like Turkey, which embody both traditional values and modernization dynamics, the relationships between political culture and organizational culture become even more critical. The state's governance style, citizens' participation in democracy, and organizations' management approach often draw on the same cultural roots (Ertürk, 2016). Therefore, analyses based on Hofstede's dimensions will significantly contribute to understanding Turkey's socio-political and institutional structure. The fundamental theoretical basis for this study is Hofstede's theory of cultural dimensions. Hofstede, through extensive research conducted at IBM, compared the cultures of different nations and identified six fundamental dimensions:

- Power Distance
- Individualism-Collectivism
- Masculinity-Femininity
- Uncertainty Avoidance
- Long-Term-Short-Term Orientation
- Tolerance-Restraint

These dimensions provide a suitable basis for analyzing the effects of culture on political and organizational systems (Hofstede et al., 2010). The concept of political culture will be based on Almond and Verba's (1963) civic culture approach. Organizational culture will be analyzed using Schein's (2017) organizational culture model. Thus, a comprehensive analysis will be conducted across three fundamental theoretical axes: Hofstede, Almond & Verba, and Schein. This research is a theoretical study and is based on a literature review. This study will use Hofstede's cultural dimensions as a conceptual framework and conduct a comparative analysis with the literature on political culture and organizational culture. Furthermore, the Turkish case study will examine the theoretical implications. The study consists of six main sections. The introduction section explains the purpose, significance, theoretical framework, and methodology of the study. The second section will address the foundations of the concept of culture, the concepts of political culture and organizational culture. The third section will provide a detailed explanation of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The fourth section will examine the relationships between political culture and these dimensions, and the fifth section will examine the relationships between organizational culture and these dimensions. The sixth section will discuss the parallels between political culture and organizational culture through the Turkish case study. The final section will provide a general assessment and recommendations. In the existing literature, political culture and organizational culture have largely been examined separately. However, systematic analysis of the interactions between the two concepts, particularly in the context of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, is limited. This study aims to fill this gap and develops a holistic approach focusing on the parallels between political culture and organizational culture.

Foundations of the Concept of Culture

Culture, in its broadest sense, is the totality of values, norms, beliefs, behavioral patterns, and symbols shared by members of a society. In the social sciences, culture is recognized as a fundamental determinant of both the construction of individuals' identities and the functioning of institutions (Williams, 1983). Anthropologist Edward B. Tylor defined culture as "the totality of knowledge, belief, art, morality, law, custom, and other skills and habits learned by human beings" (Tylor, 1871/2010). This definition encompasses both the material and spiritual dimensions of culture. Culture organizes how individuals make sense of social life. Through their culture, individuals learn who they are, what they value, and what behaviors are acceptable. Thus, culture functions as a "guide" that shapes behavioral patterns at both the individual and societal levels (Geertz, 1973).

Elements of culture include values, norms, belief systems, symbols, rituals, and language. Values are the abstract criteria that determine what is right and wrong in a society. Norms transform these values into concrete rules of behavior. Belief systems provide individuals with a framework for understanding the meaning and order of life. Language and symbols are the primary tools for transmitting culture. Culture has a dynamic structure. Interactions between societies, technological developments, economic transformations, and political changes constantly reshape culture. Therefore, culture is not static but open to change (Hannerz, 1992). Political culture refers to individuals' beliefs, values, and attitudes toward the political system. Political culture shapes citizens' perceptions of the state, government, democracy, authority, and politics (Almond & Verba, 1963). The concept of political culture has become one of the fundamental areas of study in political science, especially since the 1960s.

Almond and Verba (1963) explained political culture through three basic types:

- Parochial culture: Cultures in which citizens' interest in the political system is low and participation in politics is limited.
- Subjective culture: Cultures where citizens accept political authority but low participation.
- Participatory culture: Cultures where citizens actively participate in politics and embrace democratic values.

These three types have provided an important framework for explaining the level of democratization in societies. Today, political culture research is used to explain individuals' forms of political participation, their commitment to democratic values, and their perception of authority (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). Political culture influences not only citizens' behavior but also the functioning of political institutions. In high power distance cultures, citizens internalize state authority to a greater extent, while democratic demands are strengthened in individualist cultures (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, political culture is closely related to Hofstede's dimensions. Organizational culture is the set of values, beliefs, norms, and behavioral patterns shared by members of an organization. Organizational culture forms the organization's identity and guides the behavior of its employees (Schein, 2017). An organization's success, productivity, and capacity for innovation depend largely on its organizational culture. Schein (2017) considers organizational culture at three levels:

- Artifacts: Superficial elements such as visible symbols, language, dress, and rituals.
- Shared values: The organization's shared understanding of what is important.
- Core assumptions: Deep-level, often unconscious beliefs.

Organizational culture directly influences leadership style, decision-making processes, communication styles, and employee motivation. While adherence to authority is paramount in strictly hierarchical organizations, employee opinions are valued in participatory organizations. In this context, there are structural parallels between organizational culture and political culture (Hofstede et al., 2010). Organizational culture has also become increasingly important with globalization and the rise of multinational corporations. In organizations where employees from diverse cultural backgrounds coexist, cultural differences directly impact organizational communication and performance (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012). Political culture and organizational culture are reflections of societal values at different levels. The cultural codes prevalent in a society shape both citizen-state relations and institution-employee relations in business life. For example, in a society with a high level of uncertainty avoidance, the density of bureaucratic rules increases in both the political system and organizations. Therefore, the relationship between political culture and organizational culture is a comparison of two distinct domains nourished by the same societal roots. Hofstede's cultural dimensions provide a suitable analytical tool for this comparison.

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Geert Hofstede, through research conducted at IBM between 1967 and 1973, compared the values of employees across different countries and developed measurable dimensions of culture. This research is based on data from more than 116,000 employees from over 70 countries and forms the basis for cross-cultural comparisons (Hofstede, 2001). Initially, four cultural dimensions were identified, and later a fifth (long-term orientation) and a sixth (tolerance-restriction) dimension were added (Hofstede et al., 2010). Hofstede's theory is crucial for transforming culture from an abstract concept into a measurable one. Each dimension will be discussed in detail in this section. Power distance refers to the extent to which individuals accept the unequal distribution of power in society. In societies with high power distance, authority is respected, and hierarchy is considered natural. In societies with low power distance, egalitarian relationships are at the forefront (Hofstede, 2001).

Political Implications: High power distance; Authoritarian regimes, strong leadership culture, centralization, and low power distance; democratization, participatory politics, and separation of powers.

Organizational Implications: High power distance: Strict hierarchy, centralized decision-making, limited employee initiative; and low power distance: Horizontal organization, open communication, and employee participation.

Individualism refers to cultures in which individuals prioritize personal interests over group interests; collectivism, on the other hand, refers to cultures in which individuals prioritize group loyalty (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Political Implications: In individualist societies: Human rights, individual freedoms, and pluralism; and in collectivist societies:

Group loyalty, loyalty to the leader, and the priority of social harmony.

Organizational Implications: In individualist organizations: Performance-oriented, individual rewards, and flexible career paths; and in collectivist organizations: Teamwork, group decisions, and loyalty to the organization.

In masculine cultures, competition, success, and power are valued; In feminine cultures, cooperation, humility, and quality of life are at the forefront (Hofstede, 2001).

Political Implications: In masculine societies: Politics are competitive and conflict-oriented; military power and economic growth are at the forefront; and in feminine societies: Social policies, consensual politics, and a tendency toward a welfare state.

Organizational Implications: In masculine organizations: Competition, high performance pressure, achievement-oriented management; and in feminine organizations: Work-life balance, employee happiness, and inclusive leadership.

Uncertainty avoidance refers to an individual's tolerance level for ambiguous and unpredictable situations. In high uncertainty avoidance cultures, rules, standards, and bureaucracy are strong (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Political Implications: High uncertainty avoidance: Rigid constitutional order, bureaucratic structure, resistance to change; and low uncertainty avoidance: Flexibility, innovation, and openness to reform.

Organizational Implications: High uncertainty avoidance: Written procedures, strict control, risk aversion, and low uncertainty avoidance: Openness to trial and error, innovative management styles.

Long-term orientation refers to future focus, savings, and planning, while short-term orientation refers to adherence to tradition, achieving quick results, and a slogging approach (Hofstede & Bond, 1988).

Political Implications: Long-term orientation: Development plans, sustainable policies, and short-term orientation: Populism, short-term interests.

Organizational Implications: Long-term orientation: Strategic planning, R&D investments, long-term goals, and short-term orientation: Quick profits, pressure for quick results, short-term performance measures.

In tolerant cultures, individuals enjoy their pleasures and desires more freely, while in restrictive cultures, social norms impose strict control (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Political Implications: Tolerant cultures: Freedom of expression, democratic participation, and broad individual rights. Restrictive cultures: Authoritarianism, state control, and limitations on freedoms.

Organizational Implications: Tolerant organizations: Creativity, innovation, and employee freedom. Restrictive organizations: Rigid control, the weight of rules, and a narrowing of freedom.

Hofstede's six dimensions are fundamental determinants of both political and organizational culture. Power distance and uncertainty avoidance are more indicative of hierarchy and bureaucracy, while individualism, masculinity, and tolerance are associated with democratization, innovation, and participation. Long-term

orientation is a decisive dimension for development and strategic management.

Organizational Culture and Hofstede Dimensions

Organizational culture is a fundamental element that directly impacts the functioning of institutions, decision-making mechanisms, employee relationships, and management styles. Hofstede's cultural dimensions are considered a powerful tool for analyzing organizational culture and understanding how organizations are shaped in different national contexts. This section will examine in detail the implications of Hofstede's cultural dimensions on organizational culture. Organizational culture is defined as the set of meanings shared by employees, encompassing an organization's values, norms, symbols, rituals, beliefs, and behavioral patterns (Schein, 2017). This culture determines both the behavior of employees within the organization and the organization's relationships with the external environment. Organizational culture directs how individuals act within the organization, their relationships with authority, their risk-taking tendencies, their openness to innovation, and their collaboration styles. Hofstede's dimensions are important in explaining organizational culture for two reasons:

- They demonstrate the impact of national culture on organizational structures.
- They reveal how management styles within the organization are shaped by cultural differences.

For example, authoritarian and hierarchical management styles are common in high-power distance countries, while more participatory and democratic management styles are adopted in low-power distance countries (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). The power distance dimension determines the degree to which hierarchical relationships and authority are accepted within organizations. In high-power distance cultures, employees follow orders from their managers without questioning them. Decision-making processes are centralized, and there is a significant distance between superiors and subordinates. In such organizations, direct communication between subordinates and managers is limited. In low-power distance cultures, on the other hand, there is a more horizontal relationship between managers and employees. Employee participation in decisions is encouraged, open communication is valued, and leaders generally assume a guiding and supportive role (House et al., 2004). This dimension directly impacts cooperation, belonging, and individual responsibility in organizations. In individualistic cultures, employees are evaluated based on their own performance and personal achievements. Reward systems are based on individual performance. Competitiveness is at the forefront, and employees' ties to the organization are looser. In collectivist cultures, teamwork, solidarity, and loyalty are at the forefront. Employees act as part of a group, and group success is emphasized over individual success (Triandis, 1995). For example, in collectivist societies like Japan, organizational cultures are generally built on long-term loyalty, team spirit, and serving common goals. In contrast, organizations in individualistic cultures like the US emphasize employees' personal initiative and entrepreneurial spirit. The masculinity-femininity dimension determines whether organizations prioritize values such as success, competition, power, and status, or cooperation, humility, and quality of life. In masculine cultures, organizations have a competitive nature. Employee performance and achievements are emphasized. Promotions are based more on

individual performance. Stress levels are high in these cultures because employees are under constant competitive pressure. In feminine cultures, organizations place greater emphasis on cooperation, social harmony, and employee well-being. Empathy, support, and work-life balance are among the core values in employee relationships (Hofstede, 2001). The uncertainty avoidance dimension influences organizations' approach to change and innovation. Rules, procedures, and hierarchy are crucial in organizations with high uncertainty avoidance. Innovation is limited, and employees avoid taking risks. These organizations prioritize stability and security. In organizations with low uncertainty avoidance, rules are more flexible. Risk-taking and innovation are encouraged. Employees learn to cope with uncertainty, and entrepreneurship is at the forefront (Schein, 2017). In organizations with a long-term orientation, strategic planning, savings, patience, and future investment are at the forefront. Long-term commitment is expected from employees. In organizations with a short-term orientation, quick results, short-term successes, and immediate rewards are prioritized. Innovative initiatives are evaluated quickly, but long-term sustainability is often secondary (Hofstede et al., 2010). This dimension influences employees' degree of freedom and motivation. In organizations with high tolerance, employees are given more freedom. Work-life balance, creativity, and individual choices are valued. In organizations with a high level of restriction, discipline, strict adherence to rules, and social norms are at the forefront. Individual differences among employees are suppressed, and conformism is encouraged (Minkov, 2007). Hofstede's dimensions do not exist in isolation, but rather interact with each other to shape organizational culture. For example, the combination of high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance leads to rigid hierarchical and bureaucratic organizations, while the combination of low power distance and low uncertainty avoidance produces more flexible, participatory, and innovative organizational structures. In this context, Hofstede's dimensions not only explain organizational culture but also indicate how organizations operate in different national contexts and which management styles are more appropriate.

Political Culture - Organizational Culture Parallels

Political culture and organizational culture are two important cultural phenomena studied at different societal levels but share similar dynamics. Political culture refers to a society's beliefs, values, and attitudes regarding the political system, while organizational culture relates to the behavioral patterns, norms, and values within an organization. Hofstede's cultural dimensions allow for the theoretical bridge between these two cultural domains. Below, we will explore the parallels between these dimensions in political and organizational culture. In societies with high power distance, political culture generally exhibits centralized, hierarchical, and authoritarian characteristics. This is observed in the political system, where decisions are made by a narrow elite and citizen participation is limited (Almond & Verba, 1963). Similarly, in organizational culture, high power distance leads to authoritarian leadership, rigid hierarchy, and subordinate behavior towards superiors (Hofstede et al., 2010). In societies with low power distance, political culture tends to be more democratic and participatory, while organizational culture is characterized by horizontal structures that encourage active employee participation in decision-making (Schein, 2017). Therefore, the power distance dimension directly shapes management by creating similar effects at the political and organizational levels. In societies with high

individualism, political culture is shaped by a liberal democratic approach that prioritizes individual rights and freedoms. This cultural approach also creates a structure in organizations focused on individual achievement, competition, and personal performance (Hofstede, 2001). In collectivist societies, political culture is shaped by social solidarity, unity, and the strong role of the state in social life. This creates a cultural structure in which teamwork, group harmony, and collective behaviors toward common goals are at the forefront in organizations (House et al., 2004). In societies with high uncertainty avoidance, political culture is characterized by strict laws, strong state institutions, and bureaucratic control mechanisms. This tendency is reflected in organizations as adherence to rules, strict procedures, and a reserved attitude toward innovation (Hofstede et al., 2010). In societies with low uncertainty avoidance, political culture is shaped by flexibility, openness to innovation, and the capacity to take risks. Similarly, organizations are observed to adapt easily to change, encourage creative thinking, and adopt innovative practices (Schein, 2017). In societies with a long-term orientation, political culture is built on sustainable development, strategic planning, and intergenerational responsibility. This characteristic leads to a commitment to long-term strategic goals, investment, and innovation-oriented culture in organizations (Hofstede, 2001). In societies with a short-term orientation, political culture focuses more on quick solutions to existing problems and achieving immediate benefits. In organizations, short-term profit goals, results-orientation, and day-to-day approaches are prominent (House et al., 2004). In societies with high tolerance, political culture supports individual freedom of expression, the strengthening of civil society, and democratic participation. This understanding is paralleled in organizational culture by a structure that encourages employee creativity, prioritizes work-life balance, and enhances employee motivation (Hofstede et al., 2010). In restrictive cultures, authoritarian tendencies, restrictions on freedom of expression, and strong social control mechanisms are observed at the political level. In organizations, however, a structure characterized by strict rules, intense supervision, and limitations on individual freedoms emerges (Schein, 2017). Hofstede's cultural dimensions demonstrate significant parallels between political culture and organizational culture. The values within the political system often directly reflect the management approach of organizations; similarly, the cultural structures within organizations foster political culture as part of the broader societal culture. Therefore, there is a bidirectional, dynamic, and continuous interaction between political culture and organizational culture.

Türkiye Example

According to Hofstede's studies on cultural dimensions, Turkey exhibits a unique cultural profile, distinct from Western European countries and the Anglo-Saxon world. According to Hofstede Insights data (Hofstede Insights, 2023), Turkey's overall scores are as follows:

- Power Distance (66): A high power distance reflects the importance placed on hierarchy in Turkey. A structure in which leaders are in powerful positions and higher authority determines decision-making is prominent.
- Individualism-Collectivism (37): Turkey is closer to a collectivist culture. Family, kinship, and community ties are strong. Group affiliation plays a significant role in decision-making.

- Masculinity-Femininity (45): Turkey is close to average in the masculinity/femininity dimension, but has a structure where feminine traits predominate. In other words, cooperation, harmony, and relationships are at the forefront.
- Uncertainty Avoidance (85): This is one of Turkey's highest scores. It indicates that society dislikes uncertainty and seeks security through rules, regulations, and bureaucratic structures.
- Long-Term-Short-Term Orientation (46): Turkey has a moderate score. Both adherence to tradition and pragmatic flexibility are evident.

Tolerance-Restriction (49): Turkey is balanced on this dimension. Both the restrictive influence of social norms and the occasional individual quest for freedom are observed. These scores are informed by Turkey's historical, religious, economic, and social dynamics. In particular, the centralized state approach inherited from the Ottoman Empire, the strong family structure, the dualities experienced during the modernization process, and its position as a bridge between Europe and Asia have played a role in shaping its cultural profile (Kabasakal & Bodur, 2002). Turkey's political culture is strongly related to Hofstede's dimensions.

In Turkey, respect for political authority and the tradition of a centralized state reflect the high power distance dimension. The charismatic and decisive role played by leading figures in society is a fundamental characteristic of political culture. This explains the importance of "leader-centered" parties and the perception of a "strong leader" in the political arena (Heper, 1992). In Turkey, group identities (family, community, ethnic identity, party affiliation) are more prominent than individual political identities. Group solidarity, rather than individual preferences, can influence voting behavior. The tendency to avoid uncertainty has led to rigid bureaucratic processes and the importance of rules in legal and administrative regulations in Turkey. However, a pragmatic tendency to bend these rules is also evident. Turkey's modernization process has witnessed an oscillation between short-term pragmatic solutions and long-term reforms. For example, long-term modernization goals were set at the founding of the Republic, but short-term interests have frequently taken precedence in political practice (Keyman, 2005). There is a constant tension between the expansion of freedom and expression in political culture and the strengthening of social control mechanisms. This has led to a fluctuating course in Turkey's democratic journey. Organizational culture in Turkey can also be explained using Hofstede's dimensions:

- Hierarchy: High power distance reveals the decisive role of managers in workplaces. Employees view obedience to upper management as the norm, and decision-making processes are centralized (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008).
- Family-Like Structures: A collectivist culture creates "family-like" relationships in the workplace. Employees value personal connections with their employers.
- Uncertainty Avoidance: The abundance of rules and procedures in business processes is a result of a tendency to avoid uncertainty. However, flexibility and pragmatism can be emphasized in practice.
- Masculinity/Femininity Balance: Harmony and relationship management are more important than competition in the workplace. Teamwork, solidarity, and loyalty are emphasized.

- **Short-Term Goals:** Organizations often focus on short-term success, and long-term strategic planning can take a back seat.
- **There are strong similarities between political culture and organizational culture in the Turkish case:**
- **Centralization and Power Distance:** The centralized approach in government is similarly reflected in centralized decision-making processes in the business world.
- **Group Affiliation:** Group solidarity and affiliation are important in political life; similarly, team spirit and loyalty are prominent in business.
- **Uncertainty Avoidance:** The need for strict law and bureaucracy in politics leads to complex procedures in organizations.
- **Short-Term Solutions:** As in political reforms, short-term pragmatic solutions rather than long-term strategies are emphasized at the organizational level.

These parallels demonstrate that Turkey has historically developed a cultural structure compatible with state-society relations and social values. The Turkish case clearly demonstrates how Hofstede's cultural dimensions have similar effects on both political and organizational culture. High power distance, collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance tendencies explain common characteristics of both political life and organizational structure. However, Turkey's modernization and globalization processes carry the potential for change in long-term orientation and tolerance dimensions.

Conclusion

This study examines Hofstede's cultural dimensions in the context of the parallels between political culture and organizational culture. Analysis demonstrates that cultural values directly influence not only individual behavior but also a society's political structure and organizational governance. Political culture determines individuals' perceptions of the state, authority, democracy, and political institutions, while organizational culture shapes employees' perspectives on institutional structure, authority, rules, and innovation. Hofstede's dimensions of power distance, individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, long-term orientation, and tolerance-restriction provide a common framework for analyzing both cultural structures. The power distance dimension, in particular, directly impacts both the authoritarianism-democracy dichotomy in political systems and the hierarchical-participatory management approach in organizations. Similarly, individualism-collectivism is a fundamental variable determining citizens' democratic participation at the political level and teamwork or individual performance orientation at the organizational level. When examining the Turkish example, as confirmed by Hofstede's data, high power distance, moderate uncertainty avoidance, collectivist tendencies, and relatively short-term orientations define the characteristics of both political and organizational culture. This leads to both a tendency toward strong leadership and centralization in the political sphere, and organizational structures that are boss-centric, rule-based, and focused on security rather than innovation. Therefore, political and organizational culture are not disconnected from one another; on the contrary, they are structures nourished by the same social value system and evolving in parallel. Unless democratization, pluralism, and participation in the political sphere are strengthened, it

becomes difficult for participatory management, transparency, and a culture of innovation to become sustainable in organizations.

Theoretical Contributions: The most significant contribution of this study is its systematic comparison of the concepts of political and organizational culture based on Hofstede's dimensions. While these two domains are generally examined separately in the literature, this study clearly demonstrates the parallels between them. It emphasizes that the power distance dimension strengthens authoritarian governance in political systems and centralized structures in organizations. Uncertainty avoidance has been shown to increase the need for the rule of law and institutionalization at the political level, while at the organizational level, it leads to bureaucratization and strict adherence to rules. The parallelism between political participation and organizational teamwork has been demonstrated within the individualism-collectivism axis. Long-term orientation influences both the sustainability of political strategies and the institutional vision at the organizational level. This comparative perspective reveals that cultural values operate similarly at both the macro (political) and micro (organizational) levels.

Applied Contributions: In terms of political culture, for the democratization process in Turkey to progress, power distance must be reduced, meaning decision-making processes must be made more participatory. This will increase citizens' trust in the state and strengthen social integration. A high level of uncertainty avoidance leads to the establishment of rigid rules in the legal and political systems. In this context, it is important to implement the rule of law in conjunction with flexible and innovative policies. While collectivist values strengthen solidarity in political culture, they can hinder the prominence of individual rights and freedoms. Therefore, individualism and collectivism need to be developed in a balanced manner. In terms of Organizational Culture, a high power distance in organizations leads to passive participation among employees in relation to senior management. Therefore, the development of participatory leadership models and transparent communication channels is crucial. A high level of uncertainty avoidance leads to excessive bureaucracy and resistance to innovation in organizations. In this context, innovative management approaches, entrepreneurship, and a culture of risk-taking need to be encouraged. While collectivist tendencies support teamwork in organizations, they can also lead to the undermining of individual performance. Therefore, developing mixed performance systems would be beneficial. A low long-term orientation causes organizations to focus on short-term gains. Strategic management and sustainability cultures need to be promoted.

Recommendations for Turkey: **Education Policies:** To democratize political culture and modernize organizational cultures, curricula based on critical thinking, participation, and creativity should be strengthened in the education system. **Institutionalization:** Strengthening institutional structures at both the political and organizational levels, weakening systems dependent on individuals, and establishing transparent mechanisms are crucial. **Leadership Models:** Participatory, inclusive, and transparent management approaches need to be developed in political and organizational leadership. In this context, servant leadership and transformational leadership approaches may offer suitable models for Turkey. **Innovation and Technology Culture:** To reduce uncertainty avoidance in both political and organizational cultures, a culture that is open to innovation, risk-taking, and integrated with technology should be developed.

Cultural Awareness Programs: Re-discussing Hofstede's dimensions in Turkey and raising awareness in public institutions and the private sector can accelerate political and organizational transformations. In conclusion, political culture and organizational culture are reflections of the same cultural codes at different levels. Hofstede's dimensions offer a powerful analytical tool for understanding the similarities and differences between these two fields. The Turkish example demonstrates that democratization and institutionalization efforts cannot be considered separately from organizational modernization and efforts to create an innovative culture. As societal values change, both political and organizational structures are transformed. Therefore, reforms in political culture will be reflected in organizational culture, and innovations in organizational culture will be reflected in political culture. This interplay will contribute to the formation of a more democratic, participatory, and innovative society in the long run.

References

1. Almond, G., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton University Press.
2. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
3. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
4. Hofstede Insights. (2023). Country comparison: Turkey. <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/turkey/>
5. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage Publications.
6. Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton University Press.
7. Kabasakal, H., & Bodur, M. (2002). Arabic cluster: A bridge between East and West. *Journal of World Business*, 37(1), 40-54. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516\(01\)00073-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(01)00073-6)
8. Keyman, E. F. (2005). Modernization, globalization and democratization in Turkey: The AKP experience. *Journal of Democracy*, 16(1), 124-138. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2005.0005>
9. Minkov, M. (2007). *What makes us different and similar: A new interpretation of the World Values Survey and other cross-cultural data*. Klasika i Stil Publishing House.
10. Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 566-593. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316063>
11. Schein, E. H. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.
12. Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview Press.
13. Heper, M. (1992). *The state and public bureaucracy: A comparative and historical perspective*. Praeger.
14. Sirakaya, Assoc. Prof. Y., Yildirim, Prof. Dr. K. S., (2025). Emotional Algorithms: The Impact of Artificial Intelligence and Psychology. *IRASS Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 2(2),1-7
15. Sirakaya, Assoc. Prof. Y., (2025) EARLY DIAGNOSIS and PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT at WORK: APPROACHES to EMPLOYEES in the FIRST STAGE of ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE. *MRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 2 (3),1-9.
16. GÜRHAN, E., (2025). Comparing 4th Grade Social Studies Textbooks in Türkiye and Finland: Pedagogical and Curricular Insights. *MRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 2 (7),1-7.