PROBLEMS AND STATUS OF
SOCIOLOGY IN TURKEY

ZUHAL YONCA HANÇER

SEPTEMBER 2004

PROBLEMS AND STATUS OF
SOCIOLOGY IN TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ZUHAL YONCA HANÇER

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCES
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

SEPTEMBER, 2004

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that his thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Aytül Kasapoğlu ………………………

Prof. Dr. Bahattin Akşit ………………………

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit ………………………

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and prasented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I hava fully cidet and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name:

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

THE PROBLEMS AND STATUS OF SOCIOLOGY IN TURKEY

Hançer, Zuhal Yonca

M.S., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit

September 2004, 227 pages

The main question of this study is the insufficient developed character of sociology in Turkey. In this study it is assumed that there are few factors that lead to this situation. Official ideology and its effects on sociology and university, the problems arisen from the discipline itself, the developing character of Turkey, and the conflict among sociologist academicians can be accepted as the factors that affect the sociology in Turkey. Related to this problem, in this study the opinions of academics sociologists in Turkey are examined. By using the techniques such as questionnaire and depth-interview, academicians' evaluations are gathered.

Keywords: Sociology of Sociology, University, Conflict, Cultural Capital.

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE'DE SOSYOLOJİNİN SORUNLARI VE DURUMU

Hançer, Zuhal Yonca

M.S., Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit

Eylül 2004, 227 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın temel problemini, Türkiye'deki sosyolojinin yetersiz gelişmişliği oluşturmaktadır. Sosyolojinin bu durumunu etkilediği varsayılan etkenler ise resmi ideolojinin hem sosyoloji hem de üniversite üzerindeki etkileri, disiplinin kendi içinden kaynaklanan sorunlar, Türkiye'nin gelişmekte olan bir ülke olması ve son olarak da sosyolog akademisyenler arasında yaşanan çatışmalardır. Bu çalışmada, anket ve derinlemesine mülakat teknikleri ile elde edilen verilere dayanarak, sosyolog akademisyenlerin günümüz Türkiye'sinde sosyolojiyi nasıl değerlendirdikleri incelenmiştir .

Anahtar kelimeler: Sosyolojinin Sosyolojisi, Üniversite, Çatışma, Kültürel Sermaye.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABRIVATIONS

CHP	:	Republic People's Party
EU	:	The European Union
LES	:	Examination for Graduate Studies
METU	:	Middle East Technical University
OECD	:	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
ÖSS	:	Student Choosing Examination
ÖYP	:	Scientific Human Resource Developing Program
p<	:	Significant relation
p>	:	Not significant relation
Ph.D.	:	Doctor of Philosophy
SSCI	:	Social Science Citation Index
TÜBA	:	Turkish Academy of Science
TÜBİTAK	:	The Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey
USA	:	United States of America
USSR	:	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
YÖK	:	Higher Education Council

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to identify the problems that sociology as an academic discipline faces in Turkey today and to obtain sociologist academicians' opinions concerning this matter.

The first chapter discusses the factors that have shaped the development of sociology as an academic discipline in Turkey. The first factor is that science in general, and sociology in particular, is not neutral; in other words, science is generally influenced by the political powers. Secondly, the relationship between universities and the political governments is generally in favor of the latter. Thirdly, there are problems stemming from the discipline of sociology itself. Fourthly, Turkey's political and economic structure and her position in the world have influenced the development of sociology in the country. The final factor mentioned under the sub-title "Sociological Perspective and Assumptions" is organisational and personal relations, which are generally present at universities in the form of conflict. These relations can be studied under four headings; relations between university administrations and faculties as well as departments, relations between university administrations and academicians, interfaculty and interdepartmental relations, and relations between academicians in and across sociology departments. In this study, the relationship between science, particularly sociology, and the political government is evaluated in two dimensions; this relationship is not only generally dependent or affected by the political government but also in conflict with it. A similar relationship exists between universities and the political government. The conflict is evident moreover in the relations between university administrations and faculties as well as departments, the relations between university administrations and academicians, the relations between

faculties, the relations between departments, and finally the relations between academicians in and across departments. Of these conflicts, this study focuses only on the relations between universities and the political structure at the macro level, and the relations between academicians serving in the sociology departments of the same or different universities at the micro level. The study also reviews the problems sociology faces in Turkey and the assessments of academicians on this matter. Detailed information on these relations is given in the first chapter. The theoretical framework, aim, significance, sociological perspective and assumptions, limitations and methodology of the study are also presented in the first chapter.

In the second chapter of the study, the data obtained by means of a questionnaire and in-depth interviewing are evaluated in line with the opinions presented in the first chapter. The chi-square statistical test is utilized, and the quantitative data under evaluation are discussed together with the qualitative data obtained from the interviews. As a result of data evaluation, it is found that the problems expressed during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s are still relevant today, the reasons of which are expressed in the third chapter.

Chronological Development of Sociology in Turkey

Sociology in Turkey has always been closely linked to politics since the establishment of the republic. In other words, sociology has functioned as a means to provide the legitimacy of the dominant power. In this study, it is assumed that sociology has two effects on the society: the enlightenment of the political government and the self-enlightenment of groups in the society (Giddens, 1994:20). Related to this assumption, it can be interpreted that enlightenment leads to the development of two conflict groups in the society; the power elites and the ones ruled by these elites. Therefore, it can be said that sociology has two conflicting roles; the legitimizing of the dominance of power elites and the self-enlightenment of the public against the interests of the dominant group. In the case of Turkey,

2

especially in the early times, sociology functioned as a means to legitimize the state's and political governments interests. This tendency has continued until the present time, and this has been one of the basic factors that affects sociology in Turkey.

To show the relationship between sociology as an academic discipline and political government in Turkey, a brief description of the development of sociology in the country will be given.

The studies related to sociology in Turkey can be grouped into three: bibliographic publications, studies focusing on Turkish sociologists, and works dividing the history of Turkish sociology into time periods based on common similarities and differences. Ertürk (2004:1) asserts that the importance of monographic studies cannot be ignored but particular names need to be emphasized, such as the study of Coşkun Değirmencioğlu (1987) known as "Mehmet Izzet", that of Recep Ertürk (1989) known as "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Bir Le Playci: Tahsin Demiray", and that of Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu (1951) known as "Profesör Mehmet Izzet'i Anarken". It is possible to extend this list; however, as Sezer (cited in Ertürk, 2004:1) demonstrates, studies which focus on particular names may cause the totality of the history of Turkish sociology to be overlooked. The studies examining the history of Turkish sociology by dividing it into different periods are the most common ones. There are numerous articles and books using that technique, such as Kaçmazoğlu (1999), Kıray (1986), Kayalı (2003), and İlyasoğlu (1985). For instance, Kaçmazoğlu (1999) divides the process into five: the pre-establishment period of the Turkish Republic to the 1940s, the 1940s to the 1950s, the 1950s to the 1960s, the 1960s, and post-1980s. The main focus of this work is sociology in Turkish universities. Secondly, Kıray (1986) places more emphasis on the period between 1965 and 1985 with respect to the institutionalization of sociology not only in universities such as Ege University, Middle East Technical University, and Boğaziçi University but also in some public institutions such as DPT (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı – State Planning Organisation). Kayalı (2003), on the other hand, examines social sciences,

particularly sociology and history, during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1960s. Finally, İlyasoğlu (1985) examines the pre-Republic period, the 1933 university reform and the 1940s, 1950s to the 1960s, and the 1960s.

However, Ertürk (2004:6-7) questions whether or not these chronological classifications are reliable. Because of the lack of studies examining the historical development of sociology and which consist of all social, political and economic changes in Turkey and their effects on sociology, this study suffices with the summary of Turkish sociology in a chronological order. There is a mismatch between the terms but, as mentioned before, this is an inevitable result of the lack of comprehensive studies on sociology in Turkey.

Wallerstein (1999:1-2) divides and bounds knowledge in three ways: intellectually as disciplines; organisationally as corporate structures; and culturally as communities of scholars sharing certain elementary premises. A discipline defines not only what to think about and how to think about it, but also what is outside its purview. Knowledge emerges as corporate structures in the form of university departments, programs of instruction, degrees, scholarly journals, national and international associations, and even library classifications. The institutionalization of a discipline is the way of preserving and reproducing practice. Today these boundaries are blurred and, as a result of this, there are claims asserting that sociology is no more an intellectual discipline; in fact, it is a strong organisation. Another classification is made by Ecevit (2003), who examines sociology as an intellectual, scientific, and academic activity.

It is clear that the history of institutionalization of sociology as an academic discipline in Turkish universities is not independent from the development of sociology in the country. Therefore, in this study, sociology in Turkish universities is also examined in a chronological perspective. Ecevit's classification (2003) is taken

into consideration. In this study, Turkish sociology is limited as a scientific study in the university.

According to Berkes (1943; 1985:167-168), sociology was accepted as a science both in France and in Turkey at the end of the nineteenth century. The explicit effect of France in Turkish intellectual life may be due to the historical relations between France and the Ottoman Empire, which started with the capitulations. The social sciences, particularly sociology, have developed in Turkey largely in response to the questions arising in connection with the crises in social and political life.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Turkish sociologists thought that it was possible with the help of sociology to create a modern society in which all spheres such as religion, policy, morals and art were transformed according to science (Yıldırım, 2002:148). In other words, the main reason for the importance of sociology in Turkey during the early times is the simultaneous existence of sociology and the need for a new national identity (Coşkun, 1991:13; Sezer, 1991:7; Tüfekçioğlu, 1991:141). The general tendency of Turkish thought in solving its own problems by the help of the state is similar to the French sociology's totalitarian approach to society; and according to Sezer (1991:10-11) this is why sociology has been accepted in Turkey.

Berkes (1943;1985:167-168) and Ülken (1956:13) claim that, similar to France, there were two explicit sociological approaches in Turkish sociological thought at the beginning of the twentieth century: Durkheim's sociology and Le Play's sociology. Another important similarity between French and Turkish intellectual life during that era was the importance of Durkheimian thought due to these two societies' political interests. According to Ilyasoğlu (1985:2164) sociology emerged and developed in France during a crisis. In other words, French sociology and especially Durkheim emerged as an answer to the chaotic environment in the society. It had the function of reorganizing the society. Because of that function, sociology was easily accepted

5

by the politicians in France. However, İlyasoğlu (1985:2164-2165) adds that in Turkey, the problem was not an issue of reorganisation. In fact, after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, it was a question of establishing a new nation-state. As Ilyasoğlu (1985:2165) indicates, because of the reasons explained by her, sociology in Turkey has been integrated since its emergence in Turkey as it was the official ideology of *İttihat ve Terakki* and then the Kemalist Regime.

The two important names in Turkish sociological intellectual life were Ziya Gökalp and Prince Sabahattin. The former is accepted as the representative of Comte and Durkheim and the latter of Le Play.

Ziya Gökalp was the most effective name in Turkish sociology since he was not a mere translator or interpreter of French, especially Comte's and Durkheim's, sociology. Arı (1986:175) asserts that, because of his political interests, Gökalp was at the center of Turkish political life. Ziya Gökalp took his side on civilian-military bureaucracy which the political and social reforms could make real. At the same time, he supported the professional organisations -corporations- to establish solidarity in the society during periods of chaos. He found the scientific base of his thoughts in sociology, and according to him, Durkheim's sociology was the most appropriate for his thoughts. Because of his tendency to civilian-military bureaucracy, instead of taking into consideration the social classes, he was acting as a politician and a sociologist. Another factor that established Gökalp's importance was the similarity of his sociological approach to the Turkish Republic's ideological base. He accepted Durkheim's methodology and used all his terminology. By adaptation and additions to certain points, he made his system almost a native product (Berkes, 1936:242).

The subsequent development of sociology as an academic discipline owes much to Gökalp's personal and professional influence. Coşkun (1991:14) says that, between 1910 and 1911, Gökalp gave sociology lectures in the School of İttihat ve Terakki.

6

The first sociology lecture in the university was given by Emrullah Efendi in 1912 in Istanbul Darülfünun; but Gökalp established the sociology department in Istanbul Darülfünun in 1914. Gökalp's sociological thought had found great support, particularly at the beginning of the Turkish Republic and this continued until the 1940s in both Turkish intellectual life and education system (Ergun, 1985:2160). Durakbaşa (2001:100) asserts that, with the help of the organist view in sociology, Turkish nationalism constructed a society in which there was no class or class conflict. Sociology was one of the basic sources of Turkish modernization and it played an important role during the construction of the nation-state.

İlyasoğlu (1985: 2168) states that Prince Sabahattin was the thinker who asserted that the main problem of Turkey was not a question of administration but that of a structural problem. The compulsory condition to achieve success in the revolution was the transformation from a traditional community to a modern society. It was the conviction that the West owed its success in progress to the particularistic values of individualism, private property, and decentralized form of administration. Therefore, he saw the salvation of the Empire in a complete transformation to a modern particularistic society (İlyasoğlu, 1985:2168; Ertürk, 1990:39). Sencer (cited in İlyasoğlu, 1985:2167) asserts that the main reasons behind Prince Sabahattin's ignorance were the underdevelopment of scientific thought in Turkey and the revolutionary character of his opinions. According to him, Gökalp's approach supported and tried to develop traditions in the Turkish society whereas Prince Sabahattin had a sociological approach which aimed to make radical changes in the society.

The other clue that shows the relationship between political structure and sociology in Turkey is the changing agenda of Turkish sociology according to the agenda of the countries with which the Turkish Republic has political, economic, and military relations. Among the examples of that relationship are the effects of German sociologists during the 1930s and those of American sociologists after World War II.

7

As indicated, the development of sociology in Turkey cannot be separated from the process of its institutionalization in Turkish universities (Coşkun, 1991:14). The institutionalization of sociology as an academic discipline in Turkish universities started in 1914. The establishment of the department of sociology in Istanbul Darülfunun corresponds to that date. After the establishment of the Republican regime in 1923, sociology gained wider attention as an academic discipline. The sociology courses in the University of Istanbul followed the French school of sociology until the 1940s.

Between the years of 1933 and 1936, the increasing number of studies related to the dialectic view brought a new dimension to the Turkish sociological thought but this tendency did not find the opportunity to be practiced in a large scale (Ergun, 1985: 2162). The "University Reform" in 1933 and the acceptance of German academicians exiled by the German National Socialist Government to Turkish universities, especially to Istanbul University, affected the structure of the Turkish university. Interpretative sociological approach entered Turkish universities by the help of these German academicians and despite this development, the positivist sociological approach still found support in that university (Ergun, 1985:2161; İlyasoğlu, 1985:2171).

Berkes (1936:246) summarizes the characteristics of Turkish sociology until the 1940s:

> It had been under the influence of political movements for a long time. This made each school rather short-lived, caused them to change very rapidly in line with the changes in politics, and prevented them from producing fruitful studies. The French school of sociology became more influential in shaping the scientific outlook of Turkish sociologists; its chief concern after the World War became endless methodological discussions, and for that reason it did not contribute to scientific research while rather more interesting studies have been done in other social sciences, such as anthropology, history, economics, and folklore, with which we are not here concerned. The lack of financial support is

one of the factors which prevent the development of a research program, the carrying-out of a plan of translations of foreign literature, the publication of journals, and the continuation of sociological associations.

Social scientists of the 1940s, particularly Niyazi Berkes and Behice Boran – both educated in the United States – adopted the conflict approach and they added a historical dimension to their sociological studies (Mardin cited in İlyasoğlu, 1985:2172).   According to Kasapoğlu (1999:4-5), Behice Boran conducted an empirical research study entitled "Research on Social Structure: Comparisons of Two Villages" (1945) in the villages of Manisa and she stipulated her views and thoughts about the resolution of daily social problems in the journals called "Yurt ve Dünya" (Mother Land and World) and "Adımlar" (Steps). On the other hand, Niyazi Berkes, another important figure in Turkish sociology, conducted a field research in the villages of Ankara and proposed policies for the development of villages. Later on, asserted views and thoughts gave direction to the political life of Turkey. In addition, he related daily events occuring in the world to the actual reality of Turkey together with Boran in "Yurt ve Dünya". An important point which should be taken into consideration here is that academicians have not restricted themselves only by academic study, but they have also managed to issue journals related to world problems which may be understood by larger masses.

Kaçmazoğlu states that (1999: 46-76) the other sociology school in the 1940s was Istanbul University. Different to the studies done in Ankara University, the Istanbul School dealt with sociology in a more conventional and philosophical way. During the 1940s, Istanbul University continued to follow Ziya Gökalp's Comte and Durkheim sociology. The subjects investigated by the sociologists in Istanbul University were the history of Turkish thought, sociology of law, philosophy of Islam, sociology of religion, economy, sociology of family, labor union, and racism but these studies remained on a philosophical level and did not connect to the society's interests. In other words, no connection could be drawn between theoretical and empirical knowledge and the Istanbul School placed more emphasis on

theoretical knowledge. This may be considered the first difference between the two schools. Another difference lies in the conceptualization of science. According to Ankara school, science had to be used for the society's interests, while the sociologists in Istanbul University insisted on a more philosophical conceptualization of science. The activity and effectiveness in sociology during the 1940s came to a halt with the expulsion of academicians from the sociology department of Ankara University in 1948.

According to Timur (2000:249), the University Reform of 1946 forced the rector of Ankara University to resign and several academicians, including some from the sociology department, were expelled. As a continuation of that attempt, in 1950 and 1951, several changes were made in the Turkish Criminal Code. These changes forbade any idea supporting the left wing in the university. As a result of this, academicians in sociology departments whether changed their political standing – as in the case of Hilmi Ziya Ülken – or started to study subjects of secondary importance to them (Kaçmazoğlu, 1999:116).

When the Faculty of Letters in Ankara was founded, there were three sociological associations and a sociology department in the University of Istanbul. (Çelebi, 2004:21). The fourth association of sociology – Türk Sosyoloji Cemiyeti – was established in 1949 and closed in 1950 after the organisation of a national congress (Ülken, 1956:28). Such organisations and congresses are crucial to providing communication between sociologists and academicians. According to Ülken (1956:22), Turkish sociology was under the dominance of politics before the establishment of such associations and the attempts to bring together sociologists decreased the intensity of that dominance.

Between 1950 and 1960, Turkish sociology was in stagnation. The conflict between the governing Democratic Party and academic and non- academic sociologists was the underlying reason behind this situation. According to Timur (2000:154), after

World War II, the USA became the dominant country in the world. The close relations between the USA and Turkey were reflected in social science, especially in sociology, in Turkey. One of the signs of that relationship was the acceptance of the School of Science Sociale during the 1950s and Prince Sabahattin was the most influential name during that era (İlyasoğlu, 1985: 2172-2173; Kaçmazoğlu, 1999:153). As Timur (2000:239-240) mentions, since the 1980s, the USA has been the most dominant country in the world because of its political, economic and military power. As in many other countries, the USA used science to legitimize its power both at the national and international level. The effect of USA at political, economic and intellectual levels is felt more intensively today than it has ever been.

Despite that stagnation in 1950, Hilmi Ziya Ülken of Istanbul University attended the 1st International Sociology Association Congress in Zurich and was selected a member. In 1952, the 15th International Sociology Congress was organized in Istanbul University (Ülken, 1956: 28-35). This was another sign of the awareness of sociologists about the importance of getting together.

İlyasoğlu (1985:2173-2174) claims that in the mid-1960s, there were studies which focused on social change. The dimensions and directions of social change were examined in these studies. Mübeccel Kıray, Şerif Mardin and İbrahim Yasa were three of the sociologists who concerned themselves with these topics. The studies done in that era can be considered the followers of the studies done in the 1940s. In early 1970s, because of the political intervention in 12 March 1971, some academicians were either taken away from the universities or forced to leave. However, contrary to the case in 1947 in Ankara University, these academicians turned back to their universities after several years.

During the 1970s, the Turkish Social Science Association was founded in an attempt to provide an environment for communication and scientific debates among social scientists in Turkey. Another development experienced in the same era was the

establishment of new sociology departments in Ege University, Middle East Technical University, Boğaziçi University, and Hacettepe University. According to Kıray (1986:191), the main reason behind this development was the demand of social science experts, and especially sociologists, in both the public and private sectors. The main qualification for experts to be hired was the ability to use scientific research methods and techniques which were developed especially in the USA.

Öncü (1997:268) claims that until the 1970s, academic sociology in Turkey remained firmly grounded in the rural/urban opposition. The former represented tradition while the latter set up the standards of cultural modernity. Social change was conceived and studied as the flow from one to the other, i.e., migration. From the accumulation of village studies in the 1940s, as part of the Republic's civilizing mission to the large scale planning-oriented rural surveys of the 1960s, the homogeneous totality of the nation remained divided between rural and urban areas. This relentless homogenization of the rural was broken in the 1970s during the heated debates on agrarian class structures and capitalist transitions.

Ergun (1985:2163) claims that, the main difference of the 1970s was the debate related to methods used in sociological studies in Turkey. Concepts such as method and research technique were always used interchangibly and Ergun argues that the underlying reason for that was ignorance about the difference between these concepts. These debates in social sciences have continued to date and this is a positive development for sociology in Turkey.

Ertürk (1990:42) argues that the military coup of 1980 and the establishment of YÖK (Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu – Higher Education Counsel) in 1981 had a negative effect on the academia, and especially on the social sciences. The manipulation of universities by a higher central committee, the standardization of curricula in higher education institutions, and the performance criteria used to evaluate academicians are

some of the implementations of YÖK which have an adverse effect on the development of academic sociology in Turkey.

An event that occurred in 1984 is an good example of the relations between sociology and political interests. Durakbaşa (2001:91) evaluates this event as such:

> In 1984, a very interesting statement reflecting the ideas of Prince Sabahattin appeared in newspapers. It was given by Turgut Özal, a political leader who gave great importance to and placed emphasis on this certain period. He brought forth ideas and thoughts of Prince Sabahattin who supports individual and economic venture to fore front against the public domain, religious community of the Ottoman order by weakening the agricultural structure and relations, and modernizing them with the emphasize on individual education and training.

In addition to these aspects, Özal made his position more powerful by basing his own position on history and sociological thought (Durakbaşa, 2001:91-92).

During the 1980s, parallel to the sociological agenda in the world, there were discussions focusing on the indigenization/internationalization among the Turkish sociologists (Akşit; 1998:9). Sezer (cited in Akşit, 1998:9), maintains that sociology should be made localized in order to convey the sociological reality of Turkey and that sociology in the country has been under the strong influence of European and American sociologies with respect to theory, method and topics. By the same token, Sezer (cited in Erol, 2004:2) writes that "There is no doubt that Turkish sociology will attain its own personality with its own specific characteristics. In the meantime, it is assumed by the Turkish sociology. When we become aware of our own characteristics as a community and attempt to solve our own problems, Turkish sociology will start to build up its own personality accordingly". This trend started by Sezer in Istanbul University has continued to date (Coşkun 1991:22). With respect to this subject-matter, Ertürk (cited in Akşit, 1998:9) states that such localization attempts go together with excessive relativity and such situations put sociology at risk as science in countries outside Western countries. Ertürk, who has emphasized the relationship of sociology with political structure, also asserted that these

localization attempts have caused restraining and unjust social and political structure and implementations to become legitimate and legal in countries outside the West. On the other hand, Akşit (1998:9) pointed to the risks and dangers of these two thoughts and views, and claimed that further progress will be made in the field of sociology in Turkey when communication is reestablished simultaneously with the world through localization attempts which do not lead to excessive relativity.

Öncü (1997:268) claims that the chaotic political events during the 1990s – namely political Islam and Kurdish nationalism – have revealed the extent to which sociology lagged behind the intellectual and political agenda in Turkey. Throughout much of the 1980s, conventional social scientific analysis centered on the political economy of Turkey's opening to the world market, researching the distributive impact of structural adjustment policies, and discussing the implication of liberalization for mass politics and political parties.

Öncü (1994:234) asserts that it is not possible to understand the role of sociology in Turkey in the 1990s without evaluating the developments in sociology in the world. Worldwide hierarchy and division of labor in knowledge production lead to the emergence of a division between the center and periphery. This means that societies in the center produce knowledge and the ones in the periphery gather data appropriate to that knowledge, theory, and subject of the research.

In the mid-1990s, when religion and ethnicity gained immediate political significance in Turkey, current sociology dissertations written in the country deconstructed the grand narratives of Turkish nationalism, reconfiguring the past to understand the complexity of cultural and ethnic identities in the present (Öncü, 1997:270). Akşit (1998:10-16) states there were 15 subfields in the Turkish sociology-theory and methodology which can be listed as the history of sociology; socio-economic structural change, modernization, development and underdevelopment; religion, ideology, cultural structures, identity; rural sociology;

sociology of small towns and urban areas; family and women's studies, political sociology, class, social mobility; sociology of industry and economic structure; sociology of organisation and bureaucracy; deviance and criminology; sociology of mass communication; demography and sociology of health and illness; and the Middle East and other Islam countries. This itself was a very important indicator of the improvements in the terms of "differentiation" and "proliferation" of the studies.

Kasapoğlu (2004b:7) asserts that one of the attempts made to assure togetherness and communication among sociologists is establishing a sociology association and therefore the Sociological Association, the only organisation for Turkish sociologists, was founded in 1990 by a group of sociologists in Turkey. After its foundation, the Association held a national congress once every three years (1993-1996-2000) and each congress focused on different topics centering around the prevailing problems of Turkish society, such as "Contemporary Developments in Turkey and the World" (1993), "Migration and Society" (1996), and "Conflict, Integration and Differentiation in Turkey and the World" (2000). The congress was effective in decreasing "compartmentalization" (Akşit, 1986) among sociologists who were not aware of others' studies.

According to Gökçe (1992:3-4) the participation of more than 200 sociologists from 13 sociology departments in Turkey in the "52nd Convention of Sociology" held in 1992 in Ankara University, Faculty of Letters, History and Geography, was an evidence of the need for professional organisations. According to her, cooperation and support of colleagues is an indispensable condition. In the same convention, Kasapoğlu (1992a:5) expressed that it is an important duty for social scientists, especially for sociologists, to examine the social reality as a reason and ground of foundation for the Sociology Association. In the present day Turkey, where social relations have not been institutionalized and are being performed in an uncertain and irregular manner, there is a need to develop some common attitude and behavior models and to assure institutionalization at every level. The major reasons causing

sociologists to gather under the roof of the Sociology Association were the rapid changes occurring throughout the communities of the world and the serious need for institutionalization.

Related to today's Turkish sociologists' orientations, Öncü's (1997: 270) views can be useful: "A small number of Turkish sociologists, mostly novice ones have moved all the way into the terrain of textuality, discourse and deconstruction. The majority of sociologists continue as before, concerned with lived events but impatient with intellectual debates that lend them to meaning and shape. There is the rest of us, those who have discovered our dis-modernity in the era of postmodernism and curious to see where it goes".

With the demand for education and training increasing gradually, the number of universities in Turkey has increased along with the number of sociology departments. In 2004, there are 29 sociology departments in Turkish universities, two of which are private institutions. In addition to them, there are nine sociology departments which have second education program (education in the evening), the fees of which are higher than regular education programs in Turkish universities. Also there are two sociology departments at the universities in Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan. The existence of these two universities in the YÖK program may be due to the "State's close relations with the Turkic states after the collapse of the Soviet regime" (Tuna, 2002:164-172).

The development of sociology in Turkey has happened with the attempts and efforts to assure the legitimacy of political structure. While sociology fulfills this duty, the degree of this legitimacy attempts and efforts have increased furthermore by becoming institutionalized within universities. During these attempts and efforts, sociology has not always complied with the political structure and sociologists have brought forth their opposing attitudes and manners openly in different forms. However, the political structure is mostly more dominating in this relationship and in the present time this conflict still continues.

1.1. Problem

The main problem of this study is the insufficient development of sociology in Turkey. In this study, sociology is limited as a scientific study in the university. Related to that problem, it is noted that there are five factors that affect sociology in Turkey. The first one is the generally dependent nature of science, particularly of sociology, on the political government; the second one is the general dependence of university as an institution on political power, the third one is the problems related to the discipline of sociology itself, and the fourth one is the political and social characteristics of Turkey, its place in the world and its effect on university, and the last one is the institutional and personal relations in universities, which are generally of a conflicting nature. These relations can be studied under four headings: the relations between university administrations and faculties as well as departments, relations between university administrations and academicians, interfaculty and interdepartmental relations and lastly, relations between academicians in both the same and different sociology departments. In this section of the thesis, it is necessary to give information about these effects in order to fully clarify the subject.

The term sociology was coined by the French philosopher Auguste Comte in 1838. Sociology simply means the study of society, but modern society. Cuff and Payne (1989:9) describe sociology as an approach to understand the world. It can be differentiated from other approaches in that it attempts to be scientific. It is a kind of social science but it is distinguished from others by its assumptions, concepts, questions, methods, and answers.

The Enlightenment was an intellectual movement engaged in the invention and reproduction of modern thinking about "man", "society", and "nature". It was confined to Europe/North America in the eighteenth century. The Enlightenment was the creation of a new way of thinking about the world. This new way of thinking had the following characteristics: the individual man – not God – is the starting point for

17

all knowledge and action; science is the key to expanding all human knowledge and experience and experiment; the primacy of the reason and rationality as ways of organizing knowledge; all knowledge is based on empirical facts as opposed to metaphysic; the condition of human society can be improved by the application of science and the reason. They can be applied to any situation – universalism, an opposition to traditional constraints on beliefs, trade, communication, social interaction, sexuality, and ownership of property.

The thinkers of the Enlightenment attempted to understand the transition from a traditional social order and a traditional set of beliefs dominated by the Christian churches to new ways of thinking about the world which were distinctively modern. In other words, they moved from traditional order dominated by scripturally based beliefs about the universe, the earth, and human society to new forms of knowledge based on experience, experiment, and reason.

Is Sociology a Science

Giddens (1994:20) defines science as using systematic methods of investigation, theoretical thinking, and the logical assessment of arguments to develop a body of knowledge about a particular subject-matter. One of the main characters of scientific study is that information and insights accumulated through scientific study and debate are always tentative to some degree, open to being revised, or even completely discarded in the light of new evidence or argument (Giddens, 1994:20).

Related to the question whether sociology is a science, there are two basic debates. Some authories such as Comte and Durkheim assert that sociology is a social science which can use naturalistic perspective and its scientific method to examine the social world. This approach is called as "positivism". Others such as Weber assert that the object of social science is not similar to the natural science's object. Humans are self-aware beings who confer sense and purpose on what they do, and it is not possible to

describe social life accurately unless scientists first grasp the meaning in which people apply to their behavior.

The main reason behind the support and widespread acceptance of positivism is the claim of objectivity (Husserl, 1996:227). The claim of objectivity of sociology depends on both the researcher's personal efforts and the social community's critics. It is asserted (Giddens, 1994:21) that specific research has to do with observation and argument. Here, the public character of the discipline is of major importance.

There is an opposite argument to Giddens (1994:20)'s assertion. Elias (1956; 1978:61-66) talks about the problems of the scientist related to objectivity. According to him, scientists are, like other people, affected by their personal wishes and wants; they are often enough influenced by specific needs of the community to which they belong. They may hope that the results of their inquiries will be in line with theories they have enunciated before or with the requirements and ideals of groups with which they identify themselves.

Similar to Elias (1956; 1978:61-66), Smelser (1992:43) talks about the forces that shape the development of scientific inquiry. He classifies these factors into two: internal and external factors. By the former, he refers to the power of unsolved paradigmatic puzzles and implications of scientific thought. By the latter, he refers to those factors that are subsumed under the heading of the sociology of knowledge; these include the influences found in the larger cultural and linguistic contexts within which scientists work, the influences imparted by the social origins and positions of scientists, the hostility or receptivity of the political environment, and the organisational settings (e.g. university, research academy, industry, government) in which scientific work is performed.

According to Smelser (1992:44), the presence of external influences on the behavioral and social sciences is nearly self-evident. The reason for this is that these

sciences deal with the very subject matter from which many of those external influences arise, namely, politics, economy, social institutions, and culture. They are more likely to be responsive to changes in this subject matter. It can be speculated that sociology itself takes pride in being the most likely field to be influenced by these external forces.

Giddens (1994:23) claims that the most important practical significance of sociology is that it can provide self-enlightenment to groups in a society. The more people know about the condition of their own actions and about the overall functioning of their society, the more they are likely to be able to influence the circumstances of their lives. This is similar to Mills' (1959; 1978) "sociological imagination" concept. The two basic elements of the society, the powerful policy-makers and the less powerful public, both benefit from sociology as a science. Less powerful groups, enlightened by sociology, can respond to the policy-makers and protect their interests against them. Powerful groups, on the other hand, use sociology as a tool to make policies mostly appropriate to their own interests.

Today there are some critics to Giddens' (1994:23) claim. Franklin (1998:5), for instance, asserts that, modern science loses its traditional role as an expert advisor. Today there is doubt about the information provided by scientists. Franklin (1998:5) claims that politicians and expert scientists ignore the dynamic and keep up the facade. Scientific information loses its certainty and becomes increasingly ambiguous. This means that there is a strong impulse to turn to what it is seen as more certain forms of knowledge and understanding. Religion, morality, and the politics of authority offer one way back to a world that can be trusted and in which people feel safe.

Franklin's (1998:5) argument is true but in this study it is assumed that there is still trust in science in both political and social dimensions in developing countries. It is also assumed that the reproduction of science in a society can be made possible by

20

education. In other words, education plays a significant role in the enlightenment of both individuals and power elites. It is also assumed that universities as the institutionalization of knowledge have great importance in reproducing it.

The Development of Universities

Universities are institutions where scientific knowledge is produced. Besides this, these institutions have important functions for assuring the legitimacy of political authority. In the sense of showing these relations, it is necessary to indicate reformed experiences by universities both from the viewpoints of structure and function.

The modern university is the product of the Enlightenment. It is the most explicit institution of modernity. Its main role is to construct and produce the organisation of capitalist production. Because of this relation between universities and modernity, the criticisms directed at the latter affect the former indirectly. Before examining these critics, it would be helpful to summarise the general transformations in the structure and functions of universities in the western world. This brief examination does not reveal much information about the specific events in the societies and their interactions with universities.

Universities are one of the most important institutions in a society. Because of that, it is not possible to leave them outside the changes in the society. In the article named "The Idea of the University in the Global Era: From Knowledge as an End of the End of Knowledge" Delanty (1997:7-17) gives information about the changes in both the structure and functions of universities. According to him, in the medieval times, the university was a place of universal knowledge; it was tied to the universal ideology of Christendom and it was an appendage to the monasteries. With the rise of the territorial nation-state and the shift of universal ideology to modern experimental science and rationalizing logic from the seventeenth century onwards, the university became increasingly more nationalized and gradually lost its transnational character, and knowledge became a free-floating discourse to be used for domination and

emancipation. In the seventeenth century, the university was accepted as an important institution in the administration of the society. The Enlightenment model of the university was very different from the university in the Middle Ages. The difference was the shift from the city to the nation. At the end of the eighteenth century, the university functioned as the regulator of social-economic and social-political balance. In the nineteenth century, the development of industrial capitalism affected the location and function of the university in the society. In the twentieth century, there were two types of universities: the Anglo-American civic tradition and the continental state-centered model. The American tradition in which research and teaching were separated believed it had a public commitment to the society, not to the state. In that era, the elitist structure of the university turned into the mass public's education.

In the twentieth century, especially in the second half, there were significant transformations in universities. This is important because with these transformations, the role and function of social sciences experienced a great transformation. According to a report prepared by the Gulbenkian Commission (1995;1998:37) there have been three significant developments affecting the structure of social sciences. The first one was the changes in the political life of the world; namely, the polarization of the world on the basis of two countries' – the USA and the USSR's – political ideologies and the increasing effect of the USA on the world's political and intellectual life. The second factor, on the other hand, was the increasing population in the world and, consequently, the reorganisation of all human activities. The third factor was a result of the second factor. Because of the increase in the density of the population, there was an increase in the number of educational institutions. This is important to show the relationship between the ideology of the state, and more generally the capitalist system, and universities and social sciences.

Timur (2000:239-243) divides the era after 1945 in two sections: the first one is the period from 1945 to the 1980s, and the second term comprises the period after the

22

1980s until today. In the first period, there was the superiority of the USA in the world because of its economic and military power. To show the relation between the state's ideology and university, Timur (2000:239-240) talks about the collaboration between them. According to him, the universities in the USA worked as the provider and protector of the state's superiority by inventing war technology. This collaboration damaged the academicians' independence. It must be noted though that the relation between the state and the political government did not occur at the military level. At the political level, class analysis which was the basic approach during the crisis in the 1930s lost its effectiveness in the universities after 1945. The consensus theory was the base of intellectual debates in the universities. According to Timur (2000:253-266), after the 1950s, there have been some opposite claims in the universities both in the USA and European universities. During the 1960s, universities were the centers of societal conflict. During that period, the debates about the universities' legitimacy and independence were harder than ever. There were opposite claims in the debate of universities. In the USA, Kerr (cited in Timur, 2000:259) asserted a new concept known as "multiversite". According to him, universities lost their emphasis on the unity of aim and spirit. In fact they became organisations, each part of which had different functions. In addition to that argument, he asserts that the system of universities cannot be thought apart from the performance of the societies in which they are located. Related to the critics of universities, in France, there were some questions on what the university was and what its functions were. Gustorf (cited in Timur, 2000:261) goes against the approach which asserts a type of university under the control of technological, political, and technocratic interests and political parties. Another French authority, A. Tourine (cited in Timur, 2000:262-263), criticizes Kerr's university conceptualization. He asserts that such an approach makes the university a place in which there are conflicts among different interests; outer power relations and, as result, a combination of dominant ideology or ideologies and the university.

23

Ergur (2003:197) claims that liberal ideology shows its effect on the universities in four ways: globalisation, managerialism, academic capitalism, and entrepreneurialism. Becher and Trowler (2001:2) describe globalisation as a state in which information and resources flow on the global levels. Becher and Trowler also talk about another type of globalisation called social globalisation. Here, they assert that because of the development of communication technologies such as the Internet, there is a social network on the global level. It must be remembered that all types of globalisation – economic, political and social – cannot be separated from each other. Because of that reason, globalisation must be examined as a whole. Here it must be noted that such an attempt leads to ignoring some specific events. Because of that, this study does not go into a detailed examination of globalisation.

Globalisation also has effects on the university's structure and functions. Slaughter and Leslie (cited in Becher and Trowler, 2001:2) identify four consequences of globalisation in universities: "financial constraint by the sate on discretionary activities such as higher education, necessitated by fierce international competition; the growing centrality to higher education of techno science associated with international markets; tightening relationship between governments and multinationals related to product development and innovation; increased focus on global intellectual property strategies within multinationals and established industrial countries, representing a new environment for university research".

As mentioned before, after the second half of the twentieth century, the USA had power on the world's economic, political and intellectual lives, and its effect became more prominent with the emergence of the term globalisation. Because of this situation, to draw a general picture of the changes in the structure and functions of the universities, it is necessary to examine the general changes in the universities in the USA.

Becher and Trowler (2001:3) assert that by the beginning of the global era, "there is more rapid technology transfer, increased movement of products and processes from the university to the market, a blurring of the boundaries between public and private sectors of the higher education and a greater emphasis on applied science in universities" in the USA, as in most European countries. Besides these developments, higher education became more vocationally oriented. Another development is related to the expansion of higher education. This situation leads to an opportunity for lower social status groups to receive university education. Therefore, there is a change in the demographic characteristics of the students in the university. The increase in the number of the students entering the university, in other words the expansion of higher education towards mass system and beyond, has demanded a growing proportion of public expenditure. This leads to the emergence of other sources such as a market. As a result of this development, there is a change in the structure and content of the knowledge produced in universities. Gibbsons *et al* (cited in Becher and Trowler, 2001:7) argue that private industry has gained the advantage over universities in technological development and exploitation. According to them, this is because of the new type of transdisciplinary and problem-oriented knowledge. Gibbons and his collaborators (cited in Becher and Trowler, 2001:7) summarize the characteristics of knowledge as follows: "Knowledge is produced in the context of the application, transdisciplinary is the norm; heterogeneity and organisational diversity are common; there is enhanced social accountability; there is more broadly based system of quality". Therefore it can be stated that there has been a discernable movement towards "academic capitalism" in the world (Slaughter and Leslie cited in Becher and Trowler, 2001:9), in which market-like behaviors become common at both institutional and the academic staff levels. Universities are thus becoming more entrepreneurial and less reliant on the state grants (Becher and Trowler, 2001:9).

These changes affect both the students' and academicians' portraits. Becher and Trowler (2001:5) assert that the increase in the number of the students accessing

university leads to the lower general intellectual level of the universities. Because of that, there is a need for a regulation of curricula according to the intellectual levels of the students. Students are accepted as customers and both institutional and academic staff level universities function as businessmen in companies. Tekeli (2003:134) claims that the factor that increases the quality of an academic is related to his or her ability to provide source and project to a university. The quality of an academic as a scientist thus loses its importance. The era which is called globalisation can take different names according to the theoretical point of view. The changing functions and structure of universities in the global era are summarized by Tekeli (2003:124-127). He talks about four different scripts. However, it must be kept in mind that this classification is an "ideal" university and its function in today's society. In reality, it is possible to see all these characteristics together:

- Transformation from an industrial society to information society: In this process, the university gives up the mission of knowledge production for knowledge itself. Universities tend to produce knowledge for markets thus becoming commercial merchandise.

- Transformation from Fordist accumulation to flexible accumulation: This change experienced in the production field has increased the importance of capital for people. And this situation requires the training and education of many more number of students in universities. A change from elite education towards mass education has been experienced. However, here, it is not only an increase from the point of view of quantity, at the same time content is being changed, in accordance with the changing requirements of the community. Training and education change into a form of an activity which continues throughout a lifetime from feature of an activity conducted at certain, specific time-periods.

- Transformation from nation-state to global world: Upon changing of the Nation State concept, the state moved away from social re-production fields, and the role of providing these services has changed to regulate

26

and supervise these services. On the other hand, as the effect and influence of that condition to university, there has been a decrease in resources allocated to these institutions. In this case, other resource providers have entered the cycle. Therefore universities have entered the market.

- Transformation from modernity to post modernity: In respect with this subject, the concept of modern science is being criticized. During the modernity period, scientific knowledge used to be seen as a means with a rational foundation. But this viewpoint is in conflict with democracy. For this reason, the relationship between democracy and knowledge must be established in communication rational foundation. This falls on university as a duty and the monopoly of the state on knowledge must stop.

The university has important functions in the usually ideological nature of sociology and the re-production of this characteristic. Besides, problems arisen within sociology itself as a discipline also effect the development of this discipline in an adverse manner.

Is Sociology in a Crisis

Sociology being a product of modern thought, especially after the 1960s, has become a target for objections coming from different sections of the community. Wallerstein (1999:11-19) has collected these challenges under six headings.

The first objection came from Sigmund Freud. He claimed that irrational, strange and awkward appearing attitude and behavior can be explained by the study and examination of the subconscious, and a better understanding of such attitudes can thus be obtained. Therefore, he opposed the medical world and with this objection, he tried to express the reasons underlying these psychosis conditions that are accepted as irrational or neurotic attitudes and behaviors. In other words, Freud said

that rationality under attitudes and behaviors are accepted as irrational within communities. It can thus be said that Freud believed nothing was irrational. In addition, it can be concluded that there is no formed rationality.

The second objection against sociology culture is concerned with the topic of European centralism. Abdel-Melek, the defender of this objection, started from the concepts of "civilization" and "specificity" and claimed that the understanding of civilizations within historical periods passes through by taking into account geographic conditions in which these civilizations have existed. According to him, the time concept is different in Western and non-Western communities. The time concept in the West is functional. While there is an analytic time concept in the west, there is a non-analytic time approach in non-western communities. Time is a well-bred gentlemen in non-western communities.

The objection put forth by Fernand Braudel relates to a dual viewpoint of time, but concerns multiple realities of time and social construction. Braudel puts forth a claim about the multiple reality of time. The basic objection of Braudel is ideographic, histographic time concept being widespread within modern social science. The idea that time is constructed as a social factor was put forth by Braudel for the first time, and had not been dealt with by Durkheim, Weber and Marx, who are three important names in sociology culture.

The fourth objection has come from natural sciences and mathematics, particularly from Ilya Prigogine who has occupied the agenda with these complex and complicated studies. In accordance with Prigogino, irreversibility is the source of order which has played an important and basic role in the contraction of nature. Prigogine refuses the physicists' claims that chemistry as a natural science is incomplete because it is insufficiently deterministic. For him, integral systems are exceptions and most systems involve both deterministic processes (between bifurcations) and probabilistic processes (in the choice of branches). He also argues

that physical activities can be seen as a process of creativity and innovation. His efforts in reuniting social and natural sciences and criticism on determinism are very important for the evaluation of the present status of social sciences.

The fifth objection has come from feminism. Defenders of this objection have concentrated on the idea that science supports males. According to these defendants, women have not been taken into consideration from the viewpoint of final purposes of mankind. Women have been left outside as elements of social reality and apriory assumptions have been used about social sex differences without being based on real and factual researches. The viewpoint of women has not been defined and described.

The sixth objection has come from Bruno Latour. This objection is directed to modernity and Latour claims that as a matter of fact modernity never existed. Bruno Latour developed the hybrid concept and claims that reality is divided into three categories (nature, politics and explanation) and, at the same time, is objective as nature, narrative as explanation and collectivize as community. According to Latour, nature and community are not two separate poles.

Besides these challenges, there are arguments and discussions about the existence of problems arisen from the over-specialization in the discipline of sociology.

There are debates related to the existence of a crisis in sociology. On the one side, there are approaches such as those of Gibbs' (1990) and Genov's (2002), asserting that sociology faces difficult tasks at the turn of the century. On the other side, there are claims such as Smelser's (cited in Rutigliano, 2004:1-2) that there is no crisis in sociology today. According to Genov (2002:1-2), sociology needs a conceptual breakthrough in order to keep pace with accelerated social change. Global trends require new visions about social change and social order. Evolving patterns of regionalization and specific development paths of societies demand careful elaboration on relationships between local, regional, and global process. Deepening

social differences and efforts to re-integrate social structures foster comparative research. The growing complexity of networks involving individuals, groups, organisations and societies calls for interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary studies. Studies and teachings in the fields of the sociological theory have turned into a self-satisfactory enterprise, receiving its inspiration from the classics of the discipline and much less from the burning social problems surrounding society. Empirical studies, having only symbolic connection to sociological concepts or to the need of practical solutions, are abundant. The result of these trends is the rise of heterogeneous and diverging orientations in sociological theorizing and research and the deficit in the intellectual and institutional coherence of the discipline.

Smelser (cited in Rutigliano, 2004:1-2), similar to Genov (2002), asserts that there is a reluctance of sociologists to take on the great integrative thinking that will bring continuity and order to the great increase in specialized knowledge. That is the great need for the field of theoretical, integrating thinking. According to him, this is not a crisis in sociology. He also sees the subdivision and specialization within sociology as a positive development. According to Gibbs (1990:1-2), sociology experienced a period of fragmentation, for which there are two reasons: an indescribably diverse subject matter from the outset and, since 1960, a proliferation of sociological perspectives. According to him, the diversity discourages the pursuit of an inclusive theory and exacerabates sociology's incoherence, and he suggests the concept of "control" as central notion. There is a need for this centric notion otherwise sociology will fall apart into pieces. The functions of this notion are not only providing conceptual openness and unity, but also construction of empirical relations more quickly.

 Similar to this are the views of Gibbs (1990) and Habermas (1973:379) about the concept of "legitimation crisis". This concept is used to refer to the situation in which there is a gap between the supply of sociology and the expectations or demands of the society. In sociology, there are many subject matters and approaches. This is

interpreted as if sociology is fragmented. Because of this, it is asserted that sociology experiences a "legitimation crisis. In this sense, Gibbs' (1990) concept of "control" as a central notion can be evaluated as a tool to decrease the power of the crisis in sociology. However it must be comprehended that because of the social reality's endless variety and change, particular approaches are insufficient and as a result, diversification and differentiation in sociology is inevitable. In this sense, it can be accepted as a positive development for sociology. However, the differentiation in both subject-matter and approaches of sociology reached a level in which there are doubts about the quality of sociological studies. In that context, Gibbs's (1990) "control" conceptualization is important to save sociology from fragmentation (Kasapoğlu, 1992:217).

Smelser (cited in Rutigliano, 2004:1-2) questions the idea that sociology is in a crisis. He asserts that today sociology is better established in universities and other places than ever before; there is no decline in the numbers of sociologists; and the professional associations that represent sociology are as vital as they ever have been. He accepts that in the history of sociology, the field has continuously developed many more approaches over time, both macro and micro level, without discarding older ones very often. This may seem like disorganisation, but not as a crisis. He evaluates this situation as increasing richness of the field. He claims that the crisis is generated by a minority of scholars in the field who believe that the field does not have the political significance it should have or those scholars who still maintain that sociology should be an over-arching, unified science.

Because of the developing nature of the Turkish society, all kinds of political, social end economic developments in the world affects it. Thus, it is not possible to think about the development of sociology and universities in Turkey without taking into consideration the changes at the world level.

The Developing Nature of Turkey and Its Effects on Universities

As in the rest of the world, the state plays a determining role on universities in Turkey. However, it should be taken into consideration that there are some differences between the cases in the world and in Turkey. These differences mainly spring from Turkey's developing nature and being a country in the global era.

After the establishment of the Turkish Republic, most of the reforms were made in the political, economic and social spheres. No significant political regulations were undertaken concerning universities until 1933, when some reforms were made in Istanbul Darülfunun. In 1933, there were fundamental changes in the structure of Istanbul Darülfunun because Istanbul Darülfunun was unable to comply with the aims of the Republic. According to Timur (2000:233), with the 1933 University Reform Rule, the autonomous structure of that institution disappeared and 92 academicians were expelled from the university. It must be noted that the main criteria in that reform was the insufficiency of the university to defend the Republic. Finally in 1933, with a regulation related to the reforms in Istanbul Darülfünun, its autonomous structure was cancelled and it was accepted as an institution of the Ministry of National Education (Katoğlu, 1997:402).

A similar regulation was made in 1946 by which the autonomy of universities became legal. Even though the regulation had a democratic nature, in practice there were some interventions in the studies of some academicians in Ankara University. In 1947, some academicians in Ankara University Faculty of Letters were fired from the university. Some provisions of the Turkish Criminal Code in 1949 and 1951 forbade any leftist thought among the university academicians.

Academicians during the 1970s and 1980s were mostly accepted as the main provocateurs of political and social chaos in Turkey. As Ertürk (1990:51) asserts, universities were seen as the breeding ground for the internal unrest in the 1970s. As

a result, under the military auspices after 1982, universities became a target of reform. Social sciences were probably affected more by the changes in comparison to the more technical and seemingly less politically oriented fields of studies. By the establishment of YÖK, the autonomous structure of the universities was again cancelled. With the implementation of the law establishing YÖK, universities were tied to a higher organisation. Revisions were undertaken in the departments' curricula as to their forms and contents as well as in the evaluation criteria of academic performance.

In accordance with Ergur (2003:208) in time there has been a decrease in the pressure YÖK exercised on the universities. At the present time, this regime tries to establish a structure which addresses the requirements of the market and adopt the market principles in the universities. Timur (2000.354-355-356) has assessed this situation as a transition from the continental European university concept to the Anglo-Saxon system. However, he has stated that this transition is not over due to the existence of the tension between "State Control" and "Globalization".

In this study, it is asserted that, while science has been influenced by the university as an institution where science is produced, Turkish universities were also under the pressure of societal forces derived mostly from the population density as an internal dynamic and the political economical changes in the world as an external factor (Kasapoğlu, 2004c).

In this study, the meaning of sociology is discussed within the scientific activities and studies at the universities. That is why the problems faced by universities affect sociological studies. Besides this fact, it is accepted that the quality of the academic life, the sociology courses at universities and the students are the side factors for the development of sociology as a science in Turkey.

The study aims to determine the problems encountered by sociology as an academic discipline and the assessments of academicians related to this topic in Turkey.

1.2. Importance of the Study

It is commonly accepted that sociology has great importance in the history of the Westernization process of Turkey. The main reason for studying this subject stems from the importance of this fact. There are many studies about sociology and its history in Turkey. According to Öncü (1986: 233), many of them have used evolutionary perspectives. The results of these studies show that there is an improvement in the Turkish sociological thought. However, she claims that this is just one side of the coin and asks what the result would be if it is examined from the present to the future. In order to achieve a more developed, sophisticated, autonomous and unique Turkish sociology in the future; or in other words, if we don't want to discuss the same problems in the future (Tuna, 1991:36-37), we have to comprehend the present problems. Comprehending the problems of sociology in Turkey will help the efforts in solving or at least minimizing the negative effects of these problems.

1.3. Aim of the Study

This study, whose main research topic is the insufficient development of sociology in Turkey, aims to examine the problems of sociology as an academic discipline. Related to this general aim, there are sub-aims of this study which are stated in the question form as follows: "What are the main problems of sociology in Turkey according to the academicians?" and "Is there a consistency between their answers to the attitudinal questions in closed-ended forms?" and "their answers about the problems of sociology?"; "What are their ideas related to the reasons of these problems?" ; "What are their ideas about the solutions of these problems?" "How do academicians evaluate sociology in the world, in Turkey, and in their departments?"

"How do academicians evaluate themselves as scientists?"; "Is there a corrosion of character among sociologists?"; "Is there a conflict among academic sociologists, if so what are the reasons?"

1.4. Limitations of the study

The first limitation is that the present study is limited to 83 respondents. Additionally, the results that were obtained from the study cannot be generalized to all of the sociology departments in Turkey. Another limitation is the conceptualization of sociology; sociology in this study was accepted as a scientific study in the university. In order to examine the historical development of sociology in Turkey, the structural changes in the society must be taken into consideration; however, because there are hardly any studies related to this subject, only the chronological development of sociology is reviewed in this study. Since the Westernization efforts of Turkish society started in the 19th century, it is not possible to clearly distinguish the period of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Republic. However, in this study, the second period is taken into account. Another limitation is the subject of the conflict. In this study, only two kinds of conflict is discussed: the conflict between the state and universities in the macro level and the conflict in interpersonal relations.

1.5. Sociological perspectives and assumptions

Neuman (1994:66-72) says that the term Critical Theory has its origins in the 20th century Frankfurt School. Related to this, it can be said that this approach is traced back to Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and other social thinkers. Critical theory is particularly associated with the Conflict Theory, Feminist Analysis, and Radicals Psychotherapy.

In this thesis, the association between the Conflict Theory and Critical Theory is accepted as the theoretical base. Related to the Conflict Theory, Bartos and Wher's (2002) perspective is used in the study as an adaptation to conflict in universities.

Critical researchers criticise the interpretive approach for being too subjective and relativist. According to them, interpretive sociology is passive and it does not take value position or help people to see illusions around them so that they can improve their lives (Neuman, 1994:66-72). Social reality has multiple layers. The social reality in fact lays deep structures or unobservable mechanisms.

Neuman (1994:66-72) says that according to the Critical Approach, the social reality changes and it subjects to socially created meanings. Although subjective meaning is important, there are real, objective relations that underlie social relations. The critical researcher questions social situations and places them in a larger, macro-level historical context in order to expose hidden structures. The criterion to evaluate a theory is good or bad, for critical approach, is the capacity of the theory to be practiced. Related to that, the concept of "praxis" means that explanations are valued when they encourage people to take action that helps them to understand and change the social world.

A critical researcher uses theory to find facts and to separate them from trivial facts. In this sense, theory accepted a guiding map telling what is important and what is not (Neuman, 1994:66-72).

Neuman (1994:66-72) asserts that the critical approach has an activist orientation. It accepts social research as a moral-political activity. This means that researchers must have a value position. Related to the value neutral social research, this approach argues that this is a technician's point of view. Doing research by ignoring the moral questions satisfies the sponsor. This kind of practice leads to using science as a toll or an instrument. Critical researchers use many research techniques, but tend to use

the historical-comparative method because it helps him to uncover underlying structures. A critical researcher differs from the others less in the research techniques, in how she/he approaches a research problem, in the kinds of questions she/he asks and in her/his purpose for doing research.

Bartos and Wher (2002:13) define conflict as situation in which actors use conflict behavior against each other to attain incompatible goals and/or to repress their hostility. Here actors refer not only to individuals, but also to groups. Goal incompatibility can be explained in terms of three main causes: contested resources, incompatible roles, and incompatible values. There are three main reasons for contesting the distribution of resources: the opinion about being treated unjustly, being in absolute deprivation to live, or having belligerent culture or personality.

According to Bartos and Wher (2002:48), role incompatibility exists for one of two main reasons: either because vertical differentiation assigns those in power the responsibility for the whole organisation while assigning to the remaining members only specialized tasks or because horizontal differentiation assigns specialized tasks to different members. There are three general reasons why two parties/groups may have different values. It is either because they play different roles, or because they have been separated from each other, or because their groups differ in size and technology. Differences in size and technology matter because, when members of one party or group in a small community while most of their opponents live in large industrial cities, the first party or group will have the communal values; the opponent the system values (Bartos and Wher, 2002:48-49).

Bartos and Wher (2002:80) say that there are two main conditions to emerge an open conflict: conflict groups and a sequence of events that ignites conflict action. Members of groups with incompatible goals are likely to engage in an open conflict if they become conflict groups. Open conflict is likely to occur if the members are aware that their goals are incompatible with those of the opposing group, if they have

grievances against opponents and feel very frustrated, if they engage in free interaction that favors conflict action, and if they have sufficient resources. However, by far the two most important variables are conflict solidarity and conflict resources: a group will become a conflict group if it acquires both high conflict solidarity and sufficient conflict resources. It is asserted by Bartos and Wher (2002, 80-81) that free communication produce not only communal values but also promotes conflict solidarity. If the members of groups interact with each other frequently, if they like each other, and if they hold similar beliefs, values, and norms, this group will have high degree of solidarity. Another effect that causes conflict solidarity is hostility which is continued by the feelings of grievance and frustration.

The needed conflict solidarity is not easily achieved. The difficulty stems from the fact that to reach it, group members must be free to interact without any constraints, and yet their interaction must create conflict ideology (Dahrendorf cited in Barthos and Wher, 1959; 2002).

Bartos and Wher (2002:81-82) claim that although the availability of conflict resources plays a crucial role, the group's conflict solidarity also contributes significantly to the creation of an efficient organisation and motives the members to mobilize the needed resources. The actual beginning of a conflict is often preceded by some early warning signs. Some of them are unintentional, such as sudden mobilization of reserves; others are intentional, such as threats. In some cases, the adversaries even make a last-ditch effort to avoid open conflict. When all these conditions exist, overt conflict will occur. The main feature of the conflict theory is the acceptance of continuous conflict and agreement in the social reality.

In this conflict where insufficient development of sociology in Turkey has been dealt as a problem, it is seen that relations of factors claimed to have effect and influence on insufficient development. There is a conflict between universities at the macro level and political structure, while there is a conflict between social sciences and

natural sciences, between faculties at the middle level (medical, natural and social sciences) and conflicts between faculty administration and academicians and conflict between departments are experienced, but at the micro level, it is subject-matter having conflict experienced between academicians within a department. All these effects influence the development of sociology as an academic discipline in Turkey in an adverse manner. However, to date of this study, there are no data in respect with conflicts experienced between faculties among departments and university administrations and academicians; thus, these topics have been disregarded.

Öncü (2002:522) asserts that the common point of university reforms in Turkey is that all reform efforts in universities have coincided with political crises.

After the declaration of the Republic, as is indicated by Timur (2000: 229-230), Istanbul School of Sciences was not intervened with by political authorities for a long time. In 1933, on grounds that it could not understand and defend the purposes of the Republic/Kemalist Revolution, amendments were made on university's structure and functions. By this reform through which the relationship of both dependency and conflict between university and political government arose, Istanbul School of Sciences acquired the name Istanbul University and a great many academicians were dismissed. One of the most significant results of this reform was lifting university's autonomous status.

The 1946 university reform bears a character more democratic than the 1933 University Reform by the legal amendments preceding it. The university was recognized as an autonomous institution by this reform (Timur, 2000: 247). However, these legal amendments also affiliated universities to the Ministry of Education. The 1946 University Reform in which these legal amendments were present lost its initial positive character; and a group of academicians serving at Ankara University Faculty of Letters, History and Geography was dismissed by way of presenting their political opinions as an excuse. After this dismissal in which two

academicians from the sociology department were present, by the amendments made in the Turkish Criminal Code in 1949 and 1951, all kinds of leftist thought at universities were blocked.

Initially, the 1961 Constitution made positive amendments concerning university and its autonomy. However, a while later, universities were intervened with again, and 147 academicians, among whom was Hilmi Ziya Ülken (Coşkun, 1991: 20), were dismissed from university.

Changes were made in the 1961 Constitution by the 12th March 1971 Memorandum. Among these changes were the laws on university autonomy. The expressions ensuring university autonomy and university lecturers' membership in political parties were annulled by these changes. The legal changes implemented at universities by the 12th March Memorandum described as the "first YÖK " by Timur (2000: 292) were lifted after the annulment lawsuit filed with the Constitutional Court by Ankara University and CHP in 1975.

The universities were again intervened with by the 1981 YÖK Rule that went into effect after the 1980 military coup; and the universities were affiliated to a central system. A great many academicians, including a sociologist were, dismissed from or compelled to leave university by this law. By this law, moreover, the course programs were standardized, and new criteria taken into consideration in academic promotions were established. After 1980, a new era called globalisation was introduced worldwide, and the functions of universities in this era also changed. The role of the state as a provider of resources for universities transformed into the role of the sole regulator of mass education. As also expressed by Ergur (2003: 208), these changes were not disregarded in the YÖK code, and changes oriented to the market were made.

As in the last protest of YÖK regulation, there is a different situation from the previous ones. Here, academicians partly defended the present YÖK Rule, against the political government on grounds that it presented a danger to the secular structure of Turkey.

As earlier indicated, in this study, the relationship between universities and the political government has two aspects: dependency/determining and conflict. This relationship is generally seen today between universities and markets in the Western countries. Although this relationship is experienced in all the departments present at a university, it is more intense at sociology departments where a science with a critical aspect like sociology is present. In Turkey, the state has still great effect on the universities and this situation generally affects sociology's development as an academic discipline in Turkey in an adverse manner. Apart from this web of relations developing at the macro level, conflicts experienced at the micro level also consolidate this negative situation. Conflicts between academicians in sociology departments stemming from personal relations and political differences also affect the development of sociology negatively in Turkey. As earlier expressed, the environments where this conflict becomes apparent are mostly peer reviews at which evaluations are conducted according to universal criteria. As may also be at an individual level, this conflict is also experienced between groups with joint conflicting interests. This is one of the most significant factors adversely affecting the development of sociology in Turkey.

By depending on the Conflict theory, these political interventions of the political government in the universities can be accepted as an evidence of the conflict between the two.

It must be noted that the reason for universities to elude from these political and social crises is the common acceptance of the Western type university as a model. These models have always depended on the political and economic allies of the state,

such as the acceptance of the German model during the First World War and the American model in the 1950s (Öncü, 2002:522).

Another issue is about the ideological or, more presicely, the political aspect of education. In every reform, political governments used the discourse of modern and scientific education and the structure of the university to legitimise their political views (Öncü, 2002:522).

After the 1960s, the trend in Turkish politics became "engineers and ideology" (Göle: 1998). This concept refers to the influence of engineers in Turkish political life or, in other words, it refers to the preference of engineers as politicians rather than social scientists or people graduated from social science departments of universities. This can be evaluated as a hidden conflict between the political government and social sciences. This tendency has continued until today and now there is a close relationship between universities and the market. Newly establishjed research centers and technopolises are the signs of this continuity. Until the establishment of TÜBA, there was no central governmental organisation such as TÜBİTAK for social sciences. This is another sign of the secondary position of social sciences in Turkey.

The recent development related to the conflict between universities and the political government is the protests of academicians to the latest YÖK rule plan. This protest can be evaluated as an extention of academic protest against the privatization of universities in the 1990s. According to Öncü (2002:535), the main reason behind that behavior was Islam. In other words, academicians accepted the rise of Islamist movement as a danger for the secular state order during the 1980s.

Generally it can be said that, the conflict between the state and universities becomes overt whenever there is political and social crises in Turkey. During these times, the state accepts universities as one of the reasons of the chaotic situation and, by using

its power, it passes some regulations and even transforms the structure of universities.

Intradepartmental conflict can be accepted as interpersonal conflict. According to Bartos and Wher (2002:82) the theory of conflict between groups can be applied to interpersonal relations with a few modifications. According to them, individuals may have incompatible goals, grievances against each other, and be frustrated. However, it must be noted that individuals do not develop conflict groups and solidarity.

In the case of Turkey, by depending on the data of this study, it can be said that there is conflict among the academicians as individuals. This conflict sometimes turns into a conflict between groups when there is conflict solidarity.

These conflicts among academician sociologists is due to either differences in political standing or personal relations.

Related to the penetration of political interests into the university, Cangızbay's (2003:85) typology of academicians is important. According to him, there are two kinds of academicians. The first type ignores his/her duties at the university, completely interested in his/her own studies and projects. The second type, on the other hand, takes sides in political relationships thus obtaining power by non-academic and non-scientific ways. The analogy between the military hierarchy and the academic order made by Ergur (2003:205-206) is one of the reasons for the dependent relationship among academicians. In other words, it can be said that in Turkey, most academicians depend on others who are in a higher position because of the latter's power. It may thus be said that there is an inner conflict among academicians, which mostly becomes overt during peer reviews. By using science as an excuse, personal conflict is justified.

1.6. Methodology

The main reason for this study to evolve is to examine the general condition of sociology in Turkey. While defining the research problem, the insufficient developed nature of sociology in Turkey is asserted. Concerning the grounds and reasons for the insufficient development of sociology, it has been observed that science and universities are affected by the political government and, consequently, problems have arisen not only from sociology as a discipline but also from the specific or unique conditions of Turkey. Links were established between research findings and theories on conflict and Critical Theories details of which are given in the sub-section 1.5. As far as the study is concerned, it is basically a "descriptive research" on the problems of academic sociology in the universities of Turkey.

In this study, there are several stages in consecutive order. In the first instance, the subject and the problem of the study were determined. Then, it was accepted that using questionnaire and depth interview techniques would be appropriate. It was decided to limit this study with the academicians in the sociology departments of Turkish universities.

The survey was conducted in June and July 2004. Both questionnaires and depth interviews with the academicians in Ankara University, Hacettepe University, İstanbul University, Ege University, Boğaziçi University, Selçuk University and Middle East Technical University were applied by the researcher herself. The responses given to the questionnaire by the academicians of those universities besides those listed above were received through the Internet. 83 questionnaires were applied and 8 depth-interviews were conducted.

The questionnaire consists of 57 questions. The first thirteen questions are open-ended and nine of them are related to the demographic features of the respondents. The other 40 close-ended questions in the questionnaire are summed in two topics;

theory and methodology, and ideology. Ideological questions are also sub-divided into five topics: problems of sociology in terms of content, problems specific to limitations due to the structural condition of sociology, limited critical character of sociological studies, problems of empirical fetishism, and autonomy in scholarship. Theoretical and methodological issues are placed in the questions numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 30, 35, 44, 46, 47; questions related to the problems of sociology in terms of content are 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 51, 57; problems specific to limitations due to structural condition of sociology are debated in the questions 36, 43, 48, 52, 53; questions related to limited critical character of sociological studies are 34, 49, 56; questions related to empirical fetishism are 37, 38, 39, 40, 54; and, finally, autonomy in scholarship are examined in questions 41, 42, 45, 50, 55.

After the application of the questionnaire, open-ended questions related to the problems of sociology in Turkey and their reasons and solutions were categorized based on the answers given by the respondents. For the questions related to the problems of Turkish sociology and their reasons and solutions, the same topics were used. In other words, the respondents believed that the problems, their reasons and solutions were the same. Therefore, there are five categories for three of them. In the classification of problems of sociology in Turkey there are five topics, such as infrastructural insufficiency: money, library, etc.; ideology: of the Western world, of the state and of the university; educational problems: the quality of students, academicians, and education in the university; quality and feature of sociological studies in Turkey: lack of philosophy and historical perspective, disconnection between the social reality, insufficient research, problem of originality or plagiarism (academic theft), unawareness of contemporary debates, methodological problems, lack of interest in the problems of Turkish society, extreme empiricism, over specialization and under specialization, not being unique and original, not constructing the relation between theory and practice, fragmentation of studies, lack of interdisciplinary studies, being interested in popular subjects, not knowing much about the literature, not producing local knowledge and theory and problems related

to the organisation, coordination, communication and publication. The grouping of the questions is related to the reasons and solutions of the problems. Although there was no question on the name of the university, after the application of the questionnaire, universities were classified according the cities in which they are located. It must be remembered that all these classifications are ideal typologies. Indeed, they are in close relation among themselves.

Open-ended questions related to the basic fields of interest in sociology were also classified according to the responses. As the result of that categorization, there were seven topics: i) Theory, methodology, history of Turkish modernization and thought; ii) structure, change, transformation, social mobility, social movements, social organisations, globalisation, European Union; iii) social institutions: family, religion, politics, economy (including industry), education; iv)studies related to both rural and urban areas; v)communication and media; vi) cultural studies and identity; vii) social problems: deviance, violence, technological change, children and early adolescents, youth, women, aging, unemployment, discrimination, inequality, poverty, tourism, environment, health and illness.

Factor analyses were used in the evaluation of the questions related to the ideology, theory and methodology but no satisfactory result was obtained; therefore, chi-square analysis was used.

Academic status, the location of the university, and the country where PhD degrees were received were used as independent variables. Since no statistical differences were observed between the years of experience and academic status of the respondents, the academic status was used as an independent variable using chi-square analysis.

In the interpretation and discussion step, data that are obtained from questionnaire forms and depth-interviews are evaluated by comparing the literature about that

subject. In the last step of dimension of social research, the results of that study are integrated into the present sociological studies about the same question. At the end of the study, it is found that sociology in Turkey has an insufficient developed character. All problems that are emphasized by the respondents are similar to the problems that were mentioned in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. In this study it is found that the main reason behind this situation is the quality of "human capital". Human capital refers to the abilities, skills, and knowledge especially acquired by the individuals through education and training (Hagan, 1998:502). In other words, the general tendency among sociologists turning to others, such as the state and other sociologists, for a solution is one of the main effects that has a negative impact to sociology in Turkey. The other main negative effect is the personal conflicts among sociologists. The penetration of these conflicts to the scientific occupation decreases the quality of sociology as an academic discipline in Turkey.

In this section, factors adversely affecting the development of sociology in Turkey were discussed. Among these factors are official ideology and its effects on sociology and universities, the problems arising from the discipline itself, the developing nature of Turkey, and the conflict among sociologist academicians. It is important to keep in mind that the factors listed above not only affect the development of sociology as an academic discipline in Turkey, but also cause an ongoing conflict within sociology as a science.

In the following section, the opinions of the participants gathered through techniques such as questionnaires and in-depth interviews are assessed and evaluated in light of theoretical and conceptual discussions.

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study basically uses two different types of research techniques. The first one is questionnaires to collect respondent opinion about the conditions of sociology in Turkey today. In addition to the questionnaires, in-depth interviews are carried out in order to collect qualitative data and fill the gaps in the information gathered by the questionnaires.

2.1. Characteristics of Respondents

In this study, related to the question of sociology in Turkey, 83 respondents' thoughts and attitudes are taken into consideration. As it is noted before, the results of the study consist only of these 83 responses. Therefore, it can not be generalized to all universities' sociology departments in Turkey.

Of the 83 respondents, 44.6% are research assistants, 26.5% are assistant professors, 9.6% are associate professors, and 19.3% are professors.

Of the 83 respondents, 97.6% were graduates of Turkish universities while 2.4% were graduates of universities in foreign countries. The percentage of respondents with a master's degree from Turkish universities is 83.1% and the percentage of respondents with a bachelor's degree from foreign universities is 16.9%.

The total number of respondents who hold a PhD degree is 72. 70.8% of these 70 respondents received their degrees from Turkish universities and 29.2% from foreign universities.

Of the 83 respondents, 54.2% are academicians in the universities in the center (Ankara, İstanbul, and İzmir), and 45.8% are from universities in the periphery (Muğla, Konya, Eskişehir, Van, Antalya, Isparta, Dicle, Erzurum).

The fields of interest of these academicians fall into seven categories: i) Theory and methodology; including studies about thehistory of Turkish modernization and thought; ii) social structure and change; consisting of studies related to social transformation, social mobility, social movements, social organisations, globalisation, and the European Union; iii) social institutions: family, religion, politics, economy (including industry), education; iv) rural and urban studies; v) communication and media; vi) cultural studies and identity; vii) social problems: deviance, violence, technological changes, children and early adolescence, youth, women, aging, unemployment, discrimination, inequality, poverty, tourism, environment, health and illness.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents' fields of interest and open forms of the table are presented in pages 115-117.

Table 1: Distributions of the respondents' fields of interest

N=83

Subject	Yes %	No %	Total %	Status Chi-Square
Theory and methodology	57.7	42.3	100	4.862
Social change	48.7	51.3	100	.460
Sociology of institutions	53.8	46.2	100	3.498
Urban and rural studies	19.2	80.8	100	4.130
Communication	6.4	93.6	100	6.778
Culture and identity	20.5	79.5	100	1.757
Social problems	52.6	47.4	100	7.182

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

Table 1 shows that academicians are mostly interested in subjects related to sociological theory, methodology, history of Turkish thought and modernization (57.7%), sociology of institutions (53.8%), and social problems (52.6%). The fields of academicians are more than one and that is why the total percentage is more than one hundred percent.

This result is similar to an earlier study (Kasapoğlu 2004a) which examines the fields of academicians in Sociology Departments of seven universities in Turkey - Ankara University, METU, Hacettepe University, Istanbul University, Boğaziçi University, Mimar Sinan University and Ege University. In the study conducted in 2000, the general tendency was towards theory and methodology. Debates on methodology, postmodernity, and crisis of modernity were the most commonly studied topics following theory and methodology. In addition to the subjects mentioned here, it must be pointed out that the academicians who participated in this study are also interested in the history of Turkish thought.

The percentage of respondents who gave "yes" as answer to the question asking whether he/she is a member of any association related to sociology is 58.0%, and the percentage of "no" is 42.0%. Some of the organisations mostly repeated by the respondents are Sosyoloji Derneği (Sociological Association), Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği (The Turkish Social Science Association), Tarih Vakfı (History Foundation). Several international sociological associations, such as the American Sociology Association, International Sociological Association, International Institute of Sociology, and European Sociology Association may also be added to the list.

During the examination of the questionnaires, it was found that all of the academicians who are members of international sociological associations have received their PhD degrees from foreign countries.

Table 2 shows the distribution of the respondents' memberships to sociological organisations and the summary of Chi-square significance tests results. Open forms of this table are presented in pages 117-118.

Table 2: Distributions the respondents' memberships to sociological organisations and summary of Chi-square significance tests results

N=83

	Yes %	No %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square
Membership to sociological organisations	58.0	42.0	100.	9.2279*	.2246

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

It can be said that there is a significant relation between the status in the academy and membership to sociological organisations (p<.026). Membership is higher among professors than others (86.7%). 56.8% of research assistants and 50.0% of associate professors are not members to any sociological organisations. For novice academicians, no membership may seem normal; however, the high rate gathered from lecturers is a matter worthy of further discussion.

When the distribution of membership to sociological associations in the central cities is compared to the periphery, it is seen that the membership percentages (60.5% at universities in the central cities and 55.3% at universities in the periphery) and non-membership percentages (39.5% at universities in central cities and 44.7% at universities in the periphery) are nearly the same. Although there is no significant difference between the rates of being a member of professional associations, the interviews showed that the academicians in the periphery do not actually attend the activities of the association and their membership only exists on the papers or bureaucratic documents. The academicians lecturing in the periphery demand that, regarding attending the activities of the Sociology Association in the center, branches of this association should be established in the periphery regions.

It is pleasing that more than half of the respondents are members of certain sociological organisations. However, this is not enough. As Ülken (1956) asserts, the lack of organisations among sociologists leads to the effect of political governments on sociology. What could be some of the reasons behind te the low rate of organisations among sociologist academicians in Turkey? One couldbe the generally lazy nature of sociologists in Turkey as a developing country. Most respondents in this study say that there is a need for branch offices of the Sociological Association but they do not see themselves responsible for undertaking this responsibility. Most of them think this is the job of the Sociological Association. One result of this kind of tendency can be loss of control of sociologists on the discipline, which can facilitate the penetration of political authority and the hegemony of countries in the center.

The percentage of the answer "yes" to the question about professional qualifications (consulting, private practice, etc.) is 29.5%. Distributions of answers regarding respondents' professional qualifications and the summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given in Table 3, and open forms of this table are presented in pages 118-119.

Table 3: Distributions of answers regarding respondents' professional qualifications (consulting, private practice, etc.) and summary of Chi-square significance tests results

N=83

	Yes %	No %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	PhD Chi-Square
Professional qualification held (consulting, private practice ...)	29.5	70.5	100.	13.937**	1.200	1.913

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

There is a statistically significant relationship (p<.003) between academic status and holding professional qualifications (consulting, private practice, etc.). 69.2% of the respondents who answered "Yes" are professors, while 16.2% of them are research

assistants. Either because a kind of hierarchy similar to the military is present in universities and their departments (Ergur, 2003: 207) or, as a consequence of this, the incompetency of the academicians with lower ranks in demonstrating their qualifications could be evaluated as an evidence that academicians with higher ranks are preferred in the private sector. Besides, one should keep in mind that the consultancy services are not limited to the private sector. There are also some structures formed in the public sector, in need of consultancy services. As mentioned by Gökçe (1994:129-130), importance is not given to the research planning centers in the public institutions and their performance is thus hindered. These units are denominated as places of exile and personnel with opposing political views are assigned to work in these places. This prevents the sociologist, the expert in profession, from performing his/her duties there.

One of the reasons behind the low of percentage (29.5%) may also be the little relationship between universities and the private sector, and the ignorance of sociologists by the state's institutions either consciously or unconsciously.Also, it must be remembered that there are debates about limited employment opportunities for sociologists in both public and private sectors except universities (Özdalga, 1990:27).

While the percentage of having any national research project experience is 57.1, this proportion is 29.5 % in having international research project experience. In Table 4 distributions of answers regarding the respondents' national and international project experience and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given. It must be underlined here that the criteria considered in the evaluation of the projects nationally or internationally, is whether the institutes or foundations giving the financial support are national or foreign. Open forms of this table are presented in pages 119 and 121.

Table 4: Distributions of answers regarding the respondents' national and international project experience and summary of Chi-square significance tests results

N=83

Project experience	Yes %	No %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	PhD Chi-Square
National	57.1	42.9	100.	6.346	.976	1.285
International	29.5	70.5	100.	17.989***	6.687**	3.809*

$p<.05$*, $p<.01$**, $p<.000$***

According to Table 3, 76.9% of the respondents whose national research project experience is higher than the others are professors. 56.8% of the ones whose experience of national project is less than others are research assistants. Although there is no significant relation between the national project experience and the location of university, most of the projects were done in the universities in the central cities (62.5%). The highest amount of national project belongs to academicians with PhD degrees from foreign universities (68.4%).

In the interpretation of the high rate observed in national projects, the report dated 13 September 2003 and entitled "Changing Patterns of Governance in Higher Education" prepared by OECD(2003:1) could be used. According to this report, excluding some exceptions, all OECD countries are either undergoing some reforms in their higher education systems or reconstructing them. Behind these intentions lie the modified scopes of the higher education and within these modified conditions, and the challenges derived from the insufficiency of the higher education in satisfying the new arising needs of the people. It is possible to see the examples of the reconstruction efforts mentioned by OECD, in the studies of Timur (2000:352-353) and Ergur (2003:208). Timur (2000:352-353), points out that globalisation and Anglo-American university structure are the trends in Turkey. In a similar evaluation, Ergur (2003:208) states that the unitarian centralizative structure of YÖK is less effective nowadays and today in the universities this institute entered a period of an establishment in conformity with the market and appropriating its principles.

According to the chi-square significance tests results, there are significant relationships between international project experience and academic status (p<.000), the location of the university (p<.010), and the university where the PhD degree is received (p<.051). Regarding the relationship between academic status and international projects, professors are ranked in the first place with 76.9%. The relation between the location of the university and international project experience is high in the center (42.5%) and smaller in the periphery (15.8%). The comment on the participation to national projects can be generalised for international projects. However, according to the chi square test results about the fact that there is a significant relation between participation in international projects and the city in which the university is located, Aktay's (2003:101) concept of "peripherilization of periphery" could be used. For Aktay (2003:101), the presence of the periphery universities causes the center universities to have a good degree in quality classification. This causes the periphery universities to be considered as lower qualified in every sense – education quality, academician and student quality. As a result of this in the market mechanism, the center universities with better quality are relatively more preferred.

50.0% are academicians who received PhD degrees from foreign universities and they said "Yes" to this question. The amount of "No" as an answer is 74.5% and it is from academicians who received their PhD degrees in Turkish universities.

In Turkey as a developing country, natural sciences have more prestige than social sciences. As Ecevit (2003) indicated, there is no merit system in social sciences because of the general acceptance of these sciences as useless and unnecessary. According to him, until the 1960s, social sciences were used to teach sociology and psychology to architects and engineers. Although there is an increase in the number of projects in which there is cooperation between social and natural sciences, he asserts that, this cooperation is the result of the insistence of World Bank on Turkey

as a developing country. On the one hand, this insistence has positive effects on the increase of social sciences in Turkey, but on the other, this relation leads to the reproduction of this dependent and controlled relationship between Turkey and the World Bank. In other words, in Turkey, the role of sociology and sociologists in is not clear. There is not enough consciousness in the society about the functions of sociology in the society; and this situation leads to the continuous control of central countries or international institutions such as the World Bank. And this control leads to the reproduction of dependent policies related to using sociology in the projects in Western countries.

As mentioned before, open-ended questions related to the problems of Turkish sociology and their reasons and solutions are categorized according to the respondents' answers.

In the questions related to the problems of Turkish sociology and their reasons and solutions, the same classification is used, due to fact that responses to the problems, and their reasons and their solutions were almost the same. The problem areas of sociology are as follows: Insufficient infrastructure: money, library, not having the translations of important sociological books and articles; ideological: the effect of hegemonic relations between the western countries, the effect of the the political government and the market; quality of education in the university; quality of sociological studies in Turkey: lack of philosophy and historical perspectives, disconnection between the social reality, insufficient research, problem of originality or plagiarism (academic theft), lack of awareness in contemporary debates, methodological problems, no interested in the problems of Turkish society, extreme empiricism, over specialization and insufficient specialization, not being unique and original, not constructing the relation between theory and practice, fragmentation of studies, lack of interdisciplinary studies, interest in popular subjects, not knowing much about the literature, not producing local knowledge and theory; and finally organisational problems: not having enough communication between sociologists

including academicians, lack of coordination between sociological studies, not having enough platforms for intellectual debate, not having enough sociological organisations, and not having a sociological tradition. Although problems are classified here, it must be remembered that all these classifications are a kind of "ideal type" and in real life they can not be fully separated from each other.

2.2. The problems of sociology

In Table 5, distributions of answers according to respondents' related to basic problems of sociology in Turkey and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and in pages between 121 and 124 open forms of this table are presented.

Table 5: Distributions of answers according to respondents' attitudes related to basic problems of sociology in Turkey and summary of Chi-square significance tests results

N=83

Problems	Yes %	No %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square
Insufficient infrastructure	29.5	70.5	100	.410	1.200
Ideological	33.3	66.7	100	2.602	2.566
Quality of education	44.9	55.1	100	1.630	1.804
Quality of sociological studies	62.8	37.2	100	2.250	.167
Organisational	38.5	61.5	100	9.358*	.032

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

The 29.5% of the respondents believe that the problem of sociology in Turkey is insufficient infrastructure. While the assistant professors take the first place with the rate of 23.1% among the respondents who agree and say "Yes" to this problem; the professors are in the last place. The distribution of this rate due to central-periphery distinction among universities is as follows: While the center says "Yes" with a rate of 35.0%; the rate of "Yes" from the periphery is only 23.7%. Related to the problem of insufficient infrastructure, some respondents claim that because of lack of

basic sociological texts and books in Turkish, they do not have the opportunity to read them. This shows that there is a problem among some academicians about reading foreign languages which affects quality. Lack of resources is actually a problem for all universities and departments in Turkey but this problem is more severe in social sciences in general and in sociology in particular.

As for the concept of resource, or more generally, infrastructure necessities, Ecevit (2003) emphasises the importance of the resources to conduct scientific study and research. In his view, the resource problems experienced in universities in Turkey can be classified under three titles: limited national and international resources, ineffectiveness of the present resources, and the inequality in the distribution of resources. For the major part of the resource necessity, the fact that the university is dependent on the state, which means having limitations in creating its own resources, resulted in dependence and less autonomy, and lack of objectivity towards society. Regarding universities creating their own resources, Ergur (2003:211) agrees with Ecevit, pointing out that in time, the current mentality in universities, which is to finance themselves, will be transformed into a more profit based understanding. As a result of this, universities and academicians will not be able to perform their fundamental functions. As a fact observed in the public universities about the trading capital, Ergur (2003:211) claims that in genereal the resource acquired in this way is paid or given to the departments by which it is provided. Related to this, considering that natural sciences departments and especially engineering faculties are the departments providing more projects to universities, it can easily be said that the major part of these resources are not spent on social sciences.

Another important point to be pointed out here is that engineering faculties have more alternatives to provide resources with their political structure because of the "engineers' ideology" (Göle, 1998). There is a kind of vicious circle working against the social sciences.

33.3% of the academicians whose interpretations are presented in the study said that one of the problems of sociology in Turkey is the intervention of ideology. The interventions listed under this title can be classified as: the effects of the western societies, political authority and the effects of the market. Kasapoğlu (1991a; 1991b:32) in her similar study about the evaluations of the academicians on the problems of sociology, claimed that the problem of ideology ranks fifth for the academicians. Similarly, in this study this problem ranked fourth for the academicians. However, the important point here is what the respondents imply by stating ideology is not clear at all. Mostly, the relationship of the political authority with sociology and the hegemony of the market and the Western societies were considered as the reflection of ideology by the respondents. However, the concept of ideology was taken into consideration as broad as possible in this study: the inequality in the distribution of resources, the biased attitudes of the political authority towards natural sciences, especially towards engineering sciences, and as a result of this the employment problem, lack of organisation, the criteria considered in academic assignments and promotions were used as the sub fields of the ideology concept.

Related to sociology in Turkey being under the influence of the political government, Konuk (1994:73-74) points out that sociology in Turkey, when the first period is considered, was assumed to be the socio–political policy, which would provide liberation from the crisis. According to him, this close relationship between sociology and ideology, today, has showed improvement against sociology. Because of this relationship, sociology was considered as a science which provides solutions to political and social problems; and the sociologist as, far from being an investigator who makes effort to understand and explain public events, an ideologist with the duties of determining the future days. Ecevit (1994:114) states that the civil servant ideology has important effects on the institualisation of science in Turkey, pointing out the influence of the political government on universities and science. He further states that on the scientific level, the political government has played an important

role in failure for establishing the communication network between the institutes, universities, scientists, experts and the practicianers.

44.9% of the respondents stated that the problem of education in the universities and the problems which derive from the qualifications of academicians and students. Under this title, the quality of education provided in the universities, the qualification of the assistant and the characteristics of the students are examined. The evaluations about the quality of education comprise the negative effect of YÖK. As it can also be seen here, the effects of state ideology are everpresent. For this reason, as mentioned before, the categories formed according to the responses of academicians concerning the problems of sociology, are ideal type-casting. In reality it is not easy to isolete them from each other. Tuna (2002:109) mentions the damage caused by studies with the scope of mono-typing the lecture programmes in universities to sociology with YÖK Law, 1981. One of the important points here is that problems in sociology education cannot be seperated from the general education problems at universities. In general, the effects of the practices of YÖK, either on education or on research at universities, are mostly felt by social sciences, especially the sociology department. In addition to this evaluation, the respondents point out that, student insufficiency in forming relations between relevant knowledges and information also has a negative effect on sociology because of the conflicts between staff members in the departments, and failure in founding a sociology tradition, and of the lectures not complementing each other.

The opinion of a research assistant lecturing in a regional university about education quality is as follows:

> There is a common situation in general in the sociology departments. It is possible to observe this in graduates with undergraduate degree. 'sociological view', 'the necessity of sociology', is not clear at all in the mentality of the students. This means that the undergraduate degree needs to be reviewed in general in the country.

The evaluation of a respondent, a professor lecturing in a central university, about education at university is as follows:

> I denominate old universities and faculties like ours as a fully-equipped hospital. Here all the departments are being presented with each of their details. In contrast, in the foundation universities newly established, a faculty is formed by gathering a few departments together. And sociology is not present as a department but as a lecture in these faculties. Hence, sociology is lectured as general information. Instead at the universities like ours, sociology is lectured in all dimensions and research periods are carried out together with education facilities. Other than this, the universities established after İstanbul University, have a tendency to American sociology and American universities. At these universities, the academicians gather recent developments present in the agenda of sociology in England, America, France, the places to which they have been in to receive training. In my opinion this is not a correct attitude, they only inform about the things created there. They consider the information they brought from there as indisputable and they are considered as the representatives of the relative movement in Turkey with a few books. For the reason that these academicians cannot produce their own information, they go abroad and recollect information about the agenda there, and return to Turkey within the first opportunity. Since they cannot form the whole and the relation between information is not provided, the cumulative information of these academicians looks like a rag-bag.

It is possible to make an addition to the evaluations of the interviewer. For the aforesaid academic type, lies behind a secret hegemonical relation in the period of getting information. The information gathered from the West has an influence on both the academician and sociology in Turkey.

As understood from the respondents' evaluations, the problems of sociology education in Turkey are more generally related to Turkey's being a developing country. Turkey has problems about planning human resources. As respondents indicated, civil servant ideology does not give enough importance to sociology. It does not pay enough resources for training and sociological research in the university. One result of this situation is the decrease in the quality of sociology education. As indicated, the quality of sociology education consists also of the quality of both academicians and students in the sociology departments. Because of

being deprived from many infrastructural sources, academicians do not have much opportunity to develop themselves. Besides the problems originating from the civil servant ideology, there are also problems related to the academicians' personal features. As indicated before, it can be said that, academicians are generally lazy in their sociological studies in Turkey. An example of this feature can be the evaluation of the professor whose ideas were presented above. As he asserts, academicians generally prefer gathering recent sociological developments and only announcing them in Turkey. They generally do not prefer producing local knowledge and theory and making a synthesis between local and global ones. It must be noted that all mentioned here are some parts of the problems of sociology in Turkey. However, it must also remembered that, there is an interpenetration of effects of structural and cultural features on the insufficient developed character of sociology in Turkey.

It must be noted that the problems of sociology education can not be separated from those of social science education in Turkey. The ideas about the problems of social science education can be generalized to sociology.

About the evaluation of the qualification of the academicians, the respondents in general state that the persons remote to the discipline or is not competent in the field, are included in the academic field depending on their political relationships or utilitarian mentality. The performance evaluating measures of YÖK and the unity of the university and the market causes new types of academicians and social scientists to rise. Tekeli (2003:139) states that among the university practices today the 'social capital' has not been formed yet, and especially at the universities in big cities in which the job opportunities enlarge, inner harmony is seriously dissolved, professors do not give lectures and attend the university. "Bourdieu (1986) defines social capital as, 'the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition'. An individual's social capital is determined by the size or their relationship network, the sum of its cumulated resources (both cultural

and economic), and how successfully (quickly) the individual can set them in motion. According to Bourdieu, social networks must be continuously maintained and fostered over time in order for them to be called upon quickly in the future" (Hayes, 2004).

Cangızbay (2003:85) cites the presence of two types of academicians. The first type can be described to be ignoring their duties at university, completely interested in their own studies and projects. This type of academicians described by Cangızbay has similarities with those which Tekeli cites. The second type of academicians described by Cangızbay obtain their power through nonacademic or unscientific means without using the opportunity to establish their work by taking place in political relationships. Aktay (2003:109) claims that the factor which has a negative effect on the quality of academicians in periphery regions is that masters and doctorate of philosophy programmes are not provided to the universities in these regions. According to him, these universities are being peripherilized on purpose and by not allowing the masters and doctorate of philosophy programmes, the academicians are prevented from improving themselves.

About the problems derived from the quality of the students studying in the Sociology Department, respondents say that students who have been awarded education in this Department by unconsciously made choices and as a matter of luck were decreasing the average success of the students and relatively the content of the lecture programmes facilitated. With a similar interpretation, Tekeli (2003:140) stated that most of the students are placed by the central examination system and receive education in the departments in which they are not interested. Based on the observations obtained from the studies conducted, the major rate of these students is working in jobs unrelated to their education. It is said that the students who graduate from this system in which the education is relatively low in quality, are not equipped with the necessary skills. This evalution is done in general at universities, when the biased attitudes and behaviours of the political authorities against the social sciences

is taken into consideration, it is understood that as an academic discipline sociology tries to survive under the negative conditions of Turkey.

Among the problems of sociology in Turkey, those which derive from the quality of social studies have the prior place with the rate of 62.8%. Lack of sufficient field work, problem of lack of originality and presence of plagiarism, incompetence in methodology subject, producing information far away from social reality, failing to be independent, failure in relating theory to methodology, lack of studies between the disciplines, failure in forming theories, empiricism, lack of philosophy formation in studies, failure in interpretation, failure in forming theory-pratice unity, over-dependence to western theories, common acceptance of positivism, ignoring the macro studies by giving more credits to micro studies, lack of historical perspective, being influenced by recent and popular trends, lack of knowledge in contemporary discussions, and not studying on Turkey are the evaluations of the respondents about the general characteristics of sociological studies in Turkey. According to the research conducted by Kasapoğlu (1991a ;1991b: 33), academicians assert that the most important problem of sociology was the problem of lack of originality or presence of plagiarism. The problem of originality/plagiarism is under the general topic as the determinant factor in the quality of sociological practice or sociological studies. In addition to this, the titles of the problems of incompetency of working with theory, field research and method confusion, competency in criticizing, failure in renewing himself, and failure in transforming scientific studies into life are the interpretations of sociology academicians participated in the study of Kasapoğlu (1991a;1991b:29). Berkes (1942; 1985:242-243) talks about the same problem. According to him, scientific study was not an independent form and copying and learning by just memorizing were the basic features of social sciences in Turkey during the 1940s. Similar to this, Ülken (1956:6-10) points to the existence of the same problem during the 1950s. It is interesting that there are still debates about the same problems today. In the congress of Sociological Association in 1994 there were the same criticisms related to the sociological practice's quality in Turkey. Ecevit

(1994:144) says that there are studies of which theory and methods are not clear or unique. Peker (1994) asserts that there is a sampling problem in social studies. Sayın (1993) argues sociologists have problems in constructing a theoretical frame for their studies. Meriç (cited in Elibol: 1991:27), asserts that most studies are not based on the history of Turkey. All these debates show that this problem is felt still today by most Turkish sociologists. The reasons lying behind the continuity of this question must be debated.

About the necessity of conducting a study concerning Turkey, a professor at the center university says:

> Turkish Republic has been established upon a nation state model. From the foundation of the Republic till today a nation state concept was tried to be formed continuously by national conscious, national culture, national solidarity and national unity. However, while we were trying to form a nation state, and not having realized it completely, we saw that the world has started to become global. I mean, while we have not formed a nation state by all means, and have not completed modernization; we noticed that the world is uniting, and some countries are gathering under the European Union structure. What we were trying to do was stopped against globalization. In this case, countries which are organized by nation state conscious, and have really completed the national conscious, national culture and national economy have the opportunity to keep its essential character when united with the world or entered the EU. However, for the reason that we have not formed our national conscious, national culture and national solidity, we are afraid of dissolving when we enter the EU. In the face of these developments the sociologists are in general divided into two poles as modernists and traditional conservatives. Although we have not formed the nation state yet, the sociologists are liable for what Turkey will do against globalization and how she will evaluate the events and concepts.

There is a need to study Turkey. In other words, there is a need to construct the relation between sociological theories in the world and social reality in Turkey. However, it is hard to say that this connection was provided. The reasons behind this situation can be summed in two topics: in the structural level, the developing character of Turkey; and in the cultural level, personal features of academicians. As indicated before, the developing character of Turkey has effect on sociological

65

studies. There is hegemony of theories in the centre. This relation is strengthened by the personal laziness of many academicians. Generally academicians prefer to study the subjects in the sociological agenda in the world, not giving enough importance to construct the relation between the local and the global. Also here the civil servant ideology dimension, which is under the title of developing character of Turkey, must be added. In the criteria about the academic promotion can be accepted one sign of the effects of civil servant ideology. Giving more importance to writing articles in international journals leads to academicians studying on the topics which are determined by these journals.

There is a significant relationship between the academic status and organisational problems (p<.025). Related to this problem, agree answers is higher among professors (69.2 %) while research assistants' disagree answers is higher (75.7 %). There is consistency among professos' attitudes and behaviours because of their high percentage of membership to the any sociological organisation (84.6%).

Based on the data from Table 5, it possible to comment that one of the main problems of sociology in Turkey is organisational. As mentioned before these problems result from insufficient organisation, lack of coordination between the academicians and their work, lack of communication between academicians and lack of conditions for discussions. Though a large ratio of the respondents point to the organisational problems, only 56.4% are members of professional associations. One of the reasons of this may be that as pointed out by Önal Sayın (cited in Kasapoğlu, 2004a:117):

> We have to establish 'Chambers of Sociology'. Professional organisations must be strengthened and widened. This can solve the problems of positions in the state. Regional sociological associations must be established. Having a central association is good but not enough. If we have regional sociological associations, it will be very useful.

In the similar study done by Kasapoğlu (1991b:29), the problem of lack of organisation was mentioned by the academicians who were participants in that study. In 1956, Ülken mentioned the same problem, stating that lack of organisation related to sociology leads to losing from sociology in daily political life. As mentioned before, this title comprises not only the problem of failure in forming organisational unities between sociologists but also the problem of lack of coordination among studies, and lack of communication between academicians. For the problem of lack of coordination and communication experienced in sociology departments as well as in many departments in Turkey, Tekeli (2003:139) says that to improve the performance of research, it is really important to form an interactive community in universities. He also adds that, this has not emerged in the present situation because of the individualistic studies aimed to increase the degree of academic status and promotion. Among the reasons of this problem, the conflict concept, experienced among academicians, derived from mostly personal or political disputes, can be mentioned.

2.3. Reasons of Problems

In Table 6, distributions of answers about the reasons of basic problems of sociology in Turkey according to respondents and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and in the following sections open forms of this table are presented in the pages 124-127.

Table 6: Distribution of answers about the reasons of basic problems of sociology in Turkey according to respondents and summary of Chi-square significance tests results

N=83

Problems	Yes Answer %	No Answer %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square
Insufficient infrastructure	32.1	67.9	100	4.200	1.119
Ideological	56.4	43.6	100	.378	4.347*
Quality of education	57.7	42.3	100	.636	1.990
Quality of sociological studies	38.5	61.5	100	5.859	2.484
Organisational	30.8	69.2	100	5.545	.023

P<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

Related to the reasons of the problems that sociology faces in Turkey, most of the respondents believe that they could be education quality (57.7%) and ideological influences (56.4%). The respondents, taking into consideration the education problem in a more general context, consider the matter of not imposing, consciously or unconsciously, a criticizing and interrogative point of view to the individual in Turkish education system, as an important effect. As for the other reason they point to the lack of researches to encourage personal development. As a result of admitting enormous number of students, the importance is only given to the teaching rather than the training.

Kocacık ve İçli (1992:16) classify the problems of sociology education in five topics as social, political, economic, legal and administration. Ayas (1994:196-197) points out that sociology education in universities does not have a satisfactory level of scientific environment. In this study, even though the respondents point to the infrastructural problems, the ratio is 29.5%. In this study, the academicians at both the centre and periphery universities highlight the problems related to education and

there are no differences of opinion between the centre and periphery university academicians. However, Kasapoğlu (1991a; 1991b) in the work titled "Problems of Sociology Education in Universities" argued that academicians at the centre and periphery universities highlighted different problems according to different infrastructural characteristics. The different results of these two studies conducted at different times indicate that periphery universities may have solved their infrastructural problems within this time.

About the qualification of an academician, a research assistant from a periphery university says:

> For the acceptance of the assistants to universities LES exam and the average marks have the major importance. This causes the interested and brilliant students to stay back, increasing the chance of those who happen to succeed in these exams but in reality do not even have a regular reading habit. Sociology is not a field only related to memorisation; rather it is a field that requires a critical point of view, reading and more broadly requires to be considered as a life style.

There is significant relation between the location of the university and ideological and bureaucratic reasons underlying the problems of Turkish sociology (p<.037). 68.4% are "yes" answer, belonging to academicians in periphery universities. About the logical relationship between these two variables, it can be said that, the causes are on the one hand the pressure of political authorities, and on the other the tendency against sociology, thus universities in periphery regions feel this pressure much more. Aktay (2003:105), different from the universities in the big centres, the universities in periphery regions are more dependent on the State and are more in debility against political pressures since their relationship of with the market is not developed. This debility, according to him, is felt from top to bottom inside the university.

As a sign of the subjective policies of the government, Aktay (2003: 109) claims that there are two effects that strengthen the periphery conditions of universities located

in the periphery cities: YÖK and the market. Because of YÖK's policy, there is no permission to open graduate and doctorate programs in periphery universities. This kind of policy leads not only to prevent the opportunity and right of continuous education from students who graduated from these universities and the possibility to develop the intellectual level of academicians. Because of this restriction, academicians have to give lectures only at the undergraduate level. The program that is applied in METU is also hardened, this being a periphery position. Another factor is the market. According to Aktay (2003:110-111) the market is also affected by this policiy of YÖK. The market prefers people who are graduated from central universities and this leads to reproduction of the situation of being a periphery university.

2.4. Evaluation of Sociology

In Table 7, distribution of attitudes towards the present status of sociology and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and open forms of this table are presented in pages 128-130.

Table 7: Distribution of attitudes towards the present status of sociology and summary of Chi-square significance tests results.

<div align="center">N=83</div>

Attitudes towards the status of sociology at different levels (i.e. World, Turkey , Department)	Excellent %	Good %	Not Good %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
World level	12.2	70.7	17.1	100.	6.537	4.279	1.344
Turkey	-	29.6	70.4	100.	4.669	1.214	.000
Department	6.1	52.4	41.5	100.	3.784	2.127	2.477

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

Academicians generally evaluate the status of sociology in the world as "Good"(70.7%), in Turkey as "not good"(70.4) %, and in their own departments as

"Good"(52.4%). Related to the evaluation of own departments, nearly the other half of the academicians say that it is "Not Good Enough" (41.5%). In the similar study of Kasapoğlu (1991b:32-33), the academicians evaluated the level that sociology reached in Turkey as low and medium in general when compared with the developed countries. With regard to this study, the academicians, with a major proportion (73.1%) claimed that sociology in Turkey is "not good". The difference between the two studies is an important issue to consider. One reason could be that sociologists started to make more realistic assessments due to the their increased awareness about sociology in Turkey.

2.5. Evaluation of Himself/Herself as a Scientist

In Table 8, distribution of behaviour on satisfaction and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and open forms of this table are presented in pages 131-132.

Table 8: Distribution of behaviour on satisfaction and summary of Chi-square significance tests results.

N=83

Behavior	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Dis-agree %	Strongly disagree %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
So far I have done significant part of whatever should be done as a scientist	4.8	31.3	50.6	13.3	100.	13.138	.755	6.391

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

71

According to this table, academicians generally say that they have not undertaken whatever should be done as a scientist (50.6%). Such an evaluation, in its most general sense, is in consistence with the problems of sociology regarding to education, since it also includes the problems about education, - insufficiency in resources as a result of the enormous number of students and failure in establishing the balance between education and research .

The respondents who say "Strongly Agree" (4.8%) to that question assert that they have undertaken a significant part of whatever should be done as an educator such as opening many courses in undergraduate, graduate and doctorate levels, orienting and informing students according to their interests, and providing all kinds of sources for them. They also assert that they have done a significant part of whatever should be done as a researcher such as conducting research about many sociological subjects. Respondents who state that they "Agree", (31.3%) "Disagree" (50.6%) and "Strongly Disagree" (13.3%) to that question claim that being a scientist is a process and can not be completed. For such an essential evaluation Mills (1959; 2000:321) has similarities with the qualification that a sociologist has to carry. According to him, the most important criteria to be a scientist is to combine academic studies with personal life. Such a combination will also improve the skills of establishing a relation between sociology and all the things acquainted in life. From the evaluation of Mills (1959), it is possible to reach the result that a result: **"**Sociological Imagination, being an intellectual craftsmanship, is duration to continue all through life period.

Other than the reasons described above as related to this evaluation, the respondents claim that the political interests and the relationships most commonly experienced as conflicts between the academicians and economic insufficiencies are worth mentioning.

2.6. Evaluation of Problems in Turkish Sociology

In this part of the thesis, the answers of academicians to the questions about their attitudes to specific subjects related to the problems of sociology in Turkey are discussed. As noted before in the methodology section, these questions are classified into two topics: theoretical and methodological issues and ideological issues. Ideological issues are divided into five subtitles: problems of sociology in terms of content, problems specific to limitations due to structural conditions of sociology, limited critical character of sociology, problem of empirical fetishism, and autonomy in scholarship. It is must be noted here that, in this study, ideology is accepted in a broad meaning and it has relations with everything in society. Here it is necessary to remember that in this part of the study the answers "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" imply generally the same meaning. In other words, in the evaluation of the degree of acceptance of respondents, the total of these two options' percentages has been used.

In Table 9 the distribution of answers on theoretical and methodological issues and summary of Chi-square significance test results are given and in pages between 132 and 144 open forms of this table are presented.

Table 9: Distribution of answers on theoretical and methodological issues and summary of Chi-square significance test results

N=83

Attitudes towards theory and methodology	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
18. Collecting empirical data without theoretical background.	28.9	60.2	10.8	100.	1.736	.974	1.145
19. Negative impacts of insufficient theory	37.3	53.0	9.6	100.	2.955	1.666	.876
20. Theoretical and methodological hegemony of developed countries	51.8	45.8	2.4	100.	8.940	3.324	1.024
21. Methodological insufficiency	41.0	56.6	2.4	100	1.793	2.472	.298
22. Lack of consistency between theory and methodology in multiple data collection	19.5	53.7	26.8	100	2.182	.655	1.339
23. Reducing Research to Questionnaire Testing	53.0	36.1	10.8	100.	1.712	.817	.246
25. Insufficient philosophical foundation	50.6	44.6	4.8	100.	4.745	5.152	.709
30. Positive impacts of positivism and post-modernism	19.3	50.6	30.1	100.	7.111	3.542	2.142
35. Insufficient use of contemporary literature	34.9	56.6	8.4	100.	8.886	.398	.532
44. Insufficient development of sociology tradition	44.6	44.6	10.8	100.	4.489	2.475	.838
46. Limited production of knowledge	64.6	32.9	2.4	100	7.211	2.519	5.570
47. Limited accumulation of knowledge collected without theory	31.7	54.9	13.4	100	3.851	4.430	.0974

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

In Table 9, it can be seen that for all of the questions, academicians mostly gave "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" answers. The total percentages of these two options are generally more than 70%. This shows that there is almost a consensus on the theoretical and methodological problems of Turkish sociology. This situation is in accordance with the answers of the respondents to the open ended question of what the problems of sociology are. 62.8% of the respondents (Table5) have pointed out that the problems derive from the quality of sociological studies. As mentioned before, the problems under this title are lack of theory, insufficiency in forming a relation with reality, lack of historical perspective, not having philosophical formation, failure in forming the relation between theory and methodology, doing enormous empirical studies.

Related to the problem of limited production of knowledge, Ecevit (2003) says that, one of the important issues which will provide knowledge is knowledge accumulation in Turkey.

> The mechanism of accumulation of knowledge in Turkey is insufficient. As an expected result of this, knowledge accumulation is insufficient. There is a lack of coordination between the ones who produce, keep and maintain knowledge. All of the ones who produce the knowledge, do not keep and accumulate this knowledge. The number of institutes liable for accumulating knowledge is very few. Knowledge is considered as a waste after being produced and used in Turkey. The necessity of maintaining knowledge is not developed in Turkey, and as related to this, it brings with itself failure in development of the necessities related to history. When knowledge is not accumulated, history is virtually lost: loss in the knowledge of the recent history in particular causes a lack in functioning of the public control mechanisms. Knowledge is power and control. Producing knowledge means producing power. Using knowledge is power and keeping it is a power mechanism. Limited accumulation of knowledge in Turkey has negative effects both on theoretical and on empirical studies. The failure in storing knowledge makes the circumstances harder in theoretical studies because there is no chance to acquire abstracted knowledge. When we make a local and specific study related to Turkey, since there is failure in accumulation of knowledge, it looks as if we are starting everything from the beginning, which constitutes a problem for theoretical studies. There is a hegemonic disaccumulative condition. The central countries do not desire any knowledge storage in surrounding countries. One of the fundamental problems

is the insufficiency in producing knowledge. We are producing dependent knowledge, knowledge lacking theory.

An assistant professor from a main university says that:

There is an important inheritance of social accumulation in Turkey. However, when the publications concerning our sociological imagination up to now and the topic of how those working in sociology view sociology are examined, it is observed that the topic is considered as very weak and superficial. When the publications about sociology are examined, it can be said that there is a positivist comprehension of sociology in our country. However, there are not few people working in a positivist way, concerned in these publications. The persons serving this field in our country generally work on the statistical techniques and try to make the field more sophisticated. I mean, although there is a serious accumulation, no effort can really be seen in our country related to densifying positivism in our society. In other words, the positivism in the West as applied to the studies done in our country is considered very artificial. For this reason, the sociology of sociology or the field of the scientific sociology in Turkey has to be enhanced further. These efforts of development must not only be in the sociology field, but they have to be experienced also in other social sciences like economy and anthropology. Scientific knowledge is not neutral, and relatively this kind of knowledge is the product of society. We discuss life, and the problems happening in life with the practice of sociology and conduct researches on these topics. For this reason, the practice f sociology is a part of life, and this practice itself also has to be considered as a research topic. As a result, apart from the problems about lectures, conferences and publications, the most important problem of sociology in our country is sociology itself.

During the depth-interview, a professor lecturing in one of the centre universities says the following about the import or transfers from the West:

Some sociologists transfer or import theory from abroad. However, these persons do not know Turkey. They have no idea about the public mechanisms and how these function. For this reason, they do not know that knowledge imported from abroad does not have the potential to provide knowledge about these mechanisms. On the contrary, there is no obligation that these theories will be valid everywhere. Sociology is an event more dependent on society and societal conditions. In other words, I have some doubts about the general-reality claim of sociology. Indeed, sociology has some general-real premises or patterns, but these can not explain everything. At least, while binding these patterns to the Turkish people, a mechanism like an adaptor must be inserted in the middle, with the scope of providing balance. In my opinion, this is the

richness of sociology in Turkey. I mean, the West does not experience the change that Turkish people live. The West, from now on, has to form the sociology of an order which must not change any more. However, we have to follow the social events which are faster than our comprehension or explanation; and in my opinion this is our richness. We have to renew ourselves, comprehend new conditions and explain them continuously. Of course after this, we have to study these new conditions, systematize or develop solutions. However, in general, what I observe is we are incapable of realizing these at the moment. Some sociologists are interested in some statements, which can explain the reason for us to be in a general system, like globalization and modernization. But I could never get used to the term modernization. Modernization is a way of explaining the society in the West. However, the usage of the word modernization is very common among us. There are claims that we are going through modernization or are in a period of transition. However, in my opinion by thinking like this we are exactly using the explanations which the West is imposing on us. In my opinion it would be much more sensible to use the word Westernization in explaining the period which the Turkish society lives. I think that we must create our own terms, which are more local. Unfortunately, they come from abroad and we are using the translations. Although it looks like that, this situation gives a much more scientific manner to the sociology language we use, in reality it leads to more confusion. Of course, we can use some terms until we form the new ones. In fact, the biggest dilemma of sociology in Turkey, in my opinion is the belief of not opposing and not criticizing the unique explanation models of the West. Today in Turkey, we observe some problems in sociology derived from failure in having theory, borrowing it from the West and using it as it is. Instead the thing has to be done is uniting by considering the differences we have. To realize this, one must know very well the Ottoman Period, Transition to the Republic and the Republic. We must consider everything not only in itself, but also its position in the axis of the world. When we do this will we be powerful and rich. Otherwise, it will be a one way street for us if we insist on following the narrow and contemporary popular ones, by ignoring all these.

About being under the hegemony of the theories formed in the West, following the agenda, conducting studies free from theory, and academicianian type-casting Cangızbay (2003:89) says:

If every day a "new" arises in the field of social sciences, this also means that the former "new" loses its popularity. There is nothing to be surprised about the words of a lecturer in "Sociology Days", which was held a few months ago saying "you always talk about theories and theories but, as you see, whether it is the theory of Sorokin, or Parsons or Gadamer all the theories can only survive at most for a few years, and then the new ones arise; for this reason let us examine

the concrete reality without saying theory": the fast and comprehensive knowledge of our young scientist about the theories one by one, has hindered him from reaching the theory notion, and definitely he is not an exception. Instead, science cannot be executed without theory; because there is a saying that science exists because the reality is not as we see it.

As result of this relationship, Cangızbay (2003:84) cites about the presence of a a relationship between the ones who produce and who consume knowledge, with the hegemony of the first one.

About the confusion in concepts in sociological studies, an assistant professor from a central university says that:

> Most of the people from the sociology discipline still have the idea that the problems of sociology in Turkey comprise the technical or practical problems. Among sociologists, there is a notable rate of conceptual confusion; and there is a common belief that this could be arranged when gathered. Instead, the reason of the conceptual confusion is the fact that there are different sociologies present in Turkey. In other words, the ones causing the conceptual confusion are not neutral, they have different meanings. I mean, in the sociology discipline of our country, in fact there is no concept for which ever body has the same opinion. Both the observations and the concepts are dependent. No observation free from neutral measures is possible. And for this reason, we do not have the chance to discuss about what the fundamental assumptions of sociology in Turkey are. While the epistemological and methodological problems of sociology are being deeply discussed in the West day by day, there is no development about this subject in Turkey.

About the absence of a sociology tradition, an associate professor from the central university says:

"I think that the sociology tradition in Turkey is developing in a conservative direction. Conservation causes the primary type relations to raise the 'man favouritism'. "

In Table 10, distribution of answers on problems of sociology in terms of content and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and in pages between 144 and 154 open forms of this are presented.

Table 10: Distribution of answers on problems of sociology in terms of content and summary of Chi-square significance tests results.

N=83

Statements	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Dis-agree %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
24.Limited historical studies	45.1	47.6	7.3	100.	3.754	.264	.556
26.Insufficiency of institutional studies	34.9	53.0	12.0	100.	5.753	2.007	.238
27.Insufficiency of political analysis	48.2	39.8	12.0	100.	3.919	.269	.112
28.Insufficiency of class analysis	31.3	48.2	20.5	100.	11.827	1.076	.772
29.Positive impact of cultural studies	16.9	54.2	28.9	100.	6.062	6.240*	3.335
31.Over-specialization	7.2	26.5	66.3	100.	8107	3.721	1.768
32.Limited success in interdisciplinary studies	26.5	482	25.3	100.	7.522	4.929	.605
33.Increased variety of topics/issues	41.0	42.2	16.9	100.	4.218	1.855	1.541
51.Limited involvement in civil society	43.9	43.9	12.2	100.	5.820	7.088*	.001
57.Interest in future sociological issues	52.4	42.7	4.9	100.	11.783	.733	2.487

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

About the limitation of the historical studies, the interpretations of most of the respondents about the presence of such a problem, are in conformity with their interpretations about the problem of absence of a historical perspective in the studies done in the sociology field. Ecevit (2003) points out that the knowledge related to

history is limited and besides, the production of this knowledge is also limited. In addition to this, the interpretation of an academician lecturing as a professor in the central universities, whose interpretations were presented in the previous chapters, about the necessity of examining the Ottoman history and Republic history with the scope of liberating from the determination of the West, indicates the limited historical studies done in the field of sociology in Turkey. About this topic Kayalı (2003:63) states that social scientists and sociologists are not related to the history, the enormous interest in empirical sociology studies hinder sociologists from turning to history. According to him, giving more importance than necessary to the empirical studies, in a sense causes to be stuck in the agenda. In other words, this tendency prevents one from seeing the social reality as a whole, including the historical dimension.

For the question number 29, there is a significant relation between the place of the university and positive impact of cultural studies ($p<.044$). The percentage of the respondents who "Strongly Agree" is 21.1% who are from the regional universities, and 66.7% are from the central universities and say "Agree". According to Erdoğan (2003: 57), in Turkey, cultural studies both provide many opportunities and consist of lots of dangers. On the one hand, cultural studies provide the possibility to understand the complex transformations and to find the solutions for the organic crisis of Turkish society. On the other hand, there are some barriers in front of cultural studies. These blocks emerged both in university and in the ideological-political conjuncture at both global and local levels.

Related to the positive impact of cultural studies Kasapoğlu (2004c) claims that to understand the complex structure of society today, both culture and structure must be examined by considering their interactive relations. Instead, an assistant professor from one of the central universities says that the cultural studies in Turkey have to be of the quality to be capable of sociological deployment. According to her, the only

way for sociology to ask all contradictory questions about life today in Turkey, is considered to be cultural studies, which fait to have the capacity to hold such things.

Related to the question about the negative effect of overspecialization, it is understood that most of the respondents do not share this idea (66.3%). They mostly do not accept the opinion of Akşin (cited in Kasapoğlu 2004a:115). Akşin asserts that specialization has a negative function on social sciences because focusing on one topic leads to ignore that social reality is a whole. Different from Akşin, Ulusoy (cited in Kasapoğlu 2004a:14) says that in applied studies, specialization is an unavoidable phenomenon. Akşit (1986:195-196; 1998) claims that among the sociologists in Turkey there is a proliferation along with a compartmentalization. Stating that the proliferation is related with the sub branches of sociology, Akşit borrowed the concept of proliferation from Feyerabend (1975), the presence of more than one theory or method in one investigation field, and to be interacted, discussed, the ability of the opposing theory to be produced. He says that compartmentalization is between the approaches, generations and even between the departments; and that this could be overcome by transaction, discussion, giving references to each other, by holding seminars and conferences.

For the compartmentalization concept about which Akşit cites, it can be said that not only the differences in the scientific comprehension, but also the conflicts experienced between the persons cause this concept to rise. About this, Konuk (1994:74) states that the different terminologies observed in Turkish sociology, other than demonstrating the richness of the resources also could be the indicators of the sociological persistence. However, here it must be noted that there is an inconsistency between the percentage of respondents' answers to the questions related to the negative effects of overspecialization and of increased variety of topics. While for the former question the respondents generally do not agree, for the latter question they accept that increased variety of topics does not imply that there is a development in sociology in Turkey.

About the study between the disciplines, a professor lecturing in a central university says:

> The world has been globalized, united; and there is no possibility of isolating Turkey from this united world. The effects of this globalization, which accelerated with the influence of the computer and communication technologies, in particular, started to be more experienced in recent years. The rising of the globalization is not very far, since it develops so rapidly that its economical, political, social and national effects in all dimensions are felt all over the world. Against this modification, the theories of sociology formed due to the formerly state concept are no longer capable of solving problems. Turkey is also a part of the global world; and the theories and the applications of sociology have to be developed in order to create solutions to the problems of Turkey. With the globalization also sociology is in need of new methods and theories which could explain the events and concepts of the new world order. Now, today considering the events and concepts in a national dimension is an obstacle for understanding the global world.

> Besides, sociology has to be changed radically in order to be capable of explaining the new events and concepts experienced with globalization. As in the other social sciences, today sociology also has to be in a joint study with a few disciplines with the scope of explaining the social events and of bringing solutions to problems. For sociology to create solutions which comply with the conditions of the day, it has to act in a multidisciplinary way in certain measures.

Related to the question about the limited involvement in civil society, there is a significant relation between limited involvement in civil society and the place of the university (p<.029). "Strongly agree" constitutes 52.6% coming from periphery universities; "Agree" is from central universities with 56.8%. According to this result it can be said that the conscious of civil society did not develop well. In this study 43.6% of the respondents are members of different non-professional organisations. The distribution of that percentage according to the university location shows that 47.5% of the respondents who are members of non-professional organisations are academicians working in central universities and 39.5% are in periphery universities. According to the data, the respondents generally accept that there is a negative effect of limited involvement in civil society. However, the percentage of membership to a

non-professional organisation is 43.6%, so it is possible to see the contradiction of academicians' attitudes and behaviours.

About the necessity of the civil society discussions, Akşit (cited in Kasapoğlu, 2004a:118) says:

Civil society discussions have become very important because of increased political representation problem of political parties in Turkey. Actually, sociology investigates society. But, unfortunately, since we do not have a civic society, sociologists deal with society. But gradually civic society has started to be established. I am a member of the Sociological Association, Turkish Social Science Education, public Health Association, and Social Science Association for Health. I have also worked as a consultant or advisor in several institutions. I have also given several interviews on television.

In Table 11 the distribution of answers on problems specific to limitations due to structural conditions of sociology and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and in pages between 155 and 160 open forms of this table are presented.

Table 11: Distribution of answers on problems specific to limitations due to structural conditions of sociology and summary of Chi-square significance tests results.

N=83

Statements	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Dis agree %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
36.Negative impact of distinction between education and research in sociology	44.6	45.8	9.6	100.	13.609*	.192	5.853*
43. No difference in the distinction between writing books and articles	50.6	42.2	7.2	100.	14.640*	.432	2.328
48.Insufficient conditions of continuous accumulation of knowledge	58.5	39.0	2.4	100.	1.945	4.837	2.667
52.Limited professional organisation	61.0	35.4	3.7	100.	13.045*	3.611	6.230**
53.Insufficient coordination between academic and non-academic sociologists	60.2	38.6	1.2	100.	4.889	2.427	.557

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

There is a significant relationship between the thought about the negative impact of distinction between education and research and academic status (p<.034) and the university with doctorate degree had (p<.054). Professors "Strongly Agree" (62.5%) and associate professors "Disagree" (25.0%). 61.9% "Strongly Agree" and they had a doctorate degree from a foreign country. The academicians who had a doctorate degree from foreign countries "Agree" (54.9%). According to the answers to question related to the personal evaluation of himself/herself as a scientist, it is possible to say academicians who participated in this study accept the unity of

education and research. This shows the consistency between respondents' behaviours and attitudes.

About the education and researches to be kept together in the university, the interpretation of a research assistant from a periphery university is the following:

> Unity of processes of both education and research is preferred. But, because of the mass education, academicians have to give more importance to the education side. In addition to this, insufficient infrastructure and "ideology of engineers" (Göle, 1998) of the state and political government lead many problems in social science in Turkey.

According to Sezal (2004:149) Turkish Higher Education is teaching oriented rather than research oriented. Because of high numbers of students and as opposite to that insufficient infrastructures lead to passive teaching of which intellectual level is relatively less. This interpretation of Sezal is similar to the interpretations of the respondents about the education quality.

For question 43, there is significant relation between academic status and thought about the distinction between writing books and articles in the context of their effect to Turkish sociology (p<.023). Associate professors are "Strongly agree" (100%) and professors are "Agree" (43.8%), while assistant professors are "Disagree" (18.2%). In other words associate professors and professors say that there is no important difference between writing books or articles, only if all of them are high in quality.

Related to this, it can be said that, during the early terms of sociology in Turkey, among the academicians, translating sociology books was preferred. But, today, to say something sociological about the society which changes too fast and to catch up agenda, it is an obligation to write article. In addition to that YÖK's promotion policy which gives more credit to articles which are published in international journal is one of reasons the tendency to write article. Şaylan (2004:138-144) asserts

that publishing a book is more difficult than publishing an article. It is quite difficult academic activity in social sciences.

For question 52, there is significant relation between academic status and thought related to limited professional organisations' negative effects to sociology in Turkey (p<.042). 73.0% are "Strongly Agree" (research assistants),"Agree" is 59.1 % (assistant professors) and 14.3% is "Disagree" (associate professors). This result is in conformity with the fact that among the academicians in this study, mostly the professors are the members of the sociology associations.

About the insufficiency of knowledge accumulation professor lecturing in one of the main university says:

> Another point on which the sociologists have to work on is, the necessity of gathering the information together belonging to the periods before and after the Republic. We have certain accumulation in the history and it is a fact that the cultural inheritance was ignored for a certain period of time. The reason for this was to establish a Western type nation state. But now it is time to question ourselves and our history. As sociologists, by examining both periods, we must determine which errors were made about which subject, examine them and bring them to life by various publications.

By depending on the data in Table 11, it can be said that academicians mostly accept the existence of problems specific to limitations due to structural conditions of sociology.

In Table 12, distribution of answers on limited critical character and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and in pages between 160 and 163 open forms of this table are presented.

Table 12: Distribution of answers on limited critical character and summary of Chi-square significance tests results.

N=83

Statements	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Not Agree %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
34. Lack of tradition of written criticism	67.5	27.7	4.8	100.	10.280	.087	1.615
49. Referring and being aware of other scholars	41.0	47.0	12.0	100.	9.900	3.004	3.933
56.Insufficient interest towards problems of sociology discipline in Turkey	43.2	45.7	11.1	100.	6.127	3.802	1.349

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

There is a common belief that the tradition of criticism – written criticism specifically- does not exist. An associate professor from one of the central universities, whose interpretations are present in the questionnaire, says that there is no tradition of criticism in Turkey, nobody is capable of making criticism on scientific criteria, and what everybody does is to criticise the other for personal interests. It is possible to find clues that indicate the disputes between the academicians. About this issue Ecevit (2003) states three reasons about the absence of the tradition of criticism: that the material to be criticised is not at the level of criticism, that there is a lack of persons capable of making criticism even when the material is present, and that there is a lack of desire to make criticism despite the presence of these conditions. This third one is a situation which calls for discussion.

As mentioned by the respondents, the academicians incompetent in quality have a negative effect on sociology in Turkey. Perhaps what Ecevit intended by saying

academicians are incapable of making critisism was that these persons were incompetent in quality. In fact, there are rare written critiques (Hülür, 2002) in Turkey. However, one must remember that these critics can also be criticised, and the motive behind these critics must be questioned.

About the lack of coordination, a research assistant from a periphery region says:

> Because of insufficiency in coordination and communication, it is necessary to prevent sociology conflicts which are most commonly in the form of repeating sociology; and in specific to the form of the sociology tradition in sociology departments.

Similarly, another research assistant from a periphery region says:

> The sociological studies in Turkey are undertaken without being coordinated. Without notice, similar topics are examined in similar perspectives by using similar methods. This situation causes a waste of effort and time, and results in a repetition of the similar knowledge.

It can be generally said that most of respondents are in consensus about the limited character of Turkish sociology.

Regarding the problems of sociology in Turkey, a professor from one of the central universities says that, "sociology does not have a problem in Turkey, there are nearly a hundred precious social scientists and that they perform their duties very well." According to her, these individuals are sufficient for Turkey. Mentioning that she does not appreciate the event of founding a sociology department almost everywhere in Turkey, the professor adds that it will be a mistake to consider the problems in these departments as the problems of sociology. In fact these problems are the results of the sociology education. Starting from here, she points out that these departments do not undertake sociology, but rather the education of sociology.

Believing that the most important problem of sociology in Turkey is the absence of evaluative studies done, in other words, absence of making the sociology of sociology; an assistant professor from one of the central universities says the following:

> Sociology has many problems in Turkey; but when generalized, the problems of sociology can be classified under two titles. These can be said as the problems concerning sociology and the problems related to the technical parts of sociology. The problems can be listed as the ones derived from the application of the sociology education in Turkey, the problems of the sociology departments in the universities, the ones concerning the curriculum, the problems about the name of the lectures and the programmes, the ones comprising the employment of the graduates, and the problems about the number of the sociological facilities. These problems, at the same time, could be classified into two categories as theoretical and practical. In other words, when sociology in Turkey is considered, there are problems in which very few or too many are interested in this discipline.

> The absence of discussion on sociology is one of the most important problems of sociology in Turkey. The ones in the discipline continuously conduct empirical studies; benefiting from the resources and under the name of the discipline new knowledge is produced by the day. However, we cannot transform this information to argumentations. At this point, one of the important problems experienced in the field of sociology is the absence of discussions on the information produced in the sociology discipline. Most of the people working in the discipline of sociology could easily answer the question of 'what sociology is '. This question may seem very simple, but the essential problems of sociology in our country are around the answer of this question. The ones who are working in the sociology discipline in Turkey are trying to produce sociological knowledge without forming a conceptual understanding about sociology and without having a sociological imagination. It looks like a comprehension domain where there is only one sociology on which everyone agrees in the discipline of sociology. It looks as if the problems solely derive from the application of sociology or are only made of the conceptual confusion. In fact, the most important problem of sociology derives from itself. Sociology is a social product, not out of the social world, and not released from a social vanity. However, in Turkey, since the knowledge produced in the field of sociology is not discussed, it is not possible to march by sharing the opinions on the sociological accumulation. In other words, sociological researches and studies are being conducted in Turkey, but no researches are done on sociology itself; it is not considered; it is not discussed or considered as a matter to be discussed. The fact that sociology itself has not been discussed up to now caused the sociology to become paralysed in Turkey.

In Table 13, distribution of answers on the problem of empirical fetishism and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and in pages between 164 and 169 open forms of this table are presented.

Table 13: Distribution of answers on the problem of empirical fetishism and summary of Chi-square significance tests results.

<div align="center">

N=83

</div>

Statements	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Not Agree %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
37. Policy-oriented studies as the most funded	35.4	47.6	17.1	100.	4.734	.974	.191
38. Funds are directed to solutions rather than understanding social problems	19.5	64.6	15.9	100.	1.927	2.190	1.766
39. Priority given to quantitative rather than qualitative criteria in academic promotions	61.4	36.1	2.4	100.	7.468	1.574	1.522
40. International journals giving priority to local/empirical studies	17.1	51.2	31.7	100.	4.441	3.808	3.401
54. Importance of theoretical studies for the needs of society	63.4	36.6	-	100.	1.708	.172	.001

$p<.05^*$, $p<.01^{**}$, $p<.000^{***}$

About providing resources for the policy-oriented researches, an associate professor from a periphery university states that the situation is not like this in reality; nothing is done with these funds for the universities in the periphery regions, since these studies are not done with a certain aim, and as a result, nothing is obtained in terms of sociology.

For the question number 40, one of the respondents, an associate professor from one of the central universities says that she does not agree with this opinion because, all of the studies published in the journals are the quality studies conducted with a particular purpose.

According to the data in Table 13, academicians in this study are mostly in consensus about the importance of theoretical studies for the needs of society (100.0%).

Giving more importance to quantity rather than quality is a level to reach almost in every field of Turkey. The importance given to the quantity being supported by the political authorities and the market creates this result. The reflection of this concept on the universities can be examined around this first factor:

The criteria considered in the academic appointments done by YÖK, most commonly depend on the quantitative data. Şaylan (2004:138-144) says that the most common type of performance appraisal is based on the quality and quantity of publications by an academician. In fact the general acceptance is that the best one publishes most in high quality. Under the YÖK system, it is obligatory for Turkish social scientists to publish articles in well acknowledged foreign periodicals, especially those covered by SSCI for promotion and positive evaluation.

In addition to this, Tekeli (2003:134) says that the academician united with the market, and can access resources easily is the most preferred academician in the

Turkish academicians market. Tekeli, taking into consideration the possibility of an academician who can find resources easily to be a good scientist at the same time, has pointed out the concept of adherence to quantity.

In Table 14, distribution of answers on autonomy in scholarship and summary of Chi-square significance tests results are given and in pages between 169 and 174 open forms of this table are presented.

Table 14: Distribution of answers on autonomy in scholarship and summary of Chi-square significance tests results.

N=83

Statements	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Not Agree %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square	Ph.D. Chi-Square
41.Priority given to publishing in international journals	24.1	49.4	26.5	100.	3.234	2.473	.466
42.No difference in national or international publication unless high quality maintained	47.0	47.0	6.0	100.	4.220	2.216	1.209
45. High expectations from the state	41.0	53.0	6.0	100.	3.018	1.072	.872
50.Limited autonomy	45.8	47.0	7.2	100.	4.714	2.954	2.247
55. Importance of being an independent scholar	63.4	32.9	3.7	100.	1.851	1.718	.808

$p<.05*$, $p<.01**$, $p<.000***$

It can be understood from the Table that academicians are in consensus about the importance of being an independent scholar (96.3%). Claiming that sociology in Turkey is dependent on the political government, and that sociology which is not in conformity with the government is isolated in Turkey, a professor from one of the central university says the following:

Sociology in Turkey has played an important role in the foundation phase of the Turkish Republic. Even in the first years of the Republic, we see that it is established in accordance with the idealistic principles of the West. Sociology has two directions. While it serves the present order with one, it criticises the present order with the other. For this reason, sociology is in conflict with the present order. The culture of criticism comes from sociology among social sciences. For this reason, when we look at history, we see that sociology has been demolished all the time. After each strike, the ones under pressure are sociology and the sociologists. In the countries like ours which have been trying to solve their problems recently some parts did not appreciate the criticisms of the sociologists and following this, they were kept under pressure; and in certain periods the improvement of sociology was really prevented. In my opinion, like this sociology, sociology changed into more fanatic and conservative way, or has been converted into a tale or a story. In the Republic of Turkey, the engineers tried to establish sociology. In fact, engineers do not establish a society. It is the job of the sociologists to establish a society. Instead, when we say contemporary nation-state, the construction of this was thought by the engineers. Related to this, in my opinion, sociologists especially did not play a notable role in the establishment and foundation of Turkey, in fact, they were isolated purposefully, because the sooner a sociologist enters in, the more immediate the sociologist starts to criticise. Criticises what? For example, the structure of the society, the historical origin of this structure. There is a historical comprehension in Turkey, but this is the official history. There is no social history in particular. Sociologists have to cooperate with the historians and have to bring this history into light. Today, one of the problems we face is that the practicing sociologists are not in public institutions. In a country with so many problems, is there not a necessity for a sociologist; who is assuming the duties of the sociologist; who has solved such problems as law specialists, economists, and engineers. Instead, sociologists are employed in the private sector. We are benefiting from sociology and the sociologists but we do not employ them. Today the necessities for the social sciences are much more. Today, the target is humans. Who deals with this? The sociologist. For this reason sociology must have a place first of all.

In 1942, Berkes (1942; 1985: 241-242) said that scientific studies did not become independent, a scientific or educational tradition was not established, and this is mostly felt in the field of the social sciences. The presence of these problems makes people think.

Related to the problem about publication, Şaylan (2004:138-144) asserts that in the present system, academicians focus all their attentions abroad to get promotion. Consequently they do not give much importance to the national journals and they do not feel themselves compelled to debate among themselves. He claims that formal promotion system led many social scientists to indulge in unethical publishing.

As mentioned by the respondent whose interpretation is quoted above, sociology has two conflicting functions in society: to criticise the order of the present society and to provide the order to the present society. Universities are the institutions in which scientific activities take place by means of ideal thoughts. In order to realize this activity, these institutions must have an independent structure. However, the interpretations received up to now show that universities are under the pressure of some centres of power. Sociology had to maintain its criticising identity as a discipline because of this double pressure in society. Derrida (cited in Timur 2000:309) says that today, even the most contradictory statements take place in the universities, and this does not indicate democracy; because these contradictory statements are realized within the limits determined by the university. This interpretation of Derrida is one of the most striking statements, indicating that the university, science and social science have independent qualities.

2.7. The Solutions of Problems

In Table 15, distributions of answers according to respondents replies about the solutions for the basic problems of sociology in Turkey and summary of Chi-square

significance tests results are given and in pages between 174 and 177 open forms of this table are presented.

Table 15: Distributions of answers according to respondents' about the solutions for the basic problems of sociology in Turkey and summary of Chi-square significance tests results

N=83

Problems	Yes Answer %	No answer %	Total %	Status Chi-Square	University Chi-Square
Insufficient infrastructure	32.1	67.9	100	1.166	.328
Ideological	32.1	67.9	100	2.691	3.439
Quality of education	55.1	44.9	100	1.245	1.931
Quality of sociological studies	35.9	64.1	100	5.536	.092
Organisational	33.3	66.7	100	2.963	.411

p<.05*, p<.01**, p<.000***

Among the solutions concerning infrastructure, the respondents often said that the financial problems of the sociologists should be solved. Meanwhile, the aforesaid problems include all the financial insufficiencies in general sense: distribution of resources, fund, etc. However, there is another problem here not mentioned before: the topic concerning the increase in the salary of the academicians. About this subject Tekeli (2003:140) says that in Turkey, a very low salary is paid to such qualified human power although the university is appreciated very much, and the lecturers are expected to show a superhuman performance, and that this puts the young lecturers in a very difficult position. For the solutions of the ideological problems, the tendency of the political structure against the present social sciences has to be demolished. For the solutions concerning education, they say that the system has to be reformed and rearranged.

95

According to Kasapoğlu (1991a; 1991b), the mission of providing the education service which is appropriate to the modern education perceptivity and is integrated to the necessity of the free-market should not be ignored. Related to this solution, some academicians suggest that they must develop and reform themselves according to the changing social, political, cultural and economical conditions in the world. To increase the quality of education, infrastructural services such as money, funds, and libraries must be provided. The criteria for being an academician must depend on scientific touchstones. Random and uninformed preference of sociology in ÖSS must be prevented. To provide this, society must be informed about what sociology is.

In addition, as for the case of providing cooperation, communication and organisation between the schools of thought, it is indicated that sociology in Turkey would be much better. For organisation, the respondents said that it is highly beneficial that the establishment of branches of sociology associations in Ankara, in the sense of gathering. About the organisation, a research assistant from a periphery region suggests the following:

> The Sociology Association which contributes to the development of sociology in Turkey has to assume a more active and supportive role. It has to be in a more productive and effective relationship with the sociology departments. As a suggestion, a new organisation style can be presented with the scope of founding a new sociology centre or within the scope of the activities of the Sociology Association, with the aim of giving a new spirit to sociological studies. The aforesaid centre should be responsible for following the sociological studies in Turkey (masters and doctorate theses, articles published in local or foreign journals and books), determining the studying field of the masters and doctorate theses done in Turkey; in other words, creating new fields of study, supporting thesis studies and forwarding the sociological developments to the world. The probable positive results of a suggestion like this can be listed as follows: a variety in the sense of quantity in the sociological studies to be provided; the masters and the doctorate theses to provide positive contributions to society, in light of the determined subjects and by reviewing the problems of the Turkish Society independently; the sociologists in Turkey to be acknowledged and to show acknowledgement to each other about the national and international studies, by means of this centre.

The data obtained from sociological studies should not be considered that they have the intention to waste or erase the knowledge gathered before.

To increase the quality of sociological studies an assistant professor from a central university says that:

Knowledge determined as scientific knowledge is a kind of knowledge on which it is necessary to discuss. If we consider scientific knowledge as authoritative and non criticisable, dogmatism will rule. Scientific knowledge also has to be examined with a critical point of view. In this case, it is necessary that scientific knowledge be examined with a critical point of view and has to undergo discussion. There are very few publications concerning the discovery of the publications and the knowledge produced within the discipline of sociology, and new studies in this field are needed.

In order to increase the quality of sociological studies, a professor from one of the central universities suggests:

We have to reform ourselves and we have to observe, understand and explain the new conditions. And then we have to systemise theories about these conditions and propose solutions. I believe that we should develop local concepts and our own approaches. But unfortunately concepts and approaches are translated from foreign works and we use them. Though it appears that this makes a more scientific language, actually it complicates it.

Related to the problem about the quality of sociological studies, an assistant professor in a central university says that:

There are not many resources concerning the notable periods in the field of sociology. It is necessary that the researches comprising these periods be done urgently. For example, a study concerning the topics of the history of thoughts in Turkey, and the leaders of sociology in Turkey, have to be studied the soonest as having priority. Additionally, it is the same for the researches that relate the sociology in Turkey and the history of the Turkish society.

2.8. The Conflict

Based on the respondents' answers, it can be said that the other factor of insufficient developed character of sociology in Turkey is the conflict among academicians.
It is possible to observe conflicts experienced between the academic personnel at the universities in the sociology departments.

These conflicts, often derived from personal or political reasons, sometimes stay at the individual level, and they are sometimes caused by conflicting common benefits "conflict solidarity" (Barthos and Wher, 2002) and this conflict is experienced between the groups. The differences in the scientific opinions can also be added to the reasons of these conflicts but it is not clear at all to say whether these differences cause the conflict or there is a difference derived from the conflict.

One of the ambiances in which the conflicts obviously take place is the situations in which the academic evaluations (peer review) are made. About the aforesaid contemporary evaluation Tekeli (2003:140) says:

> The way of human relationships in Turkey, shortly culture, prevents healthy contemporary evaluation. Everybody refrains from making negative assessment. In such an atmosphere full of cultural deviations, contemporary evaluation is problematic.

Against this interpretation of Tekeli (2003:140), Koç ([2000?]: 168) states that, these contemporary evaluations is an atmosphere in which personal conflicts occur by pointing out the universal values.

Another situation to mention about the conflicts is when the conflicting sides show the reason of being or not being scientific. About this subject an assistant professor from a university in a periphery region says:

The numerous exampler events I experienced since I returned from abroad and started working in Turkey, convinced me that there is character corrosion among academicians in Turkey. I realised in time that these were not only personal experiences. The ones who received education in Turkey are capable of resisting unfair treatment since they grew up to survive in such conditions. As far as I can see, they are not influenced at all. However, especially for the ones who returned to the country after residing abroad for long years, Turkish universities and the sociology departments in this sense are the kind of atmosphere hard to stand. Definitely the reason of this is the individuals in science of these departments. Those who cannot speak a foreign language, do not have a publication in a foreign language, never been abroad even once in their life, have not either written or engaged in oral correspondence with their colleagues. Upon realising their incompetency, they prefer to demolish, apply pressure and if possible erase the ones who have these qualities, instead of trying to train themselves, which is also present in the reasons which I think that is related with the character.

Academicianship, in my opinion, is not a profession to be conducted by any person. It is a job that requires a very resistant infrastructure and relative self-confidence. I call it a job because it is not a profession. However, in Turkey people go to the university as if they are going to a vocational school, also the academicianship is considered as a profession that could be done just by anyone. As a result, the situation converts into this common opinion. For the reasons I mentioned above, it is not possible for a person who does not know about other societies to examine his own society correctly, and most of the sociologists in Turkey are in these conditions.

Besides, there are no schools of thought in sociology in Turkey, and other than some exceptions, nobody is making an effort to train young sociologists. On the contrary, they are preventing the young people.

Another problem is the division of departments into subdivisions.Even the departments, the manner of categorisation of which is unknown, are used for preventing people about staff movements. If we can talk about the specialisation in Turkey, the staff of the department do not comply with the area of specialisation.

The individuals do not see each other as colleagues. They rather consider themselves as rivals or opponents. The evidence for this are the reports issued by journal articles sent to the editors, which are far from being scientific, and are not such types to be either said or sent in the written form to a colleague or a scientist. The same thing is valid for the reports issued by the members of the jury for the lecturer to my colleagues. In short, many sociologists are using the little power they have to hurt, destroy and remove or get their colleagues fired, especially the young ones. In brief, today, the most important problem of

99

science Turkey and in particular sociology is the unqualified human capital and their lack of morality, discipline, human compassion, respect and family education.

Another exampler event of the conflict of personal gain experienced at the university is the conflict on the basis of the difference in the political opinions of one group of sociologists working in a university in the periphery region and another group of academicians who are more conservative. In time the participation of the local leaders was deployed which resulted in the firing of the academicians, who have left political tendency from the university.

The interpretations of a reseach assistant about this matter lecturing in a central university is the following:

The biggest problem of the university academicians is lack of respect towards the work that the others do but boasting about themselves. I mean, you can criticise someone's work in a scientific manner. However, the thing going on here is considering oneself as the best scientist and criticising the other by means of character aspects, for which it is obvious that it has nothing to do with scientific values. Unfortunately this is nothing than claiming that one knows everything. Thus, each academician tries to establish a hegamony on each other, and considers everyone as a rival. This situation not only makes it impossible for us to establish even acquaintanceship between each other, but it also causes hypocrisy to rise. Even when I started to serve as an assistant, during the years of my first lectures, I must confess that it was not a nice experience that, the "academicians", who were competing with me instead of guiding me for what I will teach in the lectures.

On the other hand, perhaps the academicians should be more modest. In fact, most of us do not propose such big theories. In such circumstances, there is no need to act in a conceited manner and to disapprove of others' work and to show contempt to others by saying "what does he/she know?". In fact the main reason of this has nothing to do with scientific studies. It is completely related to personal relations. When the matter is considered in this way, may be the reformation of the academicians of the relationships among each other is the fist step to be taken in the solution of the problem.

The opinions of a research assistant lecturing in the periphery region about the conflicts in the department is as follows:

> The assistants, especially in some of the universities, are responsible for doing the personal work of their professors; while they receive negative reactions. For this reason they lose their interest in the academic world. In addition to this, also the effort of the professors to include their assistants in the tension that they have with each other has negative effects on sociology.

Mills (1959; 2000:358-359) also made similar observations about this. At the time in of his lifetime, he stated that the sociologist academicians who were not using this language were contempted for using journalist language, and that behind this contempt lies the intention of the persons, whom he denominates as "science forger", to fill the academy with persons having opinions close to them about the tendency of writing in the scientific language, which was common among academicians. He was absulately right when he was calling his opponents as emperors riding on the horse without clothes. It is obvious that this interpretation of Mills describes the conflicts experienced in today's academic world of Turkey.

As the interpretations and the examples here show, there is a grave conflict between the academicians in the universities of Turkey. The presence of such conflicts in sociology departments is one of the most important problems that sociology faces in Turkey.

In this chapter where the views of the academicians participating in the study on sociology's general state and problems in Turkey are assessed, results verifying the macro and micro level conflicts expressed in the first chapter are obtained.

The participants' replies to the open-ended questions asked for the purpose of uncovering the most important problems of sociology in Turkey, what the reasons of these problems and the solutions of these problems might be are gathered under five headings as earlier indicated. These are entitled as insufficiency of infrastructure, ideological factors, education, quality of academicians and students, quality of sociological studies, inadequacy of organisation, coordination, communication, and

discussion. These groups formed in line with the views of the participants have been utilized for the reasons and solutions of the problems.

According to the assessments of the participants, the most important problem of sociology in Turkey is the inadequacies in the quality of sociological studies. As earlier expressed, under this heading the following are present: lack of philosophy and historical perspective, disconnection with the social reality, insufficient research, problem of originality, lack of information about contemporary debates, methodological problems, not being interested in the problems of Turkish society, extreme empiricism, overspecialization and insufficient specialization, not being authentic, not constructing the relationship between theory and practice, fragmentation of different studies, lack of interdisciplinary studies, interest in popular subjects, not knowing much about the literature, not producing local knowledge and theory.

Despite the general view that the most important problem of sociology in Turkey stems from the quality of sociological studies, although there is little difference between them by percentage, the actual reasons for this problem lie in ideological factors and education, inadequacies in the quality of academicians and students. It is not clear what the participants express by the expression "ideological factors." However, one needs to indicate that, in general, determining the power of the political government and the market as well as the influence of the Western societies are gathered under this heading. However, in this study, the concept of ideology is utilised in its broadest sense and it is recognized that reflections of the concept of ideology are present in resource distribution, education, quality of sociological studies, inadequacy of organisation and coordination.

Among the opinions about the solution of these problems, enhancement of the education provided in sociology departments and of the quality of academicians and students ranks first. This demonstrates an agreement with the opinion about the

102

inadequacy of quality of education, academicians and students seen as the reason for the problems.

Closed-ended questions have been gathered under two headings and evaluated: problems related to theoretical and methodological issues and those related to ideological issues. The second group is reviewed under five headings: problems of sociology in terms of content, specific problems due to structural conditions of sociology, problems related to the limited critical character, problem of empirical fetishism, and problems related to autonomy in scholarship.

There is consistency between the participants' state of agreement with the problems considered under the heading "problems related to the theoretical and methodological issues" and their expression that the problems stemming from the quality of sociological studies are the most important problems.

Under the heading "problems stemming from the quality of sociological studies," of the problems reviewed under the heading "problems of sociology in terms of content," all but overspecialization is present. The high rate of agreement with the questions in the second group agrees with the replies given to the first group.

The participant mostly agreed on answers to the questions present under the heading "problems specific to limitations due to structural conditions of sociology." In other words, the participants recognise that separation of the processes of education and research from each other harms sociology, that there is no difference with respect to contribution to sociology between writing a book and an article provided that they bear quality, that inadequacy in constantly accumulating knowledge will harm sociology, and that lack of coordination between academician sociologists and non-academician sociologists harms sociology.

The participants, to a great extent, agreed on answers to the questions on the limited critical character. In other words, according to the participants, they recognise that the absence of the tradition of written criticism, not having knowledge of other academicians' works and consequently not quoting from their works has a negative effect on sociology, and that inadequate interest in the problems of sociology in Turkey has a negative effect on the development of the discipline.

The participants in general recognise the existence of the problem of empirical fetishism. In other words, they agree that policy-oriented research is allocated more resources, that most of the foreign funds in particular is granted without performing the required scientific studies, understanding what the problems stem from and directly for solution, that quantitative criteria are given priority in academic promotions, that international journals pay attention to local empirical works, and that theoretical works are needed for the needs of the society.

Most participants agree with the views evaluated under the heading "autonomy in scholarship." The participants agree that giving priority to publishing in foreign journals negatively affects sociology, that there is no difference between publishing in national and international journals provided that it bears quality, that expecting everything from the state has a negative effect on sociology, and that being an independent academician has a positive effect on sociology.

A large majority of the participants (more than 60%) drew attention to the existence of character erosion among sociologists in Turkey stemming from their relations with the political government and the market. In these views emphasising the determining power of government and market on sociologists, latently, there are also findings that sociologists are passive.

One group of participants drawing attention to the existence of character erosion among sociologists expressed that the reasons for this were conflicts experienced

between individuals, sometimes on an individual basis while sometimes on a group basis; and indicated that this harmed sociology. This situation verifies the opinion on the negative effect of conflicts experienced at the micro level on sociology.

In this section in which the interpretations of the academicians related to the problems of sociology in Turkey were evaluated, it is observed that the problems mentioned previously in the literature are almost valid for today. It really makes us think that the problems mentioned in the 30's, 40's or 50's repeat today. The conflicting relations between the people capable of solving these, transforms the situation into a more difficult nature.

In the next chapter of the study, a general evaluation has been made in light of the information gathered in this section and some suggestions about solution have been presented.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSION

Since sociology originated and developed during the industrialisation and modernisation periods of the developed Western countries, 'insufficient development' can be considered one of the appropriate conceptualisations among others while writing a conclusion for a thesis which is basically aimed to assess problems and the status of sociology in Turkey.

The concept of an underdeveloped society is not widely used today. This concept is replaced by another concept, called developing society. Related to this, an evaluation concerning modernisation is made by Latour (cited in Wallerstein, 1999:19). According to him, modernity has never happened. By asserting the concept of 'hybrid', he suggests that nothing in social life is pure. In another interpretation of Latour, it can be stated that modern and traditional values coexist in a society. By accepting this approach in this sudy, Turkish society is accepted as a developing country in which both modern and traditional values coexit.

The modernisation venture of Turkish society started in the middle of the 19th century. The Ottoman Empire, which was weak in political, economic and military aspects, was searching for a new social, political and military model to retrieve its old strength. Since the sole or unique model to take as an example is the Western societies, a fast Westernisation process was initiated in the Ottoman Empire after this period.

Even after the Ottoman Empire collapsed and the Turkish Republic was established, the tendency towards Westernisation continued. However, there is a difference here in terms of quality. This process that had been realized in a more reformist structure

was performed in the Turkish Republic in a more revolutionary manner with the foundation of a new social organisation (Kafadar, 2002:351). Turkish society that has a policy to take Western societies as a model took its position on the evolutionary line based on the modernisation theory. However the most critical point here to take into account is that Turkish modernisation, or in particular its Westernisation, is not fully an imitation of the Western societies (Berkes, 1973; 2002:522).

In the works done in political, economic and social fields, efforts for the higher education institution took place relatively in a later period. As Timur (2000: 231) mentioned, the only higher education institution İstanbul Darülfünun did not undergo any change up until the University Reform in 1933. However, in 1933 this institution was intervened by the political authority and it was turned into İstanbul University as it did not comprehend or support the Kemalist revolution. Öncü (2002:522) stated three critical reforms in the university life of the Turkish Republic – the 1933 University Reform, 1946 Reform and 1946 University Reform and 1981 Higher Education Law – and she summarised their common points as follows: each of the three reform implementations coincided with the social crisis periods and all of them became legalised by means of the "Western models". Despite the different views of the political governments, the criterion of being Western has always had the power to "legalise" the implementations. The basic reason underlying these changes in particular with the universities were to enhance the level of education and to raise people according to the requirements of the time. Excluding the 1981 Higher Education Law, as Timur (2000: 247) mentioned, the aim was to raise people who knew the meaning of revolution and to keep the Turkish Republic intact. It can be said that this tendency transformed into raising people according to the needs of the market after the 1980s, when the liberal economy procedures started to be employed.

After the 1950s and when the superiority of the USA started to increase all around the world, Turkey as a developing country fostered its relations with the USA in political, economic and military fields. Implementations involving political content

107

but appearing to be economic aid (such as the Marshall grants or Truman doctrine) show that the modernisation of the Turkish Republic does not contain an evolutionary line but in fact it contains dependency in some way.

This relation also influenced higher education and higher education institutions similar to the American universities. The foundation of the Faculty of Zoology in Ataturk University in 1957 and the foundation of METU in 1956 are the significant results of these foreign influences. Another important feature of the 1950s, as Öncü (2002:529) mentioned is the enterprise of disseminating the higher education accepted to be an important tool of social mobility into the countryside or the periphery. Therefore more students gained the chance of receiving university education. Similarly, Ergur (2003:192) asserts that education was seen as a mobility tool in Turkey especially from the Republic and that this education prevailed into masses after 1980 when the liberal policies started to be implemented. As Öncü (2002:533) indicated, to bridge the instructor gap in the universities in the countryside or periphery, academicians in all of the universities of metropolitan cities were rotated and the promotions were stopped between 1981 and 1986. Since few academicians in the center went to the countryside, this implementation was cancelled; however, universities in the countryside composed their local staff by placing the people of similar political views into these positions. This caused the ÖYP program to be implemented, a program which aims to raise instructors for the universities that are said to be conservative with a central system in order to reduce the intensity of academic favouritism (Kafadar, 2002:369). Öncü (2002:533) suggests that the inconsistency of academic quality between the central and periphery universities widens as a consequence of academic favouritism in the countryside. Aktay (2003:105) defends that this difference in quality is produced again consciously by the political government.

As of the 1980s, the world entered a new period called globalisation. This process caused these two different processes to be experienced together in the countries that

had not complete their modernisation yet. As this process reflected upon the university institutions, according to Timur (2000:356), a hidden tension appeared between the principle of statism and globalisation. After the 1990s, YÖK system started to be debated in Turkey. Öncü (2002:533–534) asserts that these debates focused on three political issues: boundaries of growth were covered as there is no investment on man power and materials in the systems of universities; scientific and intellectual poverty of the academic institutions were understood and the universities could not keep up with the changing conditions of Turkey. Authorities that had liberal views used these reasons and it was claimed that the state was too weak to provide financial support. Therefore, the idea of private universities emerged but this idea was criticised by the academicians because it would help the Islamic capital to seep into universities according to Öncü (2002:534–535). However, legal regulations concerning the foundation of private and non-profit universities were issued in 1992. As of 2004, the total number of the universities that provide higher education is 74 and the number of the private universities among these is 24.

This fast increase in the number of universities, whose so-called objective is the dissemination of education or training of more people with lower cost (Tekeli cited in Aktay, 2003:98), brought forth important problems. Sencer (1990:145) states that planning, which is an important concept for developing countries, means regulations, which will enable the use of the resources of limited content in a most rational and efficient manner in the short or long term. According to him, it is essential to plan human resources that will stimulate social change and development. At this point, important tasks are awaiting universities.

This function of universities was regulated with the Higher Education Law in 1981 in Turkey as a developing country. However Sencer (1990:147) asserts that it is hard to say that universities whose number is ever increasing are supporting the labour force which will address the requirements of the country in terms of instructors, infrastructure, materials, and the qualities of their graduates. Among the primary

reasons are insufficiency of the resources allocated for education, distortion of the educational system and the negative effects of the regulations passed with the Higher Education Law after the 1990s on the qualities of both academicians and students. In other words, the factor that will cover all of these reasons is the partial policies of the state ideology.

Dissemination of education leads to the detachment of the processes of education and research within the university and more emphasis on education. As a result, academicians are deprived of research processes which would provide them with an opportunity to renew themselves. This is not only a concept related to dissemination of education. Inequality in the resource allocation in the universities especially to the detriment of social sciences affects both education and research processes negatively. Academicians under excessive course load often cannot renew themselves or share the results they obtained by research. Therefore the link between education and research weakens. The tendency to emphasise quantity in academic promotions with the Higher Education Law causes science to be perceived as a tool in academic promotions rather than as an end, and as a result, weak studies are produced in terms of quality. Besides these external factors that can be generalized as state ideology, the fact that academicians do not adhere to the requirements of being a scientist exacerbates this negative situation. Similarly, Tekeli (2003:140-141) contends that research infrastructure in universities cannot be used effectively because, in addition to financial problems, the social capital is not well established either.

In Turkey, universities play the role of raising the qualified labour force required by the market. Universities are characterized as high quality or low quality on the basis of meeting this requirement. As Ergur (2003:200) indicated, the universities that meet this need sufficiently are positioned in a higher status in this hierarchical sequence. The students who are placed in any higher education institution with the centralised examination system make their choices by considering this hierarchy and the successful students become registered in the high quality universities. Related to

110

this, lower quality students tend towards the universities of the lower level. This differentiation of high quality and low quality described here is also experienced in the faculties and departments. Therefore departments teaching social sciences such as sociology are preferred by the lower level students. The critical point here is the place of the university teaching sociology in the quality range. The sociology department of high quality universities is more prestigious than that of a university in the periphery. Another concept in this network of the relations is the fact that most of the students make their choices unconsciously just to be able to study in a university. This situation in particular affects the student profile of the department of sociology in a negative way.

In this study, it is problematized that sociology in Turkey as an academic discipline is insufficient developed and respective evaluations of the sociologists are given. At the end of the study, all the problems stated are also problems discussed in the previous studies such as Berkes (1936;1942), Ülken (1956), Kasapoğlu (1991a;1991b) It is also thought provoking to talk about the existence of these problems today. The possible reasons of this situation and the fact that sociology is insufficient developed in Turkey are as follows:

In Turkey the political government determines sociology. This determination evolved to be more intense as the discipline is institutionalized within universities. As indicated previously, dissemination of education as a criterion of being a developed society increased the number of students and universities.

As Tekeli (2003:140) indicated, the importance attached to academicians in Turkey has decreased in our day when compared to the 1960s. The most important factor apart from the decrease observed in the charges is that science does not have priority in the eyes of the Turkish society. University has lost its position of an active and determining element of society.

Özdalga (1990: 27) indicated the fact that social sciences, and in particular sociology, is limited to be studied out of the borders of academic environment adversely affects the status of sociology. Since the majority of Turkish universities are state institutions and they are the only places to produce sociological studies, this can itself be considered a criterion of being insufficient development of sociology according to Kasapoğlu (2004c).

Despite the increasing number of universities in Turkey, not the entire population have the chance for a university education and this problem stems from the fact that labour force is not well-planned, which Sencer (1990:147) characterized as the propelling power for social change. There was a big change in the number of private universities in Turkey after the 1990s. One of the basic objectives in doing this was to give more people a chance to receive university education. However, young students at these institutions come from priviledged families. As a consequence, it can be said that these universities legalise inequality in the economic and social fields by stressing the cultural capital of the young people. Cultural capital is a concept of Bourdieu (1973; cited in Sosyoloji Sözlüğü, 1999:448). In the study named as 'Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction', Bourdieu (cited in Sosyoloji Sözlüğü, 1999) asserts that families in the middle class gives a cultural capital and in the school in which to be successful students must have this capital. As a result of this situation, he claims that school legitimises the economical inequality.

The increase in the student numbers caused the universities in the periphery to be opened and this lead to a larger inequality among the universities on the basis of academic quality.

As another result of the dissemination of education, the task of the academicians to give lectures became important and this formed an important obstruction in front of academicians' efforts to improve themselves as a scientist.

Kasaopoğlu (2004c) also states that it is possible to talk about some problems that lead to the enquiry of sociology's quality stemming from its nature (state of being insufficient in the world ,specifically in Turkey) apart from the factors mentioned. As Ritzer (1983; cited in Kasapoğlu, 2004c) stated, there are many paradigms in sociology. The main reason of this situation is that social reality can be elaborated on various levels apart from this reality which is very complex. To exemplify, social reality has continuity both between the macro and micro dimensions (world systems, social organisations, groups, interaction) and subjective and objective dimensions (including the individual thinking and actions). Since macro and micro dimensions can be divided into the objective and subjective dimensions, it becomes differentiated for the sociologists as to which aspect of the social reality and how they study (cited in Kasapoğlu, 1992b). "Significant point here is to comprehend that certain approaches between the infinite variety and the rapid change of the social reality will always be inadequate, new approaches will be offered and diversity and differentiation will be inevitable." (Kasapoğlu, 1992b:217). In this context, apart from the sociologists' dependence on the paradigms based on the Western sources and following the innovations from behind, the fact that they cannot produce theoretical/conceptual frameworks can also be interpreted as a sign of being insufficient developed

Another important obstruction in front of the academicians to improve themselves stems from themselves. As Kasapoğlu (2004c) mentioned, another sign of being developing country is the quality of the 'human capital' (Bourdieu, 1969;cited in Kasapoğlu,2004c). Tendency of expecting everything from the state in Turkey is a basic cultural characteristic. The fact that scientists expect resources from the state or the powerful others for the activities they plan to perform can be interpreted to show that their internal locus of control is underdeveloped. It is possible for an epistemic community, constituted by creative, self-confident, responsibility-taking and sensitive to the problems, to create high quality works. Other important signs of being insufficient developed are that general 'academic culture' (Ringer, 1990; cited

in Kasapoğlu, 2004) in Turkey has a general character of yielding to bureaucracy and is suitable to make research and publications to attain a title or a degree instead of producing genuine science, neutralizing easily the people that question and investigate or not harboring them in their body. Scientists in Turkey are to cope with the 'double oppression' (Kasapoğlu, 2004b) since they are surrounded by external dynamics (Western/central science) and they try to produce science in the rigid bureaucratic rules. As a result, it can be said that academic culture is a sub-system of large socio-cultural system and this situation determines the quality of the sociology in Turkey.

One of the most significant factors of why sociology is insufficient developed in Turkey is that personal clashes among the academicians are transferred to scientific ground. In contrast with the view of Mills (1959) that sociology should be a lifestyle for a scientist, the fact that science in general and sociology in particular became a tool for the personal relations is one of the most significant problems sociology in Turkey faces.

To save sociology from its present position, sociologists are in charge of the most crucial task. They should not place the personal clashes into the center of the scientific efforts and they should attain individual consciousness and develop their internal locus of control. As Kasapoğlu (2004c) indicated, sociology in Turkey can be carried to a higher status by means of a community constituted by creative, self-confident, responsibility-taking and sensitive to the social, economical and political problems surround them.

APPENDIX 1

OPEN FORMS OF TABLES

TABLE 1

Field of interest as sociological theory and methodology according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	25	67.6	8	38.1	4	57.1	8	61.5	45	57.7
No	12	32.4	13	61.9	3	42.9	5	38.5	33	42.3
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.862^{a} df:3   p>.182

Field of interest as social structure and change according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	17	45.9	10	47.6	4	57.1	7	53.8	38	48.7
No	20	54.1	11	52.4	3	42.9	6	46.2	40	51.3
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square $.460^{a}$ df:3   p>.928

Field of interest as social institutions according to academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	17	45.9	14	66.7	5	71.4	6	46.2	42	53.8
No	20	54.1	7	33.3	2	28.6	7	53.8	36	46.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.498[a]   df:3   p>.321

Field of interest as rural-urban studies according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	6	16.2	5	23.8	3	42.9	1	7.7	15	19.2
No	31	83.8	16	76.2	4	57.1	12	92.3	63	80.8
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.130[a]   df:3   p>.248

Field of interest as communication according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	2	5.4	1	4.8	2	28.6			5	6.4
No	35	94.6	20	95.2	5	71.4	13	100.0	73	93.6
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 6.778[a]   df:3   p>.079

Field of interest as cultural studies according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	8	21.6	5	23.8	2	28.6	1	7.7	16	20.5
No	29	78.4	16	76.2	5	71.4	12	92.3	62	79.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.757^{a} df:3   p>.624

Field of interest as social problems according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	17	45.9	10	47.6	7	100.0	7	53.8	41	52.6
No	20	54.1	11	52.4			7	53.8	37	47.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 7.182^{a} df:3   p>.066

TABLE 2

Membership to the sociological associations according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	16	43.2	14	66.7	4	50.0	13	86.7	47	58.0
No	21	56.8	7	33.3	4	50.0	2	13.3	34	42.0
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	81	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 9.227^{a} df:3   p<.026

Membership to the sociological associations according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	26	60.5	21	55.3	47	58.0
No	17	39.5	17	44.7	34	42.0
TOTAL	43	100.0	38	100.0	81	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .224[b]   df:1   p>.636

TABLE 3

Holding professional qualification according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	6	16.2	5	23.8	3	42.9	9	69.2	23	29.5
No	31	83.8	16	76.2	4	57.1	4	30.8	55	70.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 13.937[a]   df:3   p<.003

Holding professional qualification according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	14	35.0	9	23.7	23	29.5
No	26	65.0	29	76.3	55	70.5
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.200[b] df:1   p>.273

Holding professional qualification according to the university from which Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	13	27.7	9	45.0	22	32.8
No	34	72.3	11	55.0	45	67.2
TOTAL	47	100.0	20	100.0	67	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.913[b]   df:1   p>.167

TABLE 4

Having national project experience according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	16	43.2	14	70.0	4	57.1	10	76.9	44	57.1
No	21	56.8	6	30.0	3	42.9	3	23.1	33	42.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	20	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	77	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   6.346[a]   df:3   p>.096

Having national project experience according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	25	62.5	19	51.4	44	57.1
No	15	37.5	18	48.6	33	42.9
TOTAL	40	100.0	37	100.0	77	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .976[b]   df:1   p>.323

Having national project experience according to the university from which Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	25	53.2	13	68.4	38	57.6
No	22	46.8	6	31.6	28	42.4
TOTAL	47	100.0	19	100.0	66	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.285[b]   df:1   p>.257

Having international project experience according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	6	16.2	6	28.6	1	14.3	10	76.9	23	29.5
No	31	83.8	15	71.4	6	85.7	3	23.1	55	70.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   17.989[a]   df:3   p<.000

Having international project experience according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	17	42.5	6	15.8	23	29.5
No	23	57.5	32	84.2	55	70.5
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   6.687[b]   df:1   p<.010

Having international project experience according to the university from which Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	12	25.5	10	50.0	22	32.8
No	35	74.5	10	50.0	45	67.2
TOTAL	47	100.0	20	100.0	67	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.809[b]   df:1   p<.051

TABLE 5

Infrastructural problems according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	11	29.7	7	33.3	2	28.6	3	23.1	23	29.5
No	26	70.3	14	66.7	5	71.4	10	76.9	55	70.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .410[a]   df:3   p>.938

Infrastructural problems according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	14	35.0	9	23.7	23	29.5
No	26	65.0	29	76.3	55	70.5
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.200[b]   df:1   p>.273

Ideological problems according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	10	27.0	7	33.3	4	57.1	5	38.5	26	33.3
No	27	70.3	14	66.7	3	42.9	8	61.5	52	66.7
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.602[a]   df:3   p>.457

Ideological problems according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	10	25.0	16	42.1	26	33.3
No	30	75.0	22	57.9	52	66.7
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.566[b]   df:1   p>.109

Educational problems according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	19	51.4	9	42.9	2	28.6	5	38.5	35	44.9
No	18	48.6	12	57.1	5	71.4	8	61.5	43	55.1
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.630[a]   df:3   p>.653

Educational problems according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	15	37.5	20	52.6	35	44.9
No	25	62.5	18	47.4	43	55.1
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.804[b]   df:1   p>.179

Problems related to the quality of sociological studies according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	24	64.9	11	52.4	4	57.1	10	76.9	49	62.8
No	13	35.1	10	47.6	3	42.9	3	23.1	29	37.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.250[a]   df:3   p>.522

Problems related to the quality of sociological studies according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	26	65.0	23	60.5	49	62.8
No	14	35.0	15	39.5	29	37.2
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .167[b]   df:1   p>.683

Organizational problems according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	9	24.3	8	38.1	4	57.1	9	69.2	30	38.5
No	28	75.7	13	61.9	3	42.9	4	30.8	48	61.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 9.358^{a} df:3   p<.025

Organizational problems according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	15	37.5	15	39.5	30	38.5
No	25	62.5	23	60.5	48	61.5
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square $.032^{b}$ df:1   p>.858

TABLE 6

Infrastructural reasons according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	8	21.6	9	42.9	2	28.6	6	46.2	25	32.1
No	29	78.4	12	57.1	5	71.4	7	53.8	53	67.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.200^{a} df:3   p>.241

Infrastructural reasons according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	15	37.5	10	26.3	25	32.1
No	25	62.5	28	73.7	53	67.9
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.119[b]   df:1   p>.290

Ideological reasons according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	20	54.1	13	61.9	4	57.1	7	53.8	44	56.4
No	17	45.9	8	38.1	3	42.9	6	46.2	34	43.6
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .378[a]   df:3   p>.945

Ideological reasons according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	18	45.0	26	68.4	44	56.4
No	22	55.0	12	31.6	34	43.6
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.347[b]   df:1   p<.037

Educational reasons according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	21	56.8	12	57.1	5	71.4	7	53.8	45	57.7
No	16	43.2	9	42.9	2	28.6	6	46.2	33	42.3
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .636[a]   df:3   p>.888

Educational reasons according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	20	50.0	25	65.8	45	57.7
No	20	50.0	13	34.2	33	42.3
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.990[b]   df:1   p>.158

Reasons related to the quality of sociological studies according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	18	48.6	5	23.8	4	57.1	3	23.1	30	38.5
No	19	51.4	16	76.2	3	42.9	10	76.9	48	61.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 5.859[a]   df:3   p>.119

Reasons related to the quality of sociological studies according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	12	30.0	18	47.4	30	38.5
No	28	70.0	20	52.6	48	61.5
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.484[b]   df:1   p>.115

Organizational reasons according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	12	32.4	4	19.0	1	14.3	7	53.8	24	30.8
No	25	67.6	17	81.0	6	85.7	6	46.2	54	69.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .545[a]   df:3   p>.136

Organizational rteasons according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	12	30.0	12	31.6	24	30.8
No	28	70.0	26	68.4	54	69.2
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .023[b]   df:1   p>.880

TABLE 7

Evaluation of sociology in the world according to academic status

	Academic Status								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Excellent	4	10.8	1	4.5	2	28.6	3	18.8	10	12.2
Good	24	64.9	19	86.4	4	57.1	11	68.8	58	70.7
Not Good	9	24.3	2	9.1	1	14.3	2	12.5	14	17.1
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   6,537[a]   df: 6   p>.366

Evaluation of sociology in the world according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Excellent	6	13.6	4	10.5	10	12.2
Good	34	77.3	24	63.2	58	70.7
Not Good	4	9.1	10	26.3	14	17.1
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   4.279[a]   df: 2   p>.118

Evaluation of sociology in the world according to the university from which Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D. Degree				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Excellent	5	10.0	4	19.0	9	12.7
Good	37	74.0	13	61.9	50	70.4
Not Good	8	16.0	4	19.0	12	16.9
TOTAL	50	100.0	21	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.344[a]   df: 2   p>.511

Evaluation of sociology in Turkey according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS							TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.				Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.		
	F	P			F	P	F	P	F	P
Good	8	21.6	10	45.5	1	14.3	5	33.3	24	29.6
Not Good	29	78.4	12	54.5	6	85.7	10	66.7	57	70.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	15	100.0	81	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.669[a]   df:3   p>.198

Evaluation of sociology in Turkey according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central					
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Good	15	34.9	9	23.7	24	29.6
Not Good	28	65.1	29	76.3	57	70.4
TOTAL	43	100.0	38	100.0	81	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.214[a]   df:1 p>.271

Evaluation of sociology in Turkey according to the university from which Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Good	15	30.0	6	30.0	21	30.0
Not Good	35	70.0	14	70.0	49	70.0
TOTAL	50	100.0	20	100.0	70	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .000[b]   df:1   p>1.000

Evaluation of sociology in own department according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Excellent	2	5.4	1	4.5			2	12.5	5	6.1
Good	17	45.9	12	54.5	4	57.1	10	62.5	443	52.4
Not Good	18	48.6	9	40.9	3	42.9	4	25.0	34	41.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.784[a]   df:6   p>706

Evaluation of sociology in own department according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Excellent	3	6.8	2	5.3	5	6.1
Good	26	59.1	17	44.7	43	52.4
Not Good	15	34.1	19	50.0	34	41.5
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.127[a]   df:2   p>.345

Evaluation of sociology in own department according to the university from which Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Excellent	2	4.0	3	14.3	5	7.0
Good	26	52.0	9	42.9	35	49.3
Not Good	22	44.0	9	42.9	31	43.7
TOTAL	50	100.0	21	100.0	71	100.0

130

Pearson Chi-Square   2.447[a]   df:2   p>.290

TABLE 8

Evaluation of himself/herself as a scientist according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	1	2.7	2	9.1			1	6.3	4	4.8
Agree	9	24.3	4	18.2	5	62.5	8	50.0	26	31.3
Disagree	19	51.4	14	63.6	3	37.5	6	37.5	42	50.6
Strongly Disagree	8	21.6	2	9.1			1	6.3	11	13.3
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   13.138[a]   df:9   p>.156

Evaluation of himself/herself as a scientist according to the place of the univesity

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	3	6.7	1	2.6	4	4.8
Agree	14	31.1	12	31.6	26	31.3
Disagree	22	48.9	20	52.6	42	50.6
Strongly Disagree	6	13.3	5	13.2	11	13.3
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .755[a]   df:3   p>.860

Evaluation of himself/herself as a scientist according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	2	3.9	2	9.5	4	5.6
Agree	12	23.5	10	47.6	22	30.6
Disagree	30	58.8	6	28.6	36	50.0
Strongly Disagree	7	13.7	3	14.3	10	13.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 6.391^{a} df:3   p>.094

TABLE 9

Attitude related to empirical data without theoretical background according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	10	27.0	7	31.8	2	25.0	5	31.3	24	28.9
Agree	22	59.5	13	59.1	6	75.0	9	56.3	50	60.2
Disagree	5	13.5	2	9.1			2	12.5	9	10.8
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.736^{a} df:6   p>.942

Attitude related to empirical data without theoretical background according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	11	24.4	13	34.2	24	28.9
Agree	29	64.4	21	55.3	50	60.2
Disagree	5	11.1	4	10.5	9	10.8
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .947[a]   df:2   p>.614

Attitude related to empirical data without theoretical background according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	13	125.5	8	38.1	21	29.2
Agree	32	62.7	11	52.4	43	59.7
Disagree	6	11.8	2	9.5	8	11.1
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.145[a]   df: 2   .564

Attitude related to the negative impacts of insufficient theory according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	14	37.8	8	36.4	2	25.0	7	43.8	31	37.3
Agree	18	48.6	12	54.5	6	75.0	8	50.0	44	53.0
Disagree	5	13.5	2	9.1			1	6.3	8	9.6
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.955[a]   df:6   p>.814

Attitude related to the negative impacts of insufficient theory according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	14	31.1	17	44.7	31	37.3
Agree	26	57.8	18	47.4	44	53.0
Disagree	5	11.1	3	7.9	8	9.6
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.666[a]   df:2   p>.435

Attitude related to the negative impacts of insufficient theory according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	19	37.3	9	42.9	28	38.9
Agree	26	51.0	11	52.4	37	51.4
Disagree	6	11.8	1	4.8	7	9.7
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .876[a]   df:2   p>.645

Attitude related to theoretical and methodological hegemony of developed countries according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	21	56.8	7	31.8	6	75.0	9	56.3	43	51.8
Agree	14	37.8	15	68.2	2	25.0	7	43.8	38	45.8
Disagree	2	5.4							2	2.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   8.940[a]   df:6   p>.177

Attitude related to theoretical and methodological hegemony of developed countries according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	20	44.4	23	60.5	43	51.8
Agree	23	51.1	15	39.5	38	45.8
Disagree	2	4.4			2	2.4
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.327[a]   df:2   p>.189

Attitude related to theoretical and methodological hegemony of developed countries according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	26	51.0	10	47.6	36	50.0
Agree	23	45.1	11	52.4	34	47.2
Disagree	2	3.9			2	2.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.024[a]   df:2   p>.599

Attitude related to methodological insufficiency according to the academic status

| | Status | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	14	37.8	10	45.5	4	50.0	6	37.5	34	41.0
Agree	22	59.5	11	50.0	4	50.0	10	62.5	47	56.6
Disagree	1	2.7	1	4.5					2	2.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.793[a]   df:6   p>.938

Attitude related to methodological insufficiency according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	33.3	19	50.0	34	41.0
Agree	29	64.4	18	47.4	47	56.6
Disagree	1	2.2	1	2.6	2	2.4
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.472[a]   df:2   p>.291

Attitude related to methodological insufficiency according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	23	45.1	8	38.1	31	43.1
Agree	28	54.9	13	61.9	41	56.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .298[b]   df:1   p>.585

Attitude related to lack of consistency between theory and methodology in multiple data collection according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	6	16.2	6	27.3	1	12.5	3	20.0	16	19.5
Agree	20	54.1	12	54.5	4	50.0	8	53.3	44	53.7
Disagree	11	29.7	4	18.2	3	37.5	4	26.7	22	26.8
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.182[a]   df:6   p>.901

Attitude related to lack of consistency between theory and methodology in multiple data collection according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	10	22.7	6	15.8	16	19.5
Agree	23	52.3	21	55.3	44	53.7
Disagree	11	25.0	11	28.9	22	28.8
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .655[a]   df:2   p>.721

Attitude related to lack of consistency between theory and methodology in multiple data collection according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	10	19.6	4	20.0	14	19.7
Agree	24	47.1	12	60.0	36	50.7
Disagree	17	33.3	4	20.0	21	29.6
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.333[a]   df:2   p>.512

Attitude related to reducing research to questionnaire testing according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	20	54.1	11	50.0	3	37.5	10	62.5	44	53.0
Agree	13	35.1	8	36.4	4	50.0	5	31.3	30	36.1
Disagree	4	10.8	3	13.6	1	12.5	1	6.3	9	10.8
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.712[a]   df:6   p>.944

137

Attitude related to reducing research to questionnaire testing according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	23	51.1	21	55.3	44	53.0
Agree	18	40.0	12	31.6	30	36.1
Disagree	4	8.9	5	13.2	9	10.8
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .817[a]   df:2   p>.664

Attitude related to reducing research to questionnaire testing according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	25	49.0	11	52.4	36	50.0
Agree	19	37.3	8	38.1	27	37.5
Disagree	7	13.7	2	9.5	9	12.5
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .246[a]   df:2   p>.884

Attitude related to insufficient philosophical foundation according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	22	59.5	9	40.9	4	50.0	7	43.8	42	50.6
Agree	14	37.8	12	54.5	4	50.0	7	43.8	37	46.6
Disagree	1	2.7	1	4.5			2	12.5	4	4.8
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   4.745[a]   df:6   p>.577

Attitude related to insufficient philosophical foundation according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	19	42.2	23	60.5	42	50.6
Agree	22	48.9	15	39.5	37	44.6
Disagree	4	8.9			4	4.8
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 5.152 　　　df:2　p>.076

Attitude related to insufficient philosophical foundation according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	26	51.0	9	42.9	35	48.6
Agree	24	47.1	11	52.4	35	48.6
Disagree	1	2.0	1	4.8	2	2.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .709[a] 　　　df:2　p>.702

Attitude related to positive impacts of positivism and post-modernism according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	7	18.9	2	9.1	4	50.0	3	18.8	16	19.3
Agree	18	48.6	14	63.6	2	25.0	8	50.0	42	50.6
Disagree	12	32.4	6	27.3	2	25.0	5	31.3	25	30.1
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	3	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 7.111[a] 　　　df:6　p>.311

Attitude related to positive impacts of positivism and post-modernism according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	11	24.4	5	13.2	16	19.3
Agree	24	53.3	18	47.4	42	50.6
Disagree	10	22.2	15	39.5	25	30.1
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.542[a]   df:2   p>.170

Attitude related to positive impacts of positivism and post-modernism according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	12	23.5	2	9.5	14	19.4
Agree	24	47.1	13	61.9	37	51.4
Disagree	15	29.4	6	28.6	21	29.2
TOTAL	41	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.142[a]   df:2   p>.343

Attitude related to insufficient use of contemporary literature according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	40.5	4	18.2	2	25.0	8	50.0	29	34.9
Agree	17	45.9	16	72.7	6	75.0	8	50.0	47	56.6
Disagree	5	13.5	2	9.1					7	8.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   8.886[a]   df:6   p>.180

140

Attitude related to insufficient use of contemporary literature according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	16	35.6	13	34.2	29	34.9
Agree	26	57.8	21	55.3	47	56.6
Disagree	3	6.7	4	10.5	7	8.4
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .398[a]   df:2   p>.820

Attitude related to insufficient use of contemporary literature according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	29.4	7	33.3	22	30.6
Agree	31	60.8	13	61.9	44	61.1
Disagree	5	9.8	1	4.8	6	8.3
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .893[a]   df:2   p>.640

Attitude related to insufficient development of sociology tradition according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	16	43.2	8	36.4	6	75.0	7	43.8	37	44.6
Agree	17	45.9	12	54.5	1	12.5	7	43.8	37	44.6
Disagree	4	10.8	2	9.1	1	12.5	2	12.5	9	10.8
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   4.489[a]   df:6   p>.611

Attitude related to insufficient development of sociology tradition according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	20	44.4	17	44.7	37	44.6
Agree	18	40.0	19	50.0	37	44.6
Disagree	7	15.6	2	5.3	9	10.8
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.475[a]   df:2   p>.290

Attitude related to insufficient development of sociology tradition according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	23	45.1	10	47.6	33	45.8
Agree	22	43.1	10	47.6	32	44.4
Disagree	6	11.8	1	4.8	7	9.7
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .838[a]   df:2   p>.658

Attitude related to limited production of knowledge according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	24	64.9	12	54.5	6	85.7	11	68.8	53	64.6
Agree	13	35.1	8	36.4	1	14.3	5	31.3	27	32.9
Disagree			2	9.1					2	2.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   7.211   df:6   p>.302

Attitude related to limited production of knowledge according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	26	59.1	27	71.1	53	64.6
Agree	16	36.4	11	28.9	27	32.9
Disagree	2	4.5			2	2.4
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.519[a]   df:2   p>.284

Attitude related to limited production of knowledge according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	33	64.7	13	65.0	46	64.8
Agree	18	35.3	5	25.0	23	32.4
Disagree			2	10.0	2	2.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 5.570[a]   df:2   p>.062

Attitude related to limited accumulation of knowledge collected without theory according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	11	29.7	7	31.8	3	42.9	5	31.3	26	31.7
Agree	21	56.8	10	45.5	4	57.1	10	62.5	45	54.9
Disagree	5	13.5	5	22.7			1	6.3	11	13.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.851[a]   df:6   p>.697

Attitude related to limited accumulation of knowledge collected without theory according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	10	22.7	16	42.1	26	31.7
Agree	26	59.1	19	50.0	45	54.9
Disagree	8	18.5	3	7.9	11	13.4
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.330[a]   df:2   p<.115

Attitude related to limited accumulation of knowledge collected without theory according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	17	33.3	7	35.0	24	33.8
Agree	28	54.9	9	45.0	37	52.1
Disagree	6	11.8	4	20.0	10	14.1
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .974[a]   df:2   p>.615

TABLE 10

Attitude related to limited historical studies according to the academic status

| | Academic Status | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	40.5	9	40.9	5	62.5	8	53.3	37	45.1
Agree	19	51.4	12	54.5	3	37.5	5	33.3	39	47.6
Disagree	3	8.1	1	4.5			2	13.3	6	7.3
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.754[a]   df:6   p>.710

Attitude related to limited historical studies according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	21	47.7	16	42.1	37	45.1
Agree	20	45.5	19	50.0	39	47.6
Disagree	3	6.8	3	7.9	6	7.3
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .264[a]   df:2   p>.876

Attitude related to limited historical studies according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	24	47.1	9	45.0	33	46.5
Agree	22	43.1	10	50.0	32	45.1
Disagree	5	9.8	1	5.0	6	8.5
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .556[a]   df:2   p>.757

Attitude related to insufficiency of institutional studies according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	13	35.1	8	36.4	2	25.0	6	37.5	29	34.9
Agree	18	48.6	10	45.5	6	75.0	10	62.5	44	53.0
Disagree	6	16.2	4	18.2					10	12.0
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 5.753[a]   df:6   p>.451

Attitude related to insufficiency of institutional studies according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	13	28.9	16	42.1	29	34.9
Agree	27	60.0	17	44.7	44	53.0
Disagree	5	11.1	5	13.2	10	12.0
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.007^{a} df:2   p>.367

Attitude related to insufficiency of institutional studies according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	19	37.3	7	33.3	26	36.1
Agree	26	51.0	12	57.1	38	52.8
Disagree	6	11.8	2	9.5	8	11.1
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square $.238^{a}$ df:2   p>.888

Attitude related to insufficiency of political analysis according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	40.5	11	50.0	5	62.5	9	53.6	40	48.2
Agree	17	45.9	7	31.8	3	37.5	6	37.5	33	39.8
Disagree	5	13.5	4	18.2			1	6.3	10	12.0
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.919^{a} df:6   p>.688

Attitude related to insufficiency of political analysis according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	21	46.7	19	50.0	40	48.2
Agree	19	42.2	14	36.8	33	39.8
Disagree	5	11.1	5	13.2	10	12.0
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .229[a]   df:2   p>.874

Attitude related to insufficiency of political analysis according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	24	47.1	10	47.6	34	47.2
Agree	21	41.2	8	38.1	29	40.3
Disagree	6	11.8	3	14.3	9	12.5
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .112[a]   df:2   p>.946

Attitude related to insufficiency of class analysis according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	8	21.6	9	40.9	5	62.5	4	25.0	26	31.3
Agree	19	51.4	7	31.8	3	37.5	11	68.8	40	48.2
Disagree	10	27.0	6	27.3			1	6.3	17	20.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   11.827[a]   df:6   p>.066

147

Attitude related to insufficiency of class analysis according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	13	28.9	13	34.2	26	31.3
Agree	24	53.3	16	42.1	40	48.2
Disagree	8	17.8	9	23.7	17	20.5
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.076^{a} df:2   p>.584

Attitude related to insufficiency of class analysis according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	29.4	7	33.3	22	30.6
Agree	24	47.1	11	52.4	35	48.6
Disagree	12	23.5	3	14.3	15	20.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square $.772^{a}$ df:2   p>.680

Attitude related to positive impact of cultural studies according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	8	21.6	1	4.5	3	37.5	3	12.5	14	16.9
Agree	18	48.6	14	63.6	3	37.5	10	62.5	45	54.2
Disagree	11	29.7	7	31.8	2	25.0	4	25.0	24	28.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 6.062^{a} df:6   p>.416

Attitude related to positive impact of cultural studies according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	6	13.3	8	21.1	14	16.9
Agree	30	66.7	15	39.5	45	54.2
Disagree	9	20.0	15	39.5	24	28.9
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   6.240[a]   df:2   p<.044

Attitude related to positive impact of cultural studies according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	10	19.6	1	4.8	11	15.3
Agree	24	47.1	14	66.7	38	52.8
Disagree	17	33.3	6	28.6	23	31.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.335[a]   df:2   p>.189

Attitude related to overspecialization according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	2	5.4	3	18.2					6	7.2
Agree	12	32.4	3	13.6	3	37.5	4	25.0	22	26.5
Disagree	23	62.2	15	68.2	5	62.5	12	75.0	55	66.3
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   8.107[a]   df:6   p>.230

Attitude related to overspecialization according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	5	11.1	1	2.6	6	7.2
Agree	9	20.0	13	34.2	22	26.5
Disagree	31	68.9	24	63.2	55	66.3
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.721   df:2 p>.156

Attitude related to overspecialization according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	4	7.8			4	5.6
Agree	12	23.5	5	23.8	17	23.6
Disagree	35	68.6	16	76.2	51	70.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.768[a]   df:2   p>.413

Attitude related to limited success in interdisciplinary studies according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	9	24.3	6	27.3			7	43.8	22	26.5
Agree	19	51.4	12	54.5	5	62.5	4	25.0	40	48.2
Disagree	9	24.3	4	18.2	3	37.5	5	31.3	21	25.3
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   7.522[a]   df:6   p>.275

Attitude related to limited success in interdisciplinary studies according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	13	28.9	9	23.7	22	26.5
Agree	17	37.8	23	60.5	40	48.2
Disagree	15	33.3	6	15.8	21	25.63
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.929^{a} df:2   p>.085

Attitude related to limited success in interdisciplinary studies according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	14	27.5	6	28.6	20	27.8
Agree	24	47.1	8	38.1	32	44.
Disagree	13	25.5	7	33.3	20	27.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square $.605^{a}$ df:2   p>.739

Attitude related to increased variety of topics/issues according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	40.5	10	45.5	2	25.0	7	43.8	34	41.0
Agree	16	43.2	8	36.4	3	37.5	8	50.0	35	42.2
Disagree	6	16.2	4	18.2	3	37.5	1	6.3	14	16.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.218^{a} df:6   p>.647

Attitude related to increased variety of topics/issues according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	16	35.6	18	47.4	34	41.0
Agree	22	48.9	13	34.2	35	42.2
Disagree	7	15.6	7	18.4	14	16.9
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.855[a]   df:2   p>.396

Attitude related to increased variety of topics/issues according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	21	41.2	8	38.1	29	40.3
Agree	20	39.2	11	52.4	31	43.1
Disagree	10	19.6	2	9.5	12	16.7
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.541[a]   df:2   p>.463

Attitude related to limited involvement in civil society according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	16	43.2	7	31.8	4	57.1	9	57.1	36	43.9
Agree	17	45.9	12	54.5	1	14.3	6	37.5	36	43.9
Disagree	4	10.8	3	13.6	2	28.6	1	6.3	10	12 .2
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   5.820[a]   df:6   p>.444

Attitude related to limited involvement in civil society according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	16	36.4	20	52.6	36	43.9
Agree	25	56.8	11	28.9	36	43.9
Disagree	3	6.8	7	18.4	10	12.2
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 7.088^{a} df:2   p<.029

Attitude related to limited involvement in civil society according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	23	45.1	9	45.0	32	45.1
Agree	23	45.1	9	45.0	32	45.1
Disagree	5	9.8	2	10.0	7	9.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square $.001^{a}$ df:2   p>1.000

Attitude related to interest in future sociological issues according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	40.5	11	50.0	4	57.1	13	81.3	43	52.4
Agree	18	48.6	11	50.0	3	42.9	3	18.8	35	42.7
Disagree	4	10.8							4	4.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 11.183^{a} df:6   p>.083

153

Attitude related to interest in future sociological issues according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	25	56.8	18	47.4	43	52.4
Agree	17	38.6	18	47.4	35	42.7
Disagree	2	4.5	2	5.3	4	4.9
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .733[a]   df:2   p>.693

Attitude related to interest in future sociological issues according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	25	49.0	13	65.0	38	53.5
Agree	22	43.1	7	35.0	29	40.8
Disagree	4	7.8			4	5.6
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.487[a]   df:2   p>.288

TABLE 11

Attitude related to negative impact of distiction between education and reserach in sociology according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	12	32.4	11	50.0	4	50.0	10	62.5	37	44.6
Agree	24	64.9	7	31.8	2	25.0	5	31.3	38	45.8
Disagree	1	2.7	4	18.2	2	25.0	1	6.3	8	9.6
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	00.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 13.609[a]   df: 6   p<.034

Attitude related to negative impact of distiction between education and reserach in sociology according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	21	46.7	16	42.1	37	44.6
Agree	20	44.4	18	47.4	38	45.8
Disagree	4	8.9	4	10.5	8	9.6
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .192[a]   df:2   p>.908

155

Attitude related to negative impact of distiction between education and reserach in sociology according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	18	35.3	13	61.9	31	43.1
Agree	28	54.9	5	23.8	33	45.8
Disagree	5	9.8	3	14.3	8	11.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 5.853[a]   df:2   p<.054

Attitude related to distinction between writing books and articles according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	19	51.4	8	36.4	8	100.0	7	43.8	42	50.6
Agree	16	43.2	10	45.5			9	56.3	35	42.2
Disagree	2	5.4	4	18.2					6	7.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 14.640[a]   df:6   p<.023

Attitude related to distinction between writing books and articles according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	22	48.9	20	52.6	42	50.6
Agree	19	42.2	16	42.1	35	42.2
Disagree	4	8.9	2	5.3	6	7.2
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .432[a]   df:2   p>.806

Attitude related to distinction between writing books and articles according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	27	52.9	10	47.6	37	51.4
Agree	20	39.2	11	52.4	31	43.1
Disagree	4	7.8			4	5.6
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.328[a]   df:2   p>.312

Attitude related to insufficient conditions of continuous accumulation of knowledge according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	22	59.5	11	50.0	5	71.4	10	62.5	48	58.5
Agree	14	37.8	10	45.5	2	28.6	6	37.5	32	39.0
Disagree	1	2.7	1	4.5					2	2.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.945[a]   df:6   p>.925

Attitude related to insufficient conditions of continuous accumulation of knowledge according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	21	47.7	27	71.1	48	58.5
Agree	22	50.0	10	26.3	32	39.0
Disagree	1	2.3	1	2.6	2	2.4
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.837[a]   df:2   p>.089

157

Attitude related to insufficient conditions of continuous accumulation of knowledge according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	27	52.9	14	70.0	41	57.7
Agree	23	45.1	5	25.0	28	39.4
Disagree	1	2.0	1	5.0	2	2.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.667[a]   df:2   p>.264

Attitudes related to limited professional organization according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	27	73.0	9	40.9	5	71.4	9	56.3	50	61.0
Agree	8	21.6	13	59.1	1	14.3	7	43.8	29	35.4
Disagree	2	5.4			1	14.3			3	3.7
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 13.045[a]   df:6   p<.042

Attitudes related to limited professional organization according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	28	63.6	22	57.9	50	61.0
Agree	16	36.4	13	34.2	29	35.4
Disagree			3	7.9	3	3.7
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.611[a]   df:2   p>.164

Attitudes related to limited professional organization according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	33	64.7	8	40.0	41	57.7
Agree	15	29.4	12	60.0	27	38.0
Disagree	3	5.9			3	4.2
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 6.230[a]   df:2   p>.044

Attitude related to insufficient coordination between academic and non-academic sociologists according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	20	54.1	12	54.5	5	62.5	13	81.3	50	60.2
Agree	16	43.2	10	45.5	3	37.5	3	18.8	32	38.6
Disagree	1	2.7							1	1.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.889[a]   df:6   p>.558

Attitude related to insufficient coordination between academic and non-academic sociologists according to the place of theuniversity

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	25	55.6	25	65.8	50	60.2
Agree	20	44.4	12	31.6	32	38.6
Disagree			1	2.6	1	1.2
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.427[a]   df:2   p>.297

Attitude related to insufficient coordination between academic and non-academic sociologists according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	31	60.8	14	66.7	45	62.5
Agree	19	37.3	7	33.3	26	36.1
Disagree	1	2.0			1	1.4
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .557[a]   df:2   p>.757

TABLE 12

Attitude related to lack of tradition of written criticism according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	25	67.6	12	54.5	8	100.0	11	68.8	56	67.5
Agree	12	32.4	7	31.8			4	25.0	23	27.7
Disagree			3	13.6			1	6.3	4	4.8
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   10.280[a]   df:6   p<.113

Attitude related to lack of tradition of written criticism according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	30	66.7	26	68.4	56	67.5
Agree	13	28.9	10	26.3	23	27.7
Disagree	2	4.4	2	5.3	4	4.8
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .087[a]   df:2   p>.957

Attitude related to lack of tradition of written criticism according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	31	60.8	16	76.2	47	65.3
Agree	17	33.3	4	19.0	21	29.2
Disagree	3	5.9	1	4.8	4	5.6
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.615[a]   df: 2   p>.446

Attitude related to referring and being aware of other scholars according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	10	27.0	9	40.9	4	50.0	11	68.8	34	41.0
Agree	20	54.1	11	50.0	3	37.5	5	31.3	39	47.0
Disagree	7	18.9	2	9.1	1	12.5			10	12.0
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 9.900[a]   df:6   p>.129

161

Attitude related to referring and being aware of other scholars according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	33.3	19	50.0	34	41.0
Agree	25	55.6	14	36.8	39	47.0
Disagree	5	11.1	5	13.2	10	12.0
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.004[a]   df:2   p>.223

Attitude related to referring and being aware of other scholars according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	19	37.3	13	61.9	32	44.4
Agree	25	49.0	7	33.3	32	44.4
Disagree	7	13.7	1	4.8	8	11.1
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.933[a]   df:2   p>.140

Attitude related to insufficient interest towards problems of sociology discipline in Turkey according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	14	37.8	8	38.1	4	57.1	9	56.3	35	43.2
Agree	16	43.2	12	57.1	3	42.9	6	37.5	37	45.7
Disagree	7	18.9	1	4.8			1	6.3	9	11.1
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	81	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 6.127[a]   df:6   p>.409

162

Attitude related to insufficient interest towards problems of sociology discipline in Turkey according to the place of university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	34.9	20	52.6	35	43.2
Agree	24	55.8	13	34.2	37	45.7
Disagree	4	9.3	5	13.2	9	11.1
TOTAL	43	100.0	38	100.0	81	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.802[a]   df:2   p>.149

Attitude related to insufficient interest towards problems of sociology discipline in Turkey according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	20	40.0	10	50.0	30	42.9
Agree	23	46.0	9	45.0	32	45.7
Disagree	7	14.0	1	5.0	8	11.4
TOTAL	50	100.0	20	100.0	70	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.349[a]   df:2   p>.509

163

TABLE 13

Attitude related to policy-oriented studies as the most funded according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	16	43.2	4	18.2	2	28.6	7	43.8	29	35.4
Agree	15	40.5	13	59.1	4	57.1	7	43.8	39	47.6
Disagree	6	16.2	5	22.5	1	14.3	2	12.5	14	17.1
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   4.734[a]   df:6   p>.578

Attitude related to policy-oriented studies as the most funded according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	14	31.8	15	39.5	29	35.4
Agree	21	47.7	18	47.4	39	47.6
Disagree	9	20.5	5	13.2	14	17.1
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .974[a]   df:2   p>.614

Attitude related to policy-oriented studies as the most funded according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	19	37.3	7	35.0	26	36.6
Agree	24	47.1	9	45.0	33	46.5
Disagree	8	15.7	4	20.0	12	16.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square $.191^{a}$ df:2   p>.909

Attitudes related to funds are directed to solutions rather than understanding social problems according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	5	13.5	5	22.7	2	28.6	4	25.0	16	19.5
Agree	26	70.3	14	63.6	4	51.7	9	56.3	53	64.6
Disagree	6	16.2	3	13.6	1	14.3	3	18.8	13	15.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.927^{a} df:6   p>.926

Attitudes related to funds are directed to solutions rather than understanding social problems according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	6	13.6	10	26.3	16	19.5
Agree	30	68.2	23	60.5	53	64.6
Disagree	8	18.2	5	13.2	13	15.9
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.190^{a} df:2   p>.335

Attitudes related to funds are directed to solutions rather than understanding social problems according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	7	13.7	5	25.0	12	16.9
Agree	36	70.6	11	55.0	47	66.2
Disagree	8	15.7	4	20.0	12	16.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.766[a]   df:2   p>.414

Attitude related to priority given to quantitative rather than qualitative criteria in academic promotions according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	21	56.8	15	68.2	5	62.5	10	62.5	51	61.4
Agree	16	43.2	5	22.7	3	37.5	6	35.7	30	36.1
Disagree			2	9.1					2	2.4
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 7.468[a]   df:6   p>.280

Attitude related to priority given to quantitative rather than qualitative criteria in academic promotions according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	25	55.6	26	68.4	51	61.4
Agree	19	42.2	11	28.9	30	36.1
Disagree	1	2.2	1	2.6	2	2.4
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.574[a]   df:2   p>.455

Attitude related to priority given to quantitative rather than qualitative criteria in academic promotions according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	30	58.8	15	71.4	45	62.5
Agree	19	37.3	6	28.6	25	34.7
Disagree	2	3.9			2	2.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.525^{a} df:2   p>.467

Attitude related to international journals giving priority to local/empirical studies according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	6	16.2	5	22.7	2	25.0	1	6.7	14	17.1
Agree	22	59.5	10	45.5	3	37.5	7	46.7	42	51.2
Disagree	9	24.3	7	31.8	3	37.5	7	46.7	26	31.7
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	15	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.441^{a} df:6   p>.617

Attitude related to international journals giving priority to local/empirical studies according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	6	13.6	8	21.1	14	17.1
Agree	20	45.5	22	57.9	42	51.2
Disagree	18	40.9	8	21.1	26	31.7
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.808^{a} df:2   p>.149

Attitude related to international journals giving priority to local/empirical studies according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	10	19.6	2	10.0	12	16.9
Agree	29	56.9	9	45.0	38	53.5
Disagree	12	23.5	9	45.0	21	29.6
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 3.401^{a} df:2   p>.183

Attitude related to importance of theoretical studies for the needs of the society according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	23	62.2	13	59.1	6	85.7	10	62.5	52	63.4
Agree	14	37.8	9	40.9	1	14.3	6	37.5	30	36.6
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.708   df:3   p>.635

Attitude related to importance of theoretical studies for the needs of the society according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	27	61.4	25	65.8	52	63.4
Agree	17	38.6	13	34.2	30	36.6
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .172   df:1   p>.678

Attitude related to importance of theoretical studies for the needs of the society according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	33	64.7	13	65.0	46	64.8
Agree	18	35.3	7	35.0	25	35.2
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .001[b]   df:1   p>.981

TABLE 14

Attitude related to priority given to publishing in international journals according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	8	21.6	7	31.8	1	12.5	4	25.0	20	24.1
Agree	18	48.6	9	40.9	6	75.0	8	50.0	41	49.4
Disagree	11	29.7	6	27.3	1	12.5	4	25.0	22	26.5
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.234   df:6   p>.779

Attitude related to priority given to publishing in international journals according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	8	17.8	12	31.6	20	24.1
Agree	23	51.1	18	47.4	41	49.4
Disagree	14	31.1	8	21.1	22	26.5
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.473[a]   df:2   p>.290

Attitude related to priority given to publishing in international journals according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	13	25.5	5	23.8	18	25.0
Agree	25	49.0	9	42.9	34	47.2
Disagree	13	25.5	7	33.3	209	27.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .466[a]   df:2   p>.792

Attitude related to no difference in national or international publication unless high quality maintained according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	40.5	12	54.5	3	37.5	9	56.3	39	47.0
Agree	19	51.4	8	36.4	5	62.5	7	43.8	39	47.0
Disagree	3	8.1	2	9.1					5	6.0
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.220[a]   df:6   p>.647

Attitude related to no difference in national or international publication unless high quality maintained according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	23	51.1	16	42.1	39	47.0
Agree	18	40.0	21	55.3	39	47.0
Disagree	4	8.9	1	2.6	5	6.0
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.716[a]   df:2   p>.257

Attitude related to no difference in national or international publication unless high quality maintained according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was established

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	22	43.1	12	57.1	34	47.2
Agree	25	49.0	8	38.1	33	45.8
Disagree	4	7.8	1	4.8	5	6.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.209[a]   df:2   p>.546

Attitude related to high expectations from the state according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	13	35.1	9	40.9	4	50.0	8	50.0	34	41.0
Agree	21	56.8	11	50.0	4	50.0	8	50.0	44	53.0
Disagree	3	8.1	2	9.1					5	6.0
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.018[a]   df:6   p>.807

Attitude related to high expectations from the state according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	17	37.8	17	44.7	34	41.0
Agree	26	57.8	18	47.4	44	53.0
Disagree	2	4.4	3	7.9	5	6.0
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.072[a] df:2 p>.585

Attitude related to high expectations from the state according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	22	43.1	9	42.9	31	43.1
Agree	27	52.9	12	57.1	39	54.2
Disagree	2	3.9			2	2.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square .872[a] df:2 p>.647

Attitude related to limited autonomy according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	15	40.5	10	45.5	4	50.0	9	56.3	38	45.8
Agree	17	45.9	11	50.0	4	50.0	7	43.8	39	47.0
Disagree	5	13.5	1	4.5					6	7.2
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 4.714[a] df:6 p>.581

Attitude related to limited autonomy according to the place of the university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	17	37.8	21	55.3	38	45.8
Agree	25	55.6	14	36.8	39	47.0
Disagree	3	6.7	3	7.9	6	7.2
TOTAL	45	100.0	38	100.0	83	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.954[a] df:2 p>.228

Attitude related to limited autonomy according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

| | Ph.D. | | | | TOTAL | |
| | In Turkey | | In Foreign | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	23	45.1	10	47.6	33	45.8
Agree	23	45.1	11	52.4	34	47.2
Disagree	5	9.8			5	6.9
TOTAL	51	100.0	21	100.0	72	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 2.247[a]   df:2   p>.325

Attitude related to importance of being an independent scholar according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	22	59.5	15	68.2	5	71.4	10	62.5	52	63.4
Agree	13	35.1	6	27.3	2	28.6	6	37.5	27	32.9
Disagree	2	5.4	1	4.5					3	3.7
TOTAL	37	100.0	22	100.0	7	100.0	16	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.851[a]   df:6   p>.933

Attitude related to importance of being an independent scholar according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Strongly Agree	26	59.1	26	68.4	52	63.4
Agree	17	38.6	10	26.3	27	32.9
Disagree	1	2.3	2	5.3	3	3.7
TOTAL	44	100.0	38	100.0	82	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square 1.718[a]   df:2   p>.424

Attitude related to importance of being an independent scholar according to the university from where Ph.D. degree was had

	Ph.D.				TOTAL	
	In Turkey		In Foreign			
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Strongly Agree	32	62.7	13	65.0	45	63.4
Agree	17	33.3	7	35.0	24	33.8
Disagree	2	3.9			2	2.8
TOTAL	51	100.0	20	100.0	71	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .808[a]   df:2   p>.668

TABLE 15

Infrastructural solutions according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Yes	10	27.0	8	38.1	3	42.9	4	30.8	25	32.1
No	27	73.0	13	61.9	4	57.1	9	69.2	53	67.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.166[a]   df:3   p>.761

Infrastructural solutions according to the place of university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	**P**	**F**	**P**	**F**	**P**
Yes	14	35.0	11	28,9	25	32.1
No	26	65.0	27	71.1	53	67.9
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .328[b]   df:1   p>.567

Ideological solutions according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	12	32.4	5	23.8	4	57.1	4	30.8	25	32.1
No	25	67.6	16	76.2	3	42.9	9	69.2	53	67.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.691[a]   df:3   p>.442

Ideological solutions according to the place of university

	CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES				TOTAL	
	Central		Periphery			
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	9	22.5	16	42.1	25	32.1
No	31	77.5	22	57.9	53	67.9
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   3.439[b]   df:1   p>.064

Educational solutions according to the academic status

	ACADEMIC STATUS								TOTAL	
	Res. Asist.		Asist. Prof. Dr.		Assoc. Prof. Dr.		Prof. Dr.			
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	19	51.4	11	52.4	5	71.4	8	61.5	43	55.1
No	18	48.6	10	47.6	2	28.6	5	38.5	35	44.9
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.245[a]   df:3   p>.742

175

Educational solutions according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	19	47.5	24	63.2	43	55.1
No	21	52.5	14	36.8	35	44.9
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   1.931[b]   df:1   p>.165

Solutions related to the quality of sociological studies according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	11	29.7	6	28.6	5	71.4	6	46.2	28	35.9
No	26	70.3	15	71.4	2	28.6	7	53.8	50	64.1
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   5.536[a]   df:3   p>.136

Solutions related to the quality of sociological studies according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	15	37.5	13	34.2	28	35.9
No	25	62.5	25	65.8	50	64.1
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .092[b]   df:1   p>.762

Organizational solutions according to the academic status

| | ACADEMIC STATUS | | | | | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Res. Asist. | | Asist. Prof. Dr. | | Assoc. Prof. Dr. | | Prof. Dr. | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	11	29.7	6	28.6	2	28.6	7	53.8	26	33.3
No	26	70.3	15	71.4	5	71.4	6	46.2	52	66.7
TOTAL	37	100.0	21	100.0	7	100.0	13	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   2.963[a]   df:3   p>.397

Organizational solutions according to the place of the university

| | CENTRAL – PERIPHERY UNIVERSITIES | | | | TOTAL | |
| | Central | | Periphery | | | |
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Yes	12	30.0	14	38.8	26	33.3
No	28	70.0	24	63.2	52	66.7
TOTAL	40	100.0	38	100.0	78	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square   .411[b]   df::1   p>.522

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONARY FORM IN TURKISH

T.C.
Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Sosyoloji Bölümü

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Bölümü yüksek lisans öğrencisi ve Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Sosyoloji Bölümü araştırma görevlisi Zuhal Yonca Hançer tarafından, "Türkiye'deki Sosyolojinin Sorunları" konulu yüksek lisans tez çalışmasının bir bölümü olarak hazırlanan bu anket formu, Türkiye'de çeşitli üniversitelerin sosyoloji bölümlerinde görev yapan öğretim elemanlarının ilgili konuya ilişkin görüşlerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Sosyoloji Bölümleri Öğretim Elemanları Anket Formu

1. Lisans eğitimi gördüğünüz üniversite ve bölüm adı:

…………………………………………..…………………………………………

2. Yüksek lisans eğitimi gördüğünüz üniversite ve bölüm adı :

…………………………………………..…………………………………………

3. Doktora derecesini aldığınız üniversite ve bölüm adı

…………………………………………..…………………………………………

4. Üniversitedeki (aynı veya farklı) toplam hizmet süreniz:

…………………………………………..…………………………………………

5. Üyesi olduğunuz dernekler/kuruluşlar (sayı ve isim olarak):

1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....

6. Üniversite dışında danışmanlık, gazete-dergi yazarlığı vb. görev yapma deneyiminiz:

1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....

7. Ulusal projelerde çalışma durumunuz:

1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....

8. Uluslararası projelerde çalışma durumunuz:

 1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....

9. Akademik unvanınız :

10. Akademik hayattaki tüm ilgi alanlarınız (geçmişte ve bugün) nelerdir?
sıralayınız :

1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....
…………………………………………………………………………………

11. Sizce günümüz Türkiye'sinde sosyolojinin yaşadığı temel sorunlar
nelerdir? Lütfen önem derecesine göre sıralayınız.

1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....
…………………………………………………………………………………

12. Bu sorunların kaynakları / nedenleri sizce nedir?

1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....
…………………………………………………………………………………

13. Lütfen temel sorunlar için çözüm önerilerinizi kısaca belirtiniz:

1……………………………………………………………………………….....
2……………………………………………………………………………….....
3……………………………………………………………………………….....
4……………………………………………………………………………….....
5……………………………………………………………………………….....
…………………………………………………………………………………

14. Genel olarak Dünya' da yapılan sosyolojinin durumu sizce nasıldır?
   ( ) Çok iyi   ( ) İyi   ( ) Kötü   ( ) Çok kötü

15. Türkiye'de yapılan sosyolojinin durumu sizce nasıldır?
   ( ) Çok iyi   ( ) İyi   ( ) Kötü   ( ) Çok kötü

16. Bölümünüzde sosyoloji (gelenek olması dahil tüm yönleriyle) sizce nasıldır?
   ( ) Çok iyi   ( ) İyi   ( ) Kötü   ( ) Çok kötü

17. Lütfen aşağıdaki sorular bağlamında önce kendinizi sonra da diğer sosyologları değerlendiriniz.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum　　　　( ) Katılıyorum
( ) Az katılıyorum　　　　　　　( ) Hiç katılmıyorum.

Bu yanıtınızın temel nedenleri olarak neler söyleyebilirsiniz?

"Türkiye'de genel olarak bilim insanlarında ve sosyologlarda 'karakter aşınması' gözlenmektedir"

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum　　　　( ) Katılıyorum
( ) Az katılıyorum　　　　　　　( ) Hiç katılmıyorum.

Bu yanıtınızın temel nedenleri olarak neler söyleyebilirsiniz?

Aşağıdaki önermelere katılma derecelerinizi, <u>Türkiye'de sosyolojiyi</u> göz önünde bulundurarak lütfen belirtiniz.

18. Türkiye'de genel eğilim, kuramsal temelleri yetersiz ampirik bilgi toplamaktır.
　　　　( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

19. Türkiye'deki sosyolojik çalışmaların kuramsal yetersizliği, sosyolojiyi en geniş biçimde olumsuz etkilemektedir.
　　　　( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

20. Türkiye'deki sosyoloji çalışmalarının kuramsal ve metodolojik çerçevesi, büyük ölçüde gelişmiş ülkelerin hegemonyası altındadır.
　　　　( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

21. Türkiye'de, sosyoloji alanında metodolojik yetkinlik sorunu vardır.
　　　　( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

22. Kuramsal ve metodolojik olarak birbiriyle tutarlı olmayan birden fazla araştırma tekniğinin birlikte kullanımı sorunlara yol açmaktadır.

　　　　( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

23. Ankete indirgenen bir sınama/ test etme anlayışı, pozitivizmin kendisine bile zarar verebilir.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

24. Türkiye'de sosyolojideki tarihsel çalışmalar çok sınırlıdır.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

25. Türkiye'deki sosyoloji çalışmalarındaki felsefi formasyon yetersizdir.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

26. Türkiye'de 'kurumlar sosyolojisi' alanındaki çalışmalar yetersizdir.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

27. Başta 'devlet' analizi olmak üzere, Türkiye'de sosyologların siyaset konusundaki çalışmaları yetersizdir.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

28. Türkiye'deki 'toplumsal sınıf' çalışmalarının yetersizliği, sosyolojiyi olumsuz etkilemektedir.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

29. Son yıllarda Türkiye'de kültür çalışmaları, sosyolojinin açılımını sağlayacak niteliktedir
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

30. Sosyolojide mikro çalışmaların bir yandan pozitivizmden diğer yandan da post-modernizmden destek alarak gelişmesi, Türkiye'de sosyoloji için önemli bir açılımdır.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

31. Türkiye'deki sosyoloji içerisinde aşırı uzmanlaşma vardır.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

32. Sadece Türkiye'deki değil, dünyadaki disiplinler arası çalışmalardaki başarısızlık da, sosyolojinin gelişmesini olumsuz etkilemektedir.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

33. Türkiye'deki sosyolojide konu çeşitliliğinin artması, disiplindeki en önemli gelişme göstergesi değildir.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

34. Türkiye'deki sosyolojinin sorunlarının en önemlilerinden bir tanesi de, yazılı eleştiri geleneğinin olmayışıdır.
( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

35. Genel olarak bilim insanlarının, özel olarak sosyologların, dünyadaki güncel literatüre hakimiyetleri yetersizdir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

36. Türkiye'de üniversitelerde, eğitim ve araştırmanın ayrışması, sosyolojinin gelişimini olumsuz etkilemektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

37. Türkiye'de sosyolojide kullanılan araştırma fonları, büyük ölçüde politika yönelimli (uygulamalı) çalışmalara yöneltilmektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

38. Toplumsal sorunların belirli bir ölçüde bilindiği varsayımı ile, özellikle uluslararası kaynaklar, toplumsal sorunların araştırılması yerine, çözümüne yönelik olarak kullanılmaktadır.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

39. Akademik yükseltmelerde nitelikten ziyade niceliksel kriterler öne çıkartılmaktadır.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

40. Uluslararası bilimsel dergilerin çoğunun ampirik bilgilere dayalı çalışmaları kuramsal çalışmalara göre daha çok tercih etmeleri, Türkiye'deki sosyolojinin gelişimini olumsuz etkilemektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

41. Yayınların ulusaldan ziyade uluslararası dergilere yönelmesi / yöneltilmesi, Türkiye'deki sosyolojinin gelişimini olumsuz etkilemektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

42. Akademik yayında yurtiçi yurt dışı ayrımı, kaliteli olmak koşulu ile, disiplinin gelişimi için temel bir farklılık değildir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

43. Akademik yayında kitap veya makale ayrımı, kaliteli olmak koşulu ile, disiplinin gelişimi için temel bir farklılık değildir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

44. Türkiye'de sosyoloji geleneği az gelişmiştir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

45. Türkiye'de genel olarak her şeyin devletten beklenmesi anlayışı hakimdir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

46. Bilginin sınırlı üretimi, Türkiye'deki sosyolojinin gelişimini olumsuz etkilemektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

47. Türkiye'de bilgi, kuramsal özü sınırlı olduğu için biriktirilememektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

48. Bilgi üretimini sürekli kılacak genel akademik ve bilimsel ortam oluşmamıştır.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

49. Genel olarak bilim insanları özel olarak sosyologlar, birbirlerinin çalışmalarından haberdar değildir ve birbirlerine referans vermemektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

50. Özerkliğin sınırlılığı, Türkiye'deki sosyoloji disiplininin gelişimini olumsuz etkilemektedir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

51. Türkiye' de üniversite ve dışındaki sosyologların sivil toplum bilinci yetersizdir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

52. Sosyolojinin mesleki örgütlenmesi son derece sınırlıdır.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

53. Gerek üniversite veya dışında çalışan sosyologlar arasında, gerekse onların yaptıkları çalışmalar arasında yeterli eşgüdüm yoktur.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

54. Üniversitenin toplumsal ihtiyaçlara cevap vermesi sadece uygulamalı çalışmalarla olmaz; kuramsal çalışmalar da toplumsal ihtiyaçlara yönelik olarak yapılabilir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

55. Sosyologların maddi ve örgütsel anlamda güçlenmesi, bağımsız olmalarından (iktidar odaklarına yakınlaşmadan uzak durabilmelerinden) geçer.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

56. Sosyologlar Türkiye'de sosyolojinin sorunlarıyla yetersiz düzeyde ilgilenmektedirler.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

57. Sosyolojinin gelişmesi, sadece bugün ile değil gelecekle de (Avrupa Birliği gibi uluslar arası konular ve Yerel Yönetim Reformu gibi ulusal konular) ilgilenmesi ile gerçekleşir.

( ) Tamamen katılıyorum ( ) Kısmen Katılıyorum ( ) Katılmıyorum

APPENDIX 3

QUESTIONARY FORM IN ENGLISH

T.C.
The Graduate School of Social Sciences
of Middle East Technical University

This questionnaire form is prepared by Zuhal Yonca Hançer as a part of master thesis of which the subject is "The Problems of Sociology in Turkey". Related to this subject, in this study, sociologists academicians' in Turkish universities opinion are examined.

Thanks for yours attributions.

1. Bachelor's degree (Name of Institution and main field of study)

....

2. Master's degree (Name of Institution and main field of study)

....

3. Ph.D. (Name of Institution and main field of study)

....

4. Years of work experience: ....

5. Membership of Professional Organization

1...
2...
3...
4...
5...

6. Please give details below any professional qualification held (consulting, private practice, ...). List in chronological order giving most recent first.

1...
2...
3...
4...
5...

7. National research project experience

1...
2...
3...
4...
5...

8. International research project experience

1...
2...
3...
4...
5...

9. What is your academic title/postion at your institution?....................................

10. What are your basic fields of interest in sociology?

1..
2..
3..
4..
5..

11. Please list basic problems of sociology in Turkey, starting the most substantial one.

1..
2..
3..
4..
5..

12. What are the main causes of these problems?

1..
2..
3..
4..
5..

13. Please list your solutions to these problems.

1..
2..
3..
4..
5..

14. What do you think about the present status of sociology in the world?

( ) Excellent   ( ) Good   ( ) Fair   ( ) Poor

15. What do you think about the present status of sociology in Turkey?
( ) Excellent   ( ) Good   ( ) Fair   ( ) Poor

16. What do you think about the present status of sociology in your department?
( ) Excellent ( ) good   ( ) Fair   ( ) Poor

17. Please first evaluate yourself and the other sociologists in the context of the following questions.

"So far I have done significant part of whatever should be done as a scientist"
( ) Strongly agree   ( ) Agree   ( ) Disagree   ( ) Strongly disagree

Please explain your reasons to justify your answer
……………………………………………………………………………………………

"There is a corrosion of character among sociologist academicians"
( ) Strongly agree   ( ) Agree   ( ) Disagree   ( ) Strongly disagree

Please explain your reasons to justify your answer
……………………………………………………………………………………………

For each of the following question please check the box that best represents your choice/agreement.

18. General trend of social researches in Turkey is to collect empirical data without theoretical background.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

19. Insufficiency of the theoretical background of sociological studies has an negative impact on Turkish sociology.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

20. Methodological and theoretical researches in Turkey have been under the hegemony of the developed countries.
      ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

21. Methodological insufficiency is an important problem in Turkish sociology.
      ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

22. Lack of consistency between theory and methodology in multiple data collection causes problems.

      ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

23. Reducing research to questionnaire testing not sufficient and could be hazardous for positivism itself.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

24. Historical studies in Turkish sociology is very limited.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

25. Philosophical foundation in Turkish sociology is very limited
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

26. The researches on social institutions are not sufficient.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

27. The researches on political/state analysis are not sufficient.

     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

28. The researches on class analysis are not sufficient.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

29. The increasing number of cultural studies in Turkish sociology has made a positive impact.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

30. The development of micro sociological studies based on positivism and post-modernism has a positive impact on Turkish sociology.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

31. There is an over specialization problem in Turkish sociology.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

32.The limited success in interdisciplinary studies both in the world and Turkey have negative impact on the development of sociology.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

33. Increased variety of topics/issues itself is not the most important criteria for the development of sociology.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

34. One of the most important problem of Turkish sociology is absence of tradition in terms of written critics.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

35. Specifically sociologists and generally scientists do not follow contemporary literature sufficiently.
     ( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

36. The distinction between research and teaching in higher education has negative effect on sociology in Turkey.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

37. The policy oriented researches are the most of the funded researches in the sociology.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

38. Assuming that social problems are already known, the most of the international research funds is used for the problem solving studies instead of real reasons of the problem.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

39. Priority is given quantitative criteria rather than qualitative criteria in academic promotion of Turkey.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

40. The preference of the international journals based on empirical studies rather than theoretical articles for publication has a negative impact on the development of Turkish sociology.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

41. Directing publication towards international journals rather than national has a negative impact on the development of Turkish sociology.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

42. Whether or not the journal is international or national, the quality is always important for the development of the discipline.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

43. The distinction between articles and books is not important for the development of the sociology as long as they are in good quality.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

44. The tradition of sociology in Turkey is insufficient

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

45. In general everything is expected from the government in Turkey.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

46. The limited production of knowledge/information has a negative impact on the development of sociology in Turkey.

( ) strongly agree   ( ) agree   ( ) disagree

47. Accumulation of knowledge/information without theoretical issues has a negative impact.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

48. There is no sufficient scientific conditions for the continuous accumulation of knowledge/information in Turkey.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

49. In general social scientists and specifically sociologists are not aware of each other studies and do not refer their studies.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

50. The limited autonomy has a negative impact on the development of sociology in Turkey.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

51. The sociologists both in and out of the academia have limited involvement in civil society

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

52. Professional organization of sociologists is very limited.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

53.There is no sufficient coordination between academic and non-academic sociologist.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

54. Theoretical studies is also important to understand and solve the problems of society.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

55. Unless sociologist is independent from the state, they cannot organize and gain power.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

56. Sociologists are not sufficiently interested in problems of sociology in Turkey.

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

57. Development of sociology depends on being interested in future sociological issues (i.e. entrance of European Union, reforms on local administration, etc.)

( ) strongly agree　　　( ) agree　　　( ) disagree

REFERENCES

Akşit, B. (1986). Türkiye'de Sosyoloji Araştırmaları: Bölmelenmişlikten Farklılaşma ve Çeşitlenmeye. In *Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi*, S. Atauz (Ed.). Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.

Akşit, B. (1998). Sosyoloji. In *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkiye'de Bilim "Sosyal Bilimler" I*. Ankara: TÜBA.

Aktay, Y. (2003). Üniversiteden Multiversiteye Taşra-Merkez Diyalektiği. *Toplum ve Bilim 97*, Summer, 93-121.

Alver, K. (2002). Türk Sosyolojisinde 'Kırılma' ya da Yeni Yönelim: 1940'lar Örneği. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, IV (1), 193-203.

Arı, O. (1986). Türkiye'de Sosyoloji Tarihi. In *Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi*, S. Atauz (Ed.). Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.

Ayas, M.R (1994). Türkiye'de Sosyoloji Eğitimi ve Bilgi Düzeyi Sorunu. In *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Güncel Sosyolojik Gelişmeler: I. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*. Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Bartos,O.J., Wher, P. (2002). *Using Conflict Theory*. New York: Cambridge.

Becher, T, Trowler, P.R. (2001). *Academic Tribles and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Berkes, N. (1936). Sosyoloji in Turkey. *The American Journal of Sosyology*, 42 (2), 238-246.

Berkes, N. (1942; 1985). Bilim Dünyasındaki Durumumuz. In *Felsefe ve Toplum Bilim Yazıları*. İstanbul: Adam.

Berkes, N. (1943; 1985). Batı Düşünü ve Türkiye. In *Felsefe ve Toplum Bilim Yazıları*. İstanbul: Adam.

Berkes, N. (1973;2002). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: YKY.

Cangızbay, K. (2003). Sürekli Seferberlik ve Teyakkuz Rejiminin Kurumu Olarak Üniversite. *Toplum ve Bilim 97*, Summer, 81-92.

Cirhinlioğlu, Z. (1999). *Azgelişmişliğin Toplumsal Boyutu*. Ankara: İmge.

Coşkun, İ. (1991). Sosyoloji Bölümünün Tarihine Dair. In *75. Yılında Türkiye'de Sosyoloji,* İ. Coşkun (Ed.). Ankara: Bağlam.

Cuff, E.C., Payne, G.C.F. (1989). *Perspectives in Sociology*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Çelebi, N. (2004). *Sosyoloji Ve Metadoloji Yazıları*. Ankara: AnıYayıncılık.

Delanty, G. (1997). The Idea of the University in the Global Era: From Knowledge as an End of the End of Knowledge, paper presented at the European Sociology Association Conference, Colchester, UK.

Durakbaşa, A. (2001). Türkiye'de Sosoyolojinin Kuruluşu ve Comte-Durkheim Geleneği. In *Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Düşünmek: Sempozyum Bildirileri*. İstanbul: Metis.

Duverger, M. (1995). *Siyaset Sosyolojisi,* Ş. Tekeli (Trans.). İstanbul: Varlık.

Ecevit, M. (1994). Türkiye'de Toplumbilim Araştırma Pratiği. In *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Güncel Sosyolojik Gelişmeler: I. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*. Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Ecevit, M. (2003). Notes for Sociology in Turkey (Unpublished Workshop Results in the Department of Sociology at METU).

Elias, N. (1956;1978). Problems of Involvement and Detachment. In *Modern Sociology,* P. Worsley (Ed.). England: Penguin Books.

Elibol, S. (1991). *Sosyoloji Konuşmaları.* Ankara: Ecem Yayıncılık.

Erdoğan, N. (2003). Kültürel Çalışmalar, (Kendiliğinden) İdeoloji(si) ve Akademya. *Toplum ve Bilim 97*, Summer, 43-64.

Ergun, D. (1985). Türkiye'de Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde Sosyoloji ve Gelişmesi. In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi,* 8, 2160-2163.

Ergur, A. (2003). Üniversitenin Pazarla Bütünleşmesi Sürecinde Akademik Dünyanın Dönüşümü. *Toplum ve Bilim* 97, Summer, 183-216.

Erol, Aydil. (2004). Türk Gerçeğini Değerlendirmek. *Türkçü Dergi*, (45). [Online] Electronic Address: http://www.orkun.com.tr/asp/orkun.asp?Tip=İçindekiler&sayi=45&ay=11&yil=2001 [20.07.2004].

Ertürk, R. (2004). Türk Sosyolojisinin Gelişimi Üstüne, (unpublished).

194

Ertürk, Y. (1990). Trends in the Development of Sociology in Turkey. *Journal of Human Science,* IX (2), 37-55.

Franklin, J. (1998). Introduction. In *The Politics of Risk Society,* F. Franklin (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Genov, N. (2002). Introduction. In *Advanced in Sociological Knowledge Over Half a Century,* N. Genov (Ed.). Paris: ISSC.

Gibbs, J. P.(1990).Control as Sociology'scentral Notion. *Social Science Journal,* 27(1),1-26.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing.

Gökçe, B. (1992). Sunuş. In *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesinde Sosyolojinin 52. Yılı Toplantısı*, A. Kasapoğlu (Ed.). Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Gökçe, B. (1994). Araştırna-Bürokrasi İlişkileri. In *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Güncel Sosyolojik Gelişmeler: I. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*. Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Göle, N. (1998). *Mühendisler ve İdeoloji*. İstanbul: Metis.

Gulbenkian Komisyonu. (1995;1998). *Sosyal Bilimleri Açın,* Ş. Tekeli (Trans.). İstanbul: Metis.

Hayes, E. (2004). Elaine Hayes on "The Forms of Capital". [Online] Web Adress: http://www.english.upenn.edu/~jenglish/Courses/hayes-pap.html [10.08.2004].

Husserl, E. (1996). An Answer to the Questıon: What is Enlighment?. In *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Antology,* L.E. Cahoone (Ed.). Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Hülür, H. (2002). Bilimsel ve Akademik Yazında İntihal: Örnek Olay İncelemesi. *Tabula Rasa* May-August (5), 7-26.

İlyasoğlu, A. (1985). Türkiye'de Sosyolojinin Gelişmesi ve Sosyoloji Araştırmaları. In *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 8, 2164-2174.

Kaçmazoğlu, H.B. (1999). *Türk Sosyoloji Tarihi Üzerine Araştırmalar*. İstanbul: Birey Yayıncılık.

Kafadar, O. (2002). Cumhuriyet Dönemi Eğitim Tartışmaları. In *Modern Türkiyede Siyasi Düşünce: Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, T. Bora, M. Gültekingil (Ed.). İstanbul: İletişim.

Kasapoğlu, A. (1991a). Türk Üniversitelerinde Sosyoloji Eğitiminin Bazı Sorunları. In *75. Yılında Türkiye'de Sosyoloji,* İ.Coşkun (Ed.). Ankara: Bağlam.

Kasapoğlu, A. (1991b). *Yüksek Öğretimde Sosyoloji Sorunları.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

Kasapoğlu, A. (1992a). Önsöz. In *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesinde Sosyolojinin 52. Yılı Toplantısı*, A. Kasapoğlu (Ed.). Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Kasapoğlu, A. (1992b). Sosyolojide Birlik Sağlama. *Araştırma Dergisi*, XIV, 201-218.

Kasapoğlu, A. (1999). *60 Yıllık Gelenek DTCF'de Uygulamalı Sosyoloji: (Berkes-Boran-Çağatay-Güler-Nirun)*. Ankara: Ümit Ofset.

Kasapoğlu, A. (2004a). Latest Developments and Discussions on Social sciences in the World, and Attitudes Towards Them in Turkey. In *Evaluation of Performance in Social Sciences,* İ. Tekeli, N. Teymur (Ed.). Ankara: UNESCO.

Kasapoğlu, A. (2004b). Sociological Studies of Higher Education in Turkey. (Unpublished Paper).

Kasapoğlu, A. (2004c). (Unpublished Paper).

Katoğlu, M. (1997). Cumhuriyet Türkiyesi'nde Eğitim, Kültür, Sanat. In *Türkiye Tarihi*: *Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980,* S. Akşin (Ed.). İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

Kayalı, K. (2003). *Türk Düşünce Dünyasında Yol İzleri.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Kıray, M.B. (1986). Toplum, Bilgi ve Türkiye. In *Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi*, S. Atauz (Ed.). Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.

Kocacık, F, İçli, G. (1992). The Development and the Problems of Sociology in Turkey, paper presented at Sociological Perspectives on a Changing Europe, Vienna, Australia.

Koç, Ş. [2000?]. Kimlik Sorunu ve Boyun Eğmiş Üniversite. In *Yirminci Yüzyıldan Yirmibirinci Yüzyıla Türkiye ve Dünya*. E. Yazıcı (Ed.). Ankara: İlke Emek.

Konuk, O. (1994). Türk Sosyolojinin Bazı Epistemolojik Problemleri. In *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Güncel Sosyolojik Gelişmeler: I. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*. Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Mills, C.W. (1959; 2000). Toplumbilimsel Düşün. Ü. Oskay (Trans.). Istanbul: Der.

Mills, C.W. (1959;1978). The Sociological Imagination. In *Modern Sociology*, P. Worsley (Ed.). New York: Penguin Books.

Neuman, W.L. (1994). *Social Research Method: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon Press.

OECD (2003). *Changing Patterns of Governance in Higher Education.* [Online] Web Adress: http://www.yok.gov.tr/duyuru/oecd_governance.htm [20.08.2004].

Öncü, A. (1986). Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Oturumu Üzerine Yorum. *Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi*, S. Atauz (Ed.). Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Öncü, A. (1994). Türkiye'de Sosyal Bilim Araştırmalarının Gelişimi. In *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Güncel Sosyolojik Gelişmeler: I. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*. Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Öncü, A. (1997). Crossing Borders into Turkish Sociology with Gunder Frank and Michel Foucalt. *Contemporary Sociology*, 26 (3), 267-270.

Öncü, A. (2002). Üniversite Reformu Ve Batılılaşma. In *Modern Türkiyede Siyasi Düşünce: Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, T. Bora, M. Gültekingil (Ed.). İstanbul: İletişim.

Özdalga, E. (1990). Türkiye'de Bir Sosyolog Olmak Üzere. *Toplum ve Bilim 48/49*, Winter-Spring, 27-33.

Peker, M. (1994). Sosyal İçerikli Araştırmalarda Örneklem Sorunu. In *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Güncel Sosyolojik Gelişmeler: I. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*. Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği.

Rutigliano, E. (2004). Sociology today, according to Neil Smelser Complexity: Grows, the value-system lasts. [Online] Web Adress: http://www.unitn.it/unitn/numero55/sociologiaoggi_eng.html [01.08.2004].

Sayın, Ö. (1993). Türkiye'de Sosyolojik Çalışmalarda Kuramsal Çerçeve Oluşturulması Sorunları. In *Sosyolojide Son Gelişmeler ve Türkiye'deki Etkileri.* Ankara: Turkish National Commission for UNESCO.

Sencer, M. (1990). İnsangücü Planlaması ve Üniversite. In *Yükseköğretimde Sorunlar ve Çözümler,* T. Saylan, Z. Üskül (Ed.). İstanbul: Cem.

Sennet, R. (2002) Karakter Aşınması. B.Yıldırım (Trans.). Istanbul: Ayrıntı.

Sezal, İ. (2004). Structural Characteristics and Their Relations to the Performance of Social Scientists in Turkey-a Preliminary Framework. In Evaluation of Performance in Social Sciences, İ. Tekeli, N. Teymur (Ed.). Ankara: UNESCO.

Sezer, B. (1991). Türk Sosyolojisinin Önündeki Sorunlar. In 75. Yılında Türkiye'de Sosyoloji, İ. Coşkun (Ed.). Ankara: Bağlam.

Smelser, N.J. (1992). External Influences on Sociology. In *Sociology and Its Publics,* T.C. Halliday, M. Janowitz (Ed.). Chigago: The University of Chigago.

Sosyoloji Sözlüğü. (1999). G.Marshall (Ed.); O. Akınhan, D. Kömürcü (Trans.). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat.

Şaylan, G. (2004). An Attempt on Performance Appraisal of Contemporary Social Sinces in Turkey. In *Evaluation of Performance in Social Sciences,* İ. Tekeli, N. Teymur (Ed.). Ankara: UNESCO.

Tekeli, İ. (2003). Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Üniverste Üzerinde Konuşmanın Değişik yolları. *Toplum ve Bilim* 97, Summer, 12-143.

Timur, T. (2000). *Toplumsal Değişme ve Üniversiteler*. Ankara: İmge.

Tuna, K. (1991). Türk Sosyolojisinin Batı Sosyolojisi ile İlişkisi ve Sonuçları. In *75. Yılında Türkiye'de Sosyoloji*, İ. Coşkun (Ed.). Ankara: Bağlam.

Tuna, K. (2002) *Yeniden Sosoloji*. İstanbul: Karakutu.

Tüfekçioğlu, H. (1991). Türkiye'de Sosyoljinin İşlevi. In *75. Yılında Türkiye'de Sosyoloji,* İ. Coşkun (Ed.). Ankara: Bağlam.

Ülken, H.Z. (1956). *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Sosyoloji Öğretim ve Araştırmaları*. İstanbul: Anıl.

Wallerstein, I. (1999). The Heritage of Sociology, The Promise of Social Science. *Current Sociology*, 47 (1), 1-37.

Yıldırım, E. (2002). Türk Milli Kimliğinin Sosyoloji Aracılığı İle İnşası. *Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 15 (2), 144-160.