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Abstract
Overview Changes in the world political climate, the integration of forms of warfare with new security challenges, and other developments in the military field have also changed the importance, content, and sphere of the discipline of military sociology. Influenced by these developments, the discipline of military sociology has also shaped the education process by equating the military with society. Rather than introducing the discipline of military sociology, this study examines its components in training within the educational system, focusing on military sociology and the educational process to identify steps that can contribute to the development and institutionalization of epistemological knowledge. This study compares the components of military sociology training, and its scope includes topics such as professional military service, the relationship between the military and other institutions, the emerging role of the military, and civil–military relations, on a country-by-country basis. A comparison was made using primary sources of educational programs in Türkiye and educational practices in other countries. Military sociology training in Türkiye has partially spread to civilian and military educational institutions since the 2000s.
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From a sociological perspective, war as a social phenomenon opens the door to knowledge concerning history, politics, and international relations. The concrete phenomenon that indicates this determination is due to the social nature of war in the historical process and the fact that war is built in the process of social reality. War is the root of violence and conflict throughout human history. With the emergence of modern states from the 17th century onwards, war has been seen as a means of ensuring the continued balance of power. The development of industry in modern times has been one of the determining factors in wars, influencing the outcome of wars and determining the quality and needs of military force. The concept of war has changed significantly, especially with developments in the last century. It has evolved to a different point where it differs from defining a state’s armed struggle against elements it perceives as a threat in terms of social, economic, and security risks.

The fact that there have been wars in the last century that have caused great destruction on a regional and global scale has also necessitated a scientific assessment of war and its social impact. Although there is debate in the literature about the year in which military sociology came to the fore periodically, World War II provides important information regarding styles of warfare and the development of the discipline of military sociology and the traditional methods of warfare and developed a new generation of war techniques. This process influenced the study of humanity and various topics (Siebold, 2001, p. 41). This period also influenced subsequent new generations of military technology and elements. It also influenced changes in human resources and weapons of mass destruction within the military, which were decisive factors in the war.

After World War II, Western countries’ acceptance of the U.S. position as a rising power, like other world wars, was achieved by the war’s victors and shaped the world political system (Canan-Sokullu, 2019). These measures that transformed the military field raised the question of not only the content of the phenomenon of war but also the nature of the postwar era and brought about a postwar process of increasing global polarization in the world. Thematic issues from the social and military fields came to the fore.

This study examines the formation process of the academic field of military sociology, which develops within the relationship between the military system and society in Türkiye. Despite the continuing debate about the perception and framework of military sociology in Türkiye, it is still important to examine the training of military sociology and its stages of development in the historical process (Ateş, 2020, p. 53; Başpınar, 2010, p. 2; 2012, p. 279). The research focus is on military sociology and training in Türkiye. Although we hope to contribute to the literature on this difference, the research framework and design were developed with input from other countries.
First, we examine topics in military sociology and education to establish a general framework. We reveal the limitations based on this information. Next, understand the Türkiye situation by considering knowledge about how military sociological training develops across nations. We discuss the educational process, which can be considered a step in institutionalizing the discipline of military sociology. We list our recommendations by presenting the current situation, the curriculum, its implementation in other countries, and the differences and limitations in Türkiye.

Military Sociology

Durkheim (2019, p. 42) argues that the features that explain sociological events are not the general nature or presence of thoughts and actions in the consciousness of individuals, but rather the beliefs, tendencies, and practices of social groups. This definition also guides the study of military institutions related to national security, in which the principles of violence management are considered. This idea was reflected in the development of sociology during World War II and by extension, in the development of the discipline of military sociology. Some of the early sociological theorists, such as Karl Marx (1848), Emile Durkheim (1897), Herbert Spencer (1902), and Max Weber (1927), used the military as a unit of analysis. Military sociology studies, as mentioned, did not begin until World War II, but later emerged as an interdisciplinary field of sociology that uses sociological concepts, theories, and methods to analyze the internal organization, practices, and perceptions of the armed forces and the relationships between the military and other social institutions (Smith et al., 2007, p. 3040–3041). Considering Durkheim’s (2019) idea, it is important to use sociological knowledge because social events are influenced by the beliefs, tendencies, and practices of the community in which they occur. The sociological perspective reveals patterns of behavior related to human unity by discovering, interpreting, analyzing, and proposing solutions to the general without losing the specific. Therefore, the fact that military institutions exist through human interaction in addition to the legitimate use of force makes it important to examine these institutions from a sociological perspective and understand the nature of violence and conflict through human interaction.

In the course of history, Saint-Simon was concerned with the general structure of military society and its negative features, which, in his opinion, prevented the development of society. As a result, he tried to prove that industrialized social structures can bring peace, prosperity, and tranquility to society (Özmen-Akalın, 2021, p. 48). Military and industrial societies are defined according to different principles of political and social life (Lang, 1965, p. 1). According to Saint-Simon, an industrial society characterized by property relations and the basis of production, unlike a feudal/military society based on consumption, provides a peaceful foundation that counters the
militaristic spirit of feudalism (Swingewood, 1998 as cited in Dolgun, 2019, p. 49). However, industrial society has become a component of war rather than peace. Sociology’s efforts to explain and understand social reality and find solutions to identified problems have not been realized as part of social reality, and peace has become a secondary issue (Doğan, 2022, p. 191). The role of peace was discussed as a social reality during the development of sociology as a new academic discipline but did not find a place in the subject matter of military sociology. The field of military sociology initially focused on the nature of military professions and differences between nations, but political and academic interest later shifted to postmodern military and similar concepts, strategies, and military reorganization (Crabb & Segal, 2018, p. 61).

The emergence of the discipline of military sociology was influenced not only by the development of sociological concepts and approaches to the study of military institutions but also by the requirements of wartime. The Age of Enlightenment brought great advances in the systematic study of human behavior by adapting the technical research of empirical sciences to social sciences. Military sociology has attempted to find answers to human relations, conflicts, and contradictions in the context of war and conflict from a sociological perspective (Durango et al., 2022, p. 4493). In 1941, with the entry of the U.S. into the war, the inadequacy of examinations of the military organizations of the nation states in World War I for the war period led to the development of the Troop Attitudes Research Program under President Samuel A. Stouffer by the U.S. Army in 1942. In these studies, it was understood that the concepts of group leadership and group integration were the factors that balanced stress factors such as escape, psychological collapse, and suicide in case of conflict (Caforio, 2017, p. 12–15). After this period, while sociological research on the relationship between war and the army continued in the U.S. and Western European countries, this situation enabled the concepts of freedom and security to be questioned and commented on in countries where liberal ideology was dominant (Özmen-Akalın, 2021, p. 252). Although World War II was a vital trajectory for military sociology, current debates on military sociology came to the fore in the postwar period.

In the early stages of the Cold War (1950–1989), the U.S., as the winner of the war, developed the ability to use heavy bombers to drop nuclear warheads. The threat of weapons of mass destruction led to relative peace between U.S. conventional forces at the bipolar level, and technicians and professional specialists began to replace traditional military missions with technological advances (Padilla & Laner, 2002, p. 116). In addition, the field of debate shaped in the context of the professional military has led to debates about the professionalization of officer-class military personnel in the collective management of violence (Huntington, 1957, p. 12). In contrast to Huntington’s (1957) view, Janowitz (1964) emphasized other qualities such as group identity and internal management systems and considered it necessary for military
personnel to reach a high level of competence in terms of professional military service (Ateş, 2022a, p. 30). According to Moskos, conscription is shifting from a value-oriented (institutional) profession to an economic profit-oriented occupation (Akal & Başpınar, 2022, p. 112).

Another issue that gained visibility in the post-war period is the efforts to answer the questions of power relations and competition in civil-military relations about the social sphere (Akal & Başpınar, 2022, p. 95). This debate, which prioritizes civil-military relations, deals with topics such as the role of military institutions in participation in social processes, communication, and interaction (Hooker, 2011, p. 1). The subjective/objective-civilian control theory developed by Huntington (1957) seeks to isolate military power from politics and to protect the political system from military power (1957, p. 2). Rules and principles that maximize the authority of civilians over military institutions constitute subjective control (Kızılaslan, 2018, p. 8). Objective control, on the other hand, assumes the existence of four conditions;

- isolating civilian control of the military from other elements of the social structure,
- provision of community defense by military groups,
- the military’s indifference to society’s social values and political ideologies,
- the army operates in an independent sphere of purely military necessity (Travis, 2017, p. 397).

In this framework, Huntington (1957) views objective civilian control as the appropriate form of democratic control, arguing that political actors should be prevented from interfering in the military sphere and military actors should be constrained from involvement in political decision-making processes (Born, 2003, p. 155). Another perspective on this topic is Janowitz’s (1964) model of civil-military relations. This approach states that the internalization of professional and social values by military personnel rather than the rule of law and traditions can make civilian control effective (1960, p. 420). In an alternative model of civil-military relations proposed by Rebecca Schiff (1995), the cooperation and harmony of the military, political elites, and citizens in the cultural dimension occur under a system of values that compromises and demarcates political and military institutions (Schiff, 1995, p. 7).

Apart from the debates on professional military service and military-civilian relations, the relationships of military institutions with other social institutions also gained importance with the events that unfolded in the years following the war. In institutional terms, the mobilization of physical and financial resources for the military has steadily declined since the 1960s. This shift moved from labor-intensive warfare to capital-intensive warfare and was part of a broader trend toward utilizing professional forces and outsourcing (Levy, 2015, p. 1).
Crabb and Segal addressed the development of the elements of irregular warfare embodied in insurgency, terrorism, and guerrilla warfare from the social sciences perspective. Crabb and Segal, who aimed to gather information about counter societies with the modernization theory that emphasized the fragility in the transition from traditional to modern society, worked in many conflicts with social sciences techniques. They stated that studies involving generalizing the topics of struggle contributed to the field (2018, pp. 67–69).

Although it is seen that the early studies conducted during World War II in terms of military sociology have evolved with the new fields of study during the Cold War, the research areas of military sociology have expanded with different fields of interest after the Cold War. In 1989, with the end of the Cold War, the innovations brought about by the third industrial revolution enabled the development of armies’ precision long-range and joint strike capabilities and the expansion of information-gathering activities on a global scale, which led to changes in military institutions. The binary logic (friend/enemy) that prevailed during the Cold War period has progressed towards a new logic of multivalence borrowed from cybernetics (friend/enemy/fuzzy) (Resteigne, 2022, p. 7). With technological change and differentiations in socio-cultural transformation, this situation has brought about the process of global actors deploying forces in regions where their interests are jeopardized (Manigart, 2017, p. 323). On the other hand, these developments have brought the need to restructure the army and reveal sociological determinations in regions where hot conflict is experienced.

The Purpose and Importance of Military Sociology

Studies in military sociology are generally concerned with the military organization and soldiers. The subject areas of military research include military service as a profession, professional ethics, the military as an institution and organization, civil-military relations, relations with other state institutions, and military relations with the armies of other countries (Siebold, 2001, p. 140). The prominence of asymmetric power relations in the global context after conventional wars has shaped today’s debates. By means of scientific research By means of that can inform the problem-solving strategies of military personnel and the military as a whole.

In the development process of military sociology, war, peace, and the effects of both on social change fell out of favor after World War I, but the current debates of this discipline gained importance in the context of macro issues by European sociologists in the following period (Kelty & Segal, 2018, p. 194; Segal & Burk, 2012). Notwithstanding the advent of novel conflict types following the world wars, military sociological research has predominantly focused on fundamental concerns that remain pertinent in conventional wars, such as cohesion and leadership, intergroup communication, discipline, and motivation (Brønd et al., 2020). The subject of this
motivation has remained a prominent area of discourse within the field of military sociology. Although discussions on the importance of primary group relations persisted throughout and after World War II, the Korean War reignited the debate. The Korean War was regarded as a specialized war, military rotation was ascribed to the decline in in-group cohesion was attributed to military rotation, and the literature continued to emphasize the substantial importance of cohesion in group relations (Segal & Segal, 1983, p. 156).

Military sociology was shaped on the basis of field research, and the first studies focused on the institution’s interaction processes. Later, the aspect of the military as a social institution was addressed in terms of social change, which also influenced the studies on military institutions and the sociality of military personnel. Mills’s (1956) “The Power Elite” research, which was critically analyzed in this process, is one of these studies (Marshall, 2020, p. 42). This study, which examines the relationship between military institutions and other institutions within the context of the military-industrial complex, asserts that military definitions dictate political and economic decisions. However, the critical studies and concepts that define military sociology have continued with research based on military and military institutions. The Texts that draw the conceptual dimension of this discipline; include the effectiveness of a conscripted army (Stouffer, 1949), the formation and shaping of the relationship between officer corps and the state (Huntington, 1957), the professionalization of the officer class (Janowitz, 1960), the question of convergence or divergence between national armies and their civil societies (Moskos, 1977), and the adoption of the terminology of post-modernism (Moskos et al., 2000) and approaches to the postmodern military model (Woodward & Jenkings, 2011, 254) are examples of texts that illustrate the conceptual dimension of this discipline.

In summary, military sociology is a subdiscipline that offers a scientific approach to military-military, military-civilian relations shaped in line with sociology’s main topics and perspectives. The sociological research topics encompass all matters of societal concern that pertain to individuals and human groups within society. Similarly, the subjects of military sociology as a subdiscipline should be considered within this framework. In this context, the subjects of sociology, ranging from family life to migration, from education to law, and comprising an extensive range, will also be incorporated into the research topics of military sociology. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge the constraints of military sociology, both globally and in context of Türkiye.

Military Sociology, Limits, and Limitations

Military sociology research encounters challenges and limitations when examining the military-military and military-civilian relations on the perspective of sociological subjects. One of the most important aspects is that the military profession possesses
strategic national information. All these studies and their results may contain critical information when considered internationally. That is, soldier-soldier or soldier-civilian relations will also contain information on how the army is structured. As is well known, the strengths and weaknesses of any organization are strategic information. Although contemporary management principles advocate for transparency and openness, there is also a recognized tendency to withhold certain institutional information.

Moreover, when considered in the international dimension, the organizational structure of armies contains components that could potentially serve as a mechanism for countries to gain superiority over one another. Given these circumstances, one could contend that allocating research efforts within the domain of military sociology is toward examining the internal mechanisms that govern military profession would result in a more effective use of its resources and expertise in military sociology. In this case, it seems logical that military sociology education should be included in the army and soldiers’ education process.

However, the contributions of the research subjects linked to sociology, especially in the subfield of military sociology, to this discipline are not open to sharing, which is a limitation. As such, every academic study produced in military sociology is theoretical. For research findings to be collected at a scientific level and for the discipline of military sociology to contribute to the military, the field research must be broadened in accordance with predetermined topics and disseminate sociological knowledge via internal research. For this reason, the cooperation between academia and the army will contribute to the exploration of corporate culture, the determination of professional military service awareness, and the adaptation of military personnel to changing conditions.

The military sociology discipline matured at the University of Michigan and the University of Chicago in the 1960s. By the 1980s, the University of Maryland, Northwestern University, and Texas A&M University (https://atasaren.msu.edu.tr) had established masters and doctoral programs in military sociology. Military institutions, where military sociological research is conducted, are public spaces with high national security concerns. These institutions also facilitate communication with military personnel. This situation presents certain limitations for sociological research. Moskos (1976) pointed to the irregularity of conducting research in military sociology despite the reasonable level of research concepts and findings. An additional drawback of military sociology pertains to the inability to compare studies conducted in different countries. It is common knowledge that scientific knowledge is strengthened by comparisons between new and previous results. Due to the aforementioned limitation, the research conducted by other countries within their borders prevents the possibility of comparison in this field. The limits and limitations of the field of military sociology
field raise the issue of this subdiscipline’s education. It should be emphasized here that military sociology as a subdiscipline cannot be considered independent from sociology but is a particular field of knowledge and expertise.

An International Outlook on Military Sociology Education

Diverse analyses have been conducted in military define military expertise as a vocation (Ateş, 2022a; Caforio, 2017; Downes, 1985; Huntington, 1957; Janowitz, 1964; Perlmutter, 1977). These studies include learning and internalizing the theoretical and practical steps in acquiring the knowledge and skills required by the military profession. There have been recommendations concerning the importance of military sociology in the field of education. However, in the historical process, military sociology has rarely been included in the curriculum of civilian universities other than military education institutions. However, regarding the evolution of military sociology, the conceptual discussions, topics, and effects extending to the present day show the necessity to grasp its social reality.

The episteme that underpins the knowledge of military sociology is hidden in the quest to discover the social reality. Socialization institutions, which express the acquisition of social and cultural elements in terms of acquisition, contribute to the individual. Acquiring technical knowledge and skills, as well as assimilating the culture of the military institution, is accomplished through the educational institutions within the army and continues for the duration of military profession. Therefore, military education institutions are important socialization institutions for the military profession. Individuals who prefer military institutions first experience professional knowledge and in-house cultural values within educational institutions. Although this process aims to acquire a set of professional technical knowledge and essential knowledge and skills specific to the structure of military service, the essential characteristics of being a soldier are also acquired by the individual, i.e., military personnel. As technical knowledge has advanced throughout process, the nature of the military profession or the need for security for societies to protect themselves has altered the function of educational institutions. The emergence of the first modern institutionalized military academies can be attributed to the Western world.

As it is known, military service, among some professions that emerged due to the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution, requires special training because it is based on knowledge of weapons. For this reason, military academies were institutionalized as institutions of military education in the Western world in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Segal & Ender, 2018, p. 6). The science of sociology, which seeks answers to the social problems of modern settlements characterized by rapid population growth due to the Enlightenment and the industrial revolution, developed after the emergence of military education institutions. The first
institutionalized military education institution in the West was the Royal Military Academy in Woolwich, England, in 1741. The use of ammunition, officers’ knowledge of ballistics and the use of weapons, mathematics for technical knowledge, engineering subjects (e.g., the construction of fortifications for protection from weapons), and artillery training became part of the education process in France after England. Following the French Revolution, the Ecole Militaire in France, which initially educated the sons of aristocrats, was succeeded by the Ecole Polytechnique, which helped to establish the West Point model in the United States (Crackel, 1981 as cited in Segal & Ender, 2018, p. 6).

Following the institutionalization of military education institutions in the West, including social sciences and sociology, the curriculum was developed relatively late. Technical education is seen to have reached the forefront in the establishment process of military education institutions. However, in the years following World War II, General Dwight Eisenhower penned a letter to West Point, wherein he bemoaned the prevalence of formal approaches among young officers were using formal methods when dealing with individuals and advocated for observations that necessitated the resolution of individual problems on a human basis. Although this letter did not result in the Sociology Program, it influenced the establishment of the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership in 1977. It paved the way for behavioral and social sciences courses (Ender et al., 2008, p. 50). However, the implementation of psychometric tests in the military elevated the importance of the expansion of the social sciences’ sphere of influence at the United States Military Academy. Founded in 1802, the U.S. Military Academy functioned served as a tertiary institution of engineering education. Moreover, the importance of social sciences became widespread with the psychometric tests used during the war. The sociology discipline’s popularity among the humanities/public relations was influenced by the turbulent 1960s (Segal et al., 1990, p. 157).

A comparative analysis was carried out to examine the historical development after this process. In Table 1, a compilation of content has been created to show the stages of military sociology education that are becoming widespread. At this point, the situation of military sociology education in several prominent countries is described in light of the results uncovered through the primary source scanning. The study incorporated this information acquired from primary sources through the utilization of document analysis. The distribution of military sociology courses at the global level was examined after explaining the components of military sociology education in the countries specified in Table 1. A list has been created in the Appendix-1 for this process. The results of the screening were shared for military sociology courses at civilian and military universities.
The first introductory sociology course in the United States was offered in 1963-1964 to familiarize cadets with contemporary society and culture. In the following years, military sociology was introduced in 1965-1966, followed by social psychology and organizational theory in 1969-1971, and sociology of minorities in 1973-1974. Due to the restructuring of the Military Academy in 1974, the Office of Military Leadership was re-established for both military and academic functions, and the courses on organizational theory, minorities, and military sociology were briefly disregarded. However, they were compensated for with the introduction of the “Topics in Sociology” course in 1976-1977, and “Military Sociology” was added to the curriculum as the third course. Although some courses were changed in the following years, sociology gained importance within behavioral sciences. The curriculum included new courses such as mass communication, marriage, and family (Segal et al. 1990, p. 158). Founded in 1845 in Annapolis, Maryland, sociology became part of the United States Naval Academy curriculum in the early 1990s (Trainor et al., 2008, p. 113). At the U.S. Air Force Academy, sociology was one of the fields that gained importance in the early 1960s (Cooney et al., 2003).

Sociology and military sociology began to be formally taught at the Dutch Military Academy from the 1960s onwards through the efforts of Jacques van Doorn, who is considered one of the founding figures of military sociology. Although how military sociology is taught has changed since then, this interest in analyzing military operations has added significant value to officer training (Moelker & Scooters, 2008, p. 36). In West Germany, the study of military sociology gained importance around the same time (Biehl, 2016, p. 168). In 1973, under the directives of Defense Minister Helmut Schmidt, the Hamburg Armed Forces University was established. Some studies described as military sociology were initiated with the other established Munich Armed
Forces University. A significant distance was made in the institutionalization process (Kalelioğlu, 2022, p. 205). While it was proposed to include sociology in the curriculum of the Military Training Academy in France before World War II, this process was seriously considered in 1982. After the 1982 reform, sociology was conducted through three courses: “General Sociology,” “Military Sociology,” and “Human Resources Management” (Boëne, 2008, p. 20). In Sweden, military sociology started to develop in the 1960s, and sociology became an elective course at the War Academy in the late 1970s (Danielsson & Weibull, 2008, p. 100). In Greece and Canada, sociology education started to be included in the curriculum of military institutions on similar dates (Segal & Ender, 2018, p. 8).

Regarding military sociology and education in other societies, the processes of education, and research differ in terms of historical development. As noted by Obraztsov (2005), in the Soviet Union before the formation of the Russian Federation, the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956 took steps towards institutionalizing the science of sociology, the revival of military sociology, and the continuation of its military practice. Applied research in military sociology gained prominence in the 1970s. Starting from 1982, theoretical courses on sociology were conducted to skills for applied sociological research. Military sociology officially became an academic discipline at the Soviet Military Academy (Obraztsov, 2005, p. 20). As a result, sociology officers were trained at the Academy from 1985 to 1991 and were assigned to the troops and naval forces. In Japan, military sociology came to the forefront in the early 1970s, but its significant development in academic research was realized after Hitoshi Kawano’s return from the USA in 1996. After this period, military sociology research has been conducted in areas such as the sociology of war and professional military service (Kurashina, 2003, p. 151). Military sociology is taught as a course at the South African Military Academy and in industrial psychology, public administration, and political science (Heinecken & Visser, 2008, p. 155).

When the curricula of the military education institutions of the countries regarding the teaching of military sociology courses are examined, it is understood that there are differences in reaching precise information. At the U.S. Military Academy Westpoint, it is seen that courses such as Introduction to Sociology, Family Sociology, Sociology Theory, Armed Forces and Society, and Military Leadership are offered in the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership. However, the Military Sociology course is not included (USMA Academic Program, 2022). Royal Military College (RMA, 2022), French Military Academy (Saint-Cry, 2022), Bundeswehr Command Academy (Bundeswehr, 2022), Modena Military Academy (Accademia Militare di Modena, 2022), Spanish Military Academy (Academia General Militar) do not contain any information on the existence or content of the Military Sociology course. In the content of the website of the Ministry of Defence of the Russian
Federation, it was determined that there is a center dedicated to military sociology practices (Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation, 2022). The sociological center is stated to be an integral part of the the Russian army’s 150-year military tradition, formulating recommendations for the government and military authorities regarding the moral and psychological aspects of building, training, and education. Its responsibilities include monitoring social processes in the army and navy. Within the Russian Federation, no information on military sociology education could be found on the website of the War Academy (War Academy, 2022). In Japan, it was understood that the National Defence Academy website includes academic program information and has a Human and Social Sciences department. Still, no course information or content on military sociology or other sociology fields was found (National Defence Academy, 2022).

In addition to this information, military sociology training given at universities was examined. Military, and civil universities offering courses related to Military Sociology and related research areas such as War and Peace Studies, Military-Civil Relations, Armed Forces and Society, and Women in the Military have been compiled and categorized according to their respective countries of origin.. To sum up the methodology used for the table, the data search was made in English on the websites of the universities and secondary sources with the words “Military Sociology”, and “Army Sociology” mentioned in it. Therefore, the universities listed in the table are those that publicly share their course syllabi in English on digital platforms, with the aforementioned keywords present in them. Some of the courses such as “SOCY462 Women in the Military” or “F1IS4525 Cultures of War” do not directly mention the keywords “Military Sociology” or “Army Sociology” in the course title, however, the course content covers the research areas of the keywords.

This compiled data from universities illustrates that The United States of America has the highest number of universities offering Military Sociology in their curriculum, with a majority of them being military institution. However, it should be noted that this could be the result of conducting the data collection process in English. When using keywords like “Military Sociology” and “Army Sociology” in languages other than English, such as in Italian (corso di Sociologia Militare), more universities covering the aforementioned topics topics appear. Since the target language of this paper is English, the courses in local languages are not included in the table (see Appendix-1). It appears that military sociology education has become widespread in most countries around the world.

Military Sociology Education in Türkiye

The modernization process in Türkiye is rooted in institutionalized reforms, with its origins tracing back to the Ottoman Empire, and extending into the Republican Era.
A crucial moment in Turkish modernization, occurred with the establishment of the War School (Mekteb-i Fünun-u Harbiye-i Sahane) in 1834, marking a critical paradigm shift. Before the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire relied on a professional army regime for military service (Berkes, 2019, p. 193). However, political changes and the outcomes of wars led to the abolition of the Janissary Corps, signaling the end of this established military structure. Despite subsequent efforts to establish a new army, the lack of success in this endeavor paved the way for the opening of the War School in 1835. In the broader context of educational reforms during the reign of Mahmud II, one of the Ottoman Sultans, the establishment of the Mekteb-i Harbiye holds paramount significance for the modernization process in the field of education (Eser, 2012, p. 99). Following the establishment of the War School, the curriculum included infantry drills and engineering courses, which addressed the need for technical education. Notably, the interest in sociology at the War School did not exhibit an institutionalized structure during the Ottoman period (Kalelioğlu, 2020, p. 141).

Considering that military sociology developed during and after World War II, the historical institutionalization process of social sciences in Republican Türkiye should be sought in the recent past. However, the information obtained from the literature indicates that the work titled “Ordu Sosyolojisi Yolunda Bir Deneme” published in 1939 by Şükrü Galib Erker, who had the rank of lieutenant, offered an opportunity for the development of military sociology on a personal level (Ateş, 2021, p. 59). Uyar and Varoğlu (2008) examined when military sociology, especially social sciences, started to be taught as a course in War Schools or other higher education institutions. It was reported that sociology did not exhibit a permanent feature in the education of War Schools (Uyar & Varoğlu, 2008, p.180). It is stated that the interest in the military sociology course gained importance in the 2000s. In the development process of this interest, it is reported that congresses, most of which were organized in Türkiye, covering topics such as professional military service, civil-military relations, and military leadership, were influential. Thus, it is stated that a favorable atmosphere was created for Turkish officers to take part in Peace Support Operations (PSO) (Uyar & Varoğlu, 2008, p. 197).

Segal and Ender (2008) conducted a study on the development of military sociology in nine countries, including Türkiye, and sociology in military educational institutions (2008, p. 3). It was noted that the military, as one of the essential institutions of Turkish Modernization, began to emphasize social sciences in the military academy curriculum. However, it was acknowledged that the position of sociology needed improvement (2018, p. 8). In the following period, military sociology education became important in War Schools. While military sociology education is provided at the undergraduate level, a graduate education program was opened in 2018. The postgraduate education program in Military Sociology operates within the Atatürk Institute of Strategic Studies.
at the National Defense University. Within the scope of this program, students are given ten different courses such as “Theories of Military Sociology,” “Civil-Military Relations,” “Professional Military Service,” “Comparative Historical Sociology,” “Sociology of War,” “Scientific Research Techniques and Publication Ethics” (MSÜ ATASAREN, 2022). Military sociology and its courses have not yet been institutionalized in other higher education institutions in Türkiye. Apart from the National Defense University, military sociology is taught as a course in other higher education institutions through the personal efforts of academics interested in this field. It is not offered as a course or a postgraduate program in other higher education institutions. However, it is integrated into other disciplines, such as management and organization, international relations, public administration, and political science. Academic research driven by the personal efforts of academics, plays a crucial role in the development of this field in Türkiye.

There needs to be more information about the course content on the official website of Land War College. The “Department of Humanities and Social Sciences” aims to raise awareness of social events, institutions, social change, social problems, group and intergroup behavior, communication, and social relations (Kara Harp Okulu, 2022). Besides the Military Academy, military sociology education is included in the curriculum of Kırklareli University (Kırklareli University Sociology Department, 2022). In addition, the “Military Sociology” course is included in the Istanbul University Sociology Department (İstanbul University Sociology Department, 2023). The “Military Sociology” course is given at Bahçeşehir University (Bahçeşehir University Sociology Department, 2023).

It is observed that military sociology education is included in the education plans as an elective course in a few higher education institutions, except for the National Defense University in Türkiye. We emphasize that detailed information about the course content is crucial for disseminating military and social studies from a sociological perspective. It is evident that this discipline, which seems to be of interest in very few educational institutions, covers an extensive disciplinary network in the field of study. This becomes apparent from the subject headings we formulated during development. Topics such as military-civilian relations, relations with military institutions and other social institutions, and the new roles of the army take their place in the current discussion areas. In addition to these discussions, which will contribute to the acquisition of sociological knowledge, we highlight the need for more research on military-society studies.

We emphasize that expanding research in the literature will contribute to educational content. As mentioned, we are discussing the acquisition of concrete research and observation skills, as well as the components within the scope of military sociology for
the steps of institutionalization. We find it promising for the development of topics such as the examination of professional military education in terms of civil-military relations (Ateş, 2022b), the evaluation of the military profession and professional military service (Ateş, 2022a), the historical dynamics of the civil-military distance (Akal & Başpınar, 2022) in the literature. Additionally, we find it helpful to state that studies highlighting the reality of Türkiye with new research will enrich the education process.

As it was mentioned by Ateş (2020, p. 55), expanding military sociology research topics (military organization and military profession; army and society relations studies; war and conflict) a part of the education system is another vital process. It should be stated that the information obtained through these steps will contribute to the development of the field and the detection of new trends in the education process.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, military sociology is a sub-discipline that systematically examines the interactions between the military and society, regarding military-military and military-civilian relations through scientific criteria. Initially, rooted in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, it evolved within the theoretical framework of professional military service and the relationship between civilian political authority and military institutions. Following World War II, the institutionalization of scientific research in military sociology introduced new dimensions to the field. The debates surrounding the military’s role, especially in Western societies that prioritize democratic and liberal values, and in collectivist societies, have been central to military sociology. Beyond traditional warfare, the emergence of various security challenges has propelled military research into the spotlight.

The post–Cold War era, marked by unconventional forms of conflict, prompted scientific inquiries into the impact of these changes on the army and soldiers. Notably, the U.S. encounter with guerrilla-style warfare, as exemplified in the Vietnam War, underscored the importance of understanding the motivations of soldiers in war. As military sociology became institutionalized in the West studies, focused on critical topics such as civil-military relations, professional military service, new roles of the army, and relations between the army and its relationship with other social institution. After the Cold War, global security concerns such as global terrorism, mass migration, and transnational crimes have elevated the importance of conducting social analysis of the military.

This study provides information about the possibilities and limitations of military sociology education specifically for Türkiye. Therefore, the development and prevalence of military sociology education on a global scale were examined. When
the findings obtained within the framework of military sociology education in the West and other societies are analyzed together with the situation in Türkiye, the importance of military sociology education is highlighted.

The cross-country development processes of military sociology education are examined in Table 1. Thus, it has been observed that developments in the field of military sociology have gained prominence in Western societies post-World War II, starting in the 1960s. This situation has developed primarily with the contributions of academics interested in the field in military education institutions. In other Western societies after the USA, it was understood that the interest in military sociology education coincided with earlier periods. Military sociology education has developed with the contributions of Huntington (1957) and Janowitz (1964), who provided a theoretical perspective, and new research topics and scope have been expanded. There was a similar interest in the field in other societies, but this process became an institutionalized structure in later periods.

Military sociology education in Türkiye has its roots in the military academy, established as a modernization step during the Ottoman period. It is understood that this process gained importance in the 2000s under the leadership of military educational institutions. It is seen that academic research has increased at the local level, but more studies are needed. It is promising that the interest in military sociology at the educational level has developed through newly institutionalized departments and graduate education programs. However, there is a pressing need for military sociology education to permeate other higher education institutions, and collaborations are essential to meet the personnel needs regarding military-society research. Military sociology courses should become widespread rather than academics who continue these efforts.

- In addition, it is deemed imperative to disseminate military sociology education within the scope of sociology education in Türkiye for the following reasons;
- Understanding the development process of professional military service and reflecting on the changing perception of compulsory military service in Turkish society,
- The processes of coping with social problems of the personnel working in the army and the responsibilities of the institutions,
- Examining the motivation processes of military personnel in the Turkish army,
- Topics such as examining professional adaptation and career processes for professional military service can be cited as justification.

The limitation of the educational process in military sociology is undoubtedly affected by the unpredictability of the interest in the field. Nevertheless, universities
should not remain indifferent to military research in the future. Understanding the limits and limitations encountered in the studies conducted in the field of military sociology is essential. The most important of these is that the military profession contains national information of a strategic nature. On the other hand, it is also important to develop a curriculum for military sociology education. Augmenting academic studies focused on military sociology, including materials with book translations, and disseminating research within the military will contribute significantly to the field (relationship between the army and other social institutions, civil political authority-military institution relations, professional military service, new roles of the army, etc.). Dissemination of research within military institutions will contribute to the field of military sociology and military institutions. We hope that this study will contribute to studies on military sociology and education with the findings mentioned above.
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### Appendix 1

**Countries and Military Sociology Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Website link</th>
<th>Course Semesters</th>
<th>Access Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>Civil-Military Relations</td>
<td><a href="https://programsandcourses.anu.edu.au/2024/course/NSPO8042">https://programsandcourses.anu.edu.au/2024/course/NSPO8042</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>09.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>The Paris Institute of Political Studies (Sciences Po)</td>
<td>F1IS4525 Cultures of War</td>
<td><a href="https://syllabus.sciencespo.fr/cours/202220/219581.html">https://syllabus.sciencespo.fr/cours/202220/219581.html</a></td>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>07.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>University of Turin</td>
<td>Military Sociology and Leadership</td>
<td><a href="https://www.suiss.unito.it/do/corsi.pl?_id=r1ip">https://www.suiss.unito.it/do/corsi.pl?_id=r1ip</a></td>
<td>2019-2023</td>
<td>09.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>UMGC Asia</td>
<td>SOCY462 Women in the Military</td>
<td><a href="https://asia.umgc.edu/online-degrees/course-descriptions/listing.socy">https://asia.umgc.edu/online-degrees/course-descriptions/listing.socy</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>07.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>University of Sargodha</td>
<td>SOCI6225 Sociology of War and Military</td>
<td><a href="https://www.academia.edu/41101725/CURRICULUM_M_Sc_SOCIOLOGY_2_YEARS_PROGRAMME_UNIVERSITY_OF_SARGODHA_SARGODHA_Applicable_from_Session">https://www.academia.edu/41101725/CURRICULUM_M_Sc_SOCIOLOGY_2_YEARS_PROGRAMME_UNIVERSITY_OF_SARGODHA_SARGODHA_Applicable_from_Session</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Course Name</td>
<td>Course Semesters</td>
<td>Access Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Palestine Ahliya University</td>
<td>130306 Military Sociology</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13.10.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>The National Defense Institute (IDN) organizes, in partnership with the School of Social Sciences of the Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV/CPDOC - Brazil)</td>
<td>Sociology of the Armed Forces</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>09.10.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>University of Ljubljana</td>
<td>Military Sociology (third level Doctoral study programme)</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>07.10.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Seoul National University</td>
<td>205.239A Armed Forces and Society</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>05.10.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish Defence University</td>
<td>Military Sociology</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>05.10.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>ZTH Zürich</td>
<td>853-0064-00L Military Sociology</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>05.10.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Kingdom</td>
<td>King’s College London</td>
<td>War and Society</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>05.10.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Website link</th>
<th>Course Semesters</th>
<th>Access Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Alice Lloyd College</td>
<td>305 Military Sociology</td>
<td><a href="https://www.alc.edu/academics/courses/sociology-courses/">https://www.alc.edu/academics/courses/sociology-courses/</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>14.09.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Colorado State University Pueblo</td>
<td>SOC334 Military Sociology</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.csupueblo.edu/course-description-information/soc/">https://catalog.csupueblo.edu/course-description-information/soc/</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>09.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Georgia Military Academy</td>
<td>MSD 211 Leadership and Ethics</td>
<td><a href="https://www.gmc.edu/degree-programs/sociology/">https://www.gmc.edu/degree-programs/sociology/</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>14.09.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Norwich University</td>
<td>SOCI330 Military Sociology</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.norwich.edu/courses/SOCI330">https://catalog.norwich.edu/courses/SOCI330</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>10.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Park University</td>
<td>SO318 Military Sociology</td>
<td><a href="https://catalog.norwich.edu/courses/SOCI330">https://catalog.norwich.edu/courses/SOCI330</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>10.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Reed College</td>
<td>Sociology371 - Military and Society</td>
<td><a href="https://www.reed.edu/sociology/courses/">https://www.reed.edu/sociology/courses/</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>14.09.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>St. Mary’s College of Maryland</td>
<td>SOCI329 Sociology of War and Peace</td>
<td><a href="https://www.smc.edu/catalog-2122/category/sociology/">https://www.smc.edu/catalog-2122/category/sociology/</a></td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>09.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>SOCI4301 Military Family</td>
<td><a href="https://www.tamuct.edu/syllabi/docs/2021_Fall/20210881180.pdf">https://www.tamuct.edu/syllabi/docs/2021_Fall/20210881180.pdf</a></td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>09.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>The Catholic University of America</td>
<td>SOC552 Military Sociology</td>
<td><a href="https://sociology.catholic.edu/academics/courses/course-descriptions/index.html">https://sociology.catholic.edu/academics/courses/course-descriptions/index.html</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>14.09.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>TUFTS University</td>
<td>SOC120 Sociology of War and Peace</td>
<td><a href="https://as.tufts.edu/sociology/academics/courses">https://as.tufts.edu/sociology/academics/courses</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>09.10.2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Website link</th>
<th>Course Semesters</th>
<th>Access Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>University of California San Diego</td>
<td>POLI143A War and Society</td>
<td><a href="http://slantchev.ucsd.edu/courses/ps143a/syllabus.pdf">http://slantchev.ucsd.edu/courses/ps143a/syllabus.pdf</a></td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>14.09.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>SOCY464 Military Sociology</td>
<td><a href="https://socy.umd.edu/sites/socy.umd.edu/files/syllabi/SOC464Syllabus-FA14all_0.pdf">https://socy.umd.edu/sites/socy.umd.edu/files/syllabi/SOC464Syllabus-FA14all_0.pdf</a></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>05.10.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>University of Missouri-St. Louis</td>
<td>3801 Military Sociology</td>
<td><a href="https://m.umsl.edu/de-fault/device/small/schedule/detail?area=SOC&amp;course=SOC3801&amp;term=5143">https://m.umsl.edu/de-fault/device/small/schedule/detail?area=SOC&amp;course=SOC3801&amp;term=5143</a></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>10.09.2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>