

THE PERSONALITY OF ATATURK AS A LEADER OF TURKISH REFORM

Geliş Tarihi: 07.10.2024

Selcen Gulce ÇAVUŞ¹

Kabul Tarihi: 27.10.2024

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Fedai ÇAVUŞ²

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Abstract

In this study, the Hermann model, which classifies leaders according to their psychological characteristics and behavioural patterns, was used to analyse Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's personality. Atatürk is a prime example of many of this model's essential traits, especially his visionary leadership, decisiveness, and flexibility. As the founder of the modern Turkish Republic, Atatürk had a clear vision for national transformation and sovereignty. His ability to articulate this vision inspired the people and created a shared sense of identity. Another key characteristic of the Hermann model that Atatürk exhibited was decisiveness. He successfully navigated the turbulent terrain of post-Ottoman Türkiye by making quick, calculated decisions, frequently in response to difficult political and social issues. A key component of the Hermann model, adaptability, emphasizes Atatürk's practical style of leadership. He demonstrated flexibility in his governance style by being able to review and adjust his plans in response to the changing demands of Turkish society. This flexibility made it easier to implement reforms that successfully addressed the concerns and goals of various social groups. Additionally, Atatürk was able to establish a rapport with the populace and cultivate a devoted following thanks to his excellent communication abilities. His persuasive speeches and public persona fostered an atmosphere of participation and trust. In conclusion, the Hermann model provides a sophisticated insight into Atatürk's character by showing how his visionary, decisive, and flexible leadership influenced the development of contemporary Türkiye and left a lasting impression on world history.

Keywords: Personality, Leadership, Republic of Türkiye, Atatürk.

JEL Codes: D73, D74, D78.

TÜRK REFORMUNUN LİDERİ OLARAK ATATÜRK'ÜN KİŞİLİĞİ

Özet

Bu çalışmada, liderleri psikolojik özelliklerine ve davranış kalıplarına göre sınıflandıran Hermann modeli, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün kişiliğini analiz etmek için kullanılmıştır. Atatürk, başta vizyoner liderlik, kararlılık ve esneklik olmak üzere bu modelin temel özelliklerinin birçoğunun en iyi örneğidir. Atatürk modern Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kurucusu olarak ulusal dönüşüm ve egemenlik için belirgin bir vizyona sahiptir. Bu vizyonu ifade etme yeteneği halka ilham vermiş ve ortak bir kimlik duygusu yaratmıştır. Atatürk'ün sergilediği Hermann modelinin bir diğer kilit özelliği de kararlılıktır. Osmanlı sonrası Türkiye'nin çalkantılı ortamında, çoğu zaman zorlu siyasi ve sosyal meseleler karşısında hızlı ve hesaplı kararlar alarak başarılı bir şekilde yol almıştır. Hermann modelinin kilit bileşenlerinden biri olan uyumluluk, Atatürk'ün pratik liderlik tarzını vurgular. Türk toplumunun değişen taleplerine karşılık olarak planlarını gözden geçirip ayarlayabilmek suretiyle yönetim tarzında esneklik göstermiştir. Bu

¹ Corresponding Author, M.Sc., Ghent University, Master of Science in Conflict and Development, Ghent, Belgium, sgcavus@gmail.com, ORCID: [0009-0007-8422-2725](https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8422-2725)

² Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Department of Management Information Systems, Osmaniye, Türkiye, mfcavus@osmaniye.edu.tr, ORCID: [0000-0002-2515-5805](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2515-5805)

esneklik, çeşitli sosyal grupların endişelerini ve hedeflerini başarıyla ele alan reformların uygulanmasını kolaylaştırmıştır. Ayrıca Atatürk, mükemmel iletişim becerileri sayesinde halkla yakınlık kurabilmiş ve sadık bir takipçi kitlesi oluşturabilmiştir. İkna edici konuşmaları ve kamusal kişiliği bir katılım ve güven ortamı yaratmıştır. Sonuç olarak, Hermann modeli Atatürk'ün vizyoner, kararlı ve esnek liderliğinin çağdaş Türkiye'nin gelişimini nasıl etkilediğini ve dünya tarihi üzerinde nasıl kalıcı bir etki bıraktığını göstererek Atatürk'ün karakterine dair sofistike bir kavrayış sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kişilik, Liderlik, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Atatürk.

JEL Kodları: D73, D74, D7.

1. INTRODUCTION

The roles of personalities in politics are usually disregarded as a major indicator of shaping a country's choices. Nevertheless, there are some theories related to this topic. These researches capture lots of different personality traits that may be effective in the decisions of leaders. In this regard, the most known leadership personality trait analysis is made by Margaret Hermann (Kaarbo, 2017). Other than her theory, other different factors can affect or change the personality of a person too which causes personalities to affect the environment differently (Mintz and Derouen, 2014). This essay will display how a personality can affect and change the providence of a country.

The first part of this paper includes information about research on personality trait analysis of a leader. A leader is essential for guiding and saving a nation in times of distress. The personality of the leader has a tremendous impact on societal norms, government, and international constraints. The perceptions of leaders are influenced by their backgrounds, goals, worldviews, and political sensitivity. Authority is concentrated at the highest levels of government during international crises, boosting decision-making flexibility and motivating leaders to act according to public opinion and national interests. This orientation might alter state relationships since the leader's choice might have an impact on those connections (Mintz and Derouen, 2014; Kaarbo, 2017; Hermann et. al, 2001; Gallagher and Allen, 2014; Derman, 2019). Therefore, it is important to understand how the personality traits of a leader might affect the decision-making process of a leader.

In the second part, the paper will demonstrate the leadership trait analysis of Margaret Hermann which indicates seven main characteristics of a leader by using the example of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk who is a defender of his homeland, the founder of the Republic of Türkiye, and an extreme Westernizer. According to Post and Hermann (2008) the personality traits of leaders can be listed as (1) Belief in the ability to control events, (2) Conceptual Complexity, (3) Need for Power, (4) Distrust of others, (5) In group biases, (6) Self Confidence, (7) Task Orientation.

The reason why Atatürk was chosen as an example is that his assessments of the world and Türkiye were always accurate. Such as, he consistently forecasts that the Ottoman will lose the First World Conflict and that the Second World War would erupt; in this war, he predicts Romania's fate and France's attitude toward Hatay. He molded events himself in his assessments of Türkiye. He was nearly never incorrect, because he was in charge (Taş, 2009). Therefore, it is important to understand his personality and leadership to see why he was successful in transforming the Sultanate into a new democracy and became a worldwide respected leader.

2. PERSONALITY AND ITS ROLE IN LEADERSHIP

There are various types of research related to personality and politics. Personality, a really broad term, explains how we shape our opinions in psychology. The narrow definitions of personality usually exclude political attitudes and opinions but apply to non-political personal differences and psychopathological differences (Greenstein, 1992).

In this regard, Stoessinger (2011) says that the case studies illustrate that when it comes to the problem of a conflict erupting, the personalities of leaders are vitally crucial. He is less fascinated by the significance of abstract elements like nationalism, militarism, and alliance formations, which are widely seen to be the causes of conflict. Furthermore, none of the cases examined indicate that economic considerations had a substantial role in the onset of conflict. On the other hand, the personalities of leaders have frequently been crucial. To support this, Henry Kissinger states that we tend to look at history in an imperial way but when we put it into practice we can see the difference caused by personalities (Kaarbo, 2017). Opinion is a massive part of personality and the decisions a personality makes (Greenstein, 1992). Decisions that a leader makes are significant to decide the orientation that a state will take. One decision may result in the benefit of the country or start a crisis that can change the direction of history. In this sense, there are lots of variants that affect the decisions of leaders. We can count them as background, sentiments, dogmas, images, biases, cognitive processes, motives, ideology, characteristics, and perception of the leader (Mintz and Derouen, 2014; Kaarbo 2017; Smith, 2012; Hermann, et. al 2001).

Furthermore, leadership traits are essential to understanding how personality affects politics by determining leadership styles. Leadership is defined as the sum of skills and understanding that enable a group of people to come together through a common objective and mobilize them to achieve that goal. Leadership can be viewed as a personality attribute, a feature of a certain authority, or a form of action (Derman, 2019). Leaders face various constraints and opportunities every day and the leadership style, which is shaped by personality traits, affects how a leader acts upon daily constraints which influences the decision-making process.

When it comes to leadership personality traits, the most developed theory is made by Margaret Hermann (Table 1). Her theory has seven personality traits which are belief in the ability to control events, conceptual complexity, need for power, distrust of others, in-group bias, self-confidence, and task orientation (Kaarbo, 2017). Additionally, there are political leadership style categorizations which are crusader vs. pragmatist, ideologist vs. opportunist, directive vs. consultative, task-oriented vs. relations-oriented, and transformational vs. transactional. According to Hermann, this categorization goes in hand with the personality traits of a leader. Different combinations of leadership personality traits result in different leadership styles. The ones who are more goal-driven- Crusaders, opportunists, directive, task-oriented and transformational- act on their beliefs, values, motives, and passions, thus hard to change their ideas; while the ones who are more responsive to the current situation- pragmatist, ideologue, consultative, relations oriented and transactional- tend to act on the present context and choose the behavior which is suitable for the context (Hermann, et. al, 2001). In actuality, leadership is impacted by the environment, as well as the possibilities and constraints it presents (Derman, 2019).

The level of conceptual complexity and self-confidence determines if the leader is open to information or not which would influence their assessment of the constraints while to what degree a leader believes in their ability to control events and their need for power determines if

the leader will challenge or respect the constraints. In group biases, distrust of others and task orientation of a leader determine their motivation in actions (Post and Hermann, 2008).

Table 1: Leadership Personality Traits by Margaret Hermann

Leadership Trait	Description
Belief in the ability to control events	perception of own degree of control over the political world
Need for power	interest in developing, preserving, or reinstating own power
Conceptual complexity	ability to distinguish complexities of political life
Distrust of others	suspensions, skepticism, worry about others outside own group
In group biases	the belief that own group constitutes the center of the political world
Self-confidence	the notion of self-importance, and of capacity to take on the political environment
Task orientation	focus on problem-solving vs. building relationships

Source: Kaarbo, J. (2017). Personality and international politics: Insights from existing research and directions for the future. *European Review of International Studies*, 4(2-3), 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.3224/eris.v4i2-3.02>

Moreover, the importance of personality is more distinguished when it comes to establishing a state, regime, or leadership (Mintz and Derouen, 2014). There are two reasons:

- a) **Domestically:** When there is a crisis, devastation of a nation, war, or similar tough situations, people need a leader who will gather them up and save them from that situation. The leader is the one whose people follow, believe, and support, even sometimes adore as their savior or hero. This means that the personality of the leader will hugely affect and shape the nation both in terms of governance and social norms (Mintz and Derouen, 2014);
- b) **Internationally:** The policy is set by the leader. As Herman and Hagan stated the international and internal restrictions of a state are defined by its leaders. They establish expectations, prepare tactics, and press their governments to take acts that reinforce their judgments about what is conceivable and probable to keep them in their positions based on their perceptions and interpretations. Governments' approaches to international affairs are shaped by such perceptions. Leaders' perceptions are shaped by their own experiences, aspirations, worldviews, and political sensitivities. (Kaarbo, 2017). In addition, Hermann, et al (2001) also stated that even in democracies, there is a strong tendency for authority to be concentrated at the highest levels of government during times of international crisis, which reduces usual institutional and normative restraints and increases leaders' decision latitude while encouraging them to act on their perceptions of national interest and public preferences. This indicates that the decision of a strong single leader is the orientation that the state follows, which means it may cause a change in the relationship between states (Gallagher and Allen, 2014).

If we look at the case of the Republic of Türkiye, the transition from the Ottoman Empire to a Republic has been started and shaped by Atatürk whose believers adored him, a charismatic leader of the crisis. According to Weber, a charismatic leader is someone who appears to his supporters to be beyond the usual human range and capable of doing miracles for their benefit. Personal attributes such as a blend of wide sensitivity, dynamic energy, and aloofness of demeanor are only a small portion of what makes someone charismatic. Above all, what binds the leader and the following is a connection, a bond of expectation. This was what set Kemal apart from other public personalities of the day his most uncharismatic characteristic. One may

describe him as an organized man who has been thrust into a charismatic scenario (Rustow, 1968).

3. ANALYSES OF THE LEADERSHIP PERSONALITY OF ATATURK

3.1. Conceptual Complexity

Greenstein (1992) explains the political behaviors of personalities as their responses to their environment. The environment, in which a person grows up and is located, is essential for the effect on one's cognitive process (Gallagher and Allen, 2014; Greenstein, 1992). Everyone reacts differently to the same content. It was the same with Ottoman scholars and politicians during the First World War. There were four different views on how to maintain stability in the country. These were Ottomanism, Islamism, Nationalism, and Westernization. Everyone was saying something different and there was no unity anymore. Some politicians were supporting the American mandate in a world order that requires national sovereignty (Taş and Göksüçukur, 2019).

At the same time, because of defeat and occupation, as well as overwhelming enthusiasm for national resistance, a mix of military and political leadership was required. The Sultan, who was morbidly bashful, irascible, suspicious, and inexperienced in politics, chose to collaborate with the enemy. The country's three most prominent generals, including Enver Pasha, failed to lead the country to victory and subsequently fled overseas. Other notable generals were Ottomans of Albanian, Kurdish, or Arab ancestry who were hesitant to lead what was expected to become a uniquely Turkish national resistance effort. Kemal was one of the three highest-ranking Turkish generals who remained behind. He was the youngest person to occupy such a position at the age of 37, in 1918. In any case, he was the first nationalist leader to seek the position (Rustow, 1968).

In such an environment, Ataturk who grew up in a multicultural city and a house with a reformist father and dogmatic mother; in addition, experienced his military accomplishments as a nationalist and ideologue soldier who fought on the eastern front and Dardanelles battle, was unacceptable. However, as early as 1909, he advocated that officers should be forbidden from participating in partisan activities, and for the following nine years, he focused only on his military duties (Akarslan, 2021). When he took over the political direction of the War of Independence, he reaffirmed the same principle even more emphatically by saying when considering and executing the army's tasks and needs, commanders must avoid allowing political concerns to affect their decisions. They must remember that there are other authorities whose job it is to consider the political side of things. Talking and politicking are insufficient to execute a soldier's mission. (Rustow, 1968).

3.2. His Belief in the Ability to Control the Situation and Self-confidence

Aggressors of the twentieth century fought for the greater good, making war a matter of survival for their desired conquests. Those who were attacked had to fight for their lives, and desperation-born courage proved to be a tremendous weapon. Those who initiated the conflict were eventually stifled, turned back, and, in some cases, entirely crushed. In no circumstance did any nation that started a war succeed in achieving its goals (Stoessinger, 2011). So, he first tried to convince Istanbul to fight against the invaders but failed. Nevertheless, he kept

gathering followers for resistance. This resulted in him being called back to the capital to receive his sentence for going against the Emperor. The reaction he gave was to take off his beloved military uniform to wear a politician's suit to start a resistance in Anatolia for independence.

It was the opportunity for him to start a new era according to his values and ethics in Turkish history. From this situation, we can see that he was challenging the constraints provided by capital and binding agreements with invaders for his own beliefs and values which come to mean that he was performing a goal-driven leadership style. His acts show how determined and self-confident he was in his actions. He believed that he could control the situation.

He was a leader who set an example for others by motivating and encouraging them (Akarşlan, 2021). Leaders give a vision, an ideal that followers may aspire to, establish high standards, and persuade people that they can achieve more than they envisage (Sigri, 2014). He took the risk of being executed for his deeds and sacrificed his uniform which he cherishes a lot. This move of him displayed how much importance he gave to the independence of the nation. As a result, he was an important figure for both soldiers and citizens. He kept them motivated and gave courage to them to keep fighting which resulted in changing the rotation of the First World War.

As an example from the military, Atatürk's decision to urge his men on the Gallipoli front to die by saying "either independence or death" during the First World War demonstrates his boldness, resolve, and risk-taking personality (Derman, 2019). An additional example from Dardanelle's battle is that Mustafa Kemal observed several men fleeing from the enemy in fright. He told them to come to a halt and fight, saying: by saying: "I am not ordering you to attack. I command you to die. In the time that will pass until we die, other forces and other commanders may take our place." as he was standing straight on top of a boulder, even though he was in danger of being shot, demonstrating his bravery to the soldiers (Akarşlan, 2021) Through doing these, he showed his ability to control the situation by influencing the public and soldiers towards a purpose. This shows how he believed in his ability to control the situation and preferred to challenge the constraints with confidence.

A supplementary example is his Ankara speech in 1919 to motivate and persuade people to resist:

"If a nation does not become concerned about its existence and its rights with its entire strength, with all its spiritual and material powers, if a nation does not rely on its strength to secure its existence and independence, then it cannot be rescued from becoming this person's or that person's puppet. Our national life, our history, and our system of administration in the last epoch are a perfect demonstration of this. Therefore, within our organization, the principle has been adopted that the national forces are supreme and that the national will is paramount. Today the nations of the whole world recognize only one sovereignty: national sovereignty. If we now look at the other details of the organization we begin our work from the village and the neighborhood and the people of the neighborhood, that is, from the individual. If the individuals do not do their thinking, the masses can be led in an arbitrary direction, can be led by anyone in good directions or bad directions. To be able to save himself, every individual must become personally concerned with his destiny. A structure that in this way rises from below to the top, from the foundation to the roof, will surely be sturdy. Nonetheless, there is a need at the beginning of any. ,"

(Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara İleri Gelenleriyle Bir Konuşma, n.d-b)

From all these cases, we can see how self-confident and determined he was for national sovereignty, and for this purpose, he acted as a crusader leader and used every opportunity to shape the public for his aim.

3.3. Need for Power

When he was deported from the shore of the capital to Samsun in 1919, his main desire was for the Turkish nation to rise in pride and dignity. The only way to reach this aim was to provide complete freedom. His most explicit argument of the nation-state, characteristically, appeals to the international community's established understanding of sovereignty and its conventions of recognition (Rustow, 1968). This was the primary task to solve at the time as the country was invaded from all sides and the military was disarmed which was a disgrace for him. He showed this in the Erzurum Congress, which was second after the Amasya Congress, by saying "The parts of the homeland within the national borders are whole. They cannot be separated from each other. Against all kinds of foreign invasion and intervention and in the event of the dissolution of the Ottoman Government, the nation will defend and resist itself." (Ataturk Arastirma Merkezi, Erzurum Kongresi, n.d.-d).

As a person with a military background, he felt that justice is absolute, but that for the right to triumph in this world, force is essential. He gave significance to laws and regulations. This can be analyzed as both a national and personal characteristic of him. As a result, it's impossible to say whether Kemal supported legality because it helped him unite other Turks or because he couldn't bring himself to use force for anything less than a worthy cause. Regarding this view of him, Ataturk said that there is justice, and right is superior to force. Furthermore, the world must be convinced that the country understands its rights and is willing to protect and preserve them. (Rustow, 1968).

For this purpose, he gave lots of speeches all around Anatolia, published circulars, and held congresses with his fellows which show us his crusader personality even more obviously and his need for developing power by using his strong, heroic, and charismatic features as a manipulative tool (Akarslan, 2021). From these events, we can see his view of governance, which has been formed by democratic theories, with his words during the Amasya Congress: "The independence of nation will be saved by the determination and will of a nation." (Amasya Valiligi, n.d-a) He strongly supports governance which involves the whole nation. Atatürk spoke to troops and people, both publicly and privately, throughout his life to discern the wants and requirements of the individuals who make up society and to meet their requests. It is to demonstrate that he has always had people's support. He says that he has always produced breakthroughs and upheavals for the welfare of the nation and country by interacting with citizens, drawing strength and encouragement from their enthusiasm, affection, and honesty (Taş, 2009).

Thus in the Amasya circular, he asked for representatives for every city to meet in a congress which will be held in Sivas and Erzurum. Later he established the Grand Assembly in 1920. This shows how he shifted the system from sultanate to democracy to achieve participative leadership and his enthusiasm to enlist the help of everyone in his vicinity, even though this assembly was immediately dubbed the Grand National Assembly, although no one could say for several years whether it was convened in the name of an Ottoman or a Turkish people. The name "millet" was deliberately vague, as it already meant "nation" in the Western sense to educated people, but it still meant "religious order" to unschooled peasants, implying Islam. (Akarslan, 2021; Rustow, 1968).

Accordingly, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Kemal's boyhood friend and subsequently the founder of the Progressive Party, wrote in 1957 that he believed in the same things he believed in the 1920s which was the Ghazi might have better monitored the revolutionary effort if he had remained an impartial head of state. After saying this he adds graciously, nonetheless, he may be mistaken. Many others argued from the beginning, with similar seriousness, that Türkiye was not ready for democracy in Ataturk's time, and that any organized opposition would inevitably jeopardize secularism and the Republic itself. In any event, Kemal was not willing to put up with the experiment. Rather, he was willing to wield personal authority through a party dictatorship and, if necessary, make his more zealous or ambitious opponents pay the price with their lives (Rustow, 1968).

3.4. In Group Biases

He was someone who enjoyed the intellectual talk. However, he had one weakness which was his belief that his rules were the most accurate ones. As a result, he could spend hours, even days to convince everyone that what he proposed was the right thing to do (Rustow, 1968). This was the same even with his closest friends. Considering the short-lived attempt with the Free or Liberal party founded in 1930 at his insistence by his good friend Fethi Okyar, one fact is for certain regarding Ataturk: he did not tolerate any political opposition, no matter how reasonable it might be (Karpas, 1985). He strongly wanted to establish a democratic country that would have opposition to him because he enjoyed showing that he was right.

3.5. Distrust of Others

Ataturk's early leadership was focused on gathering and disseminating information, conferring with colleagues who established a nationwide network, and synchronizing and concerting the acts of the country's most varied regions, social groupings, and personalities. It was a masterful display of leadership via conciliation, connection, and communication (Rustow, 1968).

As it indicates, Ataturk did trust his subordinates and the people of the nation to achieve victory. He made his decisions cautiously, he interrogated the people under his order. He established such a vast network of people that he could reach whenever and wherever needed. An example of this is that Bayar was hiding from rebels called Anzavur, in his house in Bursa. Ten minutes later, he received an order from Ataturk to suppress the rebels which had been delivered by a secretive person (Akarslan, 2021).

Atatürk worked within a hierarchical structure in which, instead of being at the top, he could be anywhere at any time, he meticulously supervised and evaluated his environment through input and output control, which led him to select alternatives to solve possible issues within the organizational framework he was attempting to form (Akarslan, 2021). Since he managed everything inside the country by himself, he did not have any reason not to trust people around him or to trust them.

3.6. Task Orientation

As stated before, Ataturk was particularly influenced by Western ideologues, thus he first solved the problem of sovereignty and then his aim after the War of Independence was to establish a new Turkish nation that could stand with developed countries, especially in terms of civilization (Akarslan, 2021) which shows us he has a tendency towards problem-solving than creating relations. He expresses this aim with these words in his Ankara speech:

“The aim of our National Organization today is to save the homeland from division and the nation from captivity. Hopefully, shortly, the national organization will

fulfill its patriotic duty in achieving this goal. But will he be deemed to have completed his mission? I think we have a very important national service and national duty from now on. In short, we need to improve our internal situation and show through our work that we can be an organ working among civilized nations. To be successful in this aim, more social work than political work is needed. Undoubtedly, the general wishes of our nation will determine what shape our National Organization should take for such a purpose.”

(Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara İleri Gelenleriyle Bir Konuşma, n.d-b)

This indicates how he took on the mission to make the nation as strong as it was during the Sultanate using new conditions which were Western democracy. He made various policies and changes to achieve this goal. After establishing the Grand Assembly and abolishing the Sultanate and Khalif, he started to reform and shape the republic, which has been called ‘inkilapçılık’, which means reformism (Akarşlan, 2021), according to his values and ethics.

Ataturk used his persuasion skills which are necessary for people to comply with certain rules by preparing the conditions. As is already stated, Ataturk made lots of changes towards transforming Türkiye to become a Western standard country he said that the goal of his revolutions, which he has led and continues to lead, is to transform the Republic of Türkiye and its citizens into a fully modern, cultured, and progressive society in all dimensions and aspects. (Taş, 2009).

Regarding this compromise, Kemal's program of decreed Westernization continued during the following phase, even as he solidified his autocracy. These are some of the reforms he made for his Türkiye: Republic for Monarchy (1922-23), abolition of the Caliphate and religious schools (1924), the Hat Law outlawing the wearing of turban and fez (1925), the shift from the Muslim to the Christian era (1925) and from Arabic to Latin letters (1928), the adoption of the Swiss civil and Italian penal codes (1926), and the constitutional article making Islam the state religion being repealed (1928) (Rustow, 1968).

Nevertheless, the reforms he made in terms of education, equality of gender, and secularist reforms should be emphasized as they aimed to improve the quality of research. The first one is the Alphabet reform (1928). He changed the Arabic alphabet to the Latin alphabet to motivate people to learn how to read and write and, as a result, get the ability to educate themselves. For this aim, as someone who had read 4000 books and written 11 books in his life, he even traveled through Türkiye and taught the alphabet himself (Akarşlan, 2019; Volkan, 1998).

Second, is the Civil Law of 1926. With this law, Turkish women gained even more rights than most Western women such as equal rights in marriage, education, and voting. Women's freedom stands out among Kemal's Westernizing measures for two reasons: It was not technically enshrined in any law, but it was the subject of some of Kemal's most passionate remarks at the time: 1) Women's seclusion is a waste of half of Türkiye's most valuable resource. Women must be educated even to accomplish their roles as spouses and mothers of future citizens. 2) Türkiye can only assume its proper position in the modern world if it is a nation of modern men and women (Rustow, 1968).

Thirdly, acceptance of secularism has been seen as the most important reform of Ataturk. He gave importance to science because it was the only way to change a dogmatic country. He was aware that his nation was divided into religions, not class distinctions (Akarşlan, 2021). Thus he has separated religion and government into two organizations. He expressed it with these words of him from his six-day speech:

“The torch that the Turkish nation holds in its hands and minds on the way to progress and civilization is a positive science. For this reason, it is our national ideal to develop our nation's high character, tireless industriousness, innate intelligence, devotion to science, love for fine arts, and sense of national unity by nurturing it at all times and with all kinds of means and measures.”

In addition, in his speech on Republic Festivals' tenth-year celebration, he said:

“If social life is permeated with irrational, useless, and harmful doctrines and traditions, it becomes paralyzed... For everything in the world – for civilization, for life, for success – the truest guide is knowledge and science. To seek a guide other than knowledge and science is [a mark of] heedlessness, ignorance, and aberration. ,,

(Ana Sayfa, 10. Yıl Nutku, n.d-c)

4. CONCLUSION

There are lots of different personality research related to how individuals affect politics. However, we tend to overlook about personalities of decision-makers but see the results as a consequence of normality. In discussing research on personality trait analysis, this paper emphasizes the critical function of leaders in directing and rescuing countries under challenging circumstances. Their character affects societal expectations, the state, and international limitations. In times of crisis, having authority at the highest levels of government encourages leaders to act in the best interests of the country and increases decision-making flexibility. Thus, this essay demonstrates how personality can affect a country's future.

Understanding how personality affects politics and identifying leadership styles depend heavily on leadership attributes. The combination of abilities and knowledge that brings people together to work toward a shared goal is leadership. Seven personality qualities are listed in Margaret Hermann's theory: task orientation, conceptual complexity, need for power, distrust, in-group bias, belief in control, and need for control. These qualities affect a leader's capacity to direct events, push boundaries, uphold rules, and inspire action.

This paper applied this theory to the case of the Republic of Türkiye and its founder Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Political behaviors are influenced by an individual's environment, which affects their cognitive process. During the First World War, Ottoman scholars and politicians held four different views on stability. This led to a lack of unity and a mix of military and political leadership. Kemal, the youngest nationalist leader, and Atatürk, a nationalist soldier, emphasized the importance of considering the political side of matters.

His belief in his ability to control events and self-confidence was demonstrated by ordering his men to die during the First World War is an example of his audacity, tenacity, and risk-taking attitude. Atatürk, was tenacious and self-assured, fighting for his principles and values. He had high expectations and inspired individuals to go beyond their expectations. Additionally, he was a man of rules and ethics. He has established the rules according to his ethics which is the major indicator that shows how he played a role in shaping the country. Regardless, Early Atatürk's leadership centered on information gathering and dissemination, building a national network, and coordinating regions, social groupings, and personalities. He used hierarchical systems, made careful decisions, and trusted his subordinates and the country. Atatürk proved that he was an expert communicator and leader.

His ideology of Westernization has exceedingly affected the new organization. Atatürk sought to create a new Turkish nation with civilization and sovereignty while being inspired by Western ideologues. His reforms included the Grand Assembly, the abolition of the Sultanate

of Khalif, and the adoption of the penal codes from Switzerland and Italy. He placed a strong emphasis on gender equality, education, and secularism, which separates religion and the state. Atatürk emphasized the value of knowledge and science in advancing civilization and governing social life.

The environment he grew up made him see the importance of gathering information and separating politics from the military. He considered this essential to act on gathered information with confidence. His knowledge and confidence persuaded people to believe in his abilities and follow him to even death. As a strong leader, even though he always believed that his rules and ethics were accurate and were built on Western ideologies, he maintained trust among his subordinates which determined how Türkiye took place in history.

Further research can be conducted on the personality of Atatürk and it influenced the foreign policy of Türkiye. As the new republic was established right after the First World War, Türkiye was in a position that required international and internal stability to establish a strong government. Atatürk was the president for 14 years in total after the establishment of a republic. Therefore, it is important to examine how the leader of Türkiye affected the relations with other countries in creating a stabilized environment for the new republic to develop in a decade.

REFERENCES

- Akarşlan, K. (2021). The Leadership Styles Atatürk Displayed Within the Framework Of Bush And Glover's Nine Models Of Leadership. *ARTIBİLİM Adana Alparşlan Turkes Bilim ve Teknoloji Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(1), 59-84. E-ISSN: 2667-8098
- Amasya Valiliđi Bilgi İşlem Şube Müdürlüğü. (n.d.-a). Amasya Tamimi (22 Haziran 1919). T.C. Amasya Valiliđi. Retrieved from: <http://www.amasya.gov.tr/amasya-tamimi-22-haziran-1919>
- Amasya Genelgesi Tarihi ve Önemi Nedir? Amasya Genelgesi Maddeleri ve Özellikleri. (2021). Hurriyet. Retrieved December 21, 2021, Retrieved from <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/aile/amasya-genelgesi-tarihi-ve-onemi-nedir-amasya-genelgesi-maddeleri-ve-ozellikleri-41937715>.
- Atatürk, M. K. (n.d.-b). Ankara İleri Gelenleriyle Bir Konuşma: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi. Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi RSS. Retrieved December 21, 2021, From <https://www.atam.gov.tr/ataturkun-soylev-ve-demecleri/ankara-ileri-gelenleriyle-bir-konusma>
- Atatürk, M. K. (n.d.-c). 10. Yıl Nutku. Ana Sayfa. Retrieved December 22, 2021, From <https://www.ktb.gov.tr/tr-96294/10-yil-nutku.html>
- Derman, G. S. (2019). The Main Differences Between Leadership and Management "Atatürk's Leadership". *International Journal of Social And Economic Sciences Uluslararası Sosyal ve Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(1), 12-16, E-ISSN: 2667-4904
- Erzurum Kongresi'nin Bildirisi ve Kararları: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi. Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi RSS. (n.d.-d). <https://www.atam.gov.tr/nutuk/erzurum-kongresinin-bildirisi-ve-kararlari>
- Gallagher, M. E. and Allen, S. H. (2014). Presidential Personality: Not Just A Nuisance. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 10(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12006>
- Greenstein, F. I. (1992). Can Personality and Politics Be Studied Systematically? *Political Psychology*, 13(1), 105-128. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3791427>

- Hermann, M. G., Preston, T., Korany, B. and Shaw, T. M. (2001). Who Leads Matters: The Effects Of Powerful Individuals. *International Studies Review*, 3(2), 83–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.00235>
- Kaarbo, J. (2017). Personality And International Politics: Insights from Existing Research and Directions For The Future. *European Review Of International Studies*, 4(2-3), 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.3224/eris.v4i2-3.02>
- Karpat, K. H. (1985). Review of the Personality Of Atatürk. Oxford University Press on Behalf of The American Historical Association, Vol. 90(No. 4). Retrieved December 2, 2021, pp. 893-99, Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1858844>.
- Mintz, A. and Derouen, K. R., (2014). Psychological Factors Affecting Foreign Policy Decisions. In *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making* (Pp. 97–120). Cambridge University Press.
- Post, J. M. and Hermann, M. G. (2008). Assessing Leadership Style. In *The Psychological Assessment of Political Leaders with Profiles of Saddam Hussein And Bill Clinton* (Pp. 178–212). Essay, The University of Michigan Press.
- Rustow, D. A. (1968). Atatürk Is The Founder Of A State- JSTOR. JSTOR. Retrieved December 10, 2021, From <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20023842>
- Sıgı, Ü. (2014, August 20). An Elaboration of the "Transformational Leadership" Using Leadership Characteristics Of Atatürk: An Outlook From Atatürk's Mausoleum. Academia.Edu. Retrieved December 10, 2021, From https://www.academia.edu/843117/an_elaboration_of_the_transformational_leadership_using_leadership_characteristics_of_ataturk_an_outlook_from_ataturks_mausoleum
- Smith, C. (2012, October 16). Personality In Foreign Policy Decision-Making. E. Retrieved December 2, 2021, From <https://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/16/personality-in-foreign-policy-decision-making/>
- Stoessinger, J. G. (2011). The Determinants of War. In *Why Nations Go to War* (Pp. 396–411). Essay, Wadsworth.
- Taş, S. (2009). Atatürk'ün Dönüşümcü Liderliği. *SDU International Journal of Technologic Sciences*, 1(2), 1–9.
- Taş, P. D. and Göksüçukur, B. (2019). Osmanlı Dönemi Batıcılık, İslamcılık, Türkçülük Fikir Akımları Ve Din. *Dini Araştırmalar*, 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.15745/da.583546>
- Volkan, V. (1998). The Power to Heal or Poison: Methods of Teaching Through Transference Used by Political Leaders, Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323811633_The_Power_to_Heal_or_Poison_Methods_of_Teaching_Through_Transference_Used_by_Political_Leaders