HISTORIES, INSTITUTIONAL REGIMES AND EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: THE CASE OF TURKISH HIGHER EDUCATION

By

ZEYNEP ERDEN

Submitted to the Institute of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Sabancı University
March 2006

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. Behlül Üsdiken _____
(Dissertation supervisor)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Yamak _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Öncü _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. S. Arzu Wasti _____

Dr. Nisan Selekler _____

DATE OF APPROVAL:

HISTORIES, INSTITUTIONAL REGIMES
AND EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:
THE CASE OF TURKISH HIGHER EDUCATION

Zeynep Erden

PhD Dissertation, 2006

Dissertation Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Behlül Üsdiken

Keywords: institutional theory, isomorphism, organizational field, institutional change, institutional logics, higher education, universities, YÖK, Turkey

This study examined the Turkish higher education field to understand plurality and its effects on an organizational field in an effort to extend new institutional theorizing. In doing this, the aim was to see how isomorphic pressures affected organizations against the backdrop of a multiple model organizational field. In addition, as the study had three data sets in three time points, it allowed for an analysis of periods with different institutional set ups. As such, the three periods displayed, first the early years when there was no strong coercive force in the field, which was followed by a period under strong coercive pressures toward homogenization, and a third period when the coercive body had allowed room for heterogeneity.

The findings showed that in the first data point (year 1975), higher education organizations in the field displayed divergent organizational features, as expected,

operating under a loose institutional set up. In this period, organizational features were shaped by the historical models educational organizations were founded upon. The second data set (year 1991), after the field having gone through a major overhaul due to the change in the higher education law, revealed more homogeneity, especially in organizational features that were monitored by the YÖK, a powerful regulatory body established in 1981. The third data set (year 2002), displayed heterogeneity the most, as expected. The entry of the private universities into the field, which began in 1992, as well as the "softened" period of YÖK increased heterogeneity.

ÖRGÜTSEL KÖKLER, KURUMSAL ÇEVRE VE ÖĞRETİM KURUMLARI: TÜRKİYE'DE YÜKSEK ÖĞRETİM

Zeynep Erden

Doktora Tezi, 2006

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Behlül Üsdiken

Anahtar sözcükler: kurumsallaşma kuramı, benzeşme, örgütsel alan, değişim, kurumsal modeller, yüksek öğretim, üniversiteler, YÖK, Türkiye

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki yüksek öğretim kuruluşlarını bir inceleme alanı olarak kullanarak, birden fazla örgütsel modelin bulunduğu alanlarda örgütlerarası benzeşmenin dinamiklerini ve sonuçlarını anlamaya çalışmış ve bu yolla örgüt kuramı içerisinde yer alan kurumsallaşma kuramına bir katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamıştır. Buna ek olarak, çalışma üç zaman noktasını incelemiş ve bu sayede üç farklı kurumsal çevrenin örgütler üzerine etkilerini de incelemiştir. Birinci ölçüm noktası (1975), örgütsel alanın ayrışmayı arttıran, çoklu model yapısına sahip olduğu ve benzeştirici, özellikle zorlayıcı baskıların az olduğu bir dönemi işaret etmiştir. İkinci ölçüm noktası (1991), birincinin aksine, örgütsel ortamda, 1981'deki yasal çerçeve değişiminin getirdiği güçlü ve zorlayıcı bir düzenleyici örgütün, Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu (YÖK), izlerini taşımıştır. Üçüncü ölçüm noktası (2002) ise Yüksek Öğretim Kurumunun (YÖK) etkisinin biraz daha yumuşadığı bir dönemi, dolayısıyla benzeşme baskılarının azaldığı, hatta ayrıştırıcı bir etkinin olduğu bir dönemin getirdiklerini inceleme fırsatı yaratmıştır.

Araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre, birinci ölçüm noktasında (1975), örgütler beklenildiği gibi bağlı oldukları farklı modellerin etkileri doğrultusunda, birbirlerinden farklı örgütsel özellikler göstermişlerdir. İkinci ölçüm noktasında (1991) ise, özellikle YÖK'ün denetimi altında bulundurduğu ve yasayla belirlenmiş olan özelliklerde örgütlerarası benzeşmenin beklenen doğrultuda arttığı görülmüştür. 2002'de ise, beklenildiği gibi, YÖK'ün biraz daha yumuşak olduğu bir dönem olma özelliği ve alana giren vakıf üniversitelerinin de etkisiyle, ayrışmanın, örgütlerarası farklılıkların arttığı bulunmuştur.

To my *Family*-ies

past

present

future

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am foremost very much grateful to Behlül *Bey* for his academic guidance and support he has given me throughout my doctoral study. He has always been a true "gentleman" with patience and persistence.

I had the privilege to observe the growing number of members of the Sabancı University Faculty of Management, throughout which I have experienced a very friendly and supportive study environment.

The members of the İTU Management Faculty have been very supportive in providing the necessary study conditions for my studies. Selime Sezgin has been a key figure in shaping my academic career. Fatma Küskü has been (is) my mentor at ITU.

Sevgi İnce has been with me from the beginning, and together with Sera İnce, have provided the best voluntary baby-sitting services. Mahmut Bayazıt has given me "valid" reason(s) to complete this dissertation. Leyla Erden has, patiently, waited for me to finish up my studies. Tufan Erden has been my voluntary sponsor throughout my studies, and without contemplating.

Tomris Atabay has been very kind in reading a text that was out of her "context". Suat Türköz has given this text a personality. Tevhide Altekin, Tankut Atan, Münire Arıkol, Gözdem Bebekoğlu, Gonca Börekçi, Özgecan Koçak, Monica-Zeki Şimşek have been very encouraging especially in the final phases. All of my friends, especially my girlfriends have given me enormous emotional support without which I could not have survived through this process.

Last of all, all the members of the two libraries, Sabanci University and Boğaziçi University, have been very helpful and accommodating during my research.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Early Thinking in Organization and Management

Organizations, as empirical objects (Clegg and Hardy, 1996), have been a frequent point of inquiry since they became a powerful social actor in society starting in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the growing dominance of large-scale organizational units in economic, social and political life (Reed, 1996). They were slowly stripped from their owners and became bureaucracies that increased their importance within society and increased attention to them. Early theorizing was concerned about how organizations processed inputs to make outputs, as well as ways to use all resources, including human, more efficiently. In doing so, pioneers in the field, such as Taylor, Fayol, Gulick and Urwick, did mostly prescriptive studies to develop general principles concerning administrative arrangements mostly based on their experiences as practitioners (Scott, 1992). Taylor was focused on work design, in finding "best" ways to increase efficiency, while Fayol was more interested in administrative principles that would be applicable to all organizations universally. In a similar vein, Urwick and Gulick were concerned with rules that would optimize coordination, spans of control, relations between line and staff (Starbuck, 2003).

Starting with the 1920s, the concern with the human element in organizations turned into the human relations movement, which spurred empirical investigation on individual and group behavior in organizations (Üsdiken and Leblebici, 2001). As Reed (1996) puts it, the core of what is called the human relations perspective was to view organizations as the

intermediate social units with naturalistic and evolutionary characteristics, which integrated individuals into modern industrial civilization. Authors such as March and Simon, Cyert and March described organizations as information processors, and focused on decision processes, incorporating views from social psychology (Starbuck, 2003). Later, with the works of authors such as Chester Barnard and Elton Mayo, in addition to the previous concern with goals, formal structure and efficiency came the interest in "non-rational", and "informal" behavior in organizations (Baum and Rowley, 2002). Hence the emergent character of organizations rather than formal design became the central issue to study. As such, organizations were to be viewed as entities with formal structures reflecting cost-efficiency concerns while having an accompanying informal structure. In these early works, the unit of analysis was mainly single organizations and the focus was processes *within* organizations. All in all, until the 1950s, these two approaches, classical management theory and the human relations movement, constituted the core of management and organization studies.

1.2. Emergence of Organization Theory as a Distinct Field

Late 1950s and 1960s witnessed an expansion in organization studies with the entrance of sociologists and economists into the field, one that was formerly occupied by mainly practitioners and psychologists. In addition to the early interest in how internal mechanisms of organizations worked, organizations now came to be seen as parts of their environments, which was defined as their immediate operating context. Thus, how organizations adapted their structures to their environments (the systems and contingency perspective) was the new path of investigation. Later, after the mid-1970s as the field of organization studies continued to expand new questions were posed, such as why organizations exist (economic perspective), why there is diversity in organizational forms (organizational ecology perspective), how external control and power affect the internal structure of organizations (resource dependency).

The structural contingency theory claimed that organizations have to adapt to their environments in order to survive (Donaldson, 1995). Early studies, which were mostly conducted in Britain by researchers such as Woodward, Burns and Stalker, Pugh and his

colleagues (Reed, 1996), dwelled on the issues of finding optimal organizational structure that was contingent upon factors such as operational technology and size each of which was considered as contingency factors. Alas, in turn, these contingency factors would reflect the environment in which the organization was located. Later with essential input that came from American authors such as Chandler, Lawrence and Lorsch (who gave the theory its name), and Perrow, other factors were investigated such as strategy and environmental complexity, yet the main focus remained as how organizational structure was shaped to fit the environment. The main argument was that misfit ended in poor performance, while fit led to better performance. In this view, organizations were seen as adaptive to their environments and managers were viewed as the controllers finding the best fit between organizations and environments (Donaldson, 1995). This was a move away from one best way of organizing to best fitting way of organizing through structural adaptation, which was regarded as positive and productive. In tandem, the focus, also, moved away from intraorganizational procedures to the characteristics of the task environment, still leaving the unit of analysis as single organizations.

Following the contingency, organization theory witnessed another influx of theorizing based upon economics. In particular, the agency theory by Jensen and Meckling (1976) and the transaction cost theory by Williamson (1975) constituted the core of organizational economics. Both the agency theory and the transaction cost theory rest on two behavioral assumptions: bounded rationality and opportunism. It is claimed that actors are not only limited in their decision making but they can, also, act with "guile". In tandem, the agency theory holds that organizations may be analyzed in terms of conflict of interests between agents (managers) and principals (owners). In order to deal with possible problems arising from these conflicts, the agency theory deals with ways to control and devise systems to align the interests of the agent with those of the principal.

Transaction cost theory is based on the work of Coase, which was re-visited by Williamson (1975) who set the basis for economic analysis of firms by explaining how and why organizations exist at all. Williamson claimed that firms are used when transactions are frequent, uncertain and demand special investments, while markets are used when transactions are straightforward and few in number, when there is no asset specificity (Swedberg, 2003). Apart from explaining why organizations exist, by focusing on the transactions rather than the commodities or services, the economic approach has introduced

the analysis of governance structures, moving away from technical production concerns (Scott, 1992).

In the mid-seventies organization theory was expanded by a novel approach from a number of sociologists such as Hannan and Freeman (1977), Aldrich (1979). Taking an outlook of organizations enriched by a sociological view, the organizational ecology sought to explain how organizations came to life and how they disappeared. As Donaldson (1995, p.42) puts it, this new approach was not a continuation of previous organization theory. The focus, different than previous conventional approaches, was organizational populations, which were composed of organizations that are engaged in similar activities. Thus, the focal point became organizations in aggregates rather then single organizations. The organizational ecology, or the population ecology, was designed to explain why certain forms or types (species) survive by emphasizing natural selection (Scott, 1992, p.113). Further, organizational diversity is explained by the rates of founding and death. Also, different than previous theorizing, organizations are not seen as adaptive to environmental change but rather they are viewed as having strong structural inertia against change. Indeed, organizations are depicted as liable to failure in case of structural change (Baum, 1996), rather than having adaptive capabilities.

Alongside the organizational ecology, another approach to organizations in 1970s was the resource-dependency view. According to this view, which was developed by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), an organization is dependent on external organizations to acquire resources in order to survive. Hence power struggles between the focal organization and other organizations that have valuable resources for it to survive, as well as parallel internal power struggles among various constituents within the focal organization, shape how an organization behaves (Donaldson, 1995). Organizations seek to find ways of coping with these dependencies through forming inter-organizational linkages such as mergers, joint ventures and board of director interlocks. This approach has brought in the political analysis of organizations and it is applicable at two levels, both intra and inter-organizational (Donaldson, 1995). Furthermore, it was a departure from the rational view of organizations and an opening to recognizing possibilities of choice.

Mid-1970s saw yet another sociological approach to organizations, namely neo-institutionalism which questioned rationality in and around organizations. Rational choice was questioned as organizations came to be regarded as embedded in a social and symbolic

context. By viewing organizations under social as well as technical influences, the institutional approach differentiated itself from other theoretical perspectives on organizations such as contingency, resource dependence and population ecology (Scott and Christensen, 1995).

1.3. Neo-Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis

The penetration of institutionalist ideas into organizational theorizing can be traced to the work of Selznick (1948) who claimed, for example, that practices in organizations, in time, may become "infused with values". As such organizations would become ends in themselves (Powell and DiMaggio, 1991). By questioning rationality within organizations Selznick (1948) laid the basis for what is now often referred to as old institutionalism.

The birth of new institutionalism, on the other hand, may be marked with the seminal work of Meyer and Rowan in 1977 in which they claimed that organizations design their formal structures according to the prescriptions of myths in the institutional environment in order to acquire legitimacy which in turn increases their chances of survival. Hence, they claimed that organizations, which are thought to design their structures to gain efficiency, in fact decouple their formal structures from their technical properties, replacing efficiency concerns with legitimacy. While associating structure with the organizational environment, institutionalists also expanded the meaning of environment, considered until then as composed of resources and technical know-how, to wider social, cultural and symbolic systems in which they are located (Scott, 1995). Thus, organizations were to be seen also as closely knit with the institutional framework, with which they were surrounded.

Following Meyer and Rowan (1977), in 1983 DiMaggio and Powell (1983/1991) published their work focusing on the reasons why organizations tend to become similar over time. They were interested in the question of why there were limited forms of organizations instead of greater diversity. While doing this they introduced the concept of *organizational field*, which they defined as being composed of "those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar

services or products" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991, p. 65).

DiMaggio and Powell (1991) claimed that organizational fields become established over time, which in turn pushes organizations toward homogenization. Further, they suggested three homogenization mechanisms that made organizations similar to one another in their forms and practices. DiMaggio and Powell (1991) claimed that this so called *isomorphic change* occurs through three mechanisms: 1) coercive isomorphism stemming from the state and other political influences; 2) mimetic isomorphism stemming from organization to organization connectedness; and 3) normative isomorphism resulting from professionalization of the field.

Coercive isomorphism results from both formal and informal pressures on organizations by other organizations. DiMaggio and Powell (1991) claimed that legal frameworks establish a common environment affecting many characteristics of organizational structures. Yet, they further claimed that not all isomorphism occurs as a result of coercive pressures. Uncertainty in the organizational field pushes organizations to imitate one another leading to diffusion of organizational features, ending in increased similarity amongst them. In fact, this diffusion of structures and practices may either be intentional or unintentional. More typically, organizations tended to imitate those organizations which were established as legitimate in the field and which were perceived as successful. DiMaggio and Powell (1983/1991) referred to these processes as mimetic isomorphism. The third mechanism of isomorphism, namely, the normative, stems from professionalization, which DiMaggio and Powell define as "the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define conditions and methods of their work, to control the production of producers" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991, p. 70). They, further contend that two major aspects of professionalization are sources for isomorphism, namely formal education and professional networks.

Supplementing the idea of isomorphism, which works at the field level, Friedland and Alford (1991) conceived institutions as being "nested", and "supraorganizational", and contended that organizational fields are under the influence of societal level institutional logics which they defined as the "set of material practices and symbolic constructions which constitute the organizing principles that are available for organizations and individuals to elaborate" (p. 248). Hence they broadened the level of analysis and opened the way for broader interactions, both local and non local, among various institutional

models. They have also brought back the political view by depicting these institutional logics as sometimes conflicting and struggling for dominance.

In sum, while "old" institutional theory brought considerations of institutionalization into in organization theory, neo-institutional views brought the cognitive turn and departed from earlier work by turning the attention from intraorganizational processes to interorganizational processes as well as making the unit of analysis "fields" of organizations, rather then analyzing individual organizations.

1.4. Neo-Institutionalist Approaches and Educational Organizations

Education has often been considered as one of the sectors in which effects of institutionalization may be observed given the goal ambiguity, uncertain technologies and professionalization that characterizes the field (Kondra and Hinings, 1998; Üsdiken, 2003). In such a field, school structures tend to reflect current institutionalized beliefs about socially legitimated structures (Rowan, 1982). Thus, educational organizations have been subject to a number of studies that have tested the general themes of institutional theory starting from the early years of institutional research. Early work on institutional theory used educational organizations to demonstrate the validity of the central institutional themes such as institutional sources for organizational structure, loose coupling of structure and activities and the diffusion of structural elements (Tolbert, 1985; Meyer et al, 1992; Meyer and Rowan, 1992; Scott and Meyer, 1994; Meyer et al, 1994; Meyer et al, 1994).

Educational organizations have also been investigated for the purpose of extending as well as questioning or challenging the very same tenets of institutional thinking on organizations. Lounsbury (2001) investigated the institutional sources for variation in practices, while Casile and Davis-Blake (2002) looked at the organizational sources for the variation of responses to environmental forces. Similarly, Kraatz and Moore (2002) demonstrated how organizational change (deinstitutionalization) is induced by executive migration in American liberal arts colleges.

1.5 Higher Education in Turkey from an Institutional Perspective

The present study follows the same tradition, focusing on the field of higher education in Turkey. The history of Turkish higher education goes back to the Ottoman Empire, to the end of 18th century and as such this study examines the last 25 years of this 200 years of history. If one is to take the foundation of the Turkish Republic as a breakpoint, then the study covers 25 years within 75 years of more recent history.

For the most part, Turkish higher education, starting from the mid-19th century has been characterized by a binary system, which evolved until the founding of the Republic as a secular alternative to the pre-existing *medrese*s. The binary system comprised the "professional" schools and the (single) university (the *Darülfünun* as it was called at the time). The duality was inherited by the Republic and continued until 1982 when there came an abrupt end by the passage of a new legal framework, which had the aim, amongst others, of standardizing the field. Before the introduction of the new set of legal arrangements, higher education in Turkey had been largely shaped by the impartation of foreign institutional models. Throughout the latter part of the 19th century France served as the primary source of inspiration, which provided the basis for the binary system. French models served as the reference both for the professional schools and the early initiatives for setting up a university. This was to be followed, after the turn of the century and due to the changing political climate, by a brief encounter with the German model of the university (Üsdiken, 2004). A stronger German influence was to follow, however, some 10 years after the founding of the Republic when the political elite in closing down the *Darülfünun* and reopening it as a new university benefited from employing a larger number of German professors fleeing from the Nazi regime (Widmann, 2000). The French and the German models dominated the higher education field in Turkey until the 1950s. This was when a university and a couple of organizations patterned very much after the American exemplars, together with a "college" under American ownership were established (İlkin, 1972; Üsdiken, 2004). It may thus be argued that the field evolved under which mimetic and normative mechanisms as organizations modeled themselves after counterparts in different western educational systems. The "west" initially meant the Continent, i.e., first French, later German, which was later to become North America for some.

Following the legal overhaul in 1980s, often referred to by the acronym YÖK

(which stood for the Law itself-*Yüksek Öğrenim Kanunu*, as well as the overarching Council that it established), the field entered a period in which coercive pressures began to play a vital role. The multiplicity was formally abolished in an effort to standardize the organizational forms in the field. This was however coupled with a major change, which allowed "foundations" (the *vakif* in Turkish) to establish private universities. Not only did this serve to inject the "market" into the higher education field but also a "form" that was to a large degree alien to Turkish higher education apart from the brief period between 1962-1971 when private "higher schools" existed. Moreover, the period under YÖK can also be considered as consisting of two sub-periods, namely, from early 1980s to the early 1990s and from early 1990s to the present day. Such a demarcation is warranted with respect to a number of notable changes. First and foremost, there was some change in the degree of the coerciveness of YÖK as a change in the law altered the way the rectors were appointed, allowing some more participation on the part of the faculties. Moreover, the attention of YÖK changed from administrative arrangements towards re-shaping the higher education field. These changes entailed a shift, for example, towards greater expansion of higher education when 25 new universities were founded in 1992, as did the emphasis towards the expansion of "vocational" education. These developments were followed by the surge of private university foundings, which primarily occurred after 1992.

The central concern of this study is to examine the effects of these changing institutional frameworks on the activities, structures and procedures of the members of the higher education field in Turkey. More specifically, it examines the interplay between historically rooted diversity within the field and the institutional regimes put into effect in the early 1970s and then in the early 1980s. As such the study provides an opportunity to assess the outcomes of the interactions between organizational histories rooted in different models and field level institutional frameworks with varying degrees of coercive push towards homogenization.

1.6 Plan of the Dissertation

The next chapter will give the theoretical framework the study employs. The chapter will start with the core concepts of institutional theory, which will be followed by

the recent issues raised within the institutional approach to organizations. This section will be followed by the questions and arguments this study raises, which constitute the theoretical framework of this study.

The third chapter explains and describes the research context the study uses. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section describes the history of higher education in Turkey with its roots, organizational forms and legal frameworks. The history has three sub divisions, namely, the pre-Republican period, the early Republican period (1920s to 1950s) and the 1950s to 1970s. Building on this background, the second section describes the alterations in institutional frameworks in the post-1970 era and by linking these to the theoretical framework develops the hypotheses examined in the study.

The fourth chapter will discuss the method used in this study. This chapter has three sections. The first section explains the data points of the study, since the study has been designed to investigate the study variables over time. The second section states the operationalization of the study variables. The final section explains the sources that have been used to collect data.

The fifth chapter reports on the findings of this study. Results and findings are given according to the data points of this study, therefore this chapter starts with three sections: The Year 1975: Activities, Structure and Procedures in the Weak Institutional Regime; The Year 1991: Strong Institutional Regime; The Year 2002: Activities, Structure and Procedures in the Market Regime. A final section in this chapter discusses the overall look of the field in 2002.

The final chapter gives the concluding remarks of this study with limitations and future research possibilities.

2.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Following the influx of various approaches to organizational studies that started in the late 1970s, early 1980s welcomed the idea that organizations were embedded in their wider social contexts, which constituted the core argument of the institutional theory. The claim that organizations acted with legitimacy concerns transcending the technical needs of the organization brought in the argument of the institutional environment. As such, institutional theory differentiated itself from previous theorizing on organizations. Institutionalists went on to claim that organizations, within this respect, decouple their formal structures from their task activities to meet this need (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). In tandem, independent of efficiency concerns, organizations conform to their institutional environments in order to gain legitimacy and in this way hope to increase their resources and survival capacities. By emphasizing the role of social context, organizations came to be seen as legitimacy seeking entities, rather than rationally acting entities whose *raison d'etre* was efficiency.

Alongside the legitimacy concerns that shape organizations' behavior, a second tenet of this approach has been the homogenizing effects of the institutional framework on organizations within an organizational field. Gradually, the members of a field come to resemble one another as their interactions increase, which results in the structuration of the field. In particular, it was claimed that organizations, in time, would become similar to one another through isomorphic pressures that result from legal frameworks, normative forces and mimetic pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).

This chapter will begin by providing and overview of the development of institutional theory, from early thinking to neo-institutional thinking. This will be followed describing the key concepts within the neo-institutional perspective together with reviews of pertinent empirical evidence. The review helps to identify the areas where institutionalist theorizing remains silent and empirical evidence is limited. The following section departs from the preceding critical assessment to put forth and develop the research problems to be addressed in this study, which will lead to the general propositions of the study.

2.1 "Old" Institutionalism

Early institutional theory, based on the work of Selznick (1948) [who was influenced by Robert K. Merton and his writings (Scott, 2001)] claimed that formal structure did not capture the nonrational dimensions of organizations and turned attention to the "unintended consequences of purposive action" (Merton, 1936, p.894). Merton discussed how actions do not always have clear-cut purposes, especially "habitual action". In tandem, Selznick (1957) was mainly concerned with how organizational practices take on a rule like status over time to which members conform. He argued that when such transformation took place, organizational goals were replaced by these emergent rules. As such, he viewed organizations not as mechanistic instruments designed to achieve specified goals, but rather as adaptive organic systems influenced by the social characteristics of its participants as well as its environment (Scott, 2001). Hence, actions are viewed by Selznick (1957) not as context free but rather constrained and shaped by the setting in which they occur (p.23). It is important to note that the context is conceptualized as local, i.e. immediate institutional environment, and the main motive behind actions are political. Selznick, later, defined "institutionalization" as to become infused "with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand" (pp.16-17). As such, action is perceived as structured by institutions, rather than mere aggregation of individual and organizational behavior (Clemens and Cook, 1999).

Built on these arguments, within the early institutional thinking, organizations that had been depicted as value-free until then by other perspectives, came to be seen as value-laden and they were treated as "emergent institutions" (Strang and Sine, 2002). In other

words, organizations were seen as evolving creatures, with goals that transformed over time. Further, this transformation was seen as guided by both the participants of organizations and external constituencies. As such, institutionalization then, is treated as a process, depicting the "natural history" of organizations. This transformed creature no longer is a rational vehicle for accomplishing original goals but becomes a value-laden creature whose participants want to preserve these values. Hence organizations, as they become institutionalized, also become stable, and not so easily changing. As such, early institutional thinking dealt with issues that were at the organizational level, and by looking at the organizational processes from within, they challenged the adaptation view that was prevalent in other perspectives, such as the contingency theory.

2.2 From "organizations as institutions" to "environment as institutional"

As noted above, viewing organizations as institutions was the central tenet in old institutional theorizing. Later, with the advent of the neo-institutionalist revision, the attention turned towards viewing the environment of organizations as embodying institutional elements. Institutions came to be defined as the "rules, norms and beliefs that describe reality for the organization, explaining what is and what is not, what can be acted upon and what cannot" (Hoffman, 1999, p.351), i.e., what are appropriate activities or relationships (Washington and Ventresca, 2004). Likewise, Scott (2003, p.880) defined institutions as "social structures that have attained a high degree of resilience, that together with associated activities and resources provide meaning and stability to social life." He also argued that institutions are composed of regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements, which he defined as the three "pillars". With reference to the institutional environment, Scott (1987, 2003) defines the regulative pillar as consisting of forces imposed by rules and regulatory structures such as the state, trade and professional associations on organizational activities. The second pillar, namely the normative, stresses norms and rules as the basis of institutional order. This particular element had been emphasized in earlier or what is now commonly referred to as "old" institutionalist thinking. The third pillar, or the cultural-cognitive on the other hand, is emphasized by organizational sociologists who brought the "*neo*-institutionalist" perspective to

organization theory, as the attention moved away from the process of institutionalization and issues of power to the shared conceptions and taken for granted beliefs that constitute the symbolic framework around organizations.

Neo-institutional theory, based on the work of Berger and Luckmann (1967), asserted that formal organizations are created in a framework provided by complexes of rules and patterns that are products of professional groups, the state and public opinion (Scott, 2003). By shifting the focus from the process of institutionalization within organizations to the symbolic role of the formal structure and the issues of legitimacy, the new institutional view regarded action taken as a result of interpreting environmental stimuli through cognitive processes and symbol systems. Until then, environments of organizations had commonly referred to their task environments, which include all aspects of the environment relevant to goal setting and goal attainment such as sources of inputs, markets for outputs, competitors, and regulators, or put in other words, the material and informational elements, (Scott, 1992). Thus, neo-institutional theory expanded the conception of environment through the notion of institutional environment, which included symbolic elements such as rules, social norms and cultural values surrounding organizations (Scott, 1992). As such, neo institutionalists, in contrast to the "old" version, turned the focus from within organizations to between organizations and treated institutions as residing at the supra-organizational level.

As a result of the concern with institutions constituting and constraining organizational action, and the impact of institutional frameworks on organizations, *cultural-cognitive* systems were accentuated at both micro and macro levels within the neo-institutional perspective. At the micro level, March and Simon (1958) had already written about how shared beliefs constrained choice. March and Simon dwelled on the issue of decision-making and rationality. They claimed that individuals were constrained by the routines in organizations and their decision-making processes were shortened through these performance programs. Hence the organizational individual is depicted as an institutionalized man. At the macro level, when Meyer and Rowan (1977) published their seminal work on the decoupling of formal structures and task activities within organizations, they added a new dimension to organization studies by emphasizing the importance of the social context on organizations, which, as pointed out above, constitutes a tenet core of neo-institutional theory.

Thus, organizations are treated as social entities, embedded in complex networks of cultural schemes and conventions that shape their behavior (Hasselbladh and Kallinikos, 2000). In broader terms, a main argument of neo-institutional theory is that "the patterning of social life is not produced solely by the aggregation of individual and organizational behavior but also by institutions that structure action" (Clemens and Cook, 1999, p. 442). Furthermore, by pointing out the influence of the social surrounding on organizational actions and outcomes, neo-institutionalists claimed that everything that happens within organizations is not the result of conscious decision processes (Scott, 1987). In their most cited work, Meyer and Rowan (1977) claimed that formal structures reflected the myths of their institutional environments, not the demands of their work activities (p. 41). Their work focused on how organizations created their informal structures as a separate body from their formal structures, which reflected the elements of the institutional environment.

As such, early empirical work within the neo-institutionalist tradition focused on how institutional processes rather than technical concerns affect the adoption of structural features, strategic decisions and procedures. For example, an early study conducted by Tolbert and Zucker (1983) looked at differences between early and late adopters of civil service reforms, demonstrating that while early adopters had economic or technical motives, late adopters had mainly social legitimacy concerns. Baron, Jennings and Dobbin (1988) similarly found that the adoption of bureaucratic employment structures (e.g., job analysis, job evaluations, promotion testing, performance rating system, time and motion studies, personnel departments) in various industries between 1927-1946 were better explained through institutional forces rather than efficiency concerns. Later, Westphal and Zajac (1994) found that firms adopting CEO incentive plans later used these symbolically, parallel to legitimacy arguments of institutional theory. These and other similar studies (e.g., Fennell and Alexander, 1987; Galaskiewicz and Wasserman, 1989) provided empirical support for the neo-institutional claim that organizational action and properties were shaped to a considerable degree by institutional influences.

Meyer and Rowan's 1977 article was followed by DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) very influential article explaining similarities among organizations operating within distinct institutional spheres. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) explained how organizations sharing a common environment became similar to one another, and they laid the foundation of what later became a very much attended research path within the new institutional thinking. This

time the focus was on organization-to-organization connectedness along with the effects of the other actors sharing the same institutional environment such as professional networks, the state, and the regulatory agencies. Through interactions, organizations, over time, reflected commonalities in their features. The homogeneity argument, also, brought with it, the idea of change. Yet, the change they proposed was a convergent change rather than divergent, and one, which was incremental, rather than revolutionary. These ideas will be further discussed in the following sections, yet it is possible to sum up the change from "old" to "new" institutional thinking, in Zucker's (1987) terms, as one from viewing "organizations as institutions", to one, which views "environment as institution". The next section will proceed from the core themes to introduce some key concepts that have been widely discussed and used in empirical works within neo-institutionalist thinking.

2.3 Key Concepts in New Institutional Theory

2.3.1 Institutional Environments and Organizational Fields

As pointed out above, one of the initial and important additions that neo-institutionalist thinking brought into organization theory has been the concept of institutional environment. As Scott notes (1992), until the 1970s the most commonly held conception of the environment had been that of the "task" environment, which is defined as those aspects of the environment that related to the goals of an organization and included "*suppliers* of material, capital, labor, work space; *customers* including both distributors and buyers; *competitors* for both markets and resources and *regulatory groups* (government agencies, unions, inter-firm associations)", (Dill, 1958, p. 424). In the 1970s, this early conception of environment was supplemented by the resource dependence view, later by the population ecology perspective. However, organizations were continued to be seen as being in interaction with the environment and they were viewed as responsive to the economic and technological pressures and requirements stemming from this immediate task environment. As institutional thinking appeared in the literature, it expanded the conception of the environment by including the broader social context. Specifically, institutional thinking put the emphasis on the symbolic structures around organizations and viewed

organizations as embedded in their wider social context. It is important to note that this conceptualization of the organizational environment does not exclude the technical aspects, but rather expands the concept by including the symbolic aspects.

Connected to the conception of the institutional environment, another concept central to neo-institutional theory is the "organizational field". Organizational field refers to "those organizations that constitute a recognized area of institutional life including suppliers, consumers, regulatory agencies as well as organizations producing similar products or services" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991, p. 64). As such, organizational fields consist of both organizational sets, which are individual organizations and their exchange partners, as well as organizational populations, which are composed of those organizations with similar forms and similar outputs. Thus, the focus moved away from competing firms or networks of organizations to "the totality of relevant actors" (p.65). An organizational field comprises members such as state agencies and professional associations, and moreover, these actors may transcend national borders, making the boundaries cultural and functional, rather than geographical (Scott, 2001). That is, the focus is on the interaction among members over time, as a result of which shared systems of meaning become defined and it is these meaning systems that establish the boundaries of organizational fields. As such, "structuration" captures this gradual process of increasing maturity of the field that involves the defining of organizational practice (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings, 2002). The notions of institutional field and institutional processes that are at play are explained by yet another key concept in neo-institutional theory; namely, isomorphism.

2.3.2 Isomorphism: Pressures towards Homogenization

In trying to understand the interconnectedness among members in an organizational field, DiMaggio and Powell (1983/1991) focused on what drives homogeneity among organizations within particular organizational fields. Their approach was based on the principle of isomorphism, which asserts that organizations in a field tend to become similar in time as the field becomes established, which results in, the authors predicted, "an inexorable push toward homogenization" in organizational forms and practices (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991, p.61). In other words, over time, the shared meanings that have been

constructed as a result of interaction among organizational members in an organizational field are reinforced by these isomorphic forces, which then bring about convergent change.

In explaining the causes of this push toward homogenization, DiMaggio and Powell (1983/1991) proposed three mechanisms through which isomorphic change occurs, namely, *coercive isomorphism, normative isomorphism* and *mimetic isomorphism.* Coercive isomorphism results from formal and informal pressures, working through regulative elements that involve the capacity to establish rules, surveillance mechanisms and sanctions. Organizations comply with an organizational structure or a structural feature because they need to comply with laws and regulations, based on their fears of sanctions. Normative isomorphism results from professionalization, which works through normative elements that involve the creation of expectations that introduce a prescriptive, evaluative and obligatory dimension into social life. Organizations, through professional associations, common educational backgrounds of their employees come to act similarly to one another or possess similar structural features. Mimetic isomorphism results from uncertainty, which works through cultural-cognitive elements that involve the creation of shared meanings (Scott, 2003), which organizations abide by without conscious thinking most of the time or imitation of other organizations within the field.

Isomorphism received much interest among organizational researchers. Empirical work on isomorphism accumulated from a stream of studies examining diffusion of practices through the three isomorphic mechanisms, though much of the emphasis has been on mimetic isomorphism (Mizruchi, and Fein, 1999). Earlier work was more concerned with the diffusion of structures and practices, while later work examined organizational strategies (Deephouse, 1996). Yet, most work on isomorphism has investigated the diffusion of only a single structure or practice and hence predicted, as well as demonstrated, "complete" homogeneity in a particular characteristic within an organizational field (Tolbert and Zucker 1983; Galaskiewics, 1985; Fligstein 1985; Fligstein, 1987; Fennell and Alexander, 1987; Galaskiewicz and Wasserman, 1989; Ginsberg and Bucholtz, 1990; Palmer, Jennings, and Zhou, 1993; Burns and Wholey, 1993; Haveman, 1993; Haunschild, 1994; Han, 1994; Konrad and Linnehan, 1995). For example, Fligstein (1985) looking at the causes of dissemination of the multidivisional form among large firms from 1919 to 1979 found the existence of other adopting firms in the industry to be a major determinant of dissemination (see, Palmer et al., 1993 for a similar finding). In another study, Burns and

Wholey (1993) examined the adoption and abandonment of matrix organizational designs in a group of hospitals. Their findings show matrix design adoptions to be effected by the hospitals location within and the cumulative force of adoption in the inter-organizational network, the dissemination of information, as well as by technical reasons (i.e., task diversity).

In addition to the studies that examined the diffusion of single organizational characteristics, some studies looked into more complex issues with respect to isomorphism such as organizational responses to conflicting institutional pressures and the ways in which isomorphic forces are facilitated. For example, D'Aunno, Sutton and Price (1991) studied how organizations that were traditionally part of the mental health treatment sector, but which later became part of the drug abuse treatment center, responded to conflicting institutional environments. They found that organizations respond to the conflicting demands of the old and new environments by viewing the institutional demands in a hierarchy, and conform to the "new" institutional environment in such a way as to gain a minimum level of legitimacy. In order to attain this, they adopted those practices that are *visible* to external groups, who cannot monitor all organizational practices and beliefs. In a study on how institutional reproduction occurs, Haunschild and Miner (1997) investigated three modes of inter-organizational imitation, namely frequency imitation (copying very common practices, which means those that are adopted by a large number of organizations), trait imitation (copying practices of other organizations with certain features such as large size, prestige and being successful), and outcome imitation (imitation based on a practice's apparent impact on others, which refers to a practice's positive impact on other organizations). They found that these three modes of imitation, although distinct, might occur simultaneously. Further, not all outcomes are imitated but only those outcomes that are detectable and salient are to be imitated, and that uncertainty in the environment enhances the chances of mimetic isomorphism. In parallel, Strang and Meyer (1993) claimed that practices that appeared as more effective or efficient than the alternatives are more likely to be imitated than others (similar to trait imitation). Furthermore, they claimed that practices being consistent with prior attributes or policies, the simplicity of the novel practice, and the opportunities for experimentation increased the adoption of a practice. Also, they proposed that "theorization", which refers to the cultural understanding that social entities belong to a common social category, makes the diffusion more rapid and

universal. Further, by giving the example of the spread of mass education, they claimed that the more social entities are constructed and legitimated as modern entities, the more frequently they are adopted. In a similar vein, Greenwood et al (2002) pointed out that diffusion occurs only if ideas are presented as more appropriate than the existing ones. Overall, these studies showed the extent to which isomorphic forces, primarily of the mimetic kind, will be influential on organizations with regards to organizational practices.

2.3.3 Institutional Logics

The idea of isomorphism, organization-to-organization connectedness, was supplemented by Friedland and Alford (1991), who claimed that a central logic comes to pervade in an organizational field, which then produces convergence among the field participants. In explaining the concept of institutional logics, they claimed that the sources of these logics lie at the broader societal level, which then affect organizational fields, as logics are "symbolically grounded, organizationally structured, politically defended, and technically and materially constrained, and hence have historical limits" (p.248). These institutional logics pattern organized social life and by mediating between society and organizations they defined the principles for organizational structures, strategies and procedures (Townley, 1997). As such, Friedland and Alford (1991) provided an additional basis for carrying the level of analysis from organizations to the field level. Moreover, as they defined institutional logics as being historically limited, Friedland and Alford (1991) also provided a theoretical expansion to the institutionalist perspective by opening the way to institutional change.

Friedland and Alford (1991) defined the notion of "institutional logic" as the "set of material practices and symbolic constructions which constitute the organizing principles and which is available to organizations and individuals to elaborate" (p.248). Their argument is that underpinning these "material practices and symbolic constructions" is an ideational base that sets out what organizations are to achieve and the means for achieving these ends. Thus, within the institutional perspective, organizations may be viewed as the empirical manifestations of particular logics, models or templates (or "interpretive schemes" of Greenwood and Hinings, 1988). As such, collective beliefs are seen as

emerging from repeated interactions among organizations sharing the same field (Greenwood et al, 2002). Hence, institutional logics, by providing the organizing principles through which they offer and outline guidelines for practice to field participants, serve to constitute meaningful organizational activity (Dacin et al, 1999). All in all, institutional logics, or models, or templates, provide what goals or values are to be pursued, as well as the means to achieve these goals within a field. Hence they specify organizational goals and structure (Scott, 2001; D'Aunno et al, 2000). Put in other words, organizations are pulled together by institutional logics that reside at the field level, which however, may themselves be subject to forces of change (Thornton and Ocasio, 1999).

2.3.4 Institutional Change and Transformation of Organizational Fields

One of the major criticisms toward neo-institutional thinking has been its lack of explanation of organizational change. By focusing on the institutionalization process and convergence of organizations in an organizational field, institutional theory has mainly focused on permanence and stability (Seo and Creed, 2002, Kraatz and Moore, 2002). Authors such as Brint and Karabel (1991) pointed out the need for understanding the transformation of institutions besides explaining their durability. Although there have been several attempts in explaining institutional change, such as DiMaggio (1988) and Zucker (1988), early writings did not bring about enough empirical follow up and were even noted as having failed in their attempts to explain change (Leblebici, Salancik, Copay and King, 1991).

As early attempts that strived to fill this gap, some empirical research tried to find explanations for change within neo-institutional thinking. For instance, in their work on the organizational history of the US broadcasting industry, Leblebici et al (1991) discussed the role of changing "conventions" in the transformation of fields. In a similar vein, Kieser (1989) pointed to the co-evolution of societal belief systems ("evolution of evolution systems") and formal organizations. Later work drew upon Friedland and Alford's (1991) concept of institutional logics. As noted above, Friedland and Alford (1991) conceived institutional logics as historically bounded, thus pointing to the possibility of transformation in logics, which in turn resulted in institutional change. That is, institutional logics were

conceptualized as being constructed in time and space, which gave way to new logics to be formed in parallel to societal level changes.

Empirical research on institutional logics mostly explained change, using logics as a tool for facilitating institutional change, or as a source of change (with the exception of Townley (1997) who studied how the prevailing institutional logic has been influential against the coercive pressures for change). For example, Haveman and Rao (1997) looked at the evolution of the thrift industry, in which they viewed thrifts as embodiments of institutional logics or "theories of moral sentiments" (p.1607). They showed how organizational forms changed along with the changes stemming from societal level institutions, which resulted in the selection of those forms that were in line with the changing logics. In their study of executive succession in higher education publishing industry, Thornton and Ocasio (1999) found that the change from an "editorial logic" to a "market logic" in the publishing industry had significant effects on the positional, relational and economic determinants of executive power and executive succession. They found that under the editorial logic, executive succession was determined by organizational size and structure, whereas under the market logic the determinants became the product market and the market for corporate control. Thornton (2001), in a further analysis, also showed how the change in dominant institutional logics in an industry led to a change in the control of the firm and in the determinants of the risk of being acquired. She found that different logics represented different selection environments for structure and strategy, and that the risk of acquisition of any firm depended on the extent to which its strategy and structure conformed to prevailing logics. In a similar vein, Ruef and Scott (1998) studied the healthcare industry, and found one of the antecedents of legitimacy to be the match between the mission of the organization and the dominant logic within the institutional environment. Similarly, in an extensive study on the healthcare field in the US, Scott, Ruef, Mendel and Caronna (2000) found that changes in field logics, namely "professional dominance", "federal involvement" and "managerial-market orientation", had effects on governance structures and organizational forms, specifically density, ownership features, subtypes and linkages among populations of organizations. In a more recent study, Reay and Hinings (2005) investigated the effect of one key actor, the government, on the changes in healthcare field in Alberta, Canada, focusing on the transformation process of field level logics from medical professionalism to business-like health care.

As the above overview reflects, neo-institutional thinking has come a long way in explaining organizational phenomena by including the social context alongside the technical explanations that have been used before. As such, it started by introducing the concept of institutional environment, which was followed by the concept of organizational field. These concepts were enriched with two other core concepts of neo-institutional thinking, namely, isomorphism and institutional logics, both serving to understand the institutional processes influencing organizations. However, there are still a variety of issues that institutionalist approaches need to address. The next section discusses some areas that need further theoretical expansion.

2.4 Silences and Points for Expansion

2.4.1 Scope of Isomorphism

In their highly cited work, DiMaggio and Powell (1991) explained the homogenization process among organizations by taking into account the above mentioned mechanisms of isomorphism, yet they left the content of isomorphism only broadly touched upon, if not untouched. In other words, while the authors claimed that organizations became similar in time through isomorphic pressures, they did not address the issue of the scope of isomorphism, i.e. whether or not isomorphism refers to a complete homogenization of organizational features or partial similarities among organizations sharing the same field. As such, they did not clarify which elements of organizations would become homogenized. This "silence" accords with the general criticism made by Brint and Karabel (1991) who claimed that difficulties of institutional theory have less to do with the tenets of the theory than with its silences (p.343). This point is taken further by other researchers. For example, Suchman (1995) noted that institutionalization will not necessarily occur uniformly across levels within organizations.

In addition to the above mentioned "silence" in explaining the concept of isomorphism, empirical evidence, also, did not escape criticism. As mentioned earlier, empirical work on isomorphism accumulated from a stream of studies examining similarities across organizations in various organizational characteristics. Yet, most work

on isomorphism has investigated the diffusion of only a single practice and hence predicted, as well as demonstrated, "complete" homogeneity in a population of organizations with respect to a particular characteristic (Tolbert and Zucker 1983; Fligstein 1985; Fligstein, 1987; Fennell and Alexander, 1987; Galaskiewicz and Wasserman, 1989; Ginsberg and Bucholtz, 1990; Palmer et al, 1993; Burns and Wholey, 1993; Haveman, 1993; Haunschild, 1994; Han, 1994; Konrad and Linnehan, 1995; Guler, Guillen and Macpherson, 2002). As these studies focused on a single characteristic, what happens to an organization as a whole, in its totality of elements, remained under investigated. Therefore, the depicted "complete" homogeneity may not be reflecting totalities of organizations. A recent similar criticism came from Hambrick, Finkelstein, Cho and Jackson (2000) who pointed out that studies on isomorphism did not attempt to understand the degree to which organizations are similar in their totality or across an array of centrally important dimensions.

2.4.2 Heterogeneity versus Homogeneity

Aside from the "silence" on the content of isomorphism, the emphasis on institutional reproduction has put organizations into a role in which there is not much chance for heterogeneity in organizational fields as they develop over time. Recently, the need for a theoretical expansion, in this respect, has been voiced by various authors. For example, Greve and Taylor (2000) studied the radio format changes and organizational responses of radio stations. These authors found that organizations responded in ways other than mimicking innovations in radio format changes. Thus, they pointed to a promising research topic, namely, that of investigating non-mimetic change, by shifting the focus from isomorphism to "variation-generating" institutional processes. In his study on the US chemical industry, Hoffman (1999) found that throughout the evolution of this field, different institutions gained support at different periods by different institutional pillars, which is against the assumption of unified and monolithic institutional forces. In parallel, Lounsbury (2001) called for a need to look at the connections between institutional pressures and variation in the content of organizational practices, as he examined the role of

the Student Environmental Action Coalition, a social movement organization, on creating variation in the staffing of recycling programs at colleges and universities. He found that the adoption of one of two recycling programs he identified was shaped by this field level organization that provided resources to student environmental groups at universities. Thus, recent work using institutional theory for explaining organizational phenomena emphasized the need for an expansion in the theory in accounting for variance besides non-variance. In other words, the possibility of divergent change and heterogeneity alongside or as opposed to homogeneity became one of the major theoretical concerns leading to calls for more studies in this path of research (for example, Glynn, Barr and Dacin, 2000).

Understanding the causes and effects of heterogeneity in an organizational field is important in advancing institutional theory. In fact, it was DiMaggio and Powell (1991) themselves who had pointed out to the possibilities of divergent pressures within organizational fields. Although DiMaggio and Powell (1991) have been often cited for the idea of convergent change, when they argued for the existence of forces pushing organizations towards homogenization, they also claimed that there might be forces that push organizations towards diversity. In tandem, as Friedland and Alford (1991) claimed that society comprises different institutional orders, each constituted around different logics, they also argued for the multiplicity and nestedness of these institutions. This point of view focuses attention on the existence of differentiated and specialized institutional logics and patterned human activities that exist in varying form and content, leading to plurality in the institutional environments of organizations (Scott, 1987). Thus, as Friedland and Alford (1991) supported the convergence prediction, they, also, opened the way for the possibility of plurality among organizations in a field as well the path for institutional change, which results from the plurality in supra-organizational fields. Hence, the concept of institutional logic has been used as a source of *convergent* institutional change, yet, this concept may also be useful in explaining *divergent* institutional change as it serves for understanding multiplicity in organizational fields.

The arguments on the possibility of divergent forces in an organizational field led to a concern with "plurality" or "non-uniformity" in institutional environments. Authors such as Rao (1998), Clemens and Cook (1999) and Üsdiken (2003) elaborated on the possibility of multiple institutional logics resulting in possible heterogeneity within the organizational field. For instance, Rao (1998) explained one possible source of variation in an

organizational field as the existence of multiple "frames" (parallel to logics) that organizations choose from to define their goals, authority, technology and clients, as a result of which conflict among organizations might occur. When explaining institutional change as opposed to durability, Clemens and Cook (1999) pointed out the possibility of multiple institutions along with mutability and internal contradictions that would create room for non- stability as well as institutional change. Üsdiken (2003), in his study of the effects of plurality of institutional models on the content of business education in Turkey, found that historical ties affected organizational features. Specifically he found that the content of business programs varied across universities based on their historical roots, though there was also uniformity in a number of curricular features. Parallel to this argument, Greenwood and Hinings (1993) suggested that there may exist a number of, though few, archetypes or institutional models (Scott, 2001) for organizations within a field to select from. Furthermore, Scott argued that while some fields may be characterized by the presence of a dominant logic, other fields may contain competing or conflicting belief systems leading to diversity within the field (Scott, 2001, p.140). Similarly, Seo and Creed (2002) claimed that there could be a plurality of institutional arrangements and accompanying prescriptions that are inter-connected, yet contradictory. Likewise, Dacin, Goldstein and Scott (2002), endorsed the observation that multiple logics may exist within a field and compete for existence. Recently, parallel to these arguments, Reay and Hinings (2005) pointed out that studies of organizational fields have focused on understanding convergent change and that they have assumed change as a natural process resulting from transition from one dominant logic to another. Instead, they proposed to use DiMaggio's (1988) "battlefield" metaphor for understanding organizational fields in which competing institutional logics exist. All in all, these authors all pointed out the importance of investigating heterogeneity as opposed to or together with homogeneity, its possible sources, and its outcomes in an organizational field. The next section discusses the possible sources of multiplicity or plurality within organizational fields.

2.4.3 Sources of Multiplicity

Neo-institutional theory by emphasizing how ideas travel through time and space

(Scott and Christensen, 1995), expanded the meaning of organizational environment to include the broader social context, going beyond the notion of "organization to organization connectedness" (Dacin, 1997). Arguably there are two sources for multiplicity if one can use such an expanded view of institutional environments. First, multiple institutional models may stem from the "non-local" spheres that may influence an organizational field. These non-local pressures may be associated with sources that are distant, so to speak, in terms of space. Second, models may stem from the past, associated with sources that are distant in time. As "new" logics, or models enter the field, the "old" logics do not disappear totally but remain in some spheres of the environment, creating plurality in the organizational field.

In terms of "non-local" being all outside sources bringing in different models, i.e. going beyond the immediate environment, Scott and Meyer (1991) claimed that organizations are embedded in larger systems of relations that may extend to international levels, transcending field and national borders. In other words, organizations are affected by i) other organizational fields, ii) societal level influences (Friedland and Alford, 1991) iii) forces stemming from across national borders. By providing the concept of logic, institutional theory incorporated the influence of societal level influences as well as the effects of other fields on organizational structures, while later research extended the notion of institutional influences across borders.

For example, Kristensen (1999) argued that institutional patterns diffuse across nations through universal science and international institutions. Thus, firms or organizations in general, must conform to these rationalized myths constructed in broad contexts in order to look modern and legitimate. This is especially true for late developing countries where it is more likely that organizations in these countries borrow or mimic models from more advanced countries. It has also been suggested that ideas that are connected with "modernity" are likely to be borrowed by peripheral countries (Ramirez and Boli, 1987). Further, Kristensen (1999) noted that a number of such "models" could be "around", rather than singular models that these countries imitate. It may be put forward that the institutional logic that is connected with the more recent or the more "modern" ideas will be more likely to dominate a field. However, what is perceived as modern changes and so the institutional model that dominates the field can be replaced over time by other models in the field. The argument of non-local forces effecting organizations is

exemplified in several other empirical studies such as the work of Christensen and Molin (1995), who examined the Danish Red Cross over a period of 125 years. They showed how the Danish Red Cross is modelled on the International Red Cross as set out by an international treaty. The study also showed how the Danish government with an elite governance model, had to finally give in to the international pressures of founding the local Red Cross, which came to symbolize democracy with its democratic governance structure. Gooderham et al (1999), on the other hand, claimed that the conceptualization of the "environment" recognizes the possibility of diversity stemming from "idiosyncratic national institutional regimes". They examined the effects of the national context in terms of legal frameworks and political structures, and drew attention to national institutional barriers in the imitation process (p. 508).

A second possible source that may result in non-uniformity is models originating in different points of time. Although dominating models may change over time, organizational histories, or the imprinting effect at the time of the founding of organizations creates a divergent force at the organizational level as well as at the field level, which may be sustained over long periods of time. Stinchcombe (1965) was the first theorist to recognize the influence of social conditions at the time of founding on organizational structure and claimed these remained relatively stable over time. In explaining the influence of social structure on organizational forms or types at the time of founding, the concern of Stinchcombe (1965) was the creation of new populations of organizations rather than single organizations. As such organizations as new foundings then are most open to institutional forces to gain legitimacy, which is critical for founding success, and so they try to fit with the institutional framework (Dacin, 1997). These adopted organizational characteristics stay with the organizations in their later stages in life.

While there is not much empirical work on imprinting (Scott, 1987), the idea of imprinting has been applied to individual organizations which can be exemplified by works of Noda and Collis (2001) on understanding the initial experiences of organizations alongside with founding conditions, and Cockburn et al (2000) on the importance of the history on a firm's action. Borum and Westenholz (1995) examined how the Copenhagen Business School adopted and incorporated five different institutional models over time. These authors concluded that an institutional model introduced in one phase was not erased by the new models introduced in the following phases and that organizational actors and

segments of the environment continued to carry the old models, which survived in certain spheres of activities. However, they did not specify which spheres these old models survived in. In a similar fashion, Cooper, Hinings, Greenwood and Brown (1996), in their study of two law firms, found that the change in organizational archetypes did not happen as one sweeping away the other, but rather one layering upon the other, whose residues continue to exist. The focus of their study being the change of archetypes, they examined two cases between 1991 and 1993, the time span not allowing much theorizing on the interplay of these two archetypes over time, as mentioned by the authors themselves as a limitation in their study. As these studies indicate, however, although new logic or logics may be imposed on the organizations, it should not be unexpected that rather than a total conformance to the prevailing logic, old logics find for themselves spaces to survive, resulting in "sedimented" logics and structures (Kitchener, 2002).

All in all, regardless of its origins (diffusion across borders, or history and imprinting), the plurality theme suggests that there can be multiple models (or institutional logics) in the institutional environment with different legitimacy bases. The previous empirical studies focused on logics as being sources of change and therefore looked at how new logics were formed, which then changed the field structure as well as organizations. It is this line of thinking that led the previous empirical research on institutional logics. These studies have shown (Thornton, 1995; Thornton and Ocasio, 1999; Scott et al. 2000) how one logic replaces another over time, depicting a natural and non-conflictual change process (Reay and Hinings, 2005), focusing on the institutional change dynamics. Yet, it could be argued that although at particular periods in time one of these models may become more dominant vis-à-vis others, their extent of influence may, also, be more balanced as "old" logics or models continue to survive in certain spheres in the field, reflected in certain organizational characteristics, leading to multiplicity within the field. In other words, it is possible that more than one logic or a model (with different legitimacy bases) to be present in an organizational field concurrently. Whatever the case in such settings, homogenizing and divergent forces coexist in a field of organizations. The following section will discuss in more detail how organizations respond to these divergent and convergent forces in their institutional environment.

2.5 Organizations Facing Multiplicity: Organizations, Institutional Regimes and History

Within the framework explained above, there is a need to understand how organizations respond to the convergent forces of coercive, mimetic and normative pressures coming from the institutional environment influenced in various ways by non-local forces, coupled at the same time with the divergent forces stemming from the imprinting effect of organizational histories shaped by their founding social context. As the plurality arguments suggest, an organizational field may contain multiple institutional models, or templates coming from either non-local organizational fields, or from those, which are rooted in the field coming from the past.

As mentioned earlier, within the institutional perspective, organizations may be viewed as empirical manifestations of particular logics, models or templates. In order to understand how organizations respond to conditions of institutional multiplicity, first it is necessary to explain how multiple models interact with one another. Friedland and Alford (1991) have argued that over time, through the interactions among the organizations, one central logic, or model, pervades the field. DiMaggio and Powell (1991), in tandem, discussed three mechanisms, namely coercive, mimetic and normative, through which convergence occurs in an organizational field. At any time existing institutional logics or models may be promoted or contested by these different mechanisms.

It is plausible to expect one logic or model to gain dominance over time when all three mechanisms support the same model. Or, it would be possible for one mechanism to be more influential than the others, in which case one model or logic again may become dominant in the field. However, it may also be argued that the remaining models or logics will be dormant or may reside in certain spheres of the field as sediments and they may be evoked at a further point in time. Even if these dormant models would not be as influential as the dominant model, these sediments may be regarded as a source of multiplicity in the field.

Aside from the issue of sediments, in some cases one may presumably observe different mechanisms supporting different models with a more balanced support. Then, one would expect multiplicity to be more explicit and different models to be more or less

equally influential in the field. This multiplicity, over time, is expected to bring about a new form of dominant model, or logic that is different to the models that have created the multiplicity. This new dominant model is expected to be a hybrid model or logic, a bricolage of those previous models. For example, the legal framework, which can be regarded as one carrier of institutional logics, might reflect this hybrid model by incorporating various features from different logics concurrently. Similarly, professional associations may adopt "best practices" from various models, which they then normatively impose on organizations to follow. Similarly, organizations may imitate different features of these various models from a variety of organizations, again leading to hybridization of the models.

Such multiplicity and its sources are of theoretical interest in and of themselves, yet the question remains to be answered is how organizations behave when faced with multiplicity in institutional conditions. In organizational fields where multiplicity of models exist, organizations may conform to extant models either totally or partially or may develop commitment to multiple models at the same time. Hence, one expects to find sets of organizations representing different institutional models in their pure forms, or when there are models or institutional logics that are equally legitimate, one can find, as Holm (1995) showed, hybrids, this time at the organizational level. In addition, hybrid models may also be formed through borrowing from other fields of organizations, or from models across national borders. These borrowed forms may also affect the extant forms leading to alterations in some of their organizational features, thus producing what may again be labeled as hybrids. Thus, at any point in time, when a new organization is established, extant panorama will include organizations representing institutional models in their pure forms or hybrid organizations that may also serve as impure templates for new organizations to select for mimicking.

The issue of hybridization necessitates a further conceptualization as to how this hybridization takes place at the organizational level. As an attempt towards understanding the responses of organizations to pressures coming from two different institutional environments, D'Aunno et al (1991) suggested that when organizations face opposing pressures to conform, they adopt practices that will help them gain minimum level of legitimacy (which are least costly) and those which are visible to external groups. This finding is parallel to other studies investigating the bases for the diffusion of organizational

practices. For example, Haunschild and Miner (1997) demonstrated that organizations imitated practices that appeared to have had good outcomes for other organizations. They claimed that not all practices or structures that have produced positive results for other organizations are imitated, but only those that are salient or visible. These two studies imply that only if an organizational characteristic is visible and its outcomes salient will it be adopted. In a similar vein, Townley (2002) argued that when organizations try to respond to conflicting logics that operate in their institutional environment, they tend to conform to the pressures at the public level, while continuing with the previous logic at the operational level, which again suggests that visibility matters.

The concepts of institutional logics or models help us understand plurality, yet it is also necessary to understand possible simultaneous isomorphic forces that may affect organizational responses to multiplicity. In other words, organizational fields may incorporate multiple models and isomorphic pressures at the same time. Isomorphic mechanisms have different strengths. One would expect to find greater convergence along organizational features that are supported by coercive pressures, as long as coercive mechanisms enforce visible and easily monitored features to converge. For mimetic mechanisms, it is necessary that some sort of selection criteria be formed in order for organizations to select from different models. Normative mechanisms will work better if the organizational field under the influence of multiple models is organized well professionally. It should be noted, however, that for both mimetic and normative mechanisms to be influential, it is necessary that the organizations sharing a field go into interaction, which at the same time results in the field to become structurated. Yet, coercive mechanism will be more influential in all points in time in the evolution of an organizational field, as it encompasses regulatory agencies and rules and regulations as its major tools. In such organizational fields, it is plausible to argue that organizations will converge along some organizational features, while maintaining divergent elements. As organizations reflect the social structures at the time of their founding, which leaves an imprinting effect, it is expected that the features at the founding time will be resilient towards isomorphic change. As such, in multiple model organizational fields where there are isomorphic pressures, organizations will adopt visible features to gain minimum legitimacy, while organizational features that are less visible will be the spheres where other models can be traced. Overall, one expects to find lesser uniformity in organizations

as a whole in organizational fields where there is plurality.

The next question is trying to predict which organizational features may be more likely to respond to isomorphic pressures as opposed to those that are resilient, or even remain unchanged. Organizations are usually depicted as made up of three dimensions: strategy, structure, and technology. As Scott (1995) notes that when organizations conform to their institutional environments, it is likely that these dimensions will respond differently.

The first category, goals and strategies, may reflect the largest heterogeneity as organizational features pertaining to strategies, which depict what goals are to be pursued, specifying what the organization exists for, is the broadest category. The organizational characteristics related to strategies, pointing to the core activities an organization pursues, define what the organization exist for. Hence, one may expect to find these to be more resilient towards convergent change.

In comparison to "strategy", "structure" is more easily monitored by the institutional framework, and at the same is more open to isomorphic pressures. Therefore it is more probable for structural features to be in line with the model supported by the institutional mechanisms in the field.

Technologies or operational procedures (Scott, 1995) are the ways organizational activities are carried out and it can be claimed that this category is also open to current pressures in the institutional framework. In organizational fields where procedures are strictly specified, such as medicine, one expects organizational features pertaining to procedures to be more or less uniform. However, in organizational fields where there is uncertainty in technologies, it is also possible that in order to deal with the uncertainty, organizations may tend to imitate others, and procedural features are expected to be imitated highly as they may be more visible. Also, through the movement of professionals, one expects this category to be similar across organizations sharing a field. In fact, this category has been an empirical interest for institutional theorizing and as Scott (1995) points out many of the rational myths described by Meyer and Rowan spell out procedures.

The extent to which these predictions are likely to hold however will also depend on the nature of pressures towards homogenization. In a field characterized by historically rooted multiplicity and where field-level institutional frameworks are relatively weak in the coercive pressures they exert or themselves embody the multiplicity in the field effects of

isomorphic pressures will be limited in generating homogenization.

When field level institutional mechanisms gain a more coercive character and embody more singular logics on the other hand the kind of outcomes that are predicted above are more likely to occur.

Altogether, these considerations lead to the following broad propositions, which have in turn served to develop the specific hypotheses to be assessed in the particular empirical context studied in this dissertation. The propositions are based on the assumption of a field where early development has been around a plurality of institutional models on which organizational foundings have been based. They then relate to more mature stages where different forms of field-level governance structures have been introduced to the field:

Proposition 1: Given a field characterized by a multiplicity of institutional models, weak field level institutional frameworks are likely to generate limited homogenization in strategies, structures and technologies.

Proposition 2:Given a field characterized by a multiplicity of institutional models, strong field-level institutional frameworks are likely to generate homogenization in structures and technologies but not in strategies.

The next chapter now turns to describing the context in which these propositions are translated into more specific hypotheses and examined empirically.

3.

THE EMPIRICAL CONTEXT: THE HIGHER EDUCATION FIELD IN TURKEY

The preceding theoretical account necessitates an understanding of the research context of the present study. In order to understand how an organizational field incorporating multiple institutional models evolves, this chapter is dedicated to the historical account of the Turkish higher education field. After a brief introduction the chapter will begin with describing the historical evolution of the field in three periods, namely, the pre- Republican period, from the early years of the Republic to the 1950s and from the 1950s to the 1970s. This section will serve to provide an overview of the variety of influences under which the higher education field and higher education organizations in Turkey have been shaped. It will thus offer an appreciation of the plurality of institutional models imported from different foreign environments that have constituted the historical roots of forms of higher education organizations in the country. The second section of the chapter will focus on the evolution of the field from the early 1970s until the early 2000s. This section serves a dual purpose. On the one hand it provides a description of the recent history of higher education in Turkey bracketed into three time periods, namely the 1970s, the 1980s and from the early 1990s onwards. The basis of this demarcation is essentially alterations in the institutional regimes governing higher education in the country. The same section also sets the contours and the concerns of the empirical study. It does so by drawing upon the theoretical ideas developed in the previous chapter and using the three time periods for advancing the hypotheses that are to be empirically examined.

Although Turkish higher education has its origins in institutions called the *medrese*

which date back to 11th century, most authors claim that when looking at the roots of today's universities, it is perhaps more appropriate to start with the initial western influences that began in the 18th century when military schools were established (e.g. Hatipoğlu, 1998; Gürüz et al, 1994; Arslan, 2004). Following the decline in its military power, Ottoman elites wanted to revitalize the Empire's military as well as administrative capabilities. In order to accomplish this, instead of reforming its own organizations, it turned its face to Western, "civilized" countries to imitate their organizations (Arslan, 2004). The establishment of these military schools was followed in the next century by the founding of civilian professional schools. These were modelled primarily on the French *Grandes Ecoles* and were geared towards meeting the personnel needs of the increasingly bureaucratized Ottoman administration, an initiative in line with the modernizing attempts of the Empire by importing Western institutions. It was in 1900 that the first "modern" university was founded based again very much upon French exemplars. From then on the higher education field in Turkey acquired a binary structure, made up of "professional" schools on the one hand, and universities on the other, which continued after the founding of the Turkish Republic.

Prior to the Second World War, Turkey became one of the host countries for German professors fleeing from the Nazi regime. These professors became very influential in the universities in which they worked. They served as carriers of the German model into the Turkish context (Öncü, 1993). The American wave came later. Following World War II, the increasing power of the US internationally showed itself in various spheres of economic and social life within Turkey too. In the late 1950s and the 1960s several universities were founded after American exemplars, together with a number of organizations and an American college to be converted in 1971 into a Turkish university as well. Hence, the field came to be characterized with multiple models and forms of higher education as the binary structure also continued together with various institutes and schools opened under the governance of the Ministry of Education (Gürüz et al, 1994). This came to an abrupt end with the passage of new legislation in the early years of the 1980s. Within the radical overhaul of institutional regime that these legal changes involved, perhaps the most prominent was the establishment of an all powerful central governance body, the Higher Education Council (YÖK). Not only did the new institutional regime eradicate the formal distinction between higher education organizations in the country, but also was very

much guided by a thrust for standardizing structures, practices and activities of universities. At the same time, however, the new institutional regime foresaw the establishment of private (or "foundation") universities, outcomes of which began to be manifested in the 1990s. The 1990s also witnessed a certain degree of "softening" in the coercive pressures of the governance body. The post-1990 period also saw a dramatic increase in the numbers and the geographical spread of universities, including private ones. By 2002, the number of universities in the country had increased to 75 (The list of these universities together with their location and the year in which they were founded is provided in Appendix A).

3.1 History of the Higher Education Field in Turkey: Roots, Organizational Forms, and Legal Frameworks

3.1.1 Pre Republican Period

As noted above, for some authors, the history of Turkish higher education goes back to the *medrese* education dating back to the 11th century. *Medrese*s were institutions that provided religious education until the 10th century, after which other subject matters such as Arabic, poetry, philosophy, history, geography, engineering, mathematics, chemistry and medicine were included in the education often under four major areas, namely, theology and law, literature and languages, philosophy, and the sciences. *Medrese*s were mostly supported by private foundations. The courses were yearly. There were no classes of students, instead students being evaluated according to their completion of textbooks with respect to different topics (Gürüz, 2001). According to Gürüz (2001), a major difference between Western and Turkish higher education is that while European universities evolved into their present institutions, *medrese*s remained unchanged and later were demolished and replaced by western forms. For this reason, some authors (e.g. Hatipoğlu, 1998) do not consider the *medrese*s as a part of the evolution of the Turkish higher education field, or as higher education understood in the West. Instead, these authors regard the roots of Turkish higher education as going back to the 18th century with the establishment of the initial Western type of secular educational organizations.

Towards the end of the 17th century, as a way of dealing with the decline of the Ottoman Empire, various reforms were initiated to revive the Empire's economic and political power. Since the Empire's major source of income had been from military conquests, priority was given to reforms in the Military. Hence, instead of starting with a reform in secondary education, the initial attempts covered tertiary education, specifically aimed at training the Military cadres. As such, the first Western type of higher education organization was set up in 1773 for engineers to be trained for the Navy (*Mühendishane-i Bahri-i Hümayun*). This first example of the higher school for "professional" training was soon followed by a similar one, this time for the Land Forces (*Mühendishane-i Berri-i Hümayun*). In 1827, a Higher School for Medicine (*Tıbbiye*) was founded, which was followed by the Military Academy (*Harbiye*) in 1834 (Gürüz et al, 1994). These schools represent the initial attempts at importing Western higher education organizations with a view to modernizing the Army and for equipping students with new skills and knowledge (Tekeli, 1980). It is important to note that, according to Tekeli (1980), the transformation of the Ottoman society began with the Military cadres, which resulted in transforming the higher education organizations before other organizations (p.69).

Although these early initiatives were inspired by similar establishments in various countries in Europe, especially for the civilian ones that followed after mid-19th century, France was the country that served as the primary model. In France it was the G*randes Ecoles*, "schools for higher education", founded after the Napoleonic reconstruction in the 18th century, that were taken as the main exemplars. These "professional" schools established as alternatives to the universities aimed at giving specialized professional education for military officers as well as engineers for the civil service (Kaiser and Neave, 1994; Friedberg and Musselin, 1987). The *Grandes Ecoles* were set up to provide education in various branches of engineering as well as commerce and administration (Burn, 1971) and were mostly located in the city of Paris. These were independent institutions, often under the direct surveillance of Ministry of Education (or other governmental ministries), though private ones also existed as in the case of commercial schools (Üsdiken, 2004). In French higher education, these higher professional schools have been elitist, especially in engineering, in their selection of students as they accepted less than one-tenth of those that applied, who were then to follow demanding curricula (Clark and Neave, 1983). As Gürüz (2001) notes, it was after 30 years or so that these types of educational establishments were

first imported to the Ottoman Empire. With the reformation in 1839, in addition to the imitation of the G*randes Ecoles*, students were then sent to France to study and bring their knowledge back home. According to Gürüz et al (1994), the choice of founding the higher education system by establishing professional schools was a continuation of the Ottoman Empire's tradition of imitating France in education in general.

Along with the professional schools and after a number of aborted attempts, in 1900, the first modern university, labeled then as the *Darülfünun* (house of sciences) was founded. The first attempt lasted for two years until a fire burnt down the university facilities. The second attempt lasted three years that ended up being closed down, which was followed by a third attempt which lasted another year (Arslan, 2004). These attempts were aborted mainly because of the social pressures coming from the clergy who did not want the power of *medrese*s to decrease. (Gürüz, 2001, Tekeli, 2003). Finally, in 1900, this time successfully, *Darülfünun* was re-organized and re-opened for the fourth time. Envisaged as offering more general as well as professional education the new university was deemed as different from the professional schools that had been established until then. The French university again served as the model. As in the French system, *Darülfünun* had five faculties – religious studies, literature, natural sciences, medicine and law (Gürüz et al, 1994), of which law and medicine were founded before the other three. The establishment of *Darülfünun* may be interpreted as parting from the professional school model, but it should instead be interpreted as following the French higher education model, which comprised the binary structure of separate professional schools and universities as two distinct forms of educational organization. Furthermore, alongside establishing the University, a commission was set up to prepare the books that would be used at the University, a body similar to what the French called the Academy of Sciences. This segmentation between the universities on the one hand and *Grandes Ecoles* on the other is assumed to be the French higher education system's most noteworthy feature (Durand-Prinborgne, 1992). Thus, similar to the French higher education field, the founding of the university in İstanbul needs particular attention in that it marks the start of the binary structure within the Turkish higher education field, which was to continue for many years to come (Unat, 1964). Furthermore, the university was organized around subject matters that were similar to those in the university in the French higher education system, leaving engineering as well as commerce outside, to the professional schools (Durand-Prinborgne,

1992). As the foundation of these institutions was essentially an attempt to generate new cadres for the military and public administration in a period when the Empire was struggling for survival, research was not on the agenda. This was very much in line with the French higher education model as it also left research outside universities to special institutions. Neither have the *Grandes Ecoles* at the time and since been known for their research (Friedberg and Musselin, 1987).

In the same years the number of vocational schools increased to nine, with the addition of one for civil administration (*Mülkiye Mektebi*) in 1877, one for fine arts (*Mekteb-i Sanayi-i Nefise-i Şahane*) in 1882, one for law (*Hukuk Mektebi*) in 1878, one commercial school (*Ticaret Mekteb-i Alisi*) in 1882, and another one for training middle level technicians (*Kondüktor Mekteb-i Alisi*) in 1911. On the other hand, during the Second Constitutional Monarchy period, in 1915, the Ministry of Education, in compliance with the emerging external links of the Empire at the time, recruited a number of professors from Germany (19 German and one Hungarian) for the *Darülfünun*, which have constituted the initial penetration of German ideas into Turkish higher education (Öncü, 1993). As Tekeli (2003) describes, these professors opened institutes and laboratories in line with the German model based on the Humboldtian idea of a research university. Although the German professors were only to stay for about two years as Tekeli (2003) also points out, overall, with engineering organized separately and with autonomy granted in a 1919 by-law, the first Ottoman university began to resemble the German model during these years.

This period is a continuation of the modernization attempts to revive the Ottoman Empire. The tool was importing western institutions and as the Empire was mostly under the influence of France at that time, higher education models were imported from this country. Still, as Gürüz et al (1994) point out, the "modern" university came to Ottoman Empire 800 years after its initial example in Europe. And its arrival did not occur without hesitation. In fact, as mentioned above, the university was closed down three times, only to have an uninterrupted life after being re-opened, and re-organized for the fourth time in 1900. Overall, as the Ottoman Empire approached its demise, the organization of the Turkish higher education field, comprised of two forms of organization for higher education, resembled the French higher education system. Yet, at the same time, the organization of the single university although broadly patterned after the French model had become subject to German influence, not least with the infusion of structures and ideas

associated with research.

The existence of separate schools for specialized professional training, as well as the university combining general education with education for the learned professions such as law and medicine resulted in a plural modelled higher education field right from the beginning. Both forms relied on a single-level post-secondary degree as the basis of higher education, though the duration varied across the two forms (being shorter in the professional) and the disciplines. This bipartite structure at the field level depicted the early years in the evolution of Turkish higher education. The above history, also, shows that the first set of higher education organizations, almost all of which have survived in transformed forms to the present day had a strong imprint of the French model, though the only university had also made some contact with the German research university that had evolved in the latter part of the 19th century.

3.1.2 Early Republican years: From the 1920s to the 1950s

The Turkish Republic when founded in 1923, in lieu of the Ottoman Empire, inherited this rudimentary dual structure for higher education, comprising nine professional schools and one university, the *Darülfünun*. These years correspond to the formative years of the Republic when the government wanted to use educational organizations as a tool for producing elites who would take part in the nation-building project of the new Republic. In fact, the major reason for the closure of the *Darülfünun* some 10 years after the founding of the Republic and its replacement by the İstanbul University was allegedly the negative attitudes prevailing in the former institution towards the modernizing reforms (ÖSYM, 1990; Ataünal, 1998; Arslan, 2004). Following an institutional reform marked by the by-law of 1934, the *Darülfünun* was abolished with roughly two thirds of its academic staff being dismissed in the process, and reopened as İstanbul University (Ataünal, 1998: 32). A Swiss professor, Albert Malche, was influential during the reform at the university. He was recruited by the Ministry of Education to give the government a detailed report in planning the reform. The report stated a need for a strong central administration as well as the need for employing foreign teachers who would later be replaced by those that would be trained in "foreign" universities (Ataünal,1998). Under this European influence, in order to fill the

teaching staff gap, the Ministry of Education recruited, this time a large number of German professors who had been forced to resign or dismissed from their positions in German universities after the arrival of the Nazi regime. Overall, for the newly founded Turkish Republic at the time the "West" essentially meant Europe, which was also apparent in the case of higher education with the dual, first French and then the German, influence in the preceding Ottoman period and the early years of the Republic.

Perhaps one of the most significant features of the German higher education model, which came with the Humboldtian university idea is viewing basic research as an end in itself and in a close relationship with academic instruction (Mommsen, 1987). German universities, at the same time, were characterized by an increasing professionalization especially starting from the nineteenth century onwards. As Mommsen (1987) claims, by the end of the nineteenth century, German universities had largely become institutions of specialized training for the learned professions. Yet, as others suggest, the central characteristic of the German universities has been the strong orientation towards scientific and scholarly research that went hand in hand with teaching, which was organized around the "chair" system. The "chair" system organizes research and teaching to be led by the senior professors around the specific academic disciplines or professional areas (Frackmann and De Weert, 1993). As such, university professors are expected to undertake both teaching and research (Kehm and Tehler, 1992). The fact that the idea of the German research university was introduced into Turkey by the German professors is further indicated in the writings of these professors. For example, Hirsch (1979), who was one of the German professors who worked first at İstanbul University and later at the Ankara University claims, that the idea behind founding a new university in 1933 was to establish a "house of sciences" equal to its exemplars in Western Europe, and that this university would be a place of sciences rather than solely a "school" for professional training. It is significant that as being imported into the Turkish higher education field, the central idea of "research-teaching unity" in the German model also came with it. This was to serve as a primary feature ostensibly distinguishing the university from the professional schools, though clearly the university also accommodated professional education. Another central feature of German higher education is the autonomy of German universities from the federal states. German universities are self-governed under "amateur" high-level administrators and with the senior professors in command of the decision-making.

However, the idea of organizational autonomy was annulled despite (or perhaps because of) the legacy of the 1919 by-law. The Ministry of Education had a direct control on İstanbul University.

The 1934 by-law which formally and legally established İstanbul University began with two articles with the heading of "university" and defined the "functions", pertaining to the goals of the then only university in the country as follows:

> "The University of İstanbul is composed of the faculties of Medicine, Law, Literature and Science as well as affiliated schools and institutes, with duties such as conducting research in areas of knowledge, developing and diffusing national culture and advanced knowledge, and helping to educate mature and able human factors who will be at the service of and work for the State and the country".

It should also be noted, however, that this was only a by-law and included stipulations that concerned the aims, governance, administration and the activities of a single organization. Still, among the goals of the university, "conducting research" is prioritized, which is a hint that the influence of the German model had powerfully infused (or was hoped to infuse) into the field. Education comes as the third main aim and together with a strong statist accent.

Along with the restructuring of the *Darülfünun*, several new independent faculties were established in Ankara, namely the Faculty of Languages, History and Geography in 1937, the Faculty of Sciences in 1943 and the Faculty of Medicine in 1945. The former Law School was also converted to a Faculty, while the Higher School of Engineering in İstanbul, one of the institutions inherited from the Empire, was accorded university status in 1944 and became İstanbul Technical University (Gürüz et al, 1994). It is worthwhile to note that the conversion of the Engineering School to an independent university signifies the inclusion of engineering into the university system and a "local" departure from both the French and the German models (Tekeli, 2003). Together with these faculties two new and separate institutes were also established in Ankara: (as they were called at the time) the Gazi Institute for Education and the Agriculture Institute, the latter in particular patterned after the German model. Especially in the latter case, a group of 11 German professors were involved in the planning of this Institute, the first rector being a German academic. These professors applied the German model with all its organizational features in this Institute. It may even be argued that this Agricultural Institute was closer to the German research university model than İstanbul University in its academic structures. İstanbul

University had a more centralized power structure, and was commanded by the Ministry of Education, whereas the Institute had delegated more power to the academic councils (Dölen, 1999).

Overall, from 1930s until 1950s about 100 German academicians had worked in Turkish higher education organizations, clearly leaving their mark on these institutions (Widmann, 2000). As Widmann (2000) points out, these professors wrote textbooks, employed students as their translators, and started PhD programs through which they transferred their academic approaches and styles. In general, it may be argued that the 1930s was a period when strong German influence in higher education through both the first university in İstanbul and through the faculties and institutes in Ankara was felt.

In the meantime, civilian professional schools were also being established, which were the continuation of their previous examples based on the French *Grandes Ecoles* tradition. A new professional school for Art and Sculpture was founded in 1937, together with an Institute for Turkish Art History (*Türk Sanat Tarihi Enstitüsü*) in the same year. Alongside these new foundings those that were established in the Ottoman period were reorganized in that the School for Arts was turned into the Fine Arts Academy in 1925, and the one for training middle level technicians was turned into a four year Technical School in 1941. In 1932, the Higher School for Commerce was turned into Higher School for Economics and Commerce (*Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi*), which was followed by another one to be opened in İzmir in 1944 (Üsdiken, 2004).

By the end of the Second World War, a new Law of Universities (no. 4936) came into effect in 1946. The new law brought previously independent faculties under the newly established Ankara University. Thus, there were three universities in 1946, two in İstanbul and one in Ankara that came to be commonly referred as the "classical universities" (Öncü, 1993). The professional schools remained as a separate track as they were left outside the purview of the 1946 Law of Universities. This is important in that it marks how the State and the academic elites continued to view universities and the professional schools as distinct forms of higher education. The 1946 law defined universities as an "autonomous institutions of advanced science, research and education". It is significant that this Law viewed universities as autonomous, which signified a return to the 1919 by-law and a

resurrection of the German model in that respect too[1]. The German professors still in the country at the time appear to have played a significant role in the preparation and the passage of this law (see e.g. Hirsch, 1950). Also, "conducting research" remained prioritized in the "definition" of what a university is and should be. As in the 1934 case, the "objectives" of the university were not explicitly stated, though the tasks of the university were listed in a separate article. Somewhat paradoxically, education came at the top of this list with an accent for preparing students for the professions. In the following clause, the second task of the university was stated as conducting research and cooperating with international institutions (Erden and Üsdiken, 2002). It may be argued that the 1946 Law was greatly influenced by the German model, leaving the French model to survive in the separate schools. Limited traces of the French model survived in the university too, as the first degree was still called the *lisans*, a term borrowed from the French. More importantly however over this period the binary structure initially imported from the French had become Germanized. In other words, it had become similar to its version in Germany. In France, the *Grandes Ecoles*, especially the engineering ones, enjoyed greater status and prestige compared to the universities and played a more significant role in educating the country's elite. In Germany, on the other hand, it was the universities that were perceived as more prestigious relative to the technical schools not least because of their scholarliness and research orientation. The duality in Turkey had gained a character that was similar to that in Germany. The universities clearly were perceived as having greater status. The binary structure had remained unaltered but its character had diverged from its original inspirer under the strong influence of a later incoming model.

Notable, of course is the fact, that in this period higher education organizations remained within two cities, İstanbul, the former Ottoman capital, and Ankara, the capital of the new Republic. This probably had to do with limited resources and the general level of development of the country. It also had to do, however, with the predominant view that in particular the universities but also the professional schools aimed to educate the country's elite and to meet primarily the demands of the public sector and the public service.

As the preceding account shows, starting with the formative years of the field,

[1] This autonomy did not last long, as in 1954 the Ministry of Education was given the right to employ academicians within its own cadres after consulting the university senates (Tekeli, 2003), which meant a direct control over the academicians.

.

Turkish higher education has embodied multiple institutional models, which in themselves although portraying significant degrees of stability, also got transformed in a number of ways. Basically, the idea of a university as well as that of the professional school and their construction as organizations has been imported into the Turkish context. They were brought in the Ottoman era, with a range of professional schools and a university, first as an alternative to the traditional religiously based institutions of higher learning, the *medrese*, and later, with the founding of the Republic, as a replacement for the latter. The university in particular was the embodiment of the ideas of science, research, debate, and advanced formal schooling for the professions and government bureaucracy. The accent on science and research can, also, be interpreted as a sign of the break Republican cadres had with their positivist ideology from the Ottoman past (Tekeli, 2003).

3.1.3 Enter the American Model: From the 1950s to the mid-1970s

As the United States (US) became a major power in the world following World War II, Turkey developed closer ties with the US not least due to its strategic location within the Cold War context. This had important influences in the field of higher education as well. During the 1950s new universities, which were planned to take American exemplars as their model, began to be founded (Gürüz et al, 1994). The intention was to establish universities, which would be markedly different from those dominating the Turkish higher education system at that time. In a short period of time four universities were founded: Middle East Technical University (in Ankara) in 1956, Ege University (in İzmir) and Karadeniz Technical University, in 1955; and Atatürk University in Erzurum in 1957. The last one in particular was envisaged as a Turkish replica of the American land-grant university and benefited in its early years from the University of Nebraska. These were accompanied by the founding of two Institutes, one for Business Administration as an annex to İstanbul University and another for Public Administration affiliated with Ankara University (Üsdiken, 2004). Both of these Institutes benefited from American funding as well as curricular and teaching support. The late 1950s also saw the establishment of an American College, providing secondary education, to be given the permission by the Government to open a "higher school" with similar status as the "professional schools" and

as the first private organization in Republican history in higher education (İlter, 1972).

Apart from the intention to shift towards emulating American forms for higher education, the 1950s and the founding of some of these organizations is significant in that higher education in Turkey was being extended beyond the major cities (Gürüz et al, 1994). As Korkut (1992) notes, starting early as the 1940s the intention of founding universities in especially Eastern Anatolia had come on the agenda, yet due to the start of the Second World War it was delayed until after the end of the War. With the establishment of these universities, higher education began to expand to parts of Turkey, other than the two major cities.

The broad turn towards emulating American forms turned out to be only partially successful especially with respect to the newly founded universities. Gürüz et al (1994), interpret this as the new universities, other than the Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara, quickly coming under the "patronage" of the old "classical" universities (i.e. the three that were already extant). METU deserves particular attention as it turned out to be the only bonafide example that rested on the American model (Dodd, 1962). It was supported by the United Nations as well as the Turkish Government. The language of instruction was English as the vision at the time was that it would serve not only Turkey but also the Middle East, thus the name Middle Eastern Technical University. Although formally a state university it was not incorporated into the legal regime governing universities at the time (i.e. the 1946 law) but had a separate Charter of its own. Thus, overall, METU represented with its structural and procedural features the penetration of American influence into Turkish higher education, as a distinct alternative to the pre-existing forms (Horobin, 1960; Dodd, 1962; Reed, 1975).

The American forms of higher education which entered with METU were markedly different to both the German and the French models that had come to dominate the Turkish higher education field until that time. One important feature of American higher education was that it accommodated both private and public organizations. This was different from its French and German counterparts that started (other than the occasional independent schools; see e.g. Locke, 1984) and remained mainly public, especially in the form of universities. Higher education in the US, on the other hand, began with private funding, though state universities followed suit there as well (Stadtman, 1992). Having developed a much more decentralized structure that accommodated a diversity of institutional forms, the

American higher education field differentiated itself from the ones in France and Germany. Thus, it is no coincidence that METU had a separate charter of its own making it distinct from the other existing institutions and which also enabled access to various funding sources, though in actual fact the Turkish government remained as the prime sponsor (Dodd, 1962).

At the organizational level, the operating units of the Turkish classical universities, based on the German model, were in the form of specialized faculties and schools, which generally concentrated on a discipline or a profession, which were then, as noted above, internally structured around specialties headed by a senior professor "Chairs", as these units were called, constituting the core structural element within this model. In ideal-typical terms, the American university, on the other hand, was organized around multi-disciplinary faculties and specialized professional schools often offering post-graduate education leading to "master's" degrees. Internally these units were structured in the form of broad departments comprised of any number of closely associated research areas that brought together faculty members of different ranks (Clark, 1978). Thus, the internal structure of the classical universities, based on the German model, presented an agglomeration of independent faculties, rather than a unity that was typical of the American model. Moreover, both the German and the French universities were likely to be spread over the city, having faculties in separate buildings. In fact, it was not unusual to have different faculties at different parts of a city, as they were largely independent of one another. On the contrary, American universities were usually located outside the city center, housed in a "campus". Again, typically, the American university was based on centralized administration at the organizational level with a powerful "executive" at the top. Within faculties, "chairs", disciplinary units directed by the "amateur" leadership of senior professors, which were typical of the classical universities, were seen as against American forms of governance as they increased the level of independence along disciplinary lines (see for example Ersoy, 1975).

In addition to the above mentioned structural differences, there were also marked "strategic" differences in the way higher education was understood. The American model is basically a two-tier system (Clark, 1983). This is to say that undergraduate education as a four-year program is understood as giving students a broadly based general education, drawing upon several disciplines, together with some orientation towards a specialized

discipline or profession. Bona fide professional education is obtained at the post-graduate level within professional schools in the form of master's level programs. In contrast, the German university model in particular represents an understanding where the locus of disciplinary or professional education is at the first degree, or the undergraduate level in American terminology (Clark, 1983). As a result, students were prepared for careers through the specialized first degree of four to six years depending on the professional field.

In addition to these structural and strategic differences METU, based as it was on the American model, differed from the classical universities as well as the "higher" schools outside the university with respect to procedural features that surrounded educational activities. In broad terms the curricular approach that came with METU, as well as its companion, the American Robert College in İstanbul was much more flexible granting the student a greater discretion in program construction as well as the choice of specialization areas. Moreover, students carried a relatively lower course load, not least in order to allow for more time for individual learning as well as extracurricular activity (Üsdiken, 2003). The classical universities and in particular the higher schools, on the other hand, had greater formal contact hours and more rigid programs. Moreover, when one considers some of the educational procedures such as the credit system, grading with letters instead of numbers, semester-based academic year, leaves of absence, advisorship and small class sizes, it is evident that they were all novel applications in Turkish higher education system that came with METU (Payaslioglu, 1996) and the American Robert College.

American influence made further inroads into Turkish higher education in the 1960s supported by a variety of US based funding schemes. More students were sent to US for education (Üsdiken, 2004). As pointed out above, clearly there were setbacks, as the universities founded in the 1950s were "patronized" by the classical universities in Ankara and in İstanbul, bringing them closer to the Continental European pattern that characterized the latter (Gürüz et al, 1994). Even the Atatürk University, which in its the early years got technical and professional assistance from the University of Nebraska increasingly turned towards the classical universities as the land did not develop well agriculturally and the aim of developing the region with agricultural motivation could not be actualized (Turgut, 1997). Yet METU essentially the only one that remained loyal to the original intentions together with the American College continued to serve as carriers of US-based educational forms and activities as in the case of introducing in various fields the two-tier system, i.e.

the master's degree as a separate graduate degree (Aysan and Kurtuluş, 1973; Freely, 2000). Moreover, there were two additions to the pattern set by METU. In 1967, Hacettepe University in Ankara was set up with support from the government and financial loans from the Red Crescent Society and the Rockerfeller Foundation. The second addition came with the conversion of the American Robert College to Boğaziçi University in 1971, after long debates among the college's faculty and the Board of Trustees (Kuran, 2002). As Kuran (2002), who was the Vice- President of the Robert College who would later become the Rector of the new university, writes in his memoirs the faculty of the college did not want to become an Academy (as the higher schools were called at the time), which would have been more in tune with the conversion of the "higher schools" into Academies about a decade ago as Robert College was a higher school formerly. In fact, it was the change in the government following the military intervention in 1971, which helped the College to become a university.

In addition to the entry of the American model to the higher education field, professional schools also flourished in the 1950s and the 1960s although they were still perceived as somewhat inferior to the universities (Reed, 1975, p.203). Two additional commercial schools were opened in Ankara and in Eskişehir respectively in the 1950s. In 1959, these schools (altogether four at the time) were converted into Academies of Economic and Commercial Sciences (*İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi, İTİA*). With this new law the duration of their programs was extended to four years. They were also given more autonomy, and the right to give academic titles as in the universities but separate, by which the duality of structure was further demarcated. This was accompanied a decade later, in 1969, by the conversion of some of the technical schools into the same status by turning the engineering schools into a State Academy for Engineering and Architecture (*Devlet Mühendislik ve Mimarlık Akademisi, DMMA*), and by two consecutive laws (1969, 1971) according to which administrative and academic bodies at the Academies were recognized as equal with those at the university. They were also given the autonomy to open new units. Similarly, the Fine Arts Academy was turned into the State Fine Arts Academy (*Devlet Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi, DGSA*). In the meantime, another *İTİA* was opened in Bursa in 1971. Hence, it was clear both in the minds of the academicians and by law that universities and academies were two forms of educational organizations. The view that there were two forms of higher education organizations was also evident in the minds

of the academicians, which can be exemplified by one university professor who explains in an article written in 1967, that higher education in Turkey was made up of two sectors, faculties and higher schools for professional training (Sarc, 1967). Yet, this did not stop academies from emulating universities, first with latent and then actual attempts over time. As one professor, who worked in the foundation years of an academy, explained even the by-laws were created by imitating the university (in their case, a classical university) by-laws (Aslier, Mustafa, personal communication). Similarly, as Oğuz (1995), who was the President of the Eskişehir Academy, wrote in his memoirs, in the late 1950s, and the early 1960s, by obtaining financial aid from a US agency, Eskişehir Academy had "successfully" opened the channel for sending students for graduate training to the US, who would later be recruited in the academy cadres.

As a result of the increase in the number of organizations in the field as well as the increase in the demand for higher education, in the 1960s universities wanted to act together in accepting students and initiated a central examination for selecting students (Tekeli, 2003). In the meantime, after 1962 there was a spur of private higher education institution foundings in response to the growth in the student population (Gürüz et al, 1994). By 1971, within the provisions of the Private Education Act that had passed in 1965, 44 private schools for higher education were created in professional fields such as commerce, engineering, pharmacy, and dentistry (Turgut, 1997). There were oppositions to private education as regards to the "quality", of these schools. For example, the Chamber of Architects did not register the graduates of these schools (Tekeli, 2003), which would prevent them from working in their profession. Under such clear opposition, not surprisingly, these private schools did not live long. After a Constitutional Court decision based on the provision giving the right to open institutions of higher education solely to the State, they were closed down (ÖSYM, 1990) and annexed to academies. Although the issue of private higher education aroused some debate (see for example Giritli, Cobanoglu, Saymen, Kazgan, Esen, 1971), the actual revival of the private higher education institutions would have to wait until the 1990s.

In 1973, the second legislative reform took place with a new Law of Universities (No. 1750); (*T.C. Resmi Gazete*, 1973), which involved an attempt to bring all universities under a common legal framework (with the exception of METU which had a separate Act of its own), accommodating both the more conventional European model and the American

model. The law also stipulated a council that would monitor, coordinate and plan higher education (Gürüz, 2001). The definition of the university remained unchanged. The goals of universities again began with educating students, and with the dual focus on teaching and research but with some change in terminology, where it was stated that universities should educate students "with a strong understanding of science, conscious of national history, dedicated to their countries, customs and traditions, and who are intellectuals with robust thinking capacities concerned with their nation". There is also explicit reference to universities working "in line with the targets of the state development plans" and in so doing "to employ its own resources in the most rational, effective, efficient and economic ways". The additional stipulations of the 1946 law with regard to internationalism, cooperation with state authorities and disseminating scientific findings were also present (Erden and Üsdiken, 2002). In a somewhat more symbolic manner in terms of the sequence in which articles are included, the section on universities now precedes that of the faculties. With respect to the internal organization of faculties, for the first time the present law includes reference to "departments" as a unit of organizing. Yet, the "chair" structure also persisted and indeed is presented before departments as the form of internal organization (Erden and Üsdiken, 2002). This is one indicator that the 1973 Law had components from both the German and the American models.

Following the 1973 change in legislation and a response to the growing demand for education, 9 new universities were founded. All these universities were established outside the three big cities (i.e. İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir). The project of disseminating higher education in the country was continuing. In addition to these universities several faculties were founded in various parts of the country as extensions of established universities (Tekeli, 2003). One such example is the founding of an engineering faculty of METU in Gaziantep. Both the patterns set by the classical as well as those resting on American models were therefore expanding to other locations.

In 1975, the Constitutional Court ruled the establishment of an intermediary council by the 1973 Law as against the 1961 Constitution, which granted autonomy to universities. Thus, the council was abolished in 1975. At this point in time, there were 18 universities (Hatiboğlu, 1998) and 10 academies in the country (Gürüz et al, 1994). The multiplicity historically characterizing the field prevailed. For one, the binary structure had remained untouched although the academies had widened their scope of education beyond

commerce and economics as they had volunteered to incorporate the private higher schools after their closure in 1971. The inclusion of a higher education council in the 1973 Law can perhaps be interpreted as an effort to bring the universities under a common framework, yet it had not succeeded. Moreover, METU continued to operate with its separate charter. Boğaziçi University, established instead of the American Robert College, had been granted a grace period for adjusting itself to the provision of the 1973 Law (Kuran, 2002). On the other hand, it may be argued that the field was maturing as time passed for mimetic and normative mechanisms to operate clearly, since, as pointed above, the academies were trying to imitate the universities. In the meantime, the American modeled universities were gaining prestige reflecting, for example, in higher entrance scores (Öz-Alp, 1975).

3.2 Histories, Institutional Regimes and Educational Organizations

As this overview indicates, starting from its very early years the Turkish higher education field exhibited two main characteristics. For one, parallel to other areas in the late Ottoman period, in the modernizing attempts that started in the 18th century, which were then pursued by the Republican elites, "western" institutions came to symbolize modernization. They were therefore emulated in all the modernization efforts in education. Secondly, although there has been a time gap between the entrances of different models, the field has had multiple sources of influence since the early days, first the French, then the German and lastly the American (Üsdiken, 2004; Widdman, 2000).

The preceding overview set the stage for an empirical examination of the central concerns for this study. An additional feature to emerge around mid-century was that as the number of organizations in the field has increased there has been some kind, or rather kinds, of common legal framework governing, as mentioned above, their activities, structures and procedures. The first was the 1946 Law for universities (then altogether three in number). This was followed in 1959 by the Law for the "professional" school track, i.e. what with the law came to be called the academies of economic and commercial sciences. This was later revised in 1969 to also include the engineering and architecture schools. Finally, as discussed above, the Universities Law was revised in 1973.

Clearly, in all these cases the laws brought sets of provisions, the implementation of

which generated homogenization among organizations within each cluster. Indeed, as the academies increasingly strived to be more like the universities, there was also similarity between the provisions of the two laws. Nevertheless, the universities also enjoyed the "autonomy" that was granted to them as a constitutional right. So did to some degree the academies although more so in the "academic" sense as they were under the purview of the Ministry of Education. Thus, although there were "coercive pressures" on these organizations they were relatively in weak forms given the legitimacy that the "autonomy" notion enjoyed.

This was however to change with the 1981 legislation as the autonomy of the universities was removed. This was to be endorsed by the removal of that right from the constitution. Moreover, the law formally abolished the binary structure that had existed in the country since the Ottoman days. Thus, overall, the law served as a stronger source of coercive pressure, as in its early years it was also implemented under a coercive regime. Nevertheless, in early the 1990s there was some weakening in the coerciveness of the law as a major change was made in the appointment of Rectors, highly symbolic with respect to the "autonomy" debate. Moreover, there was a shift towards a more democratic regime. The provision in the 1981 Law and the ensuing amendments had granted the possibility for private universities to be established. These began to bear fruit as the number of private universities blossomed in the 1990s.

The central concern of this study is the confrontation between the historical roots of organizations and various forms and strengths of isomorphic pressures upon them. The preceding overview showed the plurality in historical roots when the 1973 Universities Law came. In the following, drawing upon the theoretical ideas framing the study, hypotheses are developed for three periods in the last quarter of the 20th century where forms and strengths of isomorphic pressures have been different. Before undertaking this however, the study now turns to specifying the dimensions which history and/or isomorphic pressures are

3.3 Higher Education Organizations: Activities, Structures and Procedures

The three broad categories of goals and strategies, structures and technologies were re-specified with respect to the research setting of this study. Goals and strategies were re-

conceptualized as **patterns of activities.** This construct refers to what a higher education institution aims to achieve. It relates to the nature of its educational and research activities and orientations. This particular construct was conceptualized in terms of four facets. These relate to diversification, size, operational strategies and outward orientation in research and publication activities.

Of the four, diversification was conceived as the extent of diversity in activities. Diversity was considered with respect to three components:

a) focus of education, which is related to the relative weight of the three types and levels of educational activity.
b) Geographical dispersion, which is associated with the geographical spread of the organization's activities.
c) Scope of education, which is concerned with the diversity of areas of study an organization is engaged with.

The second facet of activity patterns involved the scale or size of the organization's educational activities.

The third was conceived as operational characteristics with respect to how educational activities were implemented.

Finally, the fourth facet would involve the nature of research activities, notably the degree to which it is outward oriented.

The second major category of **structure** was conceived in this setting as referring to whether the administrative structure of the university was built around a unitary as opposed to a more federal model. The former would involve stronger central governance and administration. A more federal model on the other hand is associated with a weaker central administration and considerable authority granted to, in particular, the faculties.

The final category, labelled as, **procedures** for higher education organization was considered as involving the procedural aspects of implementing educational curricula and for administering student affairs.

3.3.1 Weak Institutional Regimes

The mid-1970s are significant in that all the imported models in the field now had a history, as well as the initial attempts to merge and reconcile these models institutionally. So there were the three classical universities, namely İstanbul University, İstanbul Technical University and Ankara University (Öncü, 1993), whose foundations were based mostly on the German model. One may add the two universities, Ege University and Karadeniz Technical University, which were founded in 1950s, under the "classical" category, as some authors have suggested (Gürüz et al, 1994). Meanwhile, the other American modelled universities, which have been more successful in bringing and applying the American model, have existed in the field now for some time to be claimed as legitimate. Alongside these two forms of universities, academies with a distinct historical heritage existed as the third model. Furthermore, one may argue that the universities that were founded after the 1973 law would constitute a separate category too, as this law embodied plurality in itself, as it had tried to reconcile the tradition of the classical universities with the Americanized one. The law had features from both the German and the American models. Thus, as such, it provided legitimacy to all the existing models existing in the field. Therefore, newly founded universities are likely to have a more hybrid character. (The list of higher education organizations in each of these categories in the year 1975 are provided in Appendix B).

On the other hand, despite the co-existence in mid-1970s of two different university models (the classical and the Americanized), the "professional" school model (i.e. academies) and possibly a post-1973 hybrid model, it needs to be recognized that the foundations of the Turkish higher education were laid under the Continental European influence and as a part of modernization/developmentalist project of the Republic. The American model was clearly the late-comer. When the American influence began to penetrate, higher education in Turkey had become based on the first degree, to which American universities had to conform, especially in their early years of development.

As pointed out above, these four clusters of organizations, especially the universities were under a relatively weak institutional regime both due to autonomy granted and the hybrid character of the law itself (Erden and Üsdiken, 2002). Normative influences driving homogeneity are likely to have been limited as there was very little interaction and

mobility among different clusters. Some mimetic effects may have been at work however. Such kind of mimetism may, for example be observed in the case of academies. Although academies were seen as "distinct" type of higher education organizations, they emulated the universities. Yet, overall, at this stage in its development, the field is likely to have exhibited differentiation in line with the organizations' historical roots. The broad prediction therefore is that organizational characteristics will vary across the four kinds of higher education organizations. These considerations lead to the following set of hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1a: The four types of higher education organizations will differ in their patterns of activities, other than focus of education.

Hypothesis 1b: The four types will differ in their structures.

Hypothesis 1c: The four types will differ in their procedures.

3.3.2 Strong Institutional Regimes: Administered by the State, 1980 – 1990

Coming to 1980, the number of universities had risen to 19, fourteen of which were in cities other than İstanbul and Ankara, and there were 14 academies. This year is very significant in Turkish higher education field in that, following the military *coup d'etat* in 1980, the legal framework of higher education in Turkey was altered once more, bringing a powerful actor to the field. In 1981, with the new Law of Higher Education (No. 2547) (*T.C. Resmi Gazete*, 1981), YÖK, the higher education council, was established, as an all-powerful centralized board with the mission of, amongst others, standardizing the diversity of models in the field, and brought the state as a powerful actor in the Turkish higher education field. Although this had been tried before in the 1973 Law, the new Constitution in 1980 made this council come into being, this time without a break.

In addition to putting the intermediary council into effect, with the 1981 Law of Higher Education, the dual structure (university versus academy) in higher education that had persisted since the Ottoman Empire up until then came to an end, as all "academies" were granted university status and brought under the same legal framework. The main idea behind this may have been to standardize the field, and increase the level of centralized control over the higher education organizations, which were perceived as taking part in the

political clashes that had led to the 1980 military *coup d'etat*. It was also evident that in the late 1970s, academies and universities had gone into dispute. The co-existence of these two forms of organizations had started to collide and create conflict within the field. This was partly because academies, as seen somewhat inferior to the universities since the early years, now wanted a higher status in the field, which they sought through emulating universities. For example, academies wanted to open medicine and pharmacy faculties, and this was regarded as academies trying to become similar to universities by expanding their program range, which was restricted to engineering and commercial studies until then (Arslan, 2004). As Arslan (2004) explains universities resisted this kind of encroachment from the academies. Academies could only begin to expand into new fields after the private higher schools were attached to them. In addition to their demands in widening their program range, academies, also, wanted to select their own students, and they wanted to be left out of the central exam system that had been in place since 1974. This attempt, also, was resisted by the universities. The conflict between these two forms of higher education institutions came to an end following YÖK's decision to found nine universities through reconciling existing organizations of education and faculties with academies, as well as attaching the existing vocational schools to universities. Following the establishment of YÖK, in this period, only one university was founded as "new".

Alongside the general unifying effect on the field's structure, 1981 law is markedly different than the former ones in both content and scope. In the 1981 Law of Higher Education, the part related to aims as well as the remaining articles took a more detailed form. There was now a definition of not the university per se but that of higher education at large and not condensed in a single sentence but in two articles including a number of clauses each on its "objectives" and "principles". Within the detailed definition of goals, "education" gained priority as indicated not only by being listed as the first among the objectives but also with the number and the length of the items dedicated to its elaboration (Erden and Üsdiken, 2002). Furthermore, universities went under the monitoring of YÖK financially, which tied them to this regulatory body in their operational decisions as well.

In addition to this legal framework change, in the 1980s, mass education became an issue for Turkey along with the rest of the world, particularly Europe. Formerly what has been an elite education, as universities were forced to increase their access numbers, university education was becoming mass education. Increasing numbers of *lycee* graduates

that has been an issue since the late 1970s for Turkey and the populist politics of the 1980s pushed universities to increase their enrollment numbers. The theme of mass education would continue to prevail in the coming years.

Overall, following the establishment of YÖK, from 1980 to 1990, the field experienced strong coercive pressures towards uniformity, especially with respect to administrative structures and procedures within the university. Control and standardization among higher education organizations became the priority on the political agenda of YÖK. Financially as well as in terms of administration, all universities were put under the control of the state, through YÖK. Notably, YÖK's broad orientation with respect to administration and procedural practices was geared more towards the American rather than the European models (Gürüz et al, 1994), though the law also included features (like the YÖK itself being a central regulatory organization, for example) as a response to the particular societal conditions at the time (cf. Öncü, 1993). Thus, with respect to administration and procedures, coercive measures were pushing towards a model that clearly converted the university.

Along with this strong coercive push toward homogenization, the field has now been more established which has an additional homogenization effect resulting from inter-organizational mimetic behavior. However, when one considers the imprinting effect as argued by Stinchcombe (1965), although the legal framework has reduced the forms of organizations to one, it may be expected that the organizational roots will continue to have some effect on organizations. Nevertheless, in the second data point, in 1991, it is expected that there will be greater homogenization, especially in the variables related with procedures and administrative structure as they are the most visible to YÖK and which have been subject to YÖK's coercive pressures the most (D'Aunno et al, 1991; Haunschild and Miner, 1997). However, in patterns of activity, which are not likely to be easily changeable and which were less subject to YÖK's pressures, greater heterogeneity should be expected in some of the organizational features pertaining in this dimension.

Hence the following three hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 2a: The four types of universities will differ in patterns of activity significantly.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be no significant difference among the four types in administrative structure.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be no significant difference among the four types in procedures.

As of 1991, there are 28 universities, some of which with academy roots, and some of which have been founded in the 1970s, categorized as late state. The "classical" universities still exist as well as the American modelled universities. (The list of universities in each category in the year are provided in Appendix C).

3.3.3 Come in the Market, Room for Diversity: The 1990s onwards

The idea of market power replacing the state has been in the agenda in the West for some time, which has also affected Turkey starting from the 1980s with the liberal economic policies. Following these liberal forces, with the demolishment of the Berlin Wall in 1989, Europe experienced a "new wave" of Americanization (Kudo, 2004), from which Turkey also had its share in all areas of social life. The themes of "globalization" that went hand in hand with "internationalization" became almost identical as English started to become Lingua Franca (Tekeli, 2003) for the academic world. These global changes may be argued to have created non-formal pressures towards turning to the US for imitation for many organizational forms and management practices and hence emulating the American model for universities more and more. In fact, some authors even claim a fascination of the European academics in spite of their distaste for American populism (Trow, 1999). In the meantime, within the Turkish higher education field, the examples of and the influences of American models have a longer history than many European countries. Moreover, American models have come to be regarded as successful organizations as indicated by the high scores in the central university entry exam, which would make them to be imitated. Moreover, as indicated above, the YÖK project was, partly at least, geared towards Americanizing the Turkish higher education (Gürüz et al, 1994).

Against the backdrop of such growing Americanization, a final landmark in Turkish higher education field is the foundation of private universities, with a first example in the mid-1980s, followed by a surge of foundings in the 1990s. Private universities were seen as a force that would bring competition in the higher education field. Hence, in addition to the control of the state, now it was time for market forces to increase the variety of services as

well as to increase the quality of education due to expected competition among higher education organizations.

As private universities were financially supporting themselves, although with some support from YÖK, they may be regarded as being more autonomous than the state universities, though they were also bound by various rules specified by the laws. In terms of inter-organizational mechanisms, although one may argue that there would be normative ties to the other higher education organizations, which could influence these, one might also argue that these ties would not be as strong as historical roots of older universities. As newly established organizations, the question is what they will model themselves upon. It is plausible to explain this by looking at the field in 1990s. Starting from 1974, with the establishment of the central exam to enter universities, the field has gained one criteria for success: the entry scores for all universities. Coming to the 1990s, American modelled universities shared the highest entry scores in many fields, making them ideal for imitation. Hence, one may argue that this, and those general waves of influence pointing towards Americanization, which got stronger with the "globalization", would push the private universities, whose number had increased to 22 in 2002, to model themselves after the American modeled universities in the country. In tandem, as Özuğurlu (2003) argues, these universities primarily have programs in applied sciences, which make them closer to the American model, than the European models. Therefore, American modelled universities and private universities will be similar in their characteristics.

In the meantime, with the growing number of high school graduates, universities had also increasingly become a political tool for the governments. Parallel to the increasing spread of mass education worldwide that has started from the 1970s onwards and the growing population in the country, in the 1990s, the pressure from the government had increased on YÖK to open new universities. In fact, in the 1990s, the motto was "one university for every city" (Kaynar and Parlak, 2005). For example, the Ministry of Education has voiced this wish in an opening ceremony, by saying that their aim was to open a university in every city (www.bygem.gov.tr, 1994). In parallel, in a parliamentary meeting, one can find similar comments from members of parliament, as one of them remarks his wish to see a university to be opened in his election area (Millet Meclisi Tutanaklar, 1994). As a result of these pressures, alongside the foundation of private universities, 1992 saw the opening of 23 state universities, all at once. With the addition of

private universities and those founded in 1992 there were now six categories of universities based on their historical roots. The list of universities under each category are provided in Appendix D.

In the 1990s, a second priority on YÖK's agenda became the accent on vocational training. In addition to opening universities, as a response to "the increase of the population" and "the needs of industry", one of the aims of YÖK became to increase the number of students in universities, which first showed itself as the increasing number of enrollments, and second the attention given to vocational education, as a way of founding new paths of preparation for the jobs in industry (Gürüz, 1999). "Vocational" education as an approach to higher education needs to be distinguished from "professional" education at large, as its conceptualization within the Turkish context involved either short-term education (i.e. two years) or if longer highly specialized applied training. As a result, one may claim that the field experienced a return to its very early origins, as the start was with French modeled Ottoman schools where the distinction between the vocational and the professional was extremely was blurred. Hence, by early 2000s, it should be expected that there will be an increase in the vocational education percentages overall due to YÖK's turn in this direction. Yet again, it is expected that since this is a significant strategic turn, older universities (in particular the classical but also the American) will be the most resilient to this pressure, whereas universities with academy backgrounds will be the most accepting, and the post-1973 universities will have a "hybrid" outlook.

Overall, it is expected that the post-1973 universities, including those that were founded post-YÖK, will be the most exposed to the coercive pressures of YÖK, because of their shorter span of lives and together with those universities with backgrounds as academies, they will be homogenized as one form of organization reflecting the effects of YÖK policies the most. In addition to the historical roots, early 1990s saw some degree of "revisions" in the powers of YÖK as exemplified in the alteration of election procedures of university rectors. This can be considered as the relative weakening of the previous decade's coercive forces towards homogenizing the field, leaving room for more diversity.

These arguments lead to the following hypotheses of the study:

Hypothesis 3a: The six types will differ in patterns of activity significantly.

Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant difference among the six types of higher education organizations in administrative structure.

Hypothesis3c: There will be no significant difference among the six types of higher education organizations in procedures.

4.

METHOD

4. 1 Data points

Three data points were specified in line with the periods where there have been marked changes in the institutional regimes for the empirical investigation starting with 1975 followed by 1991 and finally in 2002.

The first data point is 1975 when all three models coexisted, each with considerable history. The French model, which predated the Republic, has been in the field, represented by the academies mainly. The initial penetration of the German model dates back to the 1910s, yet the powerful entry has been after the Republic, which was initially represented by the three "classical" universities in the major cities. The American model had also started to gain ground starting from the 1950s (Üsdiken, 2003). This data point reflects the field when there is no strong state agency to pull the different forms together, when all models are well established and represent themselves with a number of organizations. Thus, although it may be argued that convergent mimetic and normative pressures existed, coercive pressures at this data point were weak. In contrast, coercive pressures had divergent effects. At this measurement point, although the field had a common legal framework, the law, trying to reconcile all the models, has created divergent effects, rather than convergent. At this point in time, there were 13 universities (Hatiboğlu, 1998) and 14 academies in the country (Gürüz et al*,* 1994) (see Appendix B).

The second data point, 1991, illustrates the period after the major overhaul in

legislation. In 1981, with the Higher Education Council, YÖK, being set up, the field experienced an abrupt change that led to coercive pressures towards a unified YÖK model. The year 1991 corresponds to a time when there has been a 10 years of presence of the YÖK as a powerful actor representing the state in the field. It may be claimed that there is enough maturation and opportunity to observe the effects of the strong coercive pressures of YÖK pushing the Turkish higher education field towards convergent change. At the same time both mimetic and normative pressures continued to exist possibly more towards the American model. Hence, as a second data point, 1991 is selected when the results of the clash as well as the effects of mimetic and normative pressures are expected to appear with a stronger coercive affect of YÖK. In 1991, there were 29 universities, one of which was private (Hatiboğlu, 1998). There were no academies at this point as all had been converted into universities in 1982 (see Appendix C).

The third data point 2002, on the other hand, represents itself as an opportunity to observe the softened period of YÖK and its effects on the field. In addition to the possibility for observing the effects of some decline in the coercive force of YÖK, the year 2002, also, presents an opportunity to see the effects of the entrance of private universities that began in the 1990s. The third measurement occasion, also, provides an opportunity to see the effects of the strong winds of globalization, in many ways mediated by YÖK, which made the American model to become stronger than the European models. It may also be argued, that at this point there may be a weakening of the organizational characteristics coming from the past, if they are not in line with the American model, which may be thought of as becoming dominant in the Turkish higher education field. As of 2002 the organizational population used in this study consisted of 75 universities in Turkey, of which 22 are private and 53 are public (www.yok.gov.tr) (see table 4.1 and Appendix D).

Table 4.1

Number of Higher Education Organizations Across Six Categories

Periods	Classical University	American Modelled	Post-1973 State University	Academy Modelled	Post-1991 State University	Private University	Total
1975	5	4	4	14	-	-	27
1991	5	5	12	7	-	-	29
2002	5	4	12	7	25	22	75

4.2 Operationalization and Measurement

4.2.1 Institutional models

Universities were categorized according to the institutional models that they were shaped by. To this end, the time of foundings, as well as histories of universities were traced. For the first data point four categories were specified. The first category, numbering five, included the classical universities and the two universities that were founded in 1950s with an attempt of bringing land-grant university model from the US, but which immediately went under the control of classical universities (Gürüz et al, 1994), except for Atatürk University, which was included in the American modelled universities as it had much stronger technical and administrative ties with its American model especially in the early stages of its development (Turgut, 1997). Notably, the former three were formed within the framework of the 1946 Law. With the inclusion of Atatürk University, the second category included universities that were clearly based on the American model, altogether numbering four. The third category was formed by the universities, which were founded after the 1973 Law and named as post-1973 state with four such universities. The universities in this category had no direct affiliations with neither European nor American models. Finally, academies, numbering 14 at this data point, formed the fourth category (see Appendix B).

For the second data point, the first category remained the same. The only private university, Bilkent University, at this data point was included in the American modeled universities, as it was evidently modeled on the American model, totaling this category to five. The third category went up to 12, with the inclusion of universities that were founded together with the 1981 legislation. Of these four were founded before 1975 (and included in the previous period), five were founded in the second half of 1970s and two were established in 1982 with the YÖK law and by conversion of extant faculties into separate universities. Only one of the 12 was established in 1987, but again as a conversion from an extant faculty and indeed was the only university established in the late 1980s. The fourth category, academies, was changed into academy-modelled as this category was formed by

the seven universities, which had evolved from academy origins and had been granted university status by the 1981 legislation (see Appendix C).

For the third data point two new categories were formed. The fifth category, post-1991 universities, included universities that were founded after 1991, by the state. In fact, these 25 universities were founded in 1992, all at once. Private universities, also, founded in this period, formed the sixth category, with the inclusion of the first private university that was formerly in the second grouping, totaling 22 (see Appendix D).

4.2.2. Organizational Features

In order to assess the effects of different institutional models on totalities of the organizational features, this study assessed the dimensions specified in the previous chapter, in broader terms re-defined with reference to universities as patterns of activities, administrative structure and procedures. Patterns of activities, administrative structure and procedures were defined as the key categories capturing the totality of organizations across which the effects of isomorphic pressures, especially coercive pressures, and historical patterns may be traced within the theoretical framework developed in chapters 2 and 3. The measures employed are described below and summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Description of Measures Used in the Study

Organizational Features	Dimensions	Variables	Measures
Patterns of Activities	diversification	focus of education	# of enrollments in vocational education/total enrollments
			# of enrollments in undergraduate education/ total enrollments
		geographical dispersion	number of units outside city where the administration is
		scope of education	types of faculties
	size	size	total enrollments
	operation strategies	language of instruction	1 = totally Turkish
		student to academic ratio	total registered students/full-time academics
	outward orientation	indexed publications	total number of SSCI, SCI, AHI publications
Structure	unitary vs federal	extent of coverage of by-laws	1 = one by-law 2 = multiple
Procedures	programme construction	credit system	0 = not exists 1 = exists
		double major	0 = not exists 1 = exists
		term vs yearly course	0 = not exists 1 = exists
		advisorship	0 = not exists 1 = exists
	student affairs	grading system	0 = puantage 1 = letter grading
		grading specification	0 = not exists 1 = exists
		exams	0 = oral exam 1 = written exam
		special student	0 = not exists 1 = exists
		transfer policy	0 = not exists 1 = exists
		leave of absence	0 = not exists 1 = exists

4.2.2.1 Patterns of activities

The patterns of activities construct was operationalized by assessing the four dimensions specified for this study. As specified in the previous chapter, the first one is ***diversification,*** which has three categories: i) focus of education which is operationalized as the proportion of vocational education and of undergraduate education. These were measured by calculating enrollment numbers separately for vocational programs and undergraduate studies as a percentage of the total enrollments in the respective years; ii) geographical dispersion which is operationalized as the number of units (faculties, vocational schools - both 2 and 4 year) outside the city where the higher education organization is established; iii) the scope of education which is operationalized as the types of faculties. Types of faculties were coded as different when no common "word" matched among the names of the units. The measure was a count measure of the different units within the universities.

The second dimension of patterns of activities is ***size***, which is operationalized as the total enrollments.

The third one is ***operation strategies***, which is operationalized by two variables: The language of instruction and student to academics ratio. The language of instruction was coded from 1 to 5, (1 = totally Turkish; 2 = English as a second language; 3 = partly in English 4= totally in English; 5 = other than English). Student to academics ratio was calculated using the total student registered to the number of full-time academics.

The fourth dimension is the ***outward orientation*** of organizations, which is measured by the total number of international (SSCI, SCI and AHI) publications.

4.2.2.2 Structure

The second category, structure is operationalized as being ***unitary versus federal***, which is measured by the extent of the coverage of by-laws, i.e. whether by-laws extend to the university as whole, or multiple by-laws existed (1 = one by-law, 2 = multiple).

4.2.2.3 Procedures

The third category, **procedures,** has two dimensions. The first one is ***programme construction***, which is operationalized as a composite measure of the existence of a credit system, double major possibility, term versus yearly courses, advisorship. All of these variables are binary (0 = not exists, 1 = exists).

The second dimension is ***student affairs*** which is operationalized as a composite measure of the type of grading system (0 = with puantage, 1 = with letters); grading specification (0 = no honor system, 1 = honor system), exams (0 = oral exam, 1 = written exam), and the existence of special student category (0 = no special student status, 1 = special student exists), transfer policy (0 = no transfer policy, 1 = transfer policy exists), and whether leave of absence is available for students (0 = no leave of absence, 1 = leave of absence).

4.3 Data Sources

Data for the variables related with patterns of activities were collected mostly from yearly statistical publications of Ministry of Education for 1975, and YÖK for 1991 and 2002. The language variable was coded from the ÖSYM entrance catalogues for 1991 and 2002. For 1975, by-laws were used for this variable. Publication numbers that measured outward orientation were gathered from web of science databases having yearly publications for three indexes, namely SSCI, SCI and AHI, on university basis with respective to three data points.

Data regarding structure and procedures for years 1975 and 1991 were collected from the by-laws of population members. For the third data point 2002, most universities had their by-laws in official websites. Those universities that had recent changes in their by-laws or those that did not provide this data on their websites were contacted and with the necessary publication information, the referred by-laws were found in the Official Gazette. For 1991 and 1975, by-laws were traced, going back in the yearly almanacs. One difficulty has been to trace them before 1982 when all higher education legal framework changed, thus there has been a break in the by-laws.

4.4 Analysis Techniques

In order to have an understanding of the evolution of the field over the years, data were analyzed separately for the three data points. Although this has resulted in having very small sample sizes, for the two data points 1975 and 1991, the fact that in all three data points, data have been collected from the population makes non parametric techniques used to be valid (Siegel, 1956).

For the first and the second data points, Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test has been used in order to see if there were any differences among four categories of universities. This test is similar to the Mann-Whitney test in which cases in different samples are ranked together, except Kruskal-Wallis test can be used with more than two unrelated samples (Cramer, 1998). Hence, by using this test it was possible to see differences as well as similarities among the four categories across the set of study variables.

For the third data point, 2002, the Kruskal-Wallis test was performed twice. First, to see how the public universities evolved over time, a Kruskal-Wallis test was done with the five types of public universities, leaving private universities out. Then the same analysis was done, this time including the private universities as a sixth category. In addition, in order to explore how the field evolved by looking at the data, since the sample size permitted, a cluster analysis was done. First, a hierarchical cluster analysis was performed in order to see the number of groups that the data could be clustered with the selected variables. In the second step, using the results of the hierarchical cluster analysis, a k-means cluster analysis was performed, which pre-defines the number of clusters to be formed. By performing cluster analyses it was possible to figure out how the categories in the first and second data points have become diverged versus converged across the set of study variables, and how the field looked in 2002.

5.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the study will be discussed in three sections with regards to the analyses done for the three data points. The results are summarized in Table 5.1.

5.1 The Year 1975: Activities, Structure and Procedures in Weak Institutional Regime

In 1975, there were four forms of higher education organizations (see Appendix B). The first category was comprised of the three classical universities, and the two universities that went under the control of these universities soon after their foundings, namely Ege University and Karadeniz Technical University. The second category consisted of the three American modelled universities. Atatürk University was also included in this category as especially in the early years it had both technical and academic ties with an American university (Turgut, 1997). The third category was composed of the four post-1973 universities that were established and became operational in the early1970s (until 1975). The fourth category was the 14 higher professional schools that were turned into academies in 1959. The population is 27, 13 of which were universities, while 14 were academies.

In order to understand the differences and the similarities among these types, a non-parametric test for differences, Kruskal-Wallis, has been conducted (see Table 5.2). For the first category pertaining to organizational features, namely patterns of activities, there are four dimensions. The first dimension, *diversification,* was operationalized by four indicators. The first one, the focus of education, is measured by the percentages of vocational education and undergraduate education, separately. The first indicator did not produce significant results, making the four types of higher education organizations

Table 5.1

Confirmation of the Study Hypotheses: 1975, 1991, 2002

Year	Hypothesis#	Hypotheses	Variables	Confirmation
1975	**1a**	The four types of higher education organizations will differ in their patterns of activities, other than focus of education.	% of vocational education	supported
			% of undergraduate education	supported
			regional expansionism	supported
			faculty type	supported
			total enrollments	supported
			language	supported
			student academics ratio	supported
			outward orientation	supported
	1b	The four types will differ in their structures.	coverage of by-laws	supported
	1c	The four types will differ in their procedures.	program construction	not supported
			student affairs	supported
				supported
1991	**2a**	The four types of universities will differ in patterns of activity significantly.	% of vocational education	supported
			% of undergraduate education	supported
			regional expansionism	supported
			faculty type	not supported
			total enrollments	supported
			language	not supported
			student academics ratio	not supported
			outward orientation	supported
	2b	There will be no significant difference among the four types in administrative structure.	coverage of by-laws	supported
	2c	There will be no significant difference among the four types in procedures.	program construction	supported
			student affairs	supported
2002	**3a**	The six types will differ in patterns of activity significantly.	% of vocational education	supported
			% of undergraduate education	supported
			regional expansionism	supported
			faculty type	supported
			total enrollments	supported
			language	supported
			student academics ratio	supported
			outward orientation	supported
	3b	Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant difference among the six types of higher education organizations in administrative structure.	coverage of by-laws	supported
	3c	Hypothesis3c: There will be no significant difference among the six types of higher education organizations in procedures.	program construction	supported
			student affairs	supported

somewhat similar in their percentages of vocational training as hypothesized. As the means show, in 1975 all of the higher education organizations had very low percentages of vocational education. As the means show, among the four types, academies had the highest percentage of vocational education. Their historical roots being in professional education, making them closer to vocational education, may explain this result. Perhaps what is more important to note is that overall, the four types of higher education organizations, at this point in time, were mostly providing undergraduate education as expected. In parallel, the second indicator, the percentage of undergraduate studies, also, did not differ among the four types of higher education organizations as hypothesized in Hypothesis 1a. The means show that all four types of organizations were mostly providing undergraduate education, and further, what can be inferred from the totals of vocational education and undergraduate education is that only the classical universities and academies have some component of graduate studies, with American-modelled universities having only 2% and post-1973 none. This may be explained by the institutional roots of the categories, as the classicals, which were under the German influence, mainly had stronger research traditions, while the American modelled ones, based on a mix of liberal arts and land-grant models, focused on more teaching. Although American models have originally incorporated research into their education, it seems while transferring these into the Turkish context, research (though being more of an applied kind rather than basic as in the German Humboldtian tradition) did not find much space in the Turkish version.

The second indicator, regional expansionism, measured by the number of units outside the city in which the higher education institution was located, also, did not differ amongst the four types as hypothesized. One may conclude that neither the universities nor the academies had expanded geographically at this point. This finding is in line with the arguments that although higher education slowly extended to other parts of the country starting from the late 1950s, they were still mostly in the cities, serving small areas. One would suspect only those that were modelled on the land grant model would have regional expansion, but as noted in the third chapter, as these were patronized by the classical models soon after their foundings (except for Atatürk University), they stayed in the cities, making them closer to the European universities. In fact, regional expansionism, as noted in chapter three, came on the agenda only with the 1981 Law, YÖK.

On the contrary, the third indicator tapping diversification, the scope of education, differed significantly (with $p<.001$) as hypothesized in Hypothesis 1a. Academies had the smallest range of faculty types, while the classical universities had the greatest range. This reflects the effects of the institutional roots: Academies being higher schools for mainly commercial education (and later engineering and architecture), had been organized around single professions, while classical universities had been a home for a wider range of subject matters, which stemmed clearly from the European models that were based on specialization around professions. Post-1973 universities and American modelled universities were similar to one another in this sub-dimension. One could argue that the reason for post-1973 universities to have a narrower scope of education was their short existence, while for the American modelled ones this finding possibly resulted from their generalist education tradition.

The second dimension of patterns of activities, *size*, which is operationalized by the total number of enrollments, differed significantly, as expected. The mean ranks suggest that the post-1973 universities in this category created this difference, as being smaller in size than the other three groups. Similar to the range of studies, this may again be explained by the short span of operations these universities had at this point in time. The means of the other three types suggest that the classical universities were larger in terms of enrollments, while, as one expects from their traditions originating in the models, American modelled universities had smaller enrollments. Academies were similar to the American model in this dimension.

As for *operation strategies*, there are two sub-dimensions. The first one, language of instruction differed amongst these types as hypothesized and not surprisingly American modelled universities had the highest mean, followed by the classicals. Academies and post- 1973 universities were similar to one another in this measure, while the classical universities had a higher mean. The second dimension, student to academics ratio, also, differed significantly among the four types, with the smallest ratio belonging to the American modelled universities and academies having the largest.

The difference in the fourth dimension for the construct patterns of activities, *outward orientation*, was also significant as hypothesized in Hypothesis 1a, with similar rankings for the American modelled and the classical universities, as they had higher means. On the contrary, both the post-1973 universities and the academies had an

extremely low international publications. Classical universities, possibly with the research and teaching unity concept coming from their Humboldtian roots, had a higher number of international publications, as one would expect. What is perhaps more interesting, is the ranking of the American modelled universities. Their institutional model, being a mixture of liberal arts and land grant universities in the Turkish context, does not necessitate research output, as they are more teaching oriented. As an explanation for this finding, one may argue that some members of the faculty who were trained in the US, with the language advantage, showed up in these universities' international publications.

As for the second category in organizational features, structure, which is measured by the *coverage of by-laws*, varied among the types of higher education organizations in 1975 as hypothesized in 1b. The classical and post-1973 universities resembled each other, with less unified structures, while academies and those built on American models differed from these two, having more unified structures. This difference in structure possibly stems from the difference between the two models, as the European models were based on the faculty system, where a university is composed of independent faculties under an umbrella organization, whereas the American university model was a unified system. The results are interesting in that academies, being modelled on the French *Grandes Ecoles*, resembled the American modelled universities. At first glance, this seems to be contradicting the expectations, yet this may be attributed to historical reasons. For one, academies, having organizational roots in a single or two related "professional" education subjects, have been much more limited in the diversification of their activities. Secondly, until the late 1970s, academies were not allowed to establish faculties, which could have led to a more differentiated structure.

The third category, procedures has two dimensions, namely *program construction* and *student affairs*. The four types differed significantly in student affairs as hypothesized in Hypothesis 1c, which is related to how a student, as an ideal typical category, is formed and student performance is evaluated. The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test show that the four forms of higher education organizations differed significantly in this measure as expected. Not surprisingly, American modelled universities had the highest score in this measure, with a mean of 4. The high score signifies a more student-centered and flexible approach, which is typical of the American models. On the other hand, lower scores signify a more teacher-centered approach, which is less flexible than the former. The other three

types of organizations were similar to one another in terms of their means in this measure. It should be noted that, perhaps surprisingly, American modelled universities were followed by the "classical" universities, although evidently with a much lower mean of 1,20. For the programme construction, however, the results were not significant, contradicting Hypothesis 1c, perhaps indicating a gradual homogeneity in this dimension. Yet, then again, the means suggested that the classical and post-1973 universities had indeed very low and similar means, as one expected and the American-modelled universities had the highest score, again as expected. What was not expected was the relatively higher score of the academies in comparison with both classicals and the post-1973 universities. For some reason academies had become similar to the American modelled universities in this dimension. In fact, the data suggested that this similarity might have stemmed from the state academies of engineering and architecture. These seem to have emulated the American-modelled universities, while the commercial academies may have emulated the classical universities.

Overall, the results suggest that the higher education institutions in 1975 were different, as hypothesized in Hypotheses 1a, 1b and 1c, in all of the organizational features pertaining to patterns of activities, structure and procedures. It should be noted that no significant differences were found for their focus of education, geographical diversification and program construction. The first two were in line with the expectations, while the third one was not as expected, as noted above. As the mean ranks show, in terms of the focus of education, which is operationalized as the percentages of vocational and undergraduate education, all four categories were providing mainly non-vocational education with an emphasis on undergraduate education as hypothesized in 1a. Only classical universities, perhaps based on their stronger research tradition coming from the German Humboldtian model, had a relatively stronger component of graduate studies. The insignificant results for the second one, the geographical dispersion, suggested that none of the higher education organizations had diversified geographically in 1975. Yet, as noted above, it was not surprising to see an overall non-expansion at this data point, as regional expansionism would enter the field much later and only as a project of YÖK.

Table 5.2

Comparison of Four Types of Educational Organizations Using Mean Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables (1975)

	Classical University (n=5)			American Modelled (n=4)			Post-1973 State University (n=4)			Academies (n=14)			
Variables	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Chi-sq (3)a
Activities													
% of vocational ed	13.00	0.07	0.13	14.75	0.11	0.12	7.00	0.00	0.00	15.31	0.17	0.17	4.28 ns
% of undergraduate ed	10.80	0.72	0.19	16.25	0.87	0.12	22.00	1.00	0.00	11.08	0.70	0.22	7.70 ns
Regional expansionism	17.60	1.20	1.64	19.88	1.75	2.22	9.50	0.00	0.00	12.32	0.29	0.61	7.40 ns
Faculty type	23.70	8.40	3.29	20.63	5.25	2.06	16.50	3.00	0.00	7.93	0.43	1.09	21.26 ***
Total student intake	20.40	4502.00	3257.50	16.50	2210.50	1136.23	5.75	205.50	46.32	13.36	2095.36	2441.00	8.06 *
Language	14.40	1.20	0.45	22.50	3.00	1.41	12.00	1.00	0.00	12.00	1.00	0.00	15.04 **
Student academics ratio	11.80	23.20	4.02	7.75	18.47	2.19	4.50	10.97	7.99	18.69	513.49	1187.30	14.04 **
Outward orientation	22.80	23.60	21.22	23.13	30.25	33.45	13.13	0.75	0.96	8.50	0.00	0.00	22.98 ***
Structure													
Coverage of by-laws	19.80	1.80	0.45	12.38	1.25	0.50	22.50	2.00	0.00	9.96	1.07	0.27	15.77 ***
Procedures													
Program construction	11.40	0.60	0.89	20.25	2.00	1.41	11.00	0.50	0.58	14.00	1.00	1.04	4.22 ns
Student affairs	13.80	1.20	0.45	22.38	4.00	2.16	11.75	1.00	0.82	12.32	1.07	0.27	9.12 *

Note. a Kruskal Wallis test SD= Standard Deviation

* p< .05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Traditionally, all of the educational organizations served the main cities, and although they spread later to other cities in the country they retained their characteristics of being in the main cities. Perhaps, one surprising finding was the homogenization that was found in program construction at this point in time. One might have claimed that Americanization had already started at this point, yet a closer look at the data suggests that the similarity stemmed from the academies for engineering and architecture emulating the American modelled universities, rather than an overall homogenization in this category.

5.2 The Year 1991: Strong Institutional Regime

For the 1991 data set, as the academies had been turned into universities in 1981, those universities that had historic ties with the academies were categorized as the former academies, which numbered seven. The number of post-1973 universities had by then increased to 12 making this the largest category in number. The American modelled universities had increased to five, with the addition of the first private university, Bilkent. The three classical universities continued to exist, so did the two that were already included in this category (see Appendix C).

In order to understand the differences and the similarities among these types, the same analysis as in the previous period, Kruskal-Wallis, has been conducted (see Table 5.2). The results of the Kruskal-Wallis analysis show, *diversification* the first indicator of patterns of activities, which is measured by the percentage of vocational education, differed amongst the four forms of organizations as hypothesized in Hypothesis 2a. What is noteworthy is that the highest percentage of vocational education belonged to post-1973 universities, amounting to 45%. This is noteworthy because, in 1975 this type of universities had no vocational education. One may argue that this finding shows that one important topic on YÖK's agenda, following the standardization, had been to increase overall vocational education, and the universities that had been founded the latest, with their short history in the field making them "root"less, were less resilient to YÖK's coercive pressures in this feature. In parallel, the percentages of undergraduate education differed among the four types of universities ($p < .05$), with the American modelled

universities having the highest mean. This is in line with the increase of vocational education in the field, as the field had become more heterogeneous compared to 1975 when clearly all were providing undergraduate education. There was a slight decrease in the classicals and the American-modelled universities with respect to graduate education. Post-1973 universities had a negligible percentage in this feature. As such, it may be argued that YÖK has pushed vocational education to develop in the post-1973 universities, in which graduate studies did not flourish.

The second indicator of diversification, regional expansionism, did not differ among the four clusters, suggesting homogeneity in this variable. American modelled universities had the smallest score, making them the least expanded group of universities. When compared to 1975, the means suggest that there has been an increase in the number of units that were not in the city center. This finding is parallel with the expectations because extending higher education has been on Turkish higher education agenda since the early years, as higher education has been perceived as one of the tools for modernization. Hence, one may argue that following YÖK and its policy of expanding higher education across the country by extending the already established universities, universities overall have diversified geographically. This contradicts Hypothesis 2a.

The third indicator, the scope of education, also, did not differ, contradicting Hypothesis 2a. All types of universities have a wider range of studies when compared to the 1975 data set. One may argue that following the establishment of YÖK, with academies having been turned into universities, their range of studies had increased. Yet, it is also noteworthy not that there was an increase in the range of studies offered by the American modelled universities, perhaps an indication that they had got closer to the European models in this feature. As post-1973 universities had the smallest range, it is difficult to argue that the homogenization for this indicator stemmed from coercive pressures only. What is more likely is that this homogenization stemmed from the mimetic processes. In 1975, this sub-dimension, being different for all clusters, suggested that models played a role in the differentiation, yet, at this point in time, it seems that the models had become similar through mimetic forces as a result of the natural evolution of the field. One may conclude that there has been a move towards more specialized education.

The second dimension of patterns of activities, *size*, shows that the four clusters differed confirming the hypothesis. When compared to 1975, the four types of universities

have all increased their enrollment numbers, i.e, the number of students as new entry. Parallel to 1975, classical universities had the highest number. One change has been in the universities that had formerly been academies. Academies, in 1975, had smaller enrollments. On the other hand, the means suggest that American modelled universities retained their small size education coming from the liberal arts tradition. Interestingly, post-1973 universities, in both data points still had the smallest enrollment number. In 1975, this was attributed to their short span of operations for this data set. The same argument may still hold as this category was composed of relatively "younger" organizations.

Operation strategies, operationalized by language of instruction and student to academics ratio did not differ for the four types, not supporting Hypothesis 2a. The means suggest that there is an overall increase in the use of English, which is in line with YÖK's emphasis on internationalisation, as discussed in chapter three. The students to academics ratio differed in the 1975 data set, stemming from the larger ratio in the academies. The 1991 data set means suggested that academy-modelled universities had smaller ratios, making them closer to other types of universities, and overall, there has been an increase in the ratio, suggesting that all universities were moving towards mass education.

On the contrary, the four types of universities differed with regards to outward orientation ($p<.001$), as in 1975, which is the fourth dimension of the patterns of activities construct. As measured by the number of international publications, American modelled universities have the highest score in this category, followed by the classicals. It may be claimed that by 1991 publishing internationally had become a differentiating feature for the American and the classical universities. Overall, Hypothesis 2a was partially supported.

The second category in organizational features, structure, which is measured by the *coverage of by-laws*, did not vary among the types of higher education organizations in 1991 supporting Hypothesis 2b. The entrance of YÖK into the field, and the 2547 Law of Higher Education have successfully homogenized the field in this category, as expected. The field, having universities and academies with diversified administrative structures, in 1991 has become centralized or unified, resembling the American model.

As for the procedures, neither program construction, nor student affairs differed amongst the four types of universities, suggesting homogeneity in this variable, which supports Hypothesis 2c. The mimetic mechanism was likely to be at play for this result, as well as the overall Americanization stemming from YÖK. In addition to the coercive forces

embodying Americanization, one may also claim that starting from the 1980s, the American model had become the most successful model in the field as they had gained popularity among student choices, making it ideal for imitation. As the work on the diffusion practices suggest (D'Aunno et al, 1991) "visible" features, such as these, are more likely to be imitated by other universities, and moreover these features have been the organizational features that YÖK could easily monitor and therefore may have put a homogenizing pressure on universities.

5.3 The Year 2002: Activities, Structure and Procedures in the Market Regime

By 2002, as explained in the research context, the number of universities had increased to 75, 53 of which were public universities and 22 of which private (see Appendix D). For this data point three analyses were done. First, Kruskal-Wallis analysis was conducted for the five public university categories, leaving out the private universities in order to see the effects of YÖK on public universities, in its later stage (see Table 5.3). Although private universities have been under YÖK's governance, it may be claimed that they are relatively less controlled by YÖK compared to public universities, as they have been financially and to some degree administratively autonomous. Therefore, in order to see the effects of the late YÖK period, the hypotheses for the third data set, were tested twice, first for public universities only, then by including the private universities. Thirdly, in an attempt to get an insight of the field evolution through the data, a cluster analysis was done to see the overall clustering of the field according to the 2002 data set.

Table 5.3

Comparison of Four Types of Educational Organizations Using Mean Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables (1991)

	Classical University (n=5)			American Modelled (n=5)			Post-1973 State University (n=12)			Formerly Academy (n=7)				
Variables	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Chi-sq (3)a	
Activities														
% of vocational ed	10.20	0.26	0.10	9.20	0.21	0.15	21.00	0.45	0.14	12.29	0.31	0.20	10.58	*
% of undergraduate ed	16.20	0.59	0.06	21.20	0.65	0.10	9.92	0.48	0.12	18.43	0.58	0.17	8.16	*
Regional expansionism	13.60	3.40	2.88	10.00	2.00	2.83	16.75	4.50	2.50	16.57	4.43	3.64	2.66	ns
Faculty type	22.80	9.40	2.70	16.30	7.00	2.35	11.92	5.67	1.92	13.79	6.43	3.15	6.11	ns
Total student intake	22.00	7137.00	3457.65	13.80	3881.80	1855.75	10.50	2881.33	1563.49	18.57	5229.29	2820.14	8.06	*
Language	16.50	2.20	0.84	22.30	3.20	1.30	11.50	1.58	1.08	14.71	2.00	1.00	6.79	ns
Student academics ratio	8.60	38.50	11.45	11.80	44.62	14.19	17.83	53.33	9.67	17.83	55.52	24.48	5.25	ns
Outward orientation	23.80	92.80	46.54	24.00	119.00	93.57	9.00	14.17	11.24	12.57	24.43	20.13	17.47	***
Structure														
Coverage of by-laws	14.90	1.80	0.13	11.60	1.60	1.95	16.50	2.08	1.44	14.93	1.71	1.11	1.43	ns
Procedures														
Program construction	17.00	1.60	0.89	20.70	2.40	1.52	15.50	1.42	1.00	8.64	0.57	0.79	7.09	ns
Student affairs	11.80	1.40	0.89	20.90	3.20	2.12	15.54	1.83	1.03	12.14	1.29	0.76	4.55	ns

Note. a Kruskal Wallis test SD= Standard Deviation

* p< .05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

5.3.1. Public Universities in 2002

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test with the public universities suggested that patterns of activities showed variance and convergence, partially supporting Hypothesis 3a. The first dimension, diversification, differed significantly in the three sub-dimensions. In 2002, the focus of education differed ($p<.01$) for the five state university categories as hypothesized. The means of the percentages of vocational education indicate a general increase in the percentages, except for the American modelled universities. The fifth category, post-1991 universities together with the post-1973 universities have the highest percentages. This finding supports the arguments in chapter three on the changing priorities of YÖK. In the early years, YÖK had tried to standardize the field primarily, later had added other goals into its agenda, one of which was to increase the percentage of vocational education. It is noteworthy that YÖK seems to have accomplished this goal, most evidently, in the universities that have been under its control from the start. The percentage of graduate education is still higher in the American-modelled universities, followed by the classicals. Post-1973 universities and the academies have similar percentages, while post-1973 universities have still a negligible part in graduate education.

Geographical dispersion, measured by regional expansionism, did not differ among the university models, similar to 1991 findings and contradicting Hypothesis 3a. Overall, the means suggest that there has been an increase in this feature in all of the five types of universities, the two recently founded public university categories having the highest means.

The scope of education, contrary to the 1991 data set, differed significantly ($p<.001$) giving support for Hypothesis 3a, again the classical universities having the widest range. One may argue that the institutional models rather than YÖK's policies played a role in creating this difference, as classical universities, modelled on European models, emphasized specialization at the undergraduate level. In contrast, the American modelled universities have the smallest range of studies, not surprisingly, as the models emphasized specialization in the graduate studies following a general education characterizing the undergraduate programs.

The second dimension, size, also, differed among the five types as expected, with classical universities having the largest number of student enrollments. The American-modelled and the post-1991 universities have similar and smaller enrollment means. For the American model, this finding may be argued to have stemmed from the traditions, but for the post-1991 universities the short span of operations are more likely to explain this result. This is more evident as the mean of post-1973 universities, which had become more established in the field at this point, has increased in comparison with 1991. Overall, there has been an increase in this feature, which is likely to be the result of YÖK's pressures on increasing higher education enrollments, in general.

The third dimension, operations strategies, did not differ among the public universities in neither of the two sub-dimensions, contradicting the expectation. A similar pattern to 1991 data set is observed, as the means show that classical universities followed the American modelled universities in the language of instruction. This finding may have two causes. One, mimetic forces that supported the well established and successful American model may have forced other universities to imitate this feature. Second, as argued before, English had become the Lingua Franca in general, making it a "visible" feature to be imitated. Student to academic ratio did not differ either, as expected. This, also, suggests that the pressure of YÖK on public universities to increase their enrollments as a result of the growing number of *lycee* graduates have forced the field to move towards mass education. In fact, one may also argue that the trend of mass education across national borders has affected the Turkish higher education field as well. Further, as education traditionally represented modernization for the developing countries, the same may be argued for YÖK's policies. Still, some kind of resilience is traced, as American-modelled universities still have the smallest ratio.

The fourth dimension tapping patterns of activities, outward orientation, on the contrary, varied with regard to the types of public universities ($p<.001$) supporting Hypothesis 3a. Parallel to the 1991 data set, in 2002, both classical and American modelled universities have a higher number of publications than the other three categories. What is interesting is that, overall, the number of publications has increased. It is very likely that YÖK's pressures on internationalization and disseminating knowledge had its homogenizing effect on this organizational feature. Overall, Hypothesis 3a was partially supported, as there is some convergence in a number of organizational features pertaining

to patterns of activities. The significance levels, also, show that differences have become widened across the five types of universities in 2002, supporting the expectation of an increased diversification in the field with respect to patterns of activities.

As for the structure, the finding, being not significant, suggests homogenization among public universities in this feature, supporting Hypothesis 3b. A closer look at means show that, in comparison with the 1991 data, public universities converged around a structure towards a more federative administrative structure. This may be claimed to be an indication that YÖK has softened in this period as to allow some heterogeneity across universities in their internal structures. This supports the arguments in chapter three on how YÖK had softened after the 1990s in its standardization goal, and had opened the way for some degree of heterogeneity in the field.

The five categories of universities have also converged in procedures at this time point, as hypothesized in 3c. Both program construction and student affairs means show a general move towards the characteristics that the American model had introduced into the field, which confirms the Americanization arguments. One may, further, argue that YÖK's standardization has become successful in daily practices concerning the student (as an ideal typical category) and program construction. At the same time, as noted above, the late YÖK period has allowed some degree of space where universities may have some choices in their administrative mechanisms.

Table 5.4

Comparisons of Five Types of Public Educational Organizations Using Mean Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables (2002)

	Classical University (n=5)			American Modelled (n=4)			Post-1973 State University (n=12)			Formerly Academy (n=7)			Post-1991 State University (n=25)			
Variables	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Chi-sq (4)a
Activities																
% of vocational ed	16.20	0.33	0.18	9.00	0.21	0.16	29.75	0.51	0.08	19.43	0.37	0.19	32.84	0.49	0.21	13.52 **
% of undergraduate ed	36.40	0.48	0.05	45.75	0.54	0.04	26.17	0.42	0.08	36.00	0.48	0.14	20.00	0.36	0.15	15.30 **
Regional expansionism	21.00	8.80	12.24	18.50	6.50	9.95	36.79	15.17	7.28	20.43	8.00	12.04	26.70	9.44	6.14	8.14 ns
Faculty type	45.40	13.60	2.79	20.88	7.50	3.70	36.96	10.75	2.22	32.00	10.86	6.07	18.12	6.92	2.10	21.89 ***
Total student intake	40.20	10271.00	3700.11	27.75	6580.75	3807.46	29.92	7686.42	4727.24	34.29	8632.00	4922.78	20.80	4962.72	2941.23	9.68 *
Language	37.60	2.60	0.55	38.75	3.00	1.41	24.08	1.83	0.83	32.14	2.29	0.76	22.96	1.84	0.99	8.47 ns
Student academics ratio	15.60	35.57	20.88	12.50	30.43	7.91	27.67	47.57	12.79	24.57	44.50	14.42	31.96	65.06	45.56	9.02 ns
Outward orientation	47.00	575.40	294.83	47.38	554.25	350.65	35.46	193.33	53.58	29.86	195.57	150.58	14.88	69.40	44.27	34.59 ***
Structure																
Coverage of by-laws	31.50	2.80	1.64	30.25	3.00	2.31	30.83	3.00	1.95	27.43	2.57	1.72	23.62	2.12	1.56	2.89 ns
Procedures																
Program construction	31.00	2.60	1.14	35.25	3.00	1.15	24.83	2.17	0.94	21.86	2.00	0.82	27.36	2.36	1.04	2.85 ns
Student affairs	24.80	2.20	1.30	40.50	3.75	1.71	25.04	2.25	1.29	29.64	2.57	1.27	25.48	2.24	1.13	4.10 ns

Note. a Kruskal Wallis test SD= Standard Deviation

* p< .05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Table 5.5

Comparisons of Six Types of Educational Organizations Using Mean Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables (2002)

	Classical University (n=5)	American Modelled (n=4)	Post-1973 State University (n=12)	Formerly Academy (n=7)	Post-1991 State University (n=25)	Private University (n=22)			
Variables	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Chi-sq (4)a
Activities									
% of vocational ed	29.20	18.25	47.33	34.00	49.72	26.45	0.27	0.23	19.95 **
% of undergraduate ed	43.60	55.25	30.58	43.71	23.28	52.55	0.60	0.19	25.91 ***
Regional expansionism	40.60	34.75	58.79	37.50	46.84	16.77	0.05	0.21	38.85 ***
Faculty type	67.20	36.38	57.67	49.86	34.52	21.11	5.27	2.23	35.02 ***
Total student intake	62.20	49.50	51.92	55.86	40.76	14.00	877.73	801.52	43.95 ***
Language	44.40	49.25	27.50	37.50	26.54	53.41	3.18	0.91	24.07 ***
Student academics ratio	24.60	21.00	42.17	38.14	47.28	31.27	40.46	23.91	11.39 *
Outward orientation	68.60	68.88	55.96	49.93	34.10	16.27	26.18	67.95	50.97 ***
Structure									
Coverage of by-laws	49.30	45.75	47.00	43.00	37.72	27.84	1.45	1.18	11.44 *
Procedures									
Program construction	36.20	43.25	27.58	23.71	31.40	55.18	3.55	0.67	24.05 ***
Student affairs	26.60	48.13	27.42	32.64	27.42	58.25	4.36	0.85	31.71 ***

Note. a Kruskal Wallis test SD= Standard Deviation

* p< .05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Overall, the analysis for the public universities showed both convergence and divergence at the same time. Patterns of activities was the category where the interplay between coercive pressures and institutional roots was observed the most. It is important to note that the differences have become wider among the public universities in 2002, in comparison with the 1991 and 2002 data sets. On the other hand, universities have become homogenized around structure and procedures. Structure reflected a mid way between the centralized American model, and the decentralized European, as there are occurrences of decentralized by-laws, which allow some degree of variation among faculty implementations. Procedures exhibited a more homogenized move towards the American model. This is very much explained by the visibility arguments, that the features that help gain legitimacy and are visible by the external parties are more readily imitated than those that are not. Thus, one may argue that late YÖK has increased heterogeneity in some of the organizational characteristics, while infusing homogeneity in some of the organizational features effectively.

5.3.2. Private Universities in 2002

The second analysis was conducted by including the private universities as a sixth type of organizations in the field. With the inclusion of this type, all the dimensions showed differences amongst all the types of universities (see Table 5.4.). The mean ranks indicated that, overall, private universities were different than the other five categories, having similarities with the American modelled universities. This is not very surprising, as they were expected to imitate the American model, as it had become the "successful" model by the time private universities were founded. In addition to the American modeled public universities that have become the "successful" models, one may also argue that the first private university, Bilkent, being modelled on the American model, and which has also become to be perceived as successful, may have affected the newly founded private universities.

On a closer look, the first dimension of patterns of activities, diversification illustrates that, in the format of education, universities with the lowest percentage of

vocational education are the American modelled universities and the private universities. Post-1991 and post-1973 universities have both the highest percentages of vocational education, similar to the previous analysis. In addition, private universities have the highest percentage of undergraduate education, together with some graduate education.

Private universities, also, are the least geographically dispersed among the six categories, while the third category, the post-1973 universities, the most. Similarly, the narrowest range of studies belongs to the private universities, followed by the American modelled universities along with the post-1991 universities.

With regards to size, a similar pattern is observed as the private universities have the smallest enrollment numbers, while the classicals the largest.

As for the operational strategies, private universities use English as language of instruction the most, followed by the American modelled state universities. As for student to academics ratio, the American-modelled state universities have the smallest ratio, followed by the classicals. Private universities take the third place. What may be considered as interesting for this sub-dimension is the place of the classical universities, as they were also close to the American modelled universities in the 1991 data set. This may be explained by the resilience possibly stemming from the American liberal arts tradition against the mass education that was being enforced by YÖK.

The fourth dimension in the patterns of activities, outward orientation differed significantly as well, with the private universities having the least number of international publications, followed by the post-1991 universities. This particular dimension is where the private universities clearly showed a split from the American modelled state universities. One may argue that as such, private universities resemble the authentic liberal arts tradition, and with a focus on teaching rather than research, serve the labor market needs. Another explanation may be that these universities may also lack academic resources for supporting a strong research orientation.

The mean ranks findings show that in administrative structure, classical universities resembled the post-1973 universities, while academies and the American modelled universities resembled one another. Private universities have the most unified structure.

The third category, procedures, parallel to the above argument, showed that the private universities had the highest score both in program construction and student affairs,

representing the American model in the field even more than the American- modelled state universities.

Overall, with the inclusion of the private universities, the picture in 2002 displayed heterogeneity. Private universities, overall, represented the American model in the field, the most in parallel with the general Americanization in the field, especially in procedures.

5.4 Exploring the field in 2002

For this measurement point, the population size permitted for a cluster analysis that shows how the data depicts the field. Therefore a third analysis was performed for exploring the field in 2002. First, a hierarchical cluster analysis was done, using percentage of vocational education and regional expansionism. These two variables were chosen as they refer to the late YÖK's major policies. The cluster outcomes would show to what degree these were enforced on organizations and which types complied with these forces. The results of the hierarchical cluster analysis suggested three clusters. Based on both the historical account and the hierarchical cluster analysis, a k-means cluster analysis was done to obtain three clusters.

Table 5.6

Final Cluster Centers

	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Z score % of vocational ed (2yrs)	-1.293	0.580	0.547
Z score regional expansionism	-0.834	-0.083	1.725

As the final cluster centers indicate, the first cluster consists of those universities which have neither regionally expanded, nor have vocational education (see Table 5.6). Full lists of the universities and the clusters they belonged to in the preceding cluster analysis are shown in Appendix E. The cluster memberships show that two of the classical universities are in this category, together with two American modelled universities, and with some of the private universities. The third cluster consists of those universities, which

have both expanded regionally and have significant vocational education. This category consists of mostly post-1973 universities in line with the expectation that YÖK has more power over these. The second cluster consists of universities, which are in between these two clusters. These have not expanded regionally, yet they have a high percentage of vocational education. As this category has the highest number of universities, it may be argued that YÖK as part of its strategic agenda pushed universities towards vocational education and it was successful in this respect. Regional expansion has been a priority in YÖK's strategic agenda, yet it has not been as strong as the push towards vocational education. Private universities, in this respect, seem to have been divided into two groups, non-vocational on the one hand, while others with more vocational education. Yet, none of the private universities have expanded regionally in 2002, continuing to serve in the cities.

And finally, by using the cluster memberships a Kruskal-Wallis test was done to see the differences and similarities among the clusters across study variables (see Table 5.7). Overall, the field has become homogenized reflecting a less unified administrative structure. Parallel to the above arguments, one may argue that YÖK allowed for heterogeneity in its later stages. A second feature is the homogenization in the internationalisation of the field, as outward orientation was not significant. One may argue that YÖK has been successful in pushing universities towards publishing internationally. In the other organizational features Table 5.7 shows heterogeneity rather than homogeneity, which overall supports the theoretical arguments on how coercive mechanisms might produce heterogeneity as well.

Table 5.7

Mean Ranks, Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables (2002)

	Cluster 1 (n=23)			Cluster 2 (n=39)			Cluster 3 (n=13)			
Variables	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Mean	SD	Chi-sq (2)a
Activities										
Faculty type	27.17	6.39	3.71	39.27	7.85	3.10	53.35	10.69	4.40	12.37 **
Total student intake	23.04	2590.30	3700.78	39.69	4884.21	3508.33	59.38	9512.00	4514.46	23.58 ***
Language	56.28	3.30	0.93	33.62	2.18	0.89	18.81	1.38	0.51	29.32 ***
Student academics ratio	26.70	36.86	25.11	39.95	48.42	21.20	52.15	74.03	53.84	11.98 **
Outward orientation	33.59	146.78	238.06	36.82	139.28	209.31	49.35	175.85	128.58	4.60 ns
Structure										
Coverage of by-laws	33.46	1.96	1.69	37.92	2.13	1.54	46.27	2.85	1.82	3.63 ns
Procedures										
Program construction	49.26	3.22	1.00	36.49	2.64	1.04	22.62	1.92	0.76	14.01 ***
Student affairs	49.04	3.74	1.42	34.40	2.72	1.36	29.27	2.38	1.39	9.46 **

Note. a Kruskal Wallis test SD= Standard Deviation

* p< .05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

6.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the Turkish higher education field to understand plurality and its effects on an organizational field in an effort to extend new institutional theorizing. In doing this, the aim was to see how isomorphic pressures affected organizations against the backdrop of a multiple model organizational field. In addition, as the study had three data sets in three time points, it allowed for an analysis of periods with different institutional set ups. As such, the three periods displayed first the early years when there was no strong coercive force in the field, which was followed by a period under strong coercive pressures toward homogenization, and a third period when the coercive body had allowed room for heterogeneity.

Overall, the study has succeeded in depicting how Turkish higher education organizations evolved over time. As the previous chapters showed, Turkish higher education had from the early days incorporated different institutional models all at the same time. Alongside different models entering the field, the legal framework of the field also changed over time. The 1946 Law of Universities incorporated features from the German models, the French influence manifesting itself in the professional schools (which would later be converted into academies). The first attempt of reconciling different models in universities came with the 1973 Law, following the entry of a third model, namely the American.

As the findings of the 1975 data set shows, although there was a common legal framework, as it incorporated features from different models, it supported the plurality in the field. The hypotheses were largely supported, except for two sub-dimensions of patterns of activities and one of the procedure variables. The two sub-dimensions that were related to the patterns of activities construct, namely, focus of education and geographical

dispersion and to some degree size perhaps, indicated that the three models present in the field were at one in providing undergraduate (or rather, *lisans*) education with very low vocational education and serving mostly in the main cities. Higher education appears to have been established as the post-secondary degree, under the influence of Continental European models, a feature that even the importation of the American model could not challenge at least at that stage. Notably, homogeneity was also observed in one of the procedures variables suggesting that somewhat unexpectedly, some degree of isomorphic effects did exist, though on perhaps the most visible features. Nevertheless, all in all, in the absence of coercive homogenizing forces, historical models were the determinant for the field characteristics, leading to variety rather than unity. Although there was some hint of mimetic effects, they were not as powerful as the historical ties.

In 1981, with the entrance of YÖK, as a powerful regulatory body, the field for the first time experienced a strong push towards homogeneity. As the 1991 data set showed, this regulatory power, accompanied by the Law No. 2547 of Higher Education was successful in this attempt. Two hypotheses, with regards to homogenizing were supported. In terms of the structure and procedures the field had become homogenized, whereas there was partial heterogeneity in patterns of activities, as expected. As such, the 1991 data set allowed for the observation of the effects of the clash between historical roots of organizations versus the isomorphic pressures. The focus of education, as opposed to the 1975 data set, differed for the four types, mainly for the post-1973 universities, which were more open to the coercive pressures of YÖK as they had no historical ties to any of the institutional models and having short histories themselves probably made them more vulnerable to YÖK influence. The mean ranks showed that this group had the highest percentage of vocational education, which may be regarded as a sign of YÖK's policy of increasing vocational education. As such, the American and the European (mostly German) modelled universities had the lowest percentage of vocational education, showing that this historical feature was resilient against the coercive pressure. On the contrary, academies followed the post-1973 universities, which is an example of how two forces, i.e. historical and coercive, reconciled in this feature.

Another change in the field in 1991, in comparison with 1975, was the change in the scope of education. This organizational feature had shown significant difference across the four types of universities in 1975, contrary to 1991, as they have become unified towards a

wider range of studies. The smallest range, in 1975, had belonged to academies, as they were confined to a small number of professional areas, followed by the American modelled universities. In this feature, for the academies, as explained in the context, the change was in line with what academies had wanted, as they wanted to have a similar and higher status with universities for a long time. What is perhaps more interesting was the move towards a wider range of studies offered by the American modelled universities. In this feature, one may say that coercive pressures were more determining than the historical roots, hybridizing the American model with the German universities. Another change was seen in operational strategies. In comparison to the 1975 data set, there was no significant difference among the four types in this feature as well. In general, there was a move towards using English as the language of instruction. This may be explained by YÖK's policies, as it emphasized internationalization, which indirectly campaigned for English, coupled with the American model becoming the successful model in the field. In this case, hybridization took place for the European modelled universities. In a similar vein, student to academics ratio, contrary to the 1975 data set, showed no significant difference among the four types of organizations, as all increased their enrollments. Again, in this case, the effect of coercive pressures towards mass education overcoming the historical roots may be used in explaining this finding. One may, also, argue that this policy of YÖK was supported by the overall theme of mass education, weakening the models' connections with their historical roots.

Coming to 2002, with 75 universities in the field, 22 of which were private and 53 public, the data point provided an opportunity to analyze the later stages of coercive power in the field. Overall, in 2002 heterogeneity got wider in the patterns of activities, signifying the divergence creation role of YÖK. The heterogeneity of 1975 stemmed from the historical roots of universities coupled with the 1973 Law incorporating multiple features. This time, this heterogeneity among the public universities may be argued to be resulting from YÖK's later stage policies, giving way to heterogeneity. The scope of education has increased for all the types except for the American modelled universities. In this case, coercive forces let the historical roots continue to exist, widening the differences among the public universities in this feature.

The 2002 data set, also, allowed to test the entry of a new type of organization, namely, the private universities. Private universities may be claimed to be autonomous to a

large degree and as they had no historical ties in the field they were expected to imitate the "successful" model in the field. In line with these expectations, the analysis results showed that with the entry of the private universities the divergence in the field increased in all of the organizational features overall. This analysis also created an opportunity to see more or less only the mimetic effects on the newly founded organizations. Private universities imitated mostly the American model, in fact as they exhibited a more authentic American picture, one may argue that in addition to imitating the American modelled universities in the field, they imitated the authentic US universities, an example of how organizations import ideas, or imitate models across national borders. This may be a result of the general wave of Americanization that had started after the fall of the Berlin Wall (Kudo et al, 2004).

In addition to the above noted changes in the field in 2002, the results of the cluster analysis showed that YÖK created a push towards a less unified administrative structure along with creating groups of organizations with different levels of vocational education and with various degrees of geographical dispersion. Furthermore, the theme of internationalization, which has been a continuing theme in the Turkish higher education field, resulted in an overall emphasis on publishing internationally.

All in all, focusing on the field-level institutional effects, this study has supported the recent arguments on the possibility of convergence and divergence co-existing in organizational fields. Furthermore, as discussed by some authors (e.g., Holm, 1995), the Turkish higher education field also exemplified the hybridization of institutional models as a result of these institutional effects. A third contribution is that it also exemplified an organizational field where institutional forces that have been argued to have created homogeneity also created heterogeneity, which points to a new path in empirical research for institutional theorizing.

Specifically, in the absence of strong coercive mechanisms, and when the legal framework itself has multiplicity within, historical roots of organizations become more effective in influencing their activities, structures and procedures, creating divergence. On the contrary, in the presence of a strong institutional regime and a unified legal framework, then the field becomes homogenized around the organizational features that are emphasized by the coercive pressures. Organizational histories play a role only in the features that are left "untouched" by the coercive pressures. As the institutional regime becomes weaker,

even when the legal framework keeps its unified character, there is more room for diversity. One may also claim that the market regime diversifies the field. In addition, there is no turning back to the historical roots in the features that have become institutionalized along the way.

Overall, in view of the above arguments, this study has served several purposes. First, it made a theoretical contribution to the recent theme of "diversity coexisting with convergence" in the neo institutional perspective. By looking at a later stage of an organizational field, the effects of multiple institutional models on organizations were examined. Second, again by looking at an educational organizational field over time, it was possible to see the effects of historical roots against isomorphic pressures -with the changing degree of coercive forces. A third theoretical contribution is that the effects of isomorphic pressures on organizations as a whole were explicated. That is to say, by looking at organizations in their totalities, the effects of isomorphic pressures on different organizational characteristics of organizations were investigated, leading to a better understanding of isomorphism in an organizational field.

Being a field level study on the Turkish higher education, alongside the above-mentioned theoretical contributions, the research setting presented various opportunities. First, universities in Turkey as organizations have not previously been subjects for examination in organization studies. Second, the research setting offered the empirical investigation of the roots of the Turkish higher education organizations, which in turn has increased our understanding about these organizations as the major producers of formal knowledge. And finally, this study has highlighted the panorama of the Turkish higher education field, which may constitute a valuable material for future policy-making.

6.1. Limitations of the Study

Having succeeded in testing the hypotheses, the study has some limitations. Overall, the small population size has been one important limitation statistically. Another limitation has been the inability to measure some of the organizational features that would have made the arguments stronger. For example, in assessing the administrative structures, coverage of

by-laws has been used as a single measure, and it measured the administrative structure among the different forms of educational organizations at the university level. Yet, it was not possible to gather data on the structure within organizations to show how departments and "chair" structures have evolved over time. Perhaps, a third limitation has been that the study could not capture the daily practices of academic work, which would have expected to show greater resilience against homogenizing pressures as being deeply rooted in organizational life, they are the least "visible" to coercive pressures. A fourth limitation is that the study has mostly focused on mimetic and coercive mechanisms, not saying much on the possible normative mechanisms. Although one may argue that the absence of a strong professional association in the field makes this mechanism less effective, interactions across academicians are left unexplained. A final limitation has been the data collection in the 1975 data set. The measurement in this year has some data losses because of unavailability of archival data.

6.2 Future research

The above noted limitations also point to possible future research. One possible future study could be the examination of inter-organizational networks and their effects on the evolution of the field. Within this line of research a valuable contribution could also come from investigating the role of actors both as organizations and individuals. Another valuable contribution would be to expand the study to a meso level to include broader societal level influences on the evolution of the field along with the field level dynamics. A third line of research would be the investigation of the field starting from the 2000s, especially with respect to the entry of the private universities as the results of the study indicated that their entry has affected the field formation quite significantly.

Appendix A

List of Higher Education Organizations and Years of Foundations

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES	LOCATION	YEARS OF FOUNDINGS
1-ABANT İZZET BAYSAL UNIVERSITY	BOLU	1992
2-ADNAN MENDERES UNIVERSITY	AYDIN	1992
3-AFYON KOCATEPE UNIVERSITY	AFYON	1992
4-AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY	ANTALYA	1982
5-ANADOLU UNIVERSITY	ESKİŞEHİR	1973
6-ANKARA UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1946
7-ATATÜRK UNIVERSITY	ERZURUM	1957
8-BALIKESİR UNIVERSITY	BALIKESİR	1992
9-BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1971
10-CELAL BAYAR UNIVERSITY	MANİSA	1992
11-CUMHURİYET UNIVERSITY	SİVAS	1974
12-ÇANAKKALE ON SEKİZ MART UNIVERSITY	ÇANAKKALE	1992
13-ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY	ADANA	1973
14-DİCLE UNIVERSITY	DİYARBAKIR	1982
15-DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY	İZMİR	1982
16-DUMLUPINAR UNIVERSITY	KÜTAHYA	1992
19-FIRAT UNIVERSITY	ELAZIĞ	1975
20-GALATASARAY UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1994
21-GAZİ UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1982
22-GAZİANTEP UNIVERSITY	GAZİANTEP	1987
23-GAZİOSMANPAŞA UNIVERSITY	TOKAT	1992
24-GEBZE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	GEBZE	1992
25-HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1967
26-HARRAN UNIVERSITY	ŞANLIURFA	1992
27-İNÖNÜ UNIVERSITY	MALATYA	1975
28-İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1933
29-İSTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1944
30-İZMİR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	İZMİR	1992
31-KAFKAS UNIVERSITY	KARS	1992
32-KAHRAMANMARAŞ SÜTÇÜ İMAM UNIVERSITY	KAHRAMANMARAŞ	1992
33-KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY	TRABZON	1955
34-KIRIKKALE UNIVERSITY	KIRIKKALE	1992
35-KOCAELI UNIVERSITY	KOCAELI	1992
36-MARMARA UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1982
37-MERSIN UNIVERSITY	İÇEL	1992
38-MİMAR SİNAN UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1982
39-MUĞLA UNIVERSITY	MUĞLA	1992
40-MUSTAFA KEMAL UNIVERSITY	HATAY	1992
41-NIĞDE UNIVERSITY	NIĞDE	1992
42-ONDOKUZ MAYIS UNIVERSITY	SAMSUN	1975
43-ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1959
44-OSMANGAZI UNIVERSITY	ESKİŞEHİR	1993
45-PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY	DENİZLİ	1992
46-SAKARYA UNIVERSITY	SAKARYA	1992
47-SELÇUK UNIVERSITY	KONYA	1975
48-SÜLEYMAN DEMIREL UNIVERSITY	ISPARTA	1992
49-TRAKYA UNIVERSITY	EDİRNE	1982
50-ULUDAĞ UNIVERSITY	BURSA	1975
51-YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1982
52-YÜZÜNCÜ YIL UNIVERSITY	VAN	1982
53-ZONGULDAK KARAELMAS UNIVERSITY	ZONGULDAK	1992

List of Higher Education Organizations and Years of Foundations

PRIVATE (FOUNDATION) UNIVERSITIES	LOCATION	YEARS OF FOUNDINGS
1-ATILIM UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1997
2-BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1998
3-BAŞKENT UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1994
4-BEYKENT UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1997
5-BİLKENT UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1985
6-ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY	TARSUS	1997
7-ÇANKAYA UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1997
8-DOĞUŞ UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1997
9-FATİH UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1996
10-HALİÇ UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1998
11-IŞIK UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1996
12-İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1996
13-İSTANBUL KÜLTÜR UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1997
14-İSTANBUL COMMERCE UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	2001
15-İZMİR UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS	İZMİR	2001
16-KADİR HAS UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1997
17-KOÇ UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1992
18-MALTEPE UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1997
19-SABANCI UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1996
20-UFUK UNIVERSITY	ANKARA	1999
21-YAŞAR UNIVERSITY	İZMİR	2001
22-YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY	İSTANBUL	1996

Appendix B

Higher Education Organizations Across Four Categories in 1975

Classical modelled (n=5)	American modelled (n=4)	Post-1973 (n=4)	Academies (n=14)
Ankara	Atatürk	Bursa (Uludağ)	Adana İTİA
Ege	Boğaziçi	Çukurova	Ankara İTİA
Istanbul	Hacettepe	Diyarbakır	Bursa İTİA
ITU	METU	Fırat	Eskisehir İTİA
Karadeniz Technical			İstanbul İTİA
			Ankara DMMA
			Elazig DMMA
			Eskisehir DMMA
			İstanbul DMMA
			İzmir DMMA
			Konya DMMA
			Sakarya DMMA
			İstanbul DGSA
			İstanbul TGS

Appendix C

Higher Education Organizations Across Four Categories in 1991

Classical modelled (n=5)	American modelled (n=5)	Post-1973 (n=12)	Formerly Academy (n=7)
Ankara	Atatürk	Akdeniz	Anadolu
Ege	Boğaziçi	Bursa (Uludağ)	Dokuz Eylül
Istanbul	Hacettepe	Çukurova	Gazi
İTU	METU	Cumhuriyet	Marmara
Karadeniz Technical	Bilkent	Diyarbakır (Dicle)	Mimar Sinan
		Erciyes	Trakya
		Fırat	Yıldız Technical
		Gaziantep	
		İnönü	
		Ondokuz Mayıs	
		Selçuk	
		Yüzüncü Yıl	

Appendix D

Higher Education Organizations Across Six Categories in 2002

Classical modelled (n=5)	American modelled (n=4)	Post-1973 (n=12)	Formerly Academy (n=7)	Post-1991 (n=25)	Private (n=22)
Ankara	Atatürk	Akdeniz	Anadolu	Abant İzzet Baysal	Atılım
Ege	Boğaziçi	Bursa (Uludağ)	Dokuz Eylül	Adnan Menderes	Bahçeşehir
Istanbul	Hacettepe	Çukurova	Gazi	Afyon Kocatepe	Başkent
ITU	METU	Cumhuriyet	Marmara	Balikesir	Beykent
Karadeniz TU		Diyarbakır (Dicle)	Mimar Sinan	Celal Bayar	Bilkent
		Erciyes	Trakya	Çanakkale	Çağ
		Fırat	Yıldız Technical	Dumlupınar	Çankaya
		Gaziantep		Galatasaray	Doğuş
		İnönü		Gaziosmanpasa	Fatih
		Ondokuz Mayıs		Gebze Institute of Technology	Haliç
		Selçuk		Harran	Işık
		Yüzüncü Yıl		Technology	İstanbul Bilgi
				Kafkas	İstanbul Kültür
				Kahramanmaraş Sİ	İstanbul Commerce
				Kırıkkale	İzmir Economics
				Kocaeli	Kadir Has
				Mersin	Koç
				Muğla	Maltepe
				Mustafa Kemal	Sabancı
				Niğde	Ufuk
				Osmangazi	Yaşar
				Pamukkale	Yeditepe
				Sakarya	
				Süleyman Demirel	
				Zonguldak	

Appendix E

Higher Education Organizations Across Three Clusters

cluster 1 not regional not vocational	**cluster 2** not regional vocational	**cluster 3** regional vocational
Boğaziçi	Abant İzzet Bay.	Afyon Kocatepe
Galatasaray	Adnan Menderes	Atatürk
Gebze Inst	Akdeniz	Celal Bayar
İstanbul	Anadolu	Dicle
İTU	Ankara	Dumlupınar
İzmir Inst.	Balıkesir	Gazi
Marmara	Cumhuriyet	Karadeniz Tech.
METU	Çanakkale	Ondokuz Mayıs
Osmangazi	Çukurova	Selçuk
Yıldız Technical	Dokuz Eylül	Süleyman Demirel
Atılım	Ege	Trakya
Başkent	Erciyes	Yüzüncü Yıl
Bilkent	Fırat	Zonguldak Kara.
Çağ	Gaziantep	
Çankaya	Gaziosmanpaşa	
Fatih	Hacettepe	
Haliç	Harran	
Işık	İnönü	
İstanbul Bilgi	Kafkas	
Koç	Kahramanmaraş Sİ.	
Sabancı	Kırıkkale	
Ufuk	Kocaeli	
Yeditepe	Mersin	
	Mimar Sinan	
	Muğla	
	Mustafa Kemal	
	Niğde	
	Pamukkale	
	Sakarya	
	Uludağ	
	Bahçeşehir	
	Beykent	
	Doğuş	
	İstanbul Kültür	
	İstanbul Commerce	
	İzmir Economics	
	Kadir Has	
	Maltepe	
	Yaşar	

REFERENCES

Aldrich, H. 1979. ***Organizations and Environments.*** Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Arslan, Ali. 2004. ***Kısır Döngü: Türkiye'de Üniversite ve Siyaset***. Istanbul: Truva Yayınları.

Aslier, Mustafa. Personal Communication, 2005.

Aysan, Mustafa and Kemal Kurtuluş. 1973. ***Türkiye'de İşletmecilik Eğitiminin Durumu ve Gelişme İmkanları ile İlgili Araştırma Raporu.*** İstanbul: Sevk ve İdarecilik Eğitim Vakfı.

Ataünal, Aydoğan. 1998. ***Türkiye'de Yükseköğretim (1923-1998): Yasal Düzenlemeler ve Değerlendirmeler***. Ankara: T.C. MEB Yükseköğretim Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.

Baron, James N., Devereaijk P. Jennings and Frank R. 1988. Mission Control? The Development of Personnel Systems in US Industry. ***American Sociological Review.*** 53(4): 497-514.

Baum, Joel A. C. 1996. Organizational Ecology in Stewart R.Clegg, Cynthia Hardy and Walter R. Nord (eds). ***Handbook of Organization Studies***. (pp. 77-115) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baum, Joel A. C. and Rowley, 2002. Companion to organizations: An Introduction, in J.A.C. Baum (ed), ***Companion to Organizations***. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann 1967. ***The Social Construction of Reality***. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Borum, Finn and Ann Westenholz. 1995. The Incorporation of Multiple Institutional Models: Organizational Multiplicity and the Role of Actors, in Richard W. Scott and Soren Christensen, ***The Institutional Construction of Organizations***, (pp. 113-135). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brint, Steven and Jerome Karabel. 1991. Institutional Origins and Transformations: The Case of American Community Colleges, in Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds), ***The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis,*** (pp. 311-337). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burn, Barbara, B. 1971. ***Higher Education in Nine Countries: A Comparative Study of Colleges and Universities Abroad***. New York: McGraw Hill.

Burns, Lawton R. and Douglas R. Wholey. 1993. Adoption and Abandonment of Matrix Management Programs: Effects of Organizational Characteristics and Interorganizational Networks. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 36 (1): 106-138.

Casile, Maureen and Alison Davis-Blake. 2002. When Accreditation Standards Change: Factors Affecting Differential Responsiveness of Public and Private Organizations. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 45 (1): 180-196.

Christensen, Soren and Jan Molin. 1995. Origin and Transformation of Organizations: Institutional Analysis of the Danish Red Cross, in W. Richard Scott and Soren Christensen (eds.), ***The Institutional Construction of Organizations***, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 67-91.

Clark, Burton R. 1978. Academic Differentiation in National Systems of Higher Education. ***Comparative Education Review***, 22: 242-258.

Clark, Burton R. 1983. ***The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective***. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clegg, Stewart and Cynthia Hardy. 1996. Organizations, Organization and Organizing, in Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy and Walter R. Nord (eds), ***Handbook of Organization Studies***, (pp.1-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clemens, Elisabeth, S. and James M. Cook. 1999. Politics and Institutionalism: Explaining Durability and Change. ***Annual Review of Sociology***, 25: 441-466.

Cockburn, Iain M., Rebecca M. Henderson and Scott Stern. 2000. Untangling the Origins of Competitive Advantage. ***Strategic Management Journal,*** 21: 1123-1145.

Cooper, David J., Bob Hinings, Royston Greenwood and John L. Brown. 1996. Sedimentation and Transformation in Organizational Change: The Case of Canadian Law Firms. ***Organization Studies***, 17 (4): 623-647.

Cramer, Duncan. 1998. ***Fundamental Statistics for Social Research***, London: Routledge.

Dacin, Tina. 1997. Isomorphism in Context: The Power and Prescription of Institutional Norms. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 40 (1): 46-81.

Dacin, M. Tina, J. V. Marc, and D. B. Brent. 1999. The Embeddedness of Organizations: Dialogue & Directions. ***Journal of Management***, 25(3; Yearly Review of Management): 317-356.

Dacin, M. Tina, Jerry Goldstein and Richard W. Scott. 2002. Institutional Theory and Institutional Change: Introduction to the Special Research Forum. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 45 (1) : 45-58

D'Aunno, Thomas, Robert I. Sutton, and Richard H. Price. 1991. Isomorphism and External Support in Conflicting Institutional Environments: A Study of Drug Abuse Treatment Centers. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 34 (3): 636-661.

D'Aunno, Thomas, Melissa Succi, and A. Alexander Jeffrey. 2000. The Role of Institutional and Market Forces in Divergent Organizational Change. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 45 (4): 679-703

Deephouse, David L. 1996. Does Isomorphism Legitimate? ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 39 (4): 1024-1039.

Dill, W. R. 1958. Environment as an Influence on Managerial Autonomy. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 2: 409-443.

DiMaggio, Paul J. 1997. Culture and Cognition. ***Annual Review of Sociology***, 23: 263-287.

DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell 1983/1991. The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. ***American Sociological Review***, 48 (April): 147-160.

DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. 1991. Introduction, in Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.), ***The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis***, (pp. 1-40). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dodd, Clement H. 1962. (ed) ***Studies in University Government and Administration*** .Ankara: ODTÜ.

Dölen, Emre. 1999. Cumhuriyet'in Onuncu Yılında Kurulmuş olan "İstanbul Üniversitesi" ile "Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü'nün" Kuruluşlarının ve Akademik Yapılarının Karşılaştırılması in ***Bilanço, 1923-1998,*** Cilt 1 (pp 235-250). Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Donaldson, Lex. 1995. ***American Anti-Management Theories of Organisations.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durand-Prinborgne, C. 1992. France, in Burton R. Clark and Guy R. Neave (eds.) ***The Encyclopedia of Higher Education,*** (pp. 217-224). Oxford: Pergamon Press

Erden, Zeynep and Behlül Üsdiken. 2003. Deciphering Institutional Logics: Legislative Frameworks in Turkish Higher Education. Paper presented at 19th EGOS Colloquium. Copenhagen, 3-5 July.

Ersoy, Uğur. 1975. ***Ülkemizin Geçirdiği Deneyimlerin Işığında Üniversite Sistemleri ile İlgili Bir İrdeleme ve Öneriler***. Report presented to ODTU Faculty Administrative Committee. Ankara, Turkey.

Fennell, Mary F. and Jeffrey A. Alexander. 1987. Organizational Boundary Spanning in Institutionalized Environments. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 30 (3): 456-476.

Fligstein, Neil. 1985. The Spread of the Multidivisional Form Among Large Firms, 1919-1979. ***American Sociological Review,*** 50 (3): 377-391

Fligstein, Neil. 1987. The Interorganizational Power Struggle: Rise of Finance Personnel to Top Leadership in Large Corporations. ***American Sociological Review***, 52 (1): 44-58.

Frackmann, Edgar and Egbert De Weert. 1993. Higher Education Policy in Germany, in Leo Goedegebuure, Frans Kaiser, Peter Maassen, Lynn Meek, Frans van Vught and Egbert, De Weert, ***Higher Education Policy: An International Comparative Perspective*** (pp. 132-161). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Freely, John. 2000. ***A History of Robert College***. Vol II. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi yayınları.

Friedberg, Erhard and Christine Musselin. 1987. The Academic Profession in France, in Burton R. Clark (ed.), ***The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*** (pp. 93-122). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Friedland, Roger and Robert R. Alford. 1991. Bringing Society Back in: Symbols, Practices and Institutional Contradictions, in Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.), ***The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis***, (pp. 232-263). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Galaskiewics, Joseph. 1985. Professional Networks and the Institutionalization of a Single Mind Set. ***American Sociological Review***, 50 (5): 639-658.

Galaskiewics, Joseph and Stanley Wasserman. 1989. Mimetic Processes within an Interorganizational Field: An Empirical Test. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 34: 454-479.

Ginsberg, Ari and Ann Bucholtz. 1990. Converting to For-Profit Status: Corporate Responsiveness to Radical Change. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 33 (3): 445-477.

Giritli, İsmet, Rahmi Çobanoğlu, Ferit H. Saymen, Haydar Kazgan and Nuri Esen, 1971. ***Türk Eğitimi ve Özel Yüksek Okullar***. İstanbul: Orhan Mete Matbaası

Glynn, Mary A., Pamela S. Barr and M. Tina Dacin. 2000. Pluralism and the Problem of Variety. ***Academy of Management Review*****,** 25 (4): 726-734.

Gooderham Paul, N., Nordhaug Odd, and Ringdal Kristen. 1999. Institutional and Rational Determinants of Organizational Practices: Human Resource Management in European firms. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 44 (3): 507-531

Greenwood, Royston and C. R. Hinings. 1988. Organizational Design Types, Tracks and the Dynamics of Strategic Change. ***Organization Studies,*** 9 (3): 293-317.

Greenwood, Royston and C. R. Hinings. 1993. Understanding Strategic Change: the Contribution of Archetypes. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 36 (5): 1052-1081.

Greenwood, Royston, Roy Suddaby and C. R. Hinings. 2002. Theorizing Change: The Role of Professional Associations in the Transformation of Institutional Fields. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 45 (1): 58-80.

Greve, Henrich R. and Alva Taylor. 2000. Innovations as Catalysts for Organizational Change: Shifts in Organizational Cognition and Search. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 45 (1): 54-80.

Güler, Münir, Mauro F. Guillen and John Macpherson. 2002. Global Competition, Institutions, and the Diffusion of Organizational Practices: The International Spread of the ISO 9000. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 47: 207-2002.

Gürüz, Kemal. 1999. ***Türk Yükseköğretim Sistemi***. Rapor: 20. Mart.1999.

Gürüz, Kemal. 2001. ***Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Yükseköğretim: Tarihçe ve Bugünkü Sevk ve İdare Sistemleri*** (4. Basim). Ankara, Türkiye: ÖSYM Yayınları.

Gürüz, Kemal, Erdoğan Şuhubi, A:M: Celal Şengör, Kazim Türker, Ersin Yurtsever. 1994. ***Türkiye'de ve Dünyada Yükseköğretim, Bilim ve Teknoloji*** (Higher Education, Science Technology in Turkey and in the World), İstanbul: TÜSİAD.

Hambrick, Donald C., Sydney Finkelstein, Theresa Seung Ah Cho and Eric M. Jackson. 2000. Isomorphism in Reverse: How Macrocultural Forces Have Worked Against the "Inexorable Homogenization" Hypothesis. ***Paper presented at Conference of the Academy of Management***. Canada: Toronto.

Han, Shin-Kap. 1994. Mimetic Isomorphism and Its Effects on the Audit Services Market. ***Social Forces,*** 73 (2): 637-663.

Hannan, M. T. and J. Freeman. 1977. The Population Ecology of Organizations, ***American Journal of Sociology.*** 82: 929-964.

Hasselbladh, Hans and Jannis Kallinikos. 2000. The Project of Rationalization: A Critique and Reappraisal of Neo-Institutionalism in Organization Studies. ***Organization Studies***, 21 (4): 697-720.

Hatipoğlu, M. Tahir. 1998. ***Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi 1845-1997***. Ankara: Selvi Yayınları.

Haunschild, Pamela R. 1994. How Much Is That Company Worth? Interorganizational Relationships, Uncertainty, and Acquisition Premiums. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 39: 391-411.

Haunschild, Pamela R. and Anne S. Miner. 1997. Modes of Interorganizational Imitation: the Effects of Outcome Salience and Uncertainty. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 42 (3): 472-500.

Haveman, Heather A. 1993. Mimetic Isomorphism and Entry into New Markets. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 38 (4): 593-612.

Hirsch, Ernst. 1950. ***Dünya Üniversiteleri ve Türkiye'de Üniversitelerin Gelişmesi***. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

Hirsch, Ernst. 1979. Üniversite Kavramı ve Türkiye'deki Gelişimi. ***İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Tarafından Verilen Fahri Doktora Ünvanı Nedeniyle 22 Mayıs 1979'da Düzenlenen Törende Yapılan Konuşma***. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Fakülteler Matbaası.

Hoffman, Andrew J. 1999. Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the U.S. Chemical Industry. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 42 (4): 351-371.

Hoffman, Andrew, J. 2001. Linking Organizational and Field-level Analyses: The Diffusion of Corporate Environmental Practice. ***Organization & Environment***, 14 (2): 133-156.

Holm, Peter. 1995. The Dynamics of Institutionalization-Transformation Processes in Norwegian Fisheries, ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 40 (3): 398-422.

Horobin, Bettina. 1960. A New Middle Eastern University with Modern Western World Objectives. ***Journal of Engineering Education***, 50 (9): 703-706.

İlkin, Selim. 1972. 1920-1970 Döneminde Türkiye'deki İktisat ve Ticaret Eğitimi ile İlgili Kuruluşların Gelişimi Tarihi Üzerine Bir Deneme in Gürün, Fikret (ed) ***Türkiye'de Okutulan İktisat Üzerine***. (pp. 3-38) Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi.

Jensen, Michael.C. and William H. Meckling. 1976. Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure. ***Journal of Financial Economics***, 3: 305-360.

Kaiser, F. and G. Neave. 1994. Higher Education Policy in France in Leo Goedegebuure, F. Kaiser, P. Maassen, L. Meek, F. Vught and E. de Weert (eds) ***Higher Education Poicy: An International Comparative Perspective.*** (pp 104-132) UK: Pergamon Press.

Kaynar, Mete and İsmet Parlak. 2005. ***Her İl'e Bir Üniversite***. Ankara: Paragraf Yayınevi

Kehm, B. and U. Tehler. 1992. Germany, Federal Republic of, in Burton, R. Clark and Guy R. Neave (eds.), ***The Encyclopedia of Higher Education***, (pp.240-160). Oxford: Pergamon Press

Kieser, Alfred. 1989. Organizational, Institutional, And Societal Evolution: Med. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 34 (4): 540-565.

Kitchener, Martin. 2002. Mobilizing the Logic of Managerialism in Professional Fields: The Case of Academic Health Centre Mergers. ***Organization Studies***, 23 (3): 391-420.

Kondra, Alex Z. and C. R. Hinings. 1998. Organizational Diversity and Change in Institutional Theory. ***Organization Studies***, 19 (5): 743-767.

Konrad, Alison M. and Frank Linehan. 1995. Formalized HRM Structures: Coordinating Equal Employment Opportunity or Concealing Organizational Practices? ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 38 (3): 787-820.

Korkut, Hüseyin. 1992. Türkiye'de Üniversite Açma Politikası. **Amme İdaresi Dergisi**, 25 (4): 97-115.

Kraatz, Matthew S. and James H. Moore. 2002. Executive Migration and Institutional Change. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 45 (1): 120-144.

Kristensen, Peter Hull. 1999. Toward a New Sociology of Business Firms. ***International Studies of Management and Organization,*** 29 (2): 94-112.

Kudo, Akira, Matthias Kipping and Harm G. Schröter. 2004. Americanization: Historical and Conceptual Issues in A. Kudo, M. Kipping, and H. G. Schröter (eds), ***German and Japanese Busines in the Boom Years*** (pp 1-29), London: Routledge.

Kuran, Apdullah. 2002. ***Bir Kurucu Rektörün Anıları: Robert Kolej Yüksek Okulu'ndan Boğaziçi Üniversitesi'ne***. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Leblebici, Huseyin, Gerald R. Salancik, Anne Copay and Tom King. 1991. Institutional Change and the Transformation of Interorganizational Fields: An Organizational History of U.S. Radio Broadcasting Industry. ***Administrative Science Quarterly*****,** 36 (September): 333-363.

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

Lounsbury, Michael. 2001. Institutional Sources of Practice Variation: Staffing College and Recycling Programs. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 46 (1): 29-56.

March, J. and Herbert Simon. 1958. ***Organizations.*** New York, NY: John Wiley & Co.

Merton, Robert. 1936. The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Action. ***American Sociological Review***, 1 (6): 894-904.

Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure and Myth and Ceremony. ***American Journal of Sociology,*** 83 (2): 340-363.

Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1992. The Structure of Educational Organizations, in John W. Meyer and W. Richard Scott (eds.), ***Organizational Environments Ritual and Rationality***, (pp. 71-99) Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Meyer, John W., Richard W. Scott and Terrence E. Deal. 1992. Institutional and Technical Sources of Organizational Structure: Explaining the Structure of Educational Organizations, in John W. Meyer and W. Richard Scott (eds.), ***Organizational Environments Ritual and Rationality,*** (pp. 45-71). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Meyer, John W., Richard W. Scott and David Strang. 1994. Centralization, Fragmentation, and School District Complexity, in W. Richard Scott and John W. Meyer (eds.), ***Institutional Environments and Organizations,*** (pp. 137-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, John W., Richard W. Scott, David Strang and Andrew L Creighton. 1988. Bureaucratization without Centralization: Changes in the Organizational System of U.S. Public Education, 1940-80, in Lynne G. Zucker (ed.), ***Institutional Patterns and Organizations***, (pp. 139-169). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Millet Meclisi Tutanakları, 1994.

Mizruchi, Mark S. and Lisa C. Fein. 1999. The Social Construction of Organizational Knowledge: A Study of the Uses of Coercive, Mimetic, and Normative Isomorphism. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 44 (Dec): 653-683.

Mommsen, Wolfgang, J. 1987. The Academic Profession in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Burton R. Clark (ed.), ***The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*** (pp. 60-93). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noda, Tomo and David J. Collis. 2001. The Evolution of Intraindustry Firm Heterogeneity: Insights from a Process Study. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 44 (4): 897-925.

Oğuz, Orhan. 1995. ***Anadolu'da Bir Universitenin Kurulus Oykusu***. Istanbul: Cem Ofset.

Öncü, Ayşe. 1993. Academics: The West in the Discourse of University Reform, in Metin Heper, Ayşe Öncü and Heinz Kramer (eds.), ***Turkey and the West***, (pp. 142-176). London: I.B. Tauris.

ÖSYM. 1990. ***Higher Education in Turkey,*** Ankara: ÖSYM

Öz-Alp, Şan. 1975. Yönetim Basmaklarına Eleman Yetiştiren Okullarla İlgili Bir İnceleme. ***Eskişehir İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi Dergisi***, 11 (2): 35-43

Özuğurlu, Metin. 2003. Özel Üniversite: Üniversite Sistemindeki Gedikten Sistemin Kendisine. ***Toplum ve Bilim,*** 97 (Güz): 260-280.

Palmer, Donald A., Devereaux P. Jennings and Xueguang Zhou. 1993. Late Adoption of the Multidivisional Form by Large US Corporations: Institutional, Political and Economic Accounts. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 38 (1): 100-131.

Payaslioglu, Arif T. 1996. ***Turk Yuksekogretiminde Bir Yeniligin Tarihi: Barakadan Kampusa,*** *1954-1964* (Cilt 1). Ankara: Orta Dogu Teknik Universitesi.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Gerald R. Salancik (1978). ***The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective.*** New York: Harper & Row.

Ramirez, F.O. and J. Boli. 1987. "The Political Construction of Mass Schooling: European Origins and Worldwide Institutionalization", ***Sociology of Education***, 60 (1): 2-17.

Rao, Hayagreeva. 1998. Caveat Emptor: The Construction of Nonprofit Consumer Watchdog Organizations. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 103 (4): 912-961.

Reay Trish and C. R. (Bob) Hinnings. 2005. The Recomposition of an Organizational Field: Health Care in Alberta. ***Organization Studies***, 26 (3): 351-384.

Reed, Howard A. 1975. Hacettepe and Middle East Technical University: New Universities in Turkey. ***Minerva***, 13: 200-235.

Reed, Michael. 1996. Organizational Theorizing: A Historically Contested Terrain, in Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy and Walter R. Nord (eds.), ***Handbook of Organization Studies***, (pp. 21-55). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rowan, Brian. 1982. Organizational Structure in the Institutional Environment: The Case of Public Schools. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 27 (2): 259-279.

Ruef, Martin, and Richard W. Scott. 1998. A Multidimensional Model of Organizational Legitimacy: Hospital Survival in Changing Institutional Environments. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 43 (4): 877-904

Sarc, Ömer Celal. 1967. Türkiye'de Yüksek Öğretim, in ***Ekonomik Gelişmeyi Hızlandıran Etken Olarak Eğitim. Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Konferans Heyeti***, İstanbul

Scott, Richard W. 1987. The Adolescence of Institutional Theory. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 32: 493-511.

Scott, Richard W. 1992. ***Organizations***. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Scott, Richard W. 1995. Introduction: Institutional Theory and Organizations, in Richard W. Scott and Soren Christensen, ***The Institutional Construction of Organizations***, (pp. xi-xxiii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, Richard W. 2001. ***Institutions and Organizations***. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Scott, Richard W. 2003. Institutional Carriers: Reviewing Modes of Transporting Ideas Over Time and Space and Considering Their Consequences. ***Industrial and Corporate Change***, 12 (4): 879-894.

Scott, Richard W. and Soren Christensen. 1995. Conclusion: Crafting a Wider Lens, in W. Richard Scott and Soren Christensen (eds.), ***The Institutional Construction of Organizations***, (pp. 302-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, Richard W. and John W. Meyer. 1991. The Organization of Societal Sectors: Propositions and Early Evidence, in Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.), ***The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis***, (pp. 108-143). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scott, Richard W., and John W. Meyer. 1994. Environmental Linkages and Organizational Complexity: Public and Private Schools, in W. Richard Scott and John W. Meyer (eds.), ***Institutional Environments and Organizations,*** (pp. 137-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, Richard W., Martin Ruef, Peter Mendel and Carol A. Caronna. 2000. ***Institutional Change and Healthcare Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care***. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Selznick, Phillip. 1948. Foundations of the theory of organization. ***American Sociological Review***, 13 (1): 25–35

Selznick, Phillip. 1957. ***Leadership in Administration***. New York: Harper and Row.

Seo, Myeong-Gu and W. E. Douglas Creed. 2002. Institutional Contradictions, Praxis, and Institutional Change: A Dialectical Perspective. ***Academy of Management Review***, 27 (2): 222-247.

Siegel, Sidney. 1956. ***Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences.*** New York: McGraw Hill.

Stadtman, V. 1992. United States, in Burton, R. Clark and Guy R. Neave (eds.), ***The Encyclopedia of Higher Education***. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Starbuck, William H. 2003. The Origins of Organization Theory, in Haridimos Tsoukas and Christian Knudsen (eds.), ***The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory: Meta-Theoretical Perspectives***, (pp. 143-182) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1965. Social Structure and Organizations, in James G. March (ed.), ***Handbook of Organizations,*** (142-193). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Strang, David and John W. Meyer. 1993. Institutional Conditions of Diffusion. ***Theory and Society***, 22 (4): 487-511.

Strang, David and Wesley D. Sine. 2002. Interorganizational Institutions, in J.A.C. Baum (ed), ***Companion to Organizations***. (pp. 497-519) Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Swedberg, Richard. 2003. Economic versus Sociological Approaches to Organization Theory, in Haridimos Tsoukas and Christian Knudsen (eds.), ***The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory: Metatheoretical Perspectives***, (pp. 373-391) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

T.C. Resmi Gazete, 1973.

T.C. Resmi Gazete, 1981.

Tekeli, İlhan. 1980. ***Toplumsal Dönüşüm ve Eğitim Tarihi Üzerine Konuşmalar***. Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası.

Tekeli, İlhan. 2003. ***Eğitim Üzerine Düşünmek***. Ankara: Tübitak Matbaası.

Tekeli, İlhan. 2003. Dünyada ve Türkiye"de Üniversite Üzerinde Konuşmanın Değişik Yolları. ***Toplum ve Bilim***, 97 (Güz): 123-143.

Thornton, Patricia, H. 1995. Accounting for Acquisition Waves: Evidence from the U.S. College Publishing Industry, in Richard W. Scott and Soren Christensen, ***The Institutional Construction of Organizations***, (pp. 199-225). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thornton, Patricia, H. 2001. Personal versus Market Logics of Control: A Historically Contingent Theory of the Risk of Acquisition. ***Organization Science***, 12 (3): 294-311.

Thornton, Patricia, H., and William Ocasio. 1999. Institutional Logics and the Historical Contingency of Power in Organizations: Executive Succession in the Higher Education Publishing Industry, 1958-1990. ***The American Journal of Sociology***, 105 (3): 801-843.

Tolbert, Pamela S. 1985. Institutional Environments and Resource Dependence: Sources of Administrative Structure in Institutions of Higher Education. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 30 (1): 1-13.

Tolbert, Pamela S. and Lynn G. Zucker. 1983. Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Form, 1880-1935. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 28 (1): 22-39.

Townley, Barbara. 1997. The Institutional Logic of Performance Appraisal. ***Organization Studies***, 18 (2): 261-285.

Townley, Barbara. 2002. The Role of Competing Rationalities in Institutional Change. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 45 (1): 163-179.

Trow, Martin. 1999. From Mass Higher Education to Universal Access: The American Advantage. ***Minerva***, 37: 303-328.

Turgut, M. Fuat. 1997. Secondary Education in Turkey, in Güzver, Yıldıran and John, Durnin (eds.), ***Recent Perspectives on Turkish Education: An Inside View*** (pp. 39-81). Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies Publication.

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

Üsdiken, Behlül. 2003. Plurality in Institutional Environments and Educational Content: The Undergraduate Business Degree in Turkey, in R. P. Amdam, R. Kvalshaugen and E. Larsen (eds.) *Inside the Business School:* ***The Content of Management Education*** (Chapter 4). *Oslo: Abstrakt Press.*

Üsdiken, Behlül. 2004. The French, the German and the American: Higher Education for Business in Turkey, 1883-2003, ***New Perspectives on Turkey,*** 31 (Fall): 5-38.

Üsdiken, Behlül, and Hüseyin Leblebici. 2001. Organization Theory in N. Anderson, D. Ones, H.K. Sinangil ve C.Viswesvaran, (eds.) ***International Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology*** (Vol. 2, pp. 377-397). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Washington, Marvin and Marc J. Ventresca. 2004. How Organizations Change: The Role of Institutional Support Mechanisms in the Incorporation of Higher Education Visibility Strategies, 1874-1995. ***Organization Science***, 15(1): 82-97.

Westhpal, J. D. and E. J. Zajac. 1994. Substance and symbolism in CEO's Long-Term Incentive Plans. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 39: 367-390.

Widmann, Horst. 2000. Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

Williamson, E. Oliver. 1975. ***Markets and Hierarchies***. New York: Free Press.

www.bygem.gov.tr, 1994.

www.yok.gov.tr

Zucker, Lynne G. 1987. Institutional theories of organizations. ***Annual Review of Sociology***, 13: 443-464.