

The French, the German and the American: Higher education for business in Turkey, 1883-2003¹

Behlül Üsdiken

Graduate School of Management,
Sabancı University

Like in other parts of Europe and, indeed, the United States, early initiatives in the Ottoman Empire for higher education in business date back to the second half of the 19th century.² After a number of aborted attempts, the opening of a commercial school in İstanbul (*Hamidiye Ticaret Mektebi*) in 1883³ under the auspices of the Ministry of Trade marked the beginning of business education in the Empire, purportedly, at the “higher” level.⁴ The Commercial School was closed down in 1890 and re-opened in 1894, attached this time to the Ministry of Education. It went through a re-

Author's note: I wish to thank an anonymous reviewer of this journal for helpful comments on an earlier version of the paper.

- 1 As some readers would suspect, the first part of the title was inspired by Sergio Leone's 1966 film “The Good, the Bad and the Ugly”. It is not my intention, of course, to suggest a match between the order in which I list the foreign influences on Turkish business education (which is chronological) and the sequence in the title of the film. Nevertheless, as the article will show, proponents of different models in Turkey have quite often tended to see the others in the not so positive terms in Leone's title.
- 2 See Lars Engwall and Vera Zamagni, “Introduction,” in *Management Education in Historical Perspective*, ed. Lars Engwall and Vera Zamagni (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 5, 8, Osman Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3 (İstanbul: Osmanbey Matbaası, 1941), 936, 38.
- 3 There is some inconsistency in secondary sources as to when this school was founded. See, for example, İlhan Tekeli and Selim İlkin, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Eğitim ve Bilgi Üretim Sisteminin Dönüşümü* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993), 78, Faik Reşit Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış* (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1964), 80. In its own publications, the School itself has taken 1883 as the date of founding. See, for example, Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 938, Enver Esenkova, “İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulunun Tarihçesi,” in *İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu 1883-1958* (İstanbul: İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu, 1958), 31, *İstanbul Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Okulu, 1883-1950*, (İstanbul: Duygu Matbaası, 1950). Ergin dates it (after my conversion based on <http://www.ttk.gov.tr/>) as 28 January 1884. The School's own dating may be due to an error in conversion among calendars, though Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 938, himself also refers to a pamphlet of the School dated 1933, mentioning that it was published in commemoration of its 50th anniversary.
- 4 Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 938-41, Nafi Atuf (Kansu), *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 2 (İstanbul: Milliyet Matbaası, 1932), 8-9. The reference here is to a dedicated school. Otherwise, accounting, for example, was included in the program of the *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* during the 1867 restructuring Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*, 71.

structuring in 1915 that led to a demarcation between an upper and a junior division. The School served as the sole provider of business education till it was inherited by the Turkish Republic and remained so for more than another decade. From the second opening until the founding of the Republic, it had an average of around 12 graduates per year, which increased to about 24 in the period up to the mid-1930s.⁵

Currently, there are around 58,000 students in Turkey attending university degree programs (the *lisans*) in business. There are roughly an additional 13,000 students studying for the master's (*yüksek lisans*) degree. These figures not only point to the magnitude of growth since the mid-1930s, but also are suggestive of the current significance of business education in the country. For example, in the year 2002, 7 percent of all university diplomas (at the *lisans* level) and 19 percent of the master's degrees awarded were in business.⁶

Over this 120-year period, business education in Turkey has come under successive waves of foreign influence. Its history can thus be characterized by three periods: from the Ottoman beginnings to the early 1930s, the mid-1930s to 1950 and from the early 1950s to the present day, each associated with the entry and ensuing dominance of a foreign model, namely, French, German and American. Within a persistent orientation towards importing know-how from more developed countries, the turns to particular models have been triggered by political agendas and changes in international ties.⁷ As such, the development of business education in Turkey has largely been state-led, at times together with the involvement of foreign donors but with negligible engagement, until very recently, by business interests. All three models have had a significant role to play in the formation of and the changes in Turkish business education. Nevertheless, their adoption has not been wholesale.⁸ Major modifications in imported models have taken place,

5 *Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi 1936 Yıllığı*, (İstanbul: Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi, 1936).

6 These figures were obtained from ÖSYM, *2002-2003 Öğretim Yılı Yükseköğretim İstatistikleri* (Ankara: Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi, 2003), 100, 10-11, 88, 97, 63, 88. Students enrolled at the Open University are not included. There are also around 113,000 students attending two-year vocational programs in or related to business, constituting more than one third of all students in those types of schools.

7 See, Selim İlkin, "1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye'deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi Tarihi Üzerine Bir Deneme," in *Türkiye'de Okutulan İktisat Üzerine*, ed. Fikret Gürün (Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1972), 3-4, Ayşe Öncü, "Academics: The West in the Discourse of University Reform," in *Turkey and the West: Changing Political and Cultural Identities*, ed. Metin Heper, Ayşe Öncü, and Heinz Kramer (London: I. B. Tauris, 1993), 144-45, Behlül Üsdiken, "Plurality in Institutional Environments and Educational Content: The Undergraduate Business Degree in Turkey," in *Inside the Business Schools: The Content of European Education*, ed. Rolv P. Amdam, Ragnhild Kvalshaugen, and Eirinn Larsen (Oslo: Abstrakt, Liber, Copenhagen Business School Press, 2003), 87-90.

8 Matthias Kipping, Behlül Üsdiken, and Nuria Puig, "Imitation, Tension and Hybridization: Multiple

resulting in hybrid arrangements and variations across educational organizations. The main purpose of the article is to substantiate this claim and to account for the "translations" that have occurred.⁹ More specifically, the article argues that the adoption and diffusion of foreign models has depended upon (a) national-level institutional frameworks pertaining to education, as they emerged, solidified and were targeted for change, (b) field-level institutional processes involving historical influences and inter-organizational effects, and (c) the resources and support proponents of different models were able to muster.

Turkey is in no way unique in importing foreign models, as the development of business education in most European countries, and in various others, has involved cross-national transfers both before and after the Second World War.¹⁰ The Turkish experience is perhaps made more interesting by having been subject to the influence of all three models, French, German and American, that have risen to prominence at one stage or another in the past 150 years or so, a feature shared, to some degree, with only a few other countries in Europe, such as Italy and Spain.¹¹

The comparative literature on the history of business education has shown that cross-national transfers have resulted not in identical reproduction but, variably across recipient countries, in resistance or adoption with modifications.¹² In accounting for these outcomes, the extant literature has resorted essentially to institutionalist explanations in organizational analysis, though often to those newer versions that accord a powerful role to historical forces and to national institutional frameworks.¹³ As in this article, the key argument has been that these

'Americanizations' of Management Education in Mediterranean Europe," *Journal of Management Inquiry* 13, no. 2 (2004).

- 9 Ove Bjarnar and Matthias Kipping, "The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of US Management Models to Europe: An Introductory Framework," in *The Americanization of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of US Management Models*, ed. Ove Bjarnar and Matthias Kipping (London: Routledge, 1998), 7-8.
- 10 See, for example, Rolv Petter Amdam, ed., *Management, Education and Competitiveness: Europe, Japan and the United States* (London: Routledge, 1996), Lars Engwall and Elving Gunnarsson, eds., *Management Studies in an Academic Context* (Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1994), Terry Gourvish and Nick Tiratsoo, "Missionaries and Managers: An Introduction," in *Missionaries and Managers: American Influences on European Management Education, 1945-1960*, ed. Terry Gourvish and Nick Tiratsoo (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), F. Redlich, "Academic Education for Business," *Business History Review*, no. 31 (1957): 75.
- 11 Kipping, Üsdiken, and Puig, "Imitation, Tension and Hybridization."
- 12 See, Haldor Byrkjeflot, *Management Education and Selection of Top Managers in Europe and the United States* (Bergen: LOS Senteret, 2000), 25, Engwall and Zamagni, "Introduction," 10-15, Jonathan Zeitlin, "Introduction: Americanization and its Limits - Reworking US Technology and Management in Post-War Europe and Japan," in *Americanization and its Limits*, ed. Jonathan Zeitlin and Gary Herrigel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 38-46.
- 13 W. Richard Scott, *Institutions and Organizations*, 2 ed. (London: Sage, 2001), 132-36.

forces stand to serve, depending on their strength, as barriers to isomorphic reproduction in cross-national transfers and thus to international homogenization. Some of this literature has also recognized, however, that the tension between imported models and pre-existing arrangements has allowed room, though variably across situations, for individual or collective strategic action in affecting the outcomes of the encounters with foreign models.¹⁴

Based on secondary sources, the next three sections chronicle the major events, initiatives, struggles, and the institutional processes at work in the three periods that characterize the historical development of higher education in business in Turkey. The final section discusses the implications and points to new research agendas.

The Ottoman (and then the Turkish) “l’Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales”

The Commercial School was one of the various schools opened under different ministries in late 19th century as a part of the Ottoman orientation at the time of emulating the French educational system and, in the case of these schools, the professionally-oriented grandes écoles that dated back to Napoleonic years.¹⁵ With reference to the Commercial School, Ergin¹⁶ mentions that the founders were inspired by the *l’Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales* (HEC) in Paris, which was founded in 1881. This is also apparent in the affinity between the early curricula of the School and that of the Parisian HEC.¹⁷ The HEC was the first school in France contending to be an institution of higher education in business.¹⁸ That the HEC and not the secondary schools that had existed in France since 1820¹⁹ was claimed as the model is significant as an indicator of the

14 Matthias Kipping and Jean-Pierre Nioche, “Much Ado About Nothing? The US Productivity Drive and Management Training in France, 1945-60,” in *Missionaries and Managers: American Influences on European Management Education, 1945-1960*, ed. Terry Gourvish and Nick Tiratsoo (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 51, 68-69, Scott, *Institutions and Organizations*, 208-11, Behlül Üsdiken, Alfred Kieser, and Peter Kjaer, “Academy, Economy and Polity: Betriebswirtschaftslehre in Germany, Denmark and Turkey before 1945,” *Business History Review* 46, no. 3 (2004): 383.

15 Tekeli and İlkin, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda*, 124-25, Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*, 49. See also, İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 2 ed. (İstanbul: İletişim, 1999), 189-90.

16 Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 938. See also, Tekeli and İlkin, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda*, 78.

17 Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 938, 42-43. See also, Lester L Brookner, “History of Accounting Education in Turkey, 1923-1969” (Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1966), 131, Marc Meuleau, *Histoire d’une Grande Ecole* (Paris: Dunod, 1981), 16.

18 Robert R. Locke, *The End of the Practical Man: Entrepreneurship and Higher Education in Germany, France and Great Britain, 1880-1940* (Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, 1984), 135.

19 The *école spéciale* (and after 1852, *supérieure*) *de commerce*, Redlich, “Academic Education for Business,” 68-70.

ambitions of the Ottoman founders. This is so even though what probably transpired in classes was more at the level of the latter, a problem to which HEC was not immune either during its formative years.²⁰

The influence of the French HEC appears to have persisted well into the Republican era. For example, the three areas of specialization (commerce and industry, commerce and banking, commerce and consulship) instituted in 1915 in the upper division, replicated their introduction at the HEC in 1904.²¹ There are also indications that at this time some consideration was given to commercial schools in other European countries, in particular, the German *Handelshochschulen*.²² This is likely to have been due to the changing political climate, which brought closer links with Germany in the field of education.²³ Still, the HEC continued to prevail as the main exemplar. This was also the case during the 1924-25 reforms at the School when, for example, the name of the upper division was changed to a literal translation of that of the French school.²⁴ In addition to being outside the university system and of shorter duration (features characteristic of business education in most European countries at the time), the French imprint on the school involved a vocational orientation with bookkeeping, commercial techniques and law as the core subjects, further areas of specialization and a heavy load made up of a large number of rigid courses taught by part-time practitioners.²⁵

Despite such strong influence, however, the school in İstanbul diverged from its exemplar even at the very beginning, notably in the way it was governed and internally organized. First and foremost, the HEC in Paris was, and has since been, a private institution set up and owned by the Parisian Chamber of Commerce²⁶ The *Hamidiye Ticaret Mektebi*, on the

20 See, Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 65-66, Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, 189, Redlich, "Academic Education for Business," 70, Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*, 80.

21 Esenkova, "İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulunun Tarihçesi," 33, Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 67.

22 *Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi 1936 Yıllığı*, 32.

23 Mustafa Gencer, *Jöntürk Modernizmi ve Alman Ruhu: 1908-1918 Dönemi Türk-Alman İlişkileri ve Eğitim* (İstanbul: İletişim, 2003), 110-40.

24 Nihad Sayar, "İktisadi ve Ticari İlimlerle Meşgul Yüksek Tahsil Müesseseleri," in *İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu 75. Yılı, 1883-1958* (İstanbul: Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu, 1958), 17.

25 Jean-Louis Barsoux, "Management Education in France," in *Management Education: An International Survey*, ed. William Byrt (London: Routledge, 1989), 122. See also, Brookner, "History of Accounting Education in Turkey", 91, Anthony R. Lanza, "Business Education in the Republic of Turkey" (Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1957), 175-76, 85, İlkin, "1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye'deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi," 22, Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 81, Keith Tribe, *Strategies of Economic Order: German Economic Discourse, 1750-1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 108, 38-39.

26 Barsoux, "Management Education in France," 121-22, Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 3.

other hand, was an initiative of and relied on funding by the Ottoman state. It was initiated by the Ministry of Trade and, after the second opening, was attached to the Ministry of Education, a pattern that continued in the Republican period.²⁷ Secondly, as the School was established at a time when an alternative Western-type educational structure was in the making, it also included a division that corresponded to secondary level education (the *idadi*), though this two-plus-two arrangement did not last long and was turned into a three-year program at the School's re-opening in 1894.²⁸ Again differently from its inspirer, the 1915 reform re-introduced the two-tier structure, supplemented with a further subdivision within the secondary level during the 1924-25 school year, thus strengthening the "higher" education claim of the upper division, the *Ulumu Aliyei Ticariye*.²⁹

Thus, although in spirit and, indeed, in name, the School had remained loyal to its original inspirer, in form it had emerged and developed in different ways. The 1924-25 restructuring within the context of the newly founded Republic contributed to the beginnings of some further decoupling. Notably, the upper division had ended up with a three-year program long before the HEC, the latter having to wait until 1938.³⁰ Capitalizing on the School's own history is likely to have been at work here, as the "tradition" of three years for the *Ali* (the upper division) dated back to 1915. An international outlook that went beyond the HEC might have also played a role, as the *Handelshochschulen* in Germany, for example, also extended their curricula to three years in 1924.³¹ Some divergence in programs was also involved, as in the Turkish school there was now a greater slant towards economic subjects.³² This was probably due to having come under the auspices of the Ministry of the Economy and to the rising concern with the economy and private initiative in the new Republic. The School appears to have been more reluctant, however, to alter the French spirit and content in its teachings. This is indicated by the lack of any impact of Kühne's (a German advisor to the Ministry of Education in 1925)³³

27 Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 941-42. After the founding of the Republic, the School became attached to the Ministry of the Economy, to be handed over to the Ministry of Education in 1938. Esenkova, "İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulunun Tarihçesi," 33-34.

28 Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 938-43.

29 Z. Fahri Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye'de İktisat ve Tedrisatı, Tarihçesi ve İktisat Fakültesi Teşkilatı* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi, 1946), 64n.

30 Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 71.

31 See, Nihad Sayar, "Kamu Personeli Eğitiminde İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademilerinin Rolü," in *Kamu Personeli Eğitimi Konferansı* (Ankara: A.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1967), 110, Tribe, *Strategies of Economic Order*, 137.

32 Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye'de İktisat ve Tedrisatı*, 63, Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 68-71.

33 Kühne, *Mesleki Terbiyenin İnkişafına Dair Rapor* (Ankara: Maarif Vekilliği, 1939), 12.

report, where it was suggested that the School should take the German *betriebswirtschaftslehre* (business economics) as its curricular model. Still, the School now had four areas of specialization in the third year, namely, banking and insurance, accounting and commercial arithmetic, economics, and commerce and consulship.³⁴ This arrangement only partially paralleled the one imported from the HEC in 1915, where the areas of specialization had remained the same since 1904.³⁵ The initiatives taken in 1924-25 were expanded upon in 1932 when the term "economics" came to precede "commerce" in the School's name.³⁶ Nevertheless, in 1936, economics was eliminated from the areas of specialization altogether and the three remaining ones were re-titled as banking and accounting, commerce and public finance, and foreign commerce and consulship.³⁷ Still they continued to differ from those that existed at the time in the HEC.

The new university, the faculty of economics and the German *Betriebswirtschaftslehre*

On 31 July 1933, the *İstanbul Darülfünun*, the only university that the Republic had inherited from the Ottoman Empire, was closed down and was replaced the next day by the University of İstanbul. In its formative years, the new University benefited from the large number of emigrant German professors who had joined as faculty members.³⁸ After the relatively brief, and not so sizeable, German involvement at the *Darülfünun* from 1915 to 1918, this second and longer round of employing German professors had a strong impact on the Turkish university.³⁹ Indeed, German influence on Turkish higher education was not limited to the emigrant professors fleeing from Nazi rule. The Institute of Agriculture in Ankara, for example, was founded in 1930 under the leadership of German professors.⁴⁰ No less significantly, after economic and cultural ties resumed in the 1920s between the two countries, Germany hosted, until the late 1930s, the highest proportion of students funded by the state to study abroad.⁴¹

The restructuring that came with the new University included the founding of an Institute of Economics and Sociology within the Faculty of

34 Brookner, "History of Accounting Education in Turkey", 116-17.

35 Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 71.

36 *Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi 1936 Yıllığı*. See also, Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye'de İktisat ve Tedrisatı*, 64n.

37 *Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Basımevi, 1939).

38 Horst Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu*, trans. Aykut Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt (İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 1999).

39 Öncü, "Academics," 153.

40 Widmann, *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu*, 66-70. See also, Regine Erichsen, "The Politics behind Scientific Transfer between Turkey and Germany in the case of the 'Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü' in Ankara," *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 55, no. 2 (2000).

Law to offer a certificate and a doctoral program in economics. Among the elective seminars in these programs were, for the first time ever, courses in “business economics” (*işletme iktisadı*),⁴² signifying the entry of the *betriebswirtschaftslehre* (BWL) into Turkey. The BWL had developed as a uniquely German discipline that was anchored in economics and took the enterprise as its focus, with accounting constituting its main emphasis. It originated in and became, between 1900 and 1920, the basis for the diploma offered by the German commercial schools, the *Handelshochschulen*. These schools had also emerged outside the university system (the first one being founded in Leipzig in 1898) but were later either converted into or became parts of universities.⁴³

BWL, or “business economics,” came to Turkey at this late stage of its development; that is, after it had achieved the status of a university discipline and a separate degree in Germany. With the founding of the Faculty of Economics in 1936 at the University of İstanbul, BWL was allocated a separate chair (taken up by an emigrant German professor - Alfred Isaac) and three courses (out of 28) in the program.⁴⁴ When doctoral studies began in 1941, BWL was accepted as one of the areas of specialization, though seminar work had to include economics and one other area as well.⁴⁵ The same arrangement was extended to the university degree (*lisans*) in 1948. Business economics was one of the six options, two of which the student had to choose in addition to the economics core.⁴⁶ This was, however, as far as business economics could get within the university and the Faculty of Economics, not being able to make it as a separate degree as it had in Germany. The Faculty was for educating economists; business economics was and remained as one of the addenda. Nevertheless, the arrival of the BWL marked the beginning of university involvement in business education.

The founding of the new university had reaffirmed the dual structure in the country for higher education and thus set the stage for inter-

41 Cemil Koçak, *Türk-Alman İlişkileri, 1923-1929* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991), 181.

42 Ali Arslan, *Darülfünun'dan Üniversite'ye* (İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 1995), 420-21. See also, Behlül Üsdiken, “Türkiye’de İş Yapmanın ve İşletmenin Akademikleştirilmesi, 1930-1950,” *A.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 58, no. 1 (2003): 122-27.

43 Heinz-Dieter Meyer, “The German Handelshochschulen, 1898-1933: A New Departure in Management Education and Why It Failed,” in *Management Education in Historical Perspective*, ed. Lars Engwall and Vera Zarnagni (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 25-33, Tribe, *Strategies of Economic Order*, 139.

44 Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye’de İktisat ve Tedrisatı*, 73-76, 98-102. See also *İktisat Fakültesi Talebe Kılavuzu*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1939), 13-18.

45 Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye’de İktisat ve Tedrisatı*, 76-78.

46 İlkin, “1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye’deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi,” 25.

organizational politics and field-level institutional processes. The law that enabled the founding of the University of İstanbul had envisaged and granted powers to the government to incorporate the Higher School of Engineering and the Commercial School into the university.⁴⁷ That this did not happen may have had to do with the “French” roots of the university, as the typical faculty composition there included law, medicine, letters and sciences, and at times theology and pharmacy but not engineering, economics or commerce.⁴⁸ As İlkin also notes,⁴⁹ that a Faculty of Economics could be established a few years later can be attributed to the influence of emigrant German professors at the University, who had come from an institutional set-up where economics had a place within university structures. The commercial school, with its French orientation and vocational spirit, is likely to have been found irreconcilable with the approach to the study of economics and the strong *Wissenschaft* (science) tradition of the German university that the emigrant professors were hoping to bring with them.⁵⁰

The Higher School of Engineering became a university in 1944, as did the Institute of Agriculture when it was integrated in 1948 into the University of Ankara founded two years earlier.⁵¹ The School of Political Sciences, with institutional roots similar to those of the Commercial School, was also converted into a faculty in 1950 and attached to the same university.⁵² The commercial schools (then two in number after the founding in 1944 of a replica in İzmir)⁵³ were again left outside the university system. However, there too, what Clark refers to as “academic drift” or what the institutionalist perspective on organizations would in a more general sense call “mimetic isomorphism,” that is, imitating similar organizations that are believed to be more reputable and legitimate had been on its way.⁵⁴ In 1935, for the first time in the history of the school in

47 E. Hirş, *Dünya Üniversiteleri ve Türkiyede Üniversitelerin Gelişmesi* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 1950), 308.

48 See, Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye’de İktisat ve Tedrisatı*, 69, Unat, *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*, 52.

49 İlkin, “1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye’deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi,” 18.

50 Locke, *The End of the Practical Man*, 157. See also Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye’de İktisat ve Tedrisatı*, 68-69.

51 Hirş, *Dünya Üniversiteleri ve Türkiyede Üniversitelerin Gelişmesi*, 603-17, 1074, 349.

52 Ibid., 1443-46.

53 Nihad Sayar, *Avrupa’da İktisadi ve Ticari İlim ve Araştırma Müesseseleri* (İstanbul: Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu, 1958), 13.

54 Burton R. Clark, *The Higher Education System* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1983), 165, Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio, “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields,” in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, ed. Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 69-70. See also Francesca Fauri, “British and Italian Management Education

İstanbul, and then in 1938, the directors were professors at the University of İstanbul.⁵⁵ These administrative changes brought with them attempts to institute stricter academic regulations, as the School had also become attached to the Ministry of Education instead of the Ministry of the Economy, by which it had been overseen since 1924.⁵⁶ Eventually in 1939, a graduate of the School with a doctoral degree from the HEC of the University of Lausanne in the French-speaking part of Switzerland took over the directorship.⁵⁷ The School's two failed attempts in 1940 and 1945 for a separate legal framework followed, the second possibly fuelled by the founding of the companion institution in İzmir. In the meantime, "business economics" had also made an early entry into the program in 1934 but more in label than in substance, and then somewhat more authentically around the mid-1940s, as two of its active promoters had moved to the schools in İstanbul and İzmir respectively.⁵⁸ Even then, however, the penetration was only in the form of a group of courses. The historically rooted program again proved to be resilient.⁵⁹ Despite aspirations towards emulating the university, business economics could not even make it to becoming one of the areas of specialization that the School had so readily and frequently altered in the past.

As higher education in Turkey grew and became institutionalized in the 1940s, it also became more university-centered. Professional education had largely become accommodated within the university in the form of the post-*lycée* (high school), four-to-six-year university degree, with the doctorate being the only available level of further study. Business education had made a limited entry into this institutional framework and only as an option within economics. The commercial schools, though not at par with the university and only with a three-year program, were still the major venue for higher education in business.⁶⁰ Not disassociated with their

Before the Second World War: A Comparative Analysis," in *Management Education in Historical Perspective*, ed. Lars Engwall and Vera Zamagni (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 40. E.C. Longobardi, "Higher Commercial Education in Italy," *The Journal of Political Economy* 35, no. 1 (1927): 69-73, for somewhat earlier but similar developments in Italy.

55 *Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Broşürü*, (İstanbul: Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Okulunu Bitirenler Derneği, 1946).

56 İlkin, "1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye'deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi," 22.

57 Nihad Sayar, *Higher Business Education in the United States* (İstanbul: Sermet Matbaası, 1960), *Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Broşürü*.

58 Üsdiken, Kieser, and Kjaer, "Academy, Economy and Polity," 397.

59 See İsmet Alkan, *Genel İşletme Ekonomisi*, 2 ed. (İstanbul: İşletme Mecmuası, 1944), 33.

60 The number of graduates of the school in İstanbul had more than quadrupled in the 1936-1945 period (reaching an average of around 125) compared to the previous 10 years, *Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Broşürü*. Graduates of the Faculty of Economics averaged around 70 between 1940 and 1946 (*Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında*, 1973, p. 496).

institutional roots, there also seemed to be a division between the two educational forms, at least at the discursive level: the University's Faculty described itself as educating primarily for the state, while the commercial schools claimed the private and the entrepreneurial sectors,⁶¹ though both also mentioned the sectors that they purportedly did not prioritize. This set-up, in place by the late 1930s, was not to stay for long, however, as a strong, new wave of influence, this time American, came in the 1950s.

The turn to American "business administration"

The turn in the 1950s towards the United States (US) as the new model for business education was different from earlier periods in that the US itself was actively involved in the transfer process through its government agencies for international aid, private foundations and universities. This was the time when Turkey was seeking a place in the emerging Western alliance and trying to strengthen its ties with the US due to security reasons and attempts to fund economic growth. At the second round of multi-party elections held in 1950, the pro-business *Demokrat* Party had come to power and was searching for ways and support to initiate a new wave of industrialization based more on the private sector. For the US, within the Cold War context, Turkey was a potential ally that was strategically located as a neighbor to the Soviet Union and the Middle East.⁶² It was, therefore, to be included within the broad technical assistance initiative geared towards helping the re-construction of European economies and, thus, "preventing the spread of communism."⁶³ Such aid was in part directed to the development of business education, thus facilitating the transfer of American forms and content, complemented by the likes of the Ford Foundation as well as international organizations such as the UN, ILO, and the OECD. Funding of this kind ceased towards the end of the 1970s. Nevertheless, with increasing consolidation of its position as the leading country in practicing and studying business, the US continued to serve as a model, not only of course for Turkey, but for many others as well.

61 See, Nevzad Ayas, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Milli Eğitimi: Kuruluşlar ve Tarihçeler* (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1948), 302, Fındıkoğlu, *Türkiye'de İktisat ve Tedrisatı*, 66-68, *İktisat Fakültesi Talebe Kılavuzu*, 8, İlk, "1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye'deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi," 22-23, *İstanbul Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Okulu*, 1883-1950.

62 Atilla Eralp, "Turkey in the Changing Postwar World Order: Strategies for Development and Westernization," in *Developmentalism and Beyond: Society and Politics in Egypt and Turkey*, ed. Ayşe Öncü, Çağlar Keyder, and Saad E. İbrahim (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1996), 206-12.

63 Gourvish and Tiratsoo, "Missionaries and Managers," 1.

The new institute, the new university and the new college – the 1950s

The post-war American influence on business education in Turkey, as elsewhere in Europe, began to penetrate through different routes. The first new organizational set-up to serve as a carrier was the *İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü* (İİE) (or the Institute of Business Administration in the official documents in English; *İstanbul Üniversitesi*, 1954), founded in 1954 within the Faculty of Economics of the University of İstanbul. The İİE was the outcome of a Middle East survey by a Ford Foundation team in 1952.⁶⁴ Beginning in 1950, the Ford Foundation had been engaged in strengthening business education in the US and, indeed, directly and indirectly, in a popular phrase of the time, in the rest of the “free world.”⁶⁵ Among similar initiatives in Europe, the İİE was second only to the one in Italy, the IPSOA. However, the İİE was different in form. It had to be accommodated as an attachment within the public university system.⁶⁶ In the Turkish case, again there was nobody else with sufficient interest but a public university.⁶⁷ The donors had envisaged creating closer links with and some engagement by business through company membership in the Institute and representation on its board.⁶⁸ Even this, however, was to be achieved only with partial and diminishing success.⁶⁹

The implementation of the İİE project involved an American co-director (Robert E. Stone, a retired dean from Syracuse University) and began when five young, prospective faculty members were sent to the

64 Walter Adams and John A. Garraty, *Is the World Our Campus?* (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960), 164-65. Notable, of course, is the difference between the Turkish and English versions of the name of the Institute. In the Turkish version, the counterpart for the German BWL (*işletme iktisadı* or business economics) prevailed. However, as the name in English attests, what actually came with the Institute were American program formats, teaching methods and content. The institutionalization of the German-based label to describe the field and the fact that the Institute was attached to a faculty of economics appears to have precluded the use of the Turkish translation of the American term.

65 Thomas H Carroll, “A Foundation Expresses its Interest in Higher Education in Business Management,” *Academy of Management Journal* 2, no. 3 (1959): 160. See also, Giuliana Gemelli, “American Influence on European Management Education: The Role of the Ford Foundation,” in *Management, Education and Competitiveness: Europe, Japan and the United States*, ed. Rolv Peter Amdam (London: Routledge, 1996), 47.

66 See, Gemelli, “American Influence on European Management Education,” 50, on the founding of IPSOA as an independent institute initiated by two industrialists.

67 İlkin, “1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye’deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi,” 29, Mehmet Oluç, “Türkiye’de İşletmecilik Eğitimi ve Öğretiminin Tarihiçesi,” *Sevk ve İdare Dergisi* 8, no. 63 (1973): 12.

68 *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü Talimatnamesi*, (İstanbul: Sermet Matbaası, 1954), 3, 5, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü 1958-1959 Tedrisat Programları ve 1957-1958 Yıllığı*, (İstanbul: 1958).

69 Giuliana Gemelli, “From Imitation to Competitive-Cooperation: The Ford Foundation and Management Education in Western and Eastern Europe (1950s-1970s),” in *The Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s)*, ed. Giuliana Gemelli (Brussels: European Interuniversity Press, 1998), 180.

Harvard Business School (HBS) for training.⁷⁰ This relationship was to continue for another decade or so with the support of the Ford Foundation, extending in time to other US universities.⁷¹ İİE's initial activities were a three-month middle managers course launched in 1956 and a six-month (after 1960, nine-month) full-time program introduced the following year.⁷² The İİE programs brought to Turkey, for the first time, the idea of "graduate," as well as a "post-experience" education for business. Together with this came the teaching of business in a functional format that was different from the German BWL tradition and that involved separate courses devoted to different functions in business firms (e.g., finance, marketing and production) and the case method of instruction.⁷³ These were all copied from the HBS.⁷⁴ The full-time graduate program ("*İşletmecilik İhtisas Programı*") was the first Turkish version of the American MBA (Master of Business Administration) degree. Very much like what had happened about 70 years earlier with the Ottoman HEC, however, it had to be adapted to local conditions and institutions, not only in duration (as it was shorter), but also in being turned into a "certificate" program, as a graduate degree other than the doctorate was alien to Turkish higher education at the time. Still, like the American MBA, prospective students were promised with "becoming equipped to immediately take up higher-level positions in all kinds of businesses" and "a well-off future."⁷⁵ Within the Faculty of Economics, the İİE programs met with some reaction due to their practical orientation, the case method and in being open to commercial school graduates.⁷⁶ There was not much of a warm reception by the private sector, either.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, in one sense, the hopes of the donors and the initiators were fulfilled, as the İİE survived, whereas one of its companions, for example, the IPSOA in Italy, had to close down in 1964.⁷⁸ On the other hand, the İİE did not develop into an American-type

70 Adams and Garraty, *Is the World Our Campus?*, 104, 64. See also, Mehmet Oluç, "İşletme Fakültesinin Kuruluş ve Gelişmesi," *İ.Ü. İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi* 1, no. 1 (1972): 2-3.

71 Oluç, "İşletme Fakültesinin Kuruluş ve Gelişmesi," 4.

72 *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü 1958-1959 Tedrisat Programları ve 1957-1958 Yıllığı*, 12.

73 *Ibid.*, 4, 14-19. See also, Robert A. Stone, "İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme İktisadi Tedrisatı," *İ.Ü. İşletme Fakültesi Mecmuası* 16, no. 1-4 (1954-1955): 96-103.

74 Lanza, "Business Education in the Republic of Turkey", 211.

75 *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü 1958-1959 Tedrisat Programları ve 1957-1958 Yıllığı*, 10.

76 Adams and Garraty, *Is the World Our Campus?*, 16, Lanza, "Business Education in the Republic of Turkey", 212.

77 Nezih Neyzi, "Sevk ve İdare Eğitimi," in *Ekonomik Gelişmeyi Hızlandıran Etken Olarak Eğitim* (İstanbul: Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Konferansı Heyeti, 1967), 387, Şan Öz-Alp, *Yeni Gelişmeler Karşısında İşletme Yöneticileri ve İşletmecilik Eğitimi* (Eskişehir: İTİA, 1972), 116.

78 Gemelli, "American Influence on European Management Education," 50-54.

university business school. The Turkish promoters of the American model in the University were more interested in creating a body that would be better aligned with and likely to have more clout within the institutional framework of higher education that was in place at the time. This had to be a new faculty offering a separate university degree, which they did eventually manage to establish towards the end of the 1960s.⁷⁹

Perhaps even more important for the penetration of American business administration into Turkey was the creation of two new institutions in the latter part of the 1950s. One of these was the *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi* (ODTÜ) and the other involved the granting of permission to the American Robert College (RC) to open a *Yüksek Okul* (higher school).⁸⁰ For the first time in Turkey, the term “business administration” had become the label for a department in a university faculty (at ODTÜ in 1957) and a “higher school” (at the Robert College in 1959). It was now, with the ODTÜ case, a separate university degree.⁸¹ In both cases, beyond the label also came, like in the İİE, the functional basis for teaching business. So did content, indeed much more readily, as the medium of instruction in these two organizations was English.

Equally important, the ODTÜ and the RC were instrumental in importing the American approach to university-level education. This involved bringing into Turkish higher education a distinction between “undergraduate” and “graduate” study and new terminology such as the bachelor’s and the master’s degree. Together also came the typically American approach to the so-called undergraduate degree, which aimed to

79 Oluç, “İşletme Fakültesinin Kuruluş ve Gelişmesi,” 3-6.

80 İlkin, “1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye’deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi,” 31-35.

81 When founded, the Faculty of Administrative Sciences at ODTÜ had two additional departments - one for public and the other for industrial administration. In 1960, the departments of Business Administration and Industrial Administration were merged into a single department under the name Management, the Turkish counterpart being *İşletmecilik* Arif T. Payaslıoğlu, *Türk Yükseköğretiminde Bir Yeniliğin Tarihi: Barakadan Kampusa, 1954-1964* (Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1996), 152. This name change is interesting in two ways. First, it is the first time the label “management” was used in English in Turkey in connection with an academic department and a degree program, indeed before many American institutions. Secondly, the Turkish term cannot be literally translated into English and is the term that was being used at the University of İstanbul’s İİE at the time, of course with roots in the German BWL tradition, though amended in this case to emphasize a “practice” or a “profession” (*işletmecilik*) rather than the “firm” (*işletme*). There are also indications that at the ODTÜ, “*işletmecilik*” was seen as the Turkish “word” for “management.” See for example Mustafa Aysan and Kemal Kurtuluş, *Türkiye’de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu ve Gelişme İmkanları ile İlgili Araştırma Raporu* (İstanbul: Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı, 1973), Appendix 4.2. The discrepancy has become institutionalized within administrative structures in Turkish higher education with convergence around “*işletme*” as the Turkish label and “management” as its counterpart in English. For more on this see Üsdiken, “Türkiye’de İş Yapmanın ve İşletmenin Akademikleştirilmesi,” 143-44.

combine a general (or liberal) education with professional education. In business education this particular model had long roots in the US, though not without contestation in its historical evolution.⁸² As the “duty” of “collegiate schools of business” was perceived in this view as “to liberalize as well as to train,”⁸³ in practical terms, the curriculum included courses in humanities, social sciences, mathematics, and the sciences in the first two years, to be followed by professional and specialized ones only in the final two.⁸⁴ The business administration programs at the ODTÜ and RC were introduced when in the US the pendulum was clearly swinging towards an enhanced liberal component in the curricula, epitomized at the time by the two so-called “Foundation Reports”, one funded by the Ford Foundation and the other by the Carnegie Foundation.⁸⁵ These two studies, which turned out to be highly influential in the way higher education for business evolved in form and content in the US, strongly advised, amongst a series of other recommendations, that collegiate schools should expand the liberal component to at least half of their programs. The early curricular structures of the ODTÜ and RC were designed along these lines.⁸⁶ As opposed to the İİE, with their focus on the “undergraduate,” these new organizations were very much in conformity with the institutional framework of higher education in the country. However, they diverged significantly from prevailing notions and practices with regard to the nature of university-level education.

If these two were the “favored” educational organizations at the time within the context of strengthening ties with the US and the proclivities of the government in power, so were the commercial schools.⁸⁷ The support they enjoyed, however, was not sufficient to enable a conversion to university status. Nevertheless, progress was made in the 1950s in their project of “academicization,” as academic titles were instituted in 1952, followed by the inclusion in 1953 of the teaching staff into the coverage of

82 Adams and Garraty, *Is the World Our Campus?*, 141, James H. S Bossard and J. Frederic Dewhurst, *University Education for Business* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931), 298, 323, Leverett S. Lyon, *Education for Business* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1922), 375-84.

83 Lyon, *Education for Business*, 375.

84 Edward W. Weidner, *The World Role of Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), 15-16.

85 Robert A. Gordon and James E. Howell, *Higher Education for Business* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), Frank C. Pierson, *The Education of American Businessmen* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

86 *METU General Catalog, 1961-1962*, (Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1961), 24-25, 32-33, 37-38. For the 1959 version at RC, see Süleyman Büyükkarcı, *Türkiye'de Amerikan Okulları* (Ankara: Mikro, 2002), 152-55. See also, Howard A. Reed, “Hacettepe and Middle East Technical Universities,” *Minerva* 13, no. 2 (1975): 233.

87 İlkin, “1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye'deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi,” 30-33, Payaslıoğlu, *Türk Yükseköğretiminde Bir Yeniliğin Tarihi*, 26-56.

the statutes of what had previously been the School of Political Sciences (then a Faculty within the University of Ankara).⁸⁸ Then came the new statute put into effect in 1956, which despite maintaining attachment to the Ministry of Education, recognized their “academic autonomy.”⁸⁹ These changes were accompanied by the founding of two new evening commercial schools, one in Ankara in 1954 and another one in Eskişehir in 1958.⁹⁰ Eventually, all these developments culminated in 1959 in what the commercial schools had been aspiring for about two decades, the enactment of a new law converting them into Academies of Economic and Commercial Sciences (*İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi*, İTİA). The new law extended the duration of their programs to four years and created a separate academic career track.⁹¹

Altogether these changes were propelled by mimetic dynamics internal to the higher education field in Turkey. The HEC no longer served as a model, as turning to full-time faculty happened there only after 1963.⁹² There was no American input, either. The curricular structure had remained very much the same, however, retaining its French character, with the BWL courses still there as addenda.⁹³ The areas of specialization that had been in effect since 1936 (see above) were re-specified with the 1956 statute. They were relabeled (defying literal translation) as “economic business practice” (*iktisadi işletmecilik*), “accounting” (*muhasebe organizatörlüğü*) and “foreign trade and tourism” (*dış ticaret ve turizm*). The first two carry the flavor of BWL language, reflecting possibly a belated response to the external model (the university) and the influence of BWL’s internal proponents, while the latter is a continuation of the past, though revised to eliminate the reference to consulship.

Structuration of the field – the 1960s and the 1970s

The advent of American models and funding served to increase university involvement in the ensuing two decades. This was accompanied by the founding of three new İTİAs (academies, as the commercial schools were now called) and a boost in their student numbers. Altogether these developments served to accentuate the pre-experience character of

88 Sayar, *Avrupa'da İktisadi ve Ticari İlim ve Araştırma Müesseseleri*, 14, Sayar, “İktisadi ve Ticari İlimlerle Meşgul Yüksek Tahsil Müesseseleri,” 1-5.

89 *Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulları Talimatnamesi*, (1957), 1-5.

90 Sayar, “Kamu Personeli Eğitiminde İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademilerinin Rolü,” 109.

91 Brookner, “History of Accounting Education in Turkey”, 319-20, *Cumhuriyetin 75. Yılında Yükseköğretim*, (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1998), 520-29.

92 Meuleau, *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*, 82.

93 *İstanbul Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Okulu Öğrenci Rehberi*, (İstanbul: Işıl Matbaası, 1950), 11-12. See also, Lanza, “Business Education in the Republic of Turkey”, 177.

business education, consisting of a post-*lycée*, four-year study leading to a university or academy diploma.

Two new additions on the part of the university were the opening of a Department of Economics and Business (*İktisat ve İşletme Bölümü*) at Atatürk University in Erzurum and an area of specialization in the Faculty of Political Sciences (SBF) at the University of Ankara. The former was founded in 1957, purportedly to be patterned after the American land-grant university. To this end, it received the counsel of the University of Nebraska, through a project funded by the ICA, the American technical assistance organization precursor to the Agency for International Development (AID).⁹⁴ The department that housed the business program was founded in 1964 under the chairmanship of an American economics professor and had a curriculum that blended economics with courses like those in commercial academies as well as a few American-type ones.⁹⁵ At the SBF, an institute similar to the İİE had already been established in 1958 as one of the outcomes of the University's technical assistance project with New York University (NYU) between 1954 and 1959, sponsored again by the ICA.⁹⁶ This Institute of Business Economics and Accounting had adopted the name of the chair that had existed since conversion to a faculty, with roots in the meager entry that business economics had made into the curriculum in 1936. The activities of the Institute remained very limited, however.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, the persistent recommendations of the NYU consultants that the SBF should have a program in business administration, and not in accounting, as the Faculty had originally wanted,⁹⁸ bore fruit, though with some time lag. In 1966, the SBF added business (probably influenced by ODTÜ in naming it as "*işletmecilik*") as a fourth section to its three conventional (but now re-named) areas of specialization. The chair was still called, however, Business Economics and Accounting and the curriculum was an amalgam that contained a good dose of economics, the BWL tradition and a few American-type functional courses.⁹⁹

The proponents at the University of İstanbul were next to realize their ambitions and, indeed, all the more fully. After being blocked once in the early 1960s by the Faculty of Economics, to which they belonged, they

94 Payaslıoğlu, *Türk Yükseköğretiminde Bir Yeniliğin Tarihi*, 32.

95 *Atatürk Üniversitesi Kılavuzu*, (Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 1968), 30-32.

96 T. Rudolph Westmeyer, "Administration of the New York University-Ankara Project: A Case Study in Technical Assistance." (Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1963), 1, 48.

97 *Ibid.*, 48.

98 Lanza, "Business Education in the Republic of Turkey", 188-89, Westmeyer, "Administration of the New York University-Ankara Project", 47-49.

99 Ali Çankaya, *Yeni Mülkiye Tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler* (Ankara: Mars Matbaası, 1969), 722-23, 26-27.

managed to succeed in their second attempt in 1967, with an *İşletme Fakültesi* (referred to as the Faculty of Business Administration in English) being established within the University of İstanbul in 1968. The success in the second round had to do partly with obtaining the support of the State Planning Organization in having the “need for providing capacity for higher education in business” included in the Second Five-Year Development Plan.¹⁰⁰ With the İİE at its roots and having been funded more generously in the meantime by organizations like the Ford Foundation and the AID, the curriculum in this Faculty was entirely based on the American functional format, as was its chair structure and the affiliated institutes other than the İİE.¹⁰¹ It was, however, a purely professional program, unlike those at the ODTÜ and the RC, which contained a major liberal arts component. The same was the case for Atatürk University’s *İşletme Fakültesi*, established soon after (in 1969), which had a program very similar to the one at İstanbul.¹⁰² The programs of the Faculty of Economic and Commercial Sciences (also created in 1969 by attaching the İTİA in İzmir) within Ege University were in that sense no different.¹⁰³ Clearly, the proponents of “business administration” in these universities were aware of the two Foundation Reports.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, the institutional framing of university education in Turkey had again led to an adaptation.

The two Foundation Reports were introduced to the İTİAs (the academies), too, but apparently did not impress their administrators.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, in the İTİAs, changes in curricular structures and even the penetration of American content occurred more slowly, though this varied to some degree across institutions. This had to do with their long French tradition and the modifications that had occurred in the past by incorporating economics not only into their names but also into their curricula. It also had to do, however, with the lack of channels for direct contact with the US until the mid-1960s, when they were able to obtain sponsorship from the AID for assistance by and exchanges with the

100 Oluç, “İşletme Fakültesinin Kuruluş ve Gelişmesi,” 5.

101 Aysan and Kurtuluş, *Türkiye’de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu*, Appendix 1.1.

102 Atatürk Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi 1970-1971 Rehberi, (Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 1970), 34-37.

103 Ege Üniversitesi İktisadi ve Ticari Bilimler Fakültesi Kılavuzu, 1973-74, (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi, 1974), 15-22.

104 See, for example, the descriptions in Kemal Tosun, “Bir İşletme İdaresi Yüksek Okulunun Ders Programına Dair Bazı Mütalaa ve Teklifler,” *Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Dergisi* 1, no. 1 (1965): 49-57, Kemal Tosun, *İşletme ve Müesseselerde Sevk ve İdare: Prensipleri, Tatbikatı ve Politikası* (İstanbul: Hüsnütabiat Matbaası, 1961), 485-86.

105 See, for example İnal Cem Aşkun, “Türkiye’de İşletmecilik Öğretimi ve Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisindeki Gelişmeler,” *Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Dergisi* 50 (1973): 30, Sayar, *Higher Business Education in the United States*, 32, 37, 41, 55.

Michigan State University.¹⁰⁶ Changes propelled by this link were also supported by the founding of University of İstanbul's new *İşletme Fakültesi*, which served to legitimize a functionally-based, though professionally-oriented model as an alternative to the conventional commercial school program rooted at the İstanbul İTİA. So by the early 1970s, some divergence had emerged within the population of İTİAs. The ones in Eskişehir (founded back in the 1950s) and Bursa (founded in 1971), despite retaining some of the tradition, leaned more towards the *İşletme Fakültesi*, whereas Ankara (again from the 1950s) and Adana (founded in 1967) remained largely loyal to the İstanbul Academy, only adding a few American-type courses.¹⁰⁷ There was some convergence amongst them in the way of dividing economics and business into separate areas of specialization. Still, there were differences, as the İstanbul and Ankara İTİAs formulated, for the business area, a combination of the "new" and the "old", labeling it as "business and accounting" (*işletme-muhasebe*), whereas the one in Adana treated business (*işletme*) as an area of specialization from the third year onwards, separate from the two others it had (accounting-public finance and economics). The Bursa İTİA had a similar arrangement and within the business area offered a further division between marketing and personnel, while the one in Eskişehir allowed within its business and accounting section two fourth-year options labeled as business management (*işletme yönetimi*) and accounting.

The early 1970s was also the time when Turkey's brief experience with private "higher schools" came to an end.¹⁰⁸ At one stage, as many as, eight of these schools were offering education in "economics and commerce."¹⁰⁹ Their programs and curricular structures were very much patterned after the İTİAs.¹¹⁰ After being ruled unconstitutional, they became attached to different İTİAs, contributing not only to the already large share these organizations had in business education (so that in 1972 they had more than 80 percent of all students),¹¹¹ but also to their claims to university-like status. Beginning with the mid-1970s, the İTİAs took the initiative to

106 Brookner, "History of Accounting Education in Turkey", 321n. See also, A. Selami Sargut, "İşletme Yönetimi," in *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye'de Bilim- "Sosyal Bilimler-II"* (Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 1998), 81-83.

107 See Öz-Alp, *Yeni Gelişmeler Karşısında İşletme Yöneticileri ve İşletmecilik Eğitimi*, 159-76, for further details on the curricula of the academies.

108 Kemal Gürüz et al., *Türkiye'de ve Dünyada Yükseköğretim, Bilim ve Teknoloji* (İstanbul: TÜSİAD, 1994), 155.

109 Aydoğan Ataünel, *Türkiye'de Yüksek Öğretim, 1923-1998* (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1998), 51.

110 Aysan and Kurtuluş, *Türkiye'de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu*, Appendix 3.6 to 3.9.

111 Ünver Çınar and Ömer Saatçioğlu, "Türkiye'de İşletmecilik Eğitiminin Gelişmesi Hedefiyle Alınması Gerekli Tedbirler," *Sevk ve İdare Dergisi* 8, no. 61 (1973): Table 1.

establish faculties, amongst others in business (called *işletme*), that also meant, finally, organizational separation from economics.¹¹²

In the meantime, the American-modeled organizations, ODTÜ and RC progressed very much along their initial lines, the latter one also being converted to a Turkish university (Boğaziçi Univeristy) in 1971. Both retained their curricular structures that combined liberal arts and professional education, the latter part based on and offering options in functional areas of business.¹¹³ They were also advancing their status and prestige as well as their capability to attract the better students,¹¹⁴ leading to stronger claims of educating the managerial elite rather than technocrats for business. Interestingly, as another form of adaptation, these claims were based on the undergraduate and not on the master's programs that followed only after some time.¹¹⁵

Of the two, what was at the time Robert College pioneered in 1965 the first master's degree offering in business in the country, with the cooperation of Columbia University's Graduate School of Business. It was not, however, to be offered within a separate graduate school, but as an addition of a "fifth year."¹¹⁶ Students with first degrees in other areas had to take a selection of undergraduate courses for a year before joining the master's program.¹¹⁷ The same pattern was adopted by ODTÜ when it also introduced its master's program in 1972 and also by Boğaziçi University, the successor to RC.¹¹⁸ In addition to the "bachelor's," the American "Master of Business Administration" (the MBA) had finally come to Turkey as a degree. It had come, however, neither with the organizational form embodying it (the graduate business school) nor as the post-experience two-year program it had become, especially at the more prestigious end in its original setting, the US.¹¹⁹ These initiatives were accompanied in the

112 See Aşkun, "Türkiye'de İşletmecilik Öğretimi," 14, Sargut, "İşletme Yönetimi," 82.

113 See, for example *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Broşürü, 1975-1977*, (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 1976), 58-61, *METU General Catalog, 1975-1976*, (Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1975), 19-22. See also Mustafa Dilber, "Ülkemizdeki Sevk ve İdare Kurumlarına Genel bir Bakış," in *Sevk ve İdarecilik - Türkiye'nin Kalkınmasında Temel Unsurlar* (İstanbul: Türk Sevk ve İdare Derneği, 1971), 218.

114 See, for example Şan Öz-Alp, "Yönetim Basamaklarına Eleman Yetiştiren Okullarla İlgili Bir İnceleme," *Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Dergisi* 11, no. 2 (1975): Table 1.

115 See, for example *METU General Catalog, 1961-1962*, 24, *METU General Catalog, 1975-1976*, 20.

116 John Freely, *A History of Robert College*, Vol. II (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000), 144.

117 *Robert College Yüksek Okulu 1968-1969, 1969-1970 Catalogue*, (İstanbul: Robert College, 1969), 36.

118 See Aysan and Kurtuluş, *Türkiye'de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu*, Appendix 4.2, *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Broşürü, 1975-1977*, 63, *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Katalog 1972-1974*, (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 1973), 70, *METU General Catalog, 1975-1976*, 23-24.

119 Sami Boutaiba and Jesper S Pedersen, "Creating an MBA Identity - Between Field and Organization," in *Inside the Business Schools: The Content of European Business Education*, ed. Rolv P. Amdam, Ragnhild Kvalshaugen, and Eirinn Larsen (Oslo: Abstrakt, Liber, Copenhagen Business School Press,

early 1970s by the launching of another adapted version of this novel degree for Turkish higher education. This was the “part-time” master’s in business, with further specialization options, introduced by the Ankara İTİA and the SBF at the University of Ankara.¹²⁰ Both were inspired by earlier contacts with US universities,¹²¹ with the İİE in İstanbul and RC and the ODTÜ probably serving as additional sources of legitimacy. As an educational program alien to the Turkish setting, it was accommodated within “institutes,” an organizational form not only exemplified by the İİE but also with a long history (dating back to the mid-1910s reform efforts guided by German professors at the *Darülfünun*) in conventional Turkish university structures as an adjunct unit for specialized research or extra-mural activity by faculty members. The İİE joined this small “part-time” current by introducing in 1974 the evening, two-year version of its certificate program. As the master’s (*yüksek lisans*) degree received formal recognition with the 1973 change in university legislation,¹²² it began to be introduced in the late 1970s into faculty programs in universities, such as the SBF and the *İşletme Fakültesi*¹²³ in İstanbul. However, these, too, were fifth-year specialization programs in functional areas of business. The *İşletme Fakültesi* did admit students from other disciplines as well, but again, with a structure identical to the one at ODTÜ and Boğaziçi University. Despite these varied local adaptations, unintentionally similar to pre-World War II master’s programs in the US,¹²⁴ graduate level business education remained marginal, regardless of strong pleas to the contrary.¹²⁵

Additions to university *lisans* (in American terminology, undergraduate) programs continued in the 1970s. Faculties or departments of business were established in five other universities [Çukurova, Hacettepe, Erciyes (formerly Kayseri), İstanbul Teknik and Karadeniz Teknik]. They were accompanied by a new İTİA in Trabzon as well as satellite schools set up by some of the extant İTİAs in nearby cities.¹²⁶ By the end of the decade,

2003), 202-03, Byrkjeflot, *Management Education and Selection of Top Managers*, 9.

120 Aysan and Kurtuluş, *Türkiye’de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu*, Appendix 2.2 and 2.4.

121 Ibid., Appendix 2.2, Sargut, “İşletme Yönetimi,” 82.

122 Ataunal, *Türkiye’de Yüksek Öğretim*, 59.

123 *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi*, (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1978), 66-67, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Rehberi, 1977-1978*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi, 1978), 187-97.

124 Carter A. Daniel, *MBA: The First Century* (Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 1998), 145, Earl P. Strong, *The Organization, Administration and Supervision of Business Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1944), 177.

125 Mustafa Aysan, “Üniversitelerde Boş Kapasite Var mı? Türkiye’de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu ve Gelişme İmkanları,” *Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı ve Türk Sevk ve İdare Derneği* (1975): 19-20.

126 *Cumhuriyetin 75. Yılında Yükseköğretim*, 324, 29, Öz-Alp, “Yönetim Basamaklarına Eleman Yetiştiren Okullarla İlgili Bir İnceleme,” 39, *Türk Üniversiteleri*, Vol. 1 (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1999), 421,

education in business had become characterized almost entirely by the four-year *lisans* (or undergraduate) degree, carried out, despite increased university involvement, still largely within the academies.

This period also saw some involvement on the part of business, though again framed and instigated by American consultants and funding bodies, as it began, for example, by participation in the İİE. More significant however, was the founding of the Turkish Management Association (*Türk Sevk ve İdare Derneği* - TSİD) in 1962. As an organization outside the state and the higher education sector, its primary mission was to promote the idea of professional management in Turkey.¹²⁷ It did avail of American as well as some international funding and obtained the endorsement of state authorities to undertake a range of educational activities, amongst them initiating the establishment of a Foundation for Management Education (*Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı* – SİEV) in 1969. This was the Turkish version of similar organizations emerging at the time in various European countries and had the aim of developing “industry-university ties.”¹²⁸ In practical terms, this meant promoting and supporting case writing and raising funds for advanced study in the US for prospective faculty.¹²⁹ Foreign, primarily American, assistance for business education overall began to diminish after the mid-1970s. As foreign funds drained, the interest and commitment of local business was not at a level to sustain this enterprise and the Association and the Foundation ceased their activities in 1978. Greater involvement had to wait another 15 to 20 years.

Restructuring from above and rediscovering American models – the 1980s and the 1990s

A new law passed on the 6th November 1981 marked the beginning of a major overhaul in the institutional framework of higher education in Turkey. In addition to the changes that the law entailed in governance and administration partly shaped by a prevailing orientation towards the American university model,¹³⁰ a governmental decree in July 1982 (and the ensuing law in 1983) eradicated the dual structure converting all the

313, *Türk Üniversiteleri*, Vol. 2 (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1999), 48, 96.

127 Gemelli, “From Imitation to Competitive-Cooperation,” 181-82, Behlül Üsdiken and Nisan Selekler, “Türkiye’de İşletme Alanında Eğitim ve Araştırmanın Erken Dönemleri,” in *IV. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı* (Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1997), 266-67.

128 Kipping and Nioche, “Much Ado About Nothing?,” 69, Bülent Yazıcı, “Sunuş Konuşması,” in *Türkiye’de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitimi’nin Durumu ve Gelişme İmkanları* (İstanbul: İstanbul Sevk ve İdarecilik Vakfı ve Türk Sevk ve İdare Derneği, 1975), 4.

129 *Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı Faaliyet Raporu*, (İstanbul: SİEV, 1973), 5-10, Yazıcı, “Sunuş Konuşması,” 4-5.

130 Gürüz et al., *Türkiye’de ve Dünyada Yükseköğretim, Bilim ve Teknoloji*, 158.

academies into universities. Undergraduate and graduate study was demarcated more explicitly. The administration of the former was entrusted to faculties and the latter to disciplinary, but more so, to multi-disciplinary institutes. An amendment in 1983 enabled the establishment of private universities by foundations.¹³¹

An immediate implication of these legislative changes for business education was that, like other fields, overnight it became entirely university-based, undergraduate study now being accommodated in *İşletme* departments within faculties that were all entitled as Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences.¹³² The prevalent homogenizing logic also led to intervention in undergraduate programs, though this was relaxed a few years later.¹³³ Likewise, the statutes for graduate studies stipulated a two-year program consisting of a year's coursework and a year devoted to a dissertation for all disciplines including business. This was changed however in 1996, when a "master's without dissertation" was introduced as a separate professionally orientated degree requiring a minimum of one-year's study by coursework.¹³⁴

In this period, the expansion of the undergraduate in business organizationally and in scale continued as new universities were opened, both public and private. In 2003, of the 76 universities in the country 68 had undergraduate programs in business leading formally to the same degree (*lisans*) and offered by university departments carrying, with a few exceptions, the same label.¹³⁵ However, despite a 50-year history of looking up to American models and more formal homogenizing pressures in the last two decades, Üsdiken¹³⁶ showed that together with some degree of convergence, there was still a significant degree of variation in curricular structures associated with the institutional roots of the universities that housed these programs. In all, Üsdiken's¹³⁷ findings point to convergence essentially around the American functional format but also to three

131 For more details on these and other changes see, for example *Cumhuriyetin 75. Yılında Yükseköğretim*, 189-370, Altan Kitapçı, *Yükseköğretim Mevzuatı* (İstanbul: Yaylım Yayıncılık, 1998).

132 The SBF at the University of Ankara preserved its name. University of İstanbul and İstanbul Teknik University were also treated as exceptions and they retained their separate faculties for business (the latter with a name change). This exception was later extended to Dokuz Eylül University and some of the private universities like Bilkent, Bahçeşehir and Haliç and, more recently, in the way of a different name (*Ticari İlimler*) for a similar faculty at the İstanbul Ticaret University.

133 Ataünal, *Türkiye'de Yüksek Öğretim*, 81.

134 Kitapçı, *Yükseköğretim Mevzuatı*, 649-50.

135 Eight universities had more than one program run in different locations. See Üsdiken, "Plurality in Institutional Environments and Educational Content," 96. Data were updated in April 2003 based on information at <http://www.yok.gov.tr/universiteler/>.

136 *Ibid.*, 107-09.

137 *Ibid.*, 100-07.

clusters associated with traditions rooted in commercial schools, the older universities and the American-modeled universities. The clusters varied with respect to the extent of an orthodox professional orientation versus one that combined liberal and professional education and the salience of law and accounting subjects as opposed to management and quantitative methods in the curricula. The same study also showed that the private universities were more likely to be characterized by being closer to the American-model whereas the new public universities converged towards the present-day versions of those universities that came from a commercial school tradition.

A notable development in the last two decades has been the growth of master's level business education, clearly in scale and also, to some degree, in diversity. Although the undergraduate degree still prevails,¹³⁸ figures reported in the introductory section indicate a higher rate of expansion for the master's. The proportion that was estimated to be less than 2 percent for the latter in early 1970s¹³⁹ has now got close to 20 percent. As another indication of expansion, currently 58 universities offer some kind of a master's program in business. Very few of these programs, however, look like the archetypal American MBA and even fewer are located within units that may be considered as resembling the university graduate business school.¹⁴⁰

In particular, the conventional American-type MBA has not really been able to penetrate into the public university sector. By far the most frequent program type in these institutions is the general *işletme* (business) degree made up of (as specified in early post-1980 regulations) a year's coursework plus one-year work on a dissertation. Close to 70 percent of the 41 public universities offering the master's in business have only this particular kind of program. The second major category is made up of specialist programs often in a functional sub-field of business (like marketing, finance, or personnel) or, though less so, with a focus on a specific sector (such as the tourism industry). They are found in 11 of the public universities, especially the larger ones that come from a classical university or a commercial school tradition. Clearly, neither of these categories, which together constitute the majority of the master's programs in public universities, even approximates the American MBA.

138 This is of course relative to master's level education. As pointed out in footnote 6, two-year vocational programs in some way related to business now house the largest number of students, an issue in itself not addressed in this article.

139 Aysan, "Üniversitelerde Boş Kapasite Var mı?," 20.

140 Figures reported in the following are based on data obtained in April 2003 from university web sites, which can be accessed through <http://www.yok.gov.tr/universiteler/>. When needed additional information was collected by direct communication with university administrations. I wish to thank Gözdem Bebekoğlu for assistance in collecting and processing this data.

Perhaps getting somewhat closer to the latter, as a particular form of adaptation within the Turkish context that dates back to initiatives of such kind in the early 1970s, is the “part-time no dissertation” format of three or four-term duration. Ten of the public universities have this program, eight of which are either the newly founded ones or those that have their origins in the commercial schools. As another adapted version, six universities run two-year full-time with or without dissertation formats concurrently. Four of these, however, have a preparatory year for students from other disciplines, again a deviation from the archetypal MBA. The only two that do not are the two universities that have originally been patterned after the American model. In both, instruction is in English and the degree is labeled as the MBA, for both versions in one and only in the case of the “no dissertation” format in the other. Joining these two is one other public university that only offers a “two-year, full-time, no dissertation” program taught partly in English, though with specialization options and with no reference to the MBA label.¹⁴¹

The archetypal MBA then has largely been able to infiltrate through the private universities, yet even there in a constrained way. A significant number of these organizations have essentially emulated the public university sector, also adding their further adaptations, as in eight cases, for example, where the “with” and “without dissertation” formats are offered concurrently but on a part-time basis, in three among them together with a range of specialist programs. As single examples there are also cases of concurrent full-time “with” and “without dissertation” or only part-time “with” or “without dissertation” versions. Some of these are offered fully or partly in English and reference to the MBA label is somewhat more frequent than in public universities. Nevertheless, the private universities that offer the archetypal two-year, full-time, generalist, taught MBA, though short of the prior experience requirement, are only three in number. All three of these organizations label their programs as the MBA and do their teaching in English.

Two of these private universities also have the post-experience but part-time Executive MBA, again a US-based variant of the MBA. Three other private universities offer the Executive MBA with a similar format (two in English, one in Turkish), together with two public universities (also with instruction in English) - two of the three that, as noted above, come close to the archetypal American model in their full-time MBA.

141 It should be noted however that this university also has a “two-year full-time with dissertation” program in a related field but linked to the rather unique “engineering with business” undergraduate that it has.

Notably, it is also the small club of the three private universities, which make some claim towards a distinct identity for a separate “graduate school of business.” This is different from all the other public¹⁴² as well as private universities where business is one of the disciplines within multi-disciplinary administrative units for graduate study.

The appearance of private universities in the Turkish higher education scene is also indicative of the coming in of business interests. This has been the case not only through the involvement of the big business groups in the country as a part of their larger scale university projects (like the Koç, Sabancı and Yaşar groups) but also by the chambers of commerce in İstanbul and İzmir in the form of more specialized universities carrying terms such as commerce or economics in their names.

Concluding discussion

Almost everything that passed as a notable form of business education in the late 19th and throughout the 20th centuries did come to Turkey, by and large when each of them was in its prime. In the post-war American case it also involved the active engagement of the exporter. Markedly, each new model was brought in through a new form of organization. The French model came via the commercial school, the German BWL with the new faculty of economics, the undergraduate business administration degree through the American-modeled new university and college, and finally the “authentic” MBA with the new private universities. The importation of these models, however, did not lead to local replicas that were widely diffused. Adaptations often had to be made at the moment of entry, leading to hybrid arrangements at the outset, which then evolved in ways different from the original model as in the case of the commercial schools. Initiatives that aimed to remain loyal to the imported model found it difficult to diffuse, as in the liberal arts based version of the undergraduate degree in the American-modeled organizations. The MBA, making a belated entry even in label, essentially got stuck with an older edition of the original model, having to wait for about three decades for re-entry and again only at a small scale and with various forms and degrees of adaptation.

The adaptations until the founding of the Republic and for the following three decades or so can be partly attributed to material conditions like resource shortages and, particularly, an underdeveloped business sector operating essentially as an annex to enterprises under state control. They also had to do however with the early organizational formations in

142 Two exceptions are an Institute of Advanced Technology that only offers graduate programs and the İİE at the University of İstanbul.

business education and the inter-organizational dynamics which were set into motion. Indeed this early period was character defining for Turkish higher education, as professional education became incorporated into the higher-status public university system, which purportedly also upheld science and the scientific,¹⁴³ an idea itself largely appropriated from Europe. It was located in specialized faculties in universities and consisted of four to six years of study after secondary education. This formation constituted the dominant institutional framework into which imported models for business education tried to infiltrate. It is essentially this framework that appears to have shaped the adaptation requirements, the time lags, and the fate of the different models. Therefore, the commercial schools for example, if they were to avoid marginalization, had to struggle to become more and more like the university. Neither could or did the American liberal arts based "college" version for business education enjoy a welcome reception, remaining confined to the two organizations through which it had entered. Even there, however, there are indications of departures from the original version, though there are also signs that this particular model is now being rejuvenated by some of the private universities.¹⁴⁴ The master's degree could eventually carve out a space, especially after the 1981 legislation. Nevertheless, in the case of business education what became dominant was not its generalist professional version, but as an extension to four years of undergraduate study, a "fifth year" for further specialization.

There has been relatively less resilience to the entry of new content into curricula. Each new model came with the claim of being more "modern", more "scientific" and thus "better" than the extant one(s). However in this instance, existing organizational types had a significant mediating role to play. What came in as "new" was reluctant to accommodate the "old", the latter turning out to be resilient too, having built up a tradition as well as resources and power sources to support it, as in the historical case of the commercial school resistance to the incorporation of the BWL. Nevertheless, there was some penetration of the new into the old, especially in the case of the American functional format in the post-war period. Still, this was always partial, as even today, three separate hybridized clusters of undergraduate curricula rooted in the French, German and the American traditions have been shown to persist.¹⁴⁵

143 Güzver Yıldırım, "An Overlook at the Turkish Educational System," in *Recent Perspectives on Turkish Education: An Inside View*, ed. Güzver Yıldırım and John Durnin (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1997), 1. See also, Meyer, "The German Handelshochschulen, 1898-1933," 22.

144 Üsdiken, "Plurality in Institutional Environments and Educational Content," 100-01.

145 *Ibid.*, 107.

Overall, these observations seem to carry an involuntary tone with regard to the local adaptations in organizational forms and program formats for higher education in business.¹⁴⁶ Clearly first of all, there were instances of, using the language of the neo-institutionalist perspective on organizations, “coercive” limitations¹⁴⁷ on actors to transplant in intact form the models that they might have aspired. The early İİE program could not have been turned into a master’s degree. In the aftermath of the 1981 legislation the dissertation was a requirement for all master’s programs. More often though, there was room for discretion and the actors did act strategically. They did mostly act however in ways to obtain outcomes which were in conformity with the dominant institutional framework for higher education, as exemplified by the almost 50-year struggle of the commercial schools to become universities and those in the universities to establish faculties to offer the university degree in business. Even after the relative “liberalization” in mid-1990s of the format of the master’s degree, many universities as well as some of the newly founded private ones retained its “fifth-year” character, holding on also to the dissertation requirement, a residue of the 1981 legislation. Despite the power of institutional influences, admittedly, there were also a few instances of moving beyond institutional structures due to strong commitments to particular foreign models,¹⁴⁸ though this time diffusion turned out to be very limited. At times this involved a compromise, as in initially bringing in the undergraduate version of the American business administration model. There were rare cases of defiance too, like in the introduction of the master’s degree, which then led the way for its endorsement through legislative change and consequent diffusion to some universities and academies.

Having focused on national-level educational frameworks and field level institutional effects, this article has not considered the interconnections between the developments in business education and the ways in which the Turkish business system has evolved. Broadly put, every new model that was brought in was promulgated as a means for meeting emerging demands and contributing to economic and social change. On the other hand, given the foregoing accounts, it may well be conjectured that, throughout, initiatives for business education and the aspirations associated with them have been model driven rather than demand driven.¹⁴⁹

146 Eleanor D. Westney, *Imitation and Innovation: The Transfer of Western Organizational Patterns to Meiji Japan* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987), 24-32.

147 Powell and DiMaggio, “The Iron Cage Revisited,” 67-69.

148 Christine Oliver, “Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes,” *Academy of Management Review* 16, no. 1 (1991): 151-59.

149 This is exemplified for a very early stage by Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Vol. 3, 943. Account, where he documents that of the first cohort of graduates after the commercial school in İstanbul was re-

Clearly, the connection between education and business can be two-way and raises questions of in what ways developments in business education has affected the business sector as well as the ways in which educational forms themselves have been influenced by the latter. Both beg, in turn, the question concerning the extent to which organizations for business education have served as sources for specialist expertise as opposed to the reproduction of the business and the managerial elite. The latter concern would then lead to considering other routes to such positions like political connections, prior state sector experience, familial ties, education abroad, command of foreign languages and an engineering education. There are indications in the literature that these routes may have been more salient for getting to higher echelons and that this may be associated with the state-dependent development of Turkish business.¹⁵⁰ This is likely to have generated internal markets for managerial careers where firm specific knowledge and ties are more important than fields of study. So the fact that business has not been vocal and involved in business education even in the post-1950 period may also be linked, other than benefiting from state funding, to the fit between what was demanded and what has been on offer. Business education could have been and is perhaps still considered a specialist area of study for “technical” work or aide positions in firms and for careers in non-industrial sectors. Managerial elites, like business entrepreneurs, on the other hand, could come from anywhere. It may well be that in its conception of “management,” Turkish business, despite aspirations for the American, is as much under the influence of its European administrative roots, as the higher education sector is in its understanding of university education. These conjectures and possibly others require research not only for an enriched understanding of the role and the impact of business education but also of the ways in which business and managerial careers have been and are constructed in this country.

References

- Adams, Walter, and John A. Garraty. *Is the World Our Campus?* East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960.
- Alkan, İsmet. *Genel İşletme Ekonomisi*. 2 ed. İstanbul: İşletme Mecmuası, 1944.
- Amdam, Rolv Petter, ed. *Management, Education and Competitiveness: Europe, Japan and the United States*. London: Routledge, 1996.

opened in 1894 all but one sought employment in civil service.

150 Ayşe Buğra, *State and Business in Modern Turkey: A Comparative Study* (New York: SUNY Press, 1994), 63-68.

- Arslan, Ali. *Darülfünun'dan Üniversite'ye*. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 1995.
- Aşkun, İnal Cem. "Türkiye'de İşletmecilik Öğretimi ve Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisindeki Gelişmeler." *Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Dergisi* 50 (1973): 1-63.
- Atatürk Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi 1970-1971 Rehberi*. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 1970.
- Atatürk Üniversitesi Kılavuzu*. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 1968.
- Ataünal, Aydoğan. *Türkiye'de Yüksek Öğretim, 1923-1998*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1998.
- Ayas, Nevzad. *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Milli Eğitimi: Kuruluşlar ve Tarihçeler*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1948.
- Aysan, Mustafa. "Üniversitelerde Boş Kapasite Var mı? Türkiye'de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu ve Gelişme İmkanları." *Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı ve Türk Sevk ve İdare Derneği* (1975).
- Aysan, Mustafa, and Kemal Kurtuluş. *Türkiye'de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitiminin Durumu ve Gelişme İmkanları ile İlgili Araştırma Raporu*. İstanbul: Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı, 1973.
- Barsoux, Jean-Louis. "Management Education in France." In *Management Education: An International Survey*, edited by William Byrt, 120-50. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Bjarnar, Ove, and Matthias Kipping. "The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of US Management Models to Europe: An Introductory Framework." In *The Americanization of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of US Management Models*, edited by Ove Bjarnar and Matthias Kipping, 1-17. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Boğaziçi Üniversitesi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Broşürü, 1975-1977*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 1976.
- Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Katalog 1972-1974*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 1973.
- Bossard, James H. S, and J. Frederic Dewhurst. *University Education for Business*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931.
- Boutaiba, Sami, and Jesper S Pedersen. "Creating an MBA Identity - Between Field and Organization." In *Inside the Business Schools: The Content of European Business Education*, edited by Rolv P. Amdam, Ragnhild Kvalshaugen and Eirinn Larsen, 197-218. Oslo: Abstrakt, Liber, Copenhagen Business School Press, 2003.
- Brookner, Lester L. "History of Accounting Education in Turkey, 1923-1969." *Ph.D. Dissertation*, New York University, 1966.
- Buğra, Ayşe. *State and Business in Modern Turkey: A Comparative Study*. New York: SUNY Press, 1994.
- Büyükkarcı, Süleyman. *Türkiye'de Amerikan Okulları*. Ankara: Mikro, 2002.
- Byrkjeflot, Haldor. *Management Education and Selection of Top Managers in Europe and the United States*. Bergen: LOS Senteret, 2000.
- Carroll, Thomas H. "A Foundation Expresses its Interest in Higher Education in Business Management." *Academy of Management Journal* 2, no. 3 (1959): 155-65.
- Clark, Burton R. *The Higher Education System*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1983.
- Cumhuriyetin 75. Yılında Yükseköğretim*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1998.
- Çankaya, Ali. *Yeni Mülkiye Tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler*. Ankara: Mars Matbaası, 1969.
- Çınar, Ünver, and Ömer Saatçioğlu. "Türkiye'de İşletmecilik Eğitiminin Gelişmesi Hedefiyle Alınması Gerekli Tedbirler." *Sevk ve İdare Dergisi* 8, no. 61 (1973): 23-29.
- Daniel, Carter A. *MBA: The First Century*. Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 1998.
- Dilber, Mustafa. "Ülkemizdeki Sevk ve İdare Kurumlarına Genel bir Bakış." In *Sevk ve İdarecilik -*

- Türkiye'nin Kalkınmasında Temel Unsur*, 214-22. İstanbul: Türk Sevk ve İdare Derneği, 1971.
- Ege Üniversitesi İktisadi ve Ticari Bilimler Fakültesi Kılavuzu, 1973-74. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi, 1974.
- Engwall, Lars, and Elving Gunnarsson, eds. *Management Studies in an Academic Context*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1994.
- Engwall, Lars, and Vera Zamagni. "Introduction." In *Management Education in Historical Perspective*, edited by Lars Engwall and Vera Zamagni, 1-18. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Eralp, Atilla. "Turkey in the Changing Postwar World Order: Strategies for Development and Westernization." In *Developmentalism and Beyond: Society and Politics in Egypt and Turkey*, edited by Ayşe Öncü, Çağlar Keyder and Saad E. İbrahim, 204-29. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1996.
- Ergin, Osman. *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*. Vol. 3. İstanbul: Osmanbey Matbaası, 1941.
- Erichsen, Regine. "The Politics behind Scientific Transfer Between Turkey and Germany in the Case of the 'Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü' in Ankara." *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* 55, no. 2 (2000): 37-53.
- Esenkova, Enver. "İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulunun Tarihçesi." In *İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu 1883-1958*, 28-35. İstanbul: İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu, 1958.
- Fauri, Francesca. "British and Italian Management Education Before the Second World War: A Comparative Analysis." In *Management Education in Historical Perspective*, edited by Lars Engwall and Vera Zamagni, 34-49. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Fındıkoğlu, Z. Fahri. *Türkiye'de İktisat ve Tedrisatı, Tarihçesi ve İktisat Fakültesi Teşkilatı*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi, 1946.
- Freely, John. *A History of Robert College*. Vol. II. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000.
- Gemelli, Giuliana. "American Influence on European Management Education: The Role of the Ford Foundation." In *Management, Education and Competitiveness: Europe, Japan and the United States*, edited by Rolv Peter Amdam, 38-68. London: Routledge, 1996.
- "From Imitation to Competitive-Cooperation: The Ford Foundation and Management Education in Western and Eastern Europe (1950s-1970s)." In *The Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s)*, edited by Giuliana Gemelli, 167-304. Brussels: European Interuniversity Press, 1998.
- Gencer, Mustafa. *Jöntürk Modernizmi ve Alman Ruhu: 1908-1918 Dönemi Türk-Alman İlişkileri ve Eğitim*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2003.
- Gordon, Robert A., and James E. Howell. *Higher Education for Business*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Gourvish, Terry, and Nick Tiratsoo. "Missionaries and Managers: An Introduction." In *Missionaries and Managers: American Influences on European Management Education, 1945-1960*, edited by Terry Gourvish and Nick Tiratsoo, 1-12. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Gürüz, Kemal, Erdoğan Şuhubi, A. M. Celal Şengör, Kazım Türker, and Ersin Yurtsever. *Türkiye'de ve Dünyada Yükseköğretim, Bilim ve Teknoloji*. İstanbul: TÜSİAD, 1994.
- Hirş, E. *Dünya Üniversiteleri ve Türkiye'de Üniversitelerin Gelişmesi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 1950.
- (Kansu), Nafi Atuf. *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*. Vol. 2. İstanbul: Milliyet Matbaası, 1932.
- Kipping, Matthias, and Jean-Pierre Nioche. "Much Ado About Nothing? The US Productivity Drive and Management Training in France, 1945-60." In *Missionaries and Managers: American Influences on European Management Education, 1945-1960*, edited by Terry Gourvish and Nick Tiratsoo, 50-76.

- Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Kipping, Matthias, Behlül Üsdiken, and Nuria Puig. "Imitation, Tension and Hybridization: Multiple 'Americanizations' of Management Education in Mediterranean Europe." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 13, no. 2 (2004): 98-108.
- Kitapçı, Altan. *Yükseköğretim Mevzuatı*. İstanbul: Yayılım Yayıncılık, 1998.
- Koçak, Cemil. *Türk-Alman İlişkileri, 1923-1929*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991.
- İktisat Fakültesi Talebe Kılavuzu*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1939.
- Kühne. *Mesleki Terbiyenin İnkişafına Dair Rapor*. Ankara: Maarif Vekilliği, 1939.
- Lanza, Anthony R. "Business Education in the Republic of Turkey." *Ph.D. Dissertation*, New York University, 1957.
- İlkin, Selim. "1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye'deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi Tarihi Üzerine Bir Deneme." In *Türkiye'de Okutulan İktisat Üzerine*, edited by Fikret Gürün, 3-38. Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1972.
- Locke, Robert R. *The End of the Practical Man: Entrepreneurship and Higher Education in Germany, France and Great Britain, 1880-1940*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1984.
- Longobardi, E.C. "Higher Commercial Education in Italy." *The Journal of Political Economy* 35, no. 1 (1927): 39-90.
- Lyon, Leverett S. *Education for Business*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1922.
- METU General Catalog, 1961-1962*. Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1961.
- METU General Catalog, 1975-1976*. Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1975.
- Meuleau, Marc. *Histoire d'une Grande Ecole*. Paris: Dunod, 1981.
- Meyer, Heinz-Dieter. "The German Handelshochschulen, 1898-1933: A New Departure in Management Education and Why It Failed." In *Management Education in Historical Perspective*, edited by Lars Engwall and Vera Zamagni, 19-33. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Neyzi, Nezih. "Sevk ve İdare Eğitimi." In *Ekonomik Gelişmeyi Hızlandıran Etken Olarak Eğitim*, 370-91. İstanbul: Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdlere Konferansı Heyeti, 1967.
- Oliver, Christine. "Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes." *Academy of Management Review* 16, no. 1 (1991): 145-79.
- Oluç, Mehmet. "İşletme Fakültesinin Kuruluş ve Gelişmesi." *İ.Ü. İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi* 1, no. 1 (1972): 1-14.
- "Türkiye'de İşletmecilik Eğitimi ve Öğretiminin Tarihçesi." *Sevk ve İdare Dergisi* 8, no. 63 (1973): 9-13.
- Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. 2 ed. İstanbul: İletişim, 1999.
- Öncü, Ayşe. "Academics: The West in the Discourse of University Reform." In *Turkey and the West: Changing Political and Cultural Identities*, edited by Metin Heper, Ayşe Öncü and Heinz Kramer, 142-76. London: I. B. Tauris, 1993.
- ÖSYM. *2002-2003 Öğretim Yılı Yükseköğretim İstatistikleri*. Ankara: Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi, 2003.
- Öz-Alp, Şan. *Yeni Gelişmeler Karşısında İşletme Yöneticileri ve İşletmecilik Eğitimi*. Eskişehir: İTİA, 1972.
- "Yönetim Basamaklarına Eleman Yetiştiren Okullarla İlgili Bir İnceleme." *Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Dergisi* 11, no. 2 (1975): 35-43.

- Payaslıoğlu, Arif T. *Türk Yükseköğretiminde Bir Yeniliğin Tarihi: Barakadan Kampusa, 1954-1964*. Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1996.
- Pierson, Frank C. *The Education of American Businessmen*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Powell, Walter W., and Paul J. DiMaggio. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio, 63-82. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Redlich, F. "Academic Education for Business." *Business History Review*, no. 31 (1957): 35-91.
- Reed, Howard A. "Hacettepe and Middle East Technical Universities." *Minerva* 13, no. 2 (1975): 200-35.
- Robert College Yüksek Okulu 1968-1969, 1969-1970 Catalogue*. İstanbul: Robert College, 1969.
- Sargut, A. Selami. "İşletme Yönetimi." In *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye'de Bilim- "Sosyal Bilimler-II"*, 77-95. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 1998.
- Sayar, Nihad. *Avrupa'da İktisadi ve Ticari İlim ve Araştırma Müesseseleri*. İstanbul: Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu, 1958.
- *Higher Business Education in the United States*. İstanbul: Sermet Matbaası, 1960.
- "Kamu Personeli Eğitiminde İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademilerinin Rolü." In *Kamu Personeli Eğitimi Konferansı*, 103-16. Ankara: A.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1967.
- "İktisadi ve Ticari İlimlerle Meşgul Yüksek Tahsil Müesseseleri." In *İstanbul Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu 75. Yılı, 1883-1958*, 11-19. İstanbul: Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulu, 1958.
- Scott, W. Richard. *Institutions and Organizations*. 2 ed. London: Sage, 2001.
- Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı Faaliyet Raporu*. İstanbul: SİEV, 1973.
- Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1978.
- İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü Talimatnamesi*. İstanbul: Sermet Matbaası, 1954.
- İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü 1958-1959 Tedrisat Programları ve 1957-1958 Yıllığı*. İstanbul, 1958.
- İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Rehberi, 1977-1978*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi, 1978.
- İstanbul Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Okulu Öğrenci Rehberi*. İstanbul: Işıl Matbaası, 1950.
- İstanbul Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Okulu, 1883-1950*. İstanbul: Duygu Matbaası, 1950.
- Stone, Robert A. "İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme İktisadi Tedrisatı." *İ.Ü. İşletme Fakültesi Mecmuası* 16, no. 1-4 (1954-1955): 89-116.
- Strong, Earl P. *The Organization, Administration and Supervision of Business Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1944.
- Tekeli, İlhan, and Selim İlkin. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Eğitim ve Bilgi Üretim Sisteminin Dönüşümü*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993.
- Tosun, Kemal. "Bir İşletme İdaresi Yüksek Okulunun Ders Programına Dair Bazı Mütalaa ve Teklifler." *Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Dergisi* 1, no. 1 (1965): 38-62.
- *İşletme ve Müesseselerde Sevk ve İdare: Prensipleri, Tatbikatı ve Politikası*. İstanbul: Hüsnütabiat Matbaası, 1961.
- Tribe, Keith. *Strategies of Economic Order: German Economic Discourse, 1750-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 1995.

Türk Üniversiteleri. Vol. 1. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1999.

Türk Üniversiteleri. Vol. 2. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1999.

Unat, Faik Reşit. *Türkiye Eğitim Sisteminin Gelişmesine Tarihi Bir Bakış*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1964.

Üsdiken, Behlül. "Plurality in Institutional Environments and Educational Content: The Undergraduate Business Degree in Turkey." In *Inside the Business Schools: The Content of European Education*, edited by Rolv P. Amdam, Ragnhild Kvalshaugen and Eirinn Larsen, 87-109. Oslo: Abstrakt, Liber, Copenhagen Business School Press, 2003.

— "Türkiye'de İş Yapmanın ve İşletmenin Akademikleştirilmesi, 1930-1950." *A.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 58, no. 1 (2003): 119-47.

Üsdiken, Behlül, Alfred Kieser, and Peter Kjaer. "Academy, Economy and Polity: Betriebswirtschaftslehre in Germany, Denmark and Turkey before 1945." *Business History Review* 46, no. 3 (2004): 381-406.

Üsdiken, Behlül, and Nisan Selekler. "Türkiye'de İşletme Alanında Eğitim ve Araştırmanın Erken Dönemleri." In *IV. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı*, 260-76. Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1997.

Weidner, Edward W. *The World Role of Universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Westmeyer, T. Rudolph. "Administration of the New York University-Ankara Project: A Case Study in Technical Assistance." *Ph.D. Dissertation*, New York University, 1963.

Westney, Eleanor D. *Imitation and Innovation: The Transfer of Western Organizational Patterns to Meiji Japan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Widmann, Horst. *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu*. Translated by Aykut Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt. İstanbul: Kabalıcı Yayınevi, 1999.

Yazıcı, Bülent. "Sunuş Konuşması." In *Türkiye'de Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitimi'nin Durumu ve Gelişme İmkanları*, 3-5. İstanbul: İstanbul Sevk ve İdarecilik Vakfı ve Türk Sevk ve İdare Derneği, 1975.

Yıldıran, Güzver. "An Overlook at the Turkish Educational System." In *Recent Perspectives on Turkish Education: An Inside View*, edited by Güzver Yıldıran and John Durnin, 1-12. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Broşürü. İstanbul: Yüksek Ekonomi ve Ticaret Okulunu Bitirenler Derneği, 1946.

Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi. İstanbul: Türkiye Basımevi, 1939.

Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi 1936 Yıllığı. İstanbul: Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi, 1936.

Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Okulları Talimatnamesi. 1957.

Zeitlin, Jonathan. "Introduction: Americanization and its Limits - Reworking US Technology and Management in Post-War Europe and Japan." In *Americanization and its Limits*, edited by Jonathan Zeitlin and Gary Herrigel, 1-50. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.