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Abstract

The logic multiplicity is an important issue in the organization studies and it is commonly voiced that it has a significant effect on the organizations. Moreover, organizations have reacted differently to issues because of being under the influence of different logics and this also influences the success of organizations and hence the logic multiplicity may be an opportunity or problem for the organization. However, there are minimum requirements that must be met to discuss logic multiplicity and then the advantages and disadvantages of it or other issues can be discussed. Therefore, in this study, it is claimed that if these requirements are not provided, the discussion of logic multiplicity will be meaningless. Universities that have the presidency change - it is an issue of 36 universities in Turkey - in 2016 are focused on conducting the study. The situation before and after the change will be compared to understand under which conditions logic multiplicity creates synergies and under which conditions it causes conflicts.
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1. Introduction

The logic multiplicity is an important issue in the organization studies and it is commonly voiced that it has a significant effect on the organizations (e.g. Besharov and Smith, 2014; Dunn and Jones, 2010; Thornton, 2004; Thornton and Ocasio, 2008). The studies of institutional logics have focused on the practices, assumptions, values and beliefs that shape the actions and behaviors of institutions (Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury, 2012) to identify the logics behind them (Lindberg, 2014). While Friedland and Alford (1991) see the capitalist market, bureaucratic state, democracy, nuclear family, and Christian religion as the major institutions, Thornton (2004 as cited in Thornton and Ocasio, 2008) stated them as markets, corporations, professions, states, families, and religions. Each of these institutions has its own distinct logics and characteristics, and they represent a different belief system or worldview. In most cases, organizations have been affected by various institutions and these may cause the competition or coordination between multiple logics (Besharov and Smith; Lindberg, 2014) and hence managing such situation may be very challenging especially in the development processes (Marquis and Lounsbury, 2007, Lounsbury, 2007). Moreover, organizations have reacted differently to issues because of being under the influence of different logics and this also influences the success of organizations: it may be an opportunity or problem (Besharov and Smith, 2014). However, there are minimum requirements that must be met to discuss logic multiplicity and then the advantages and disadvantages of it or any another issue can be discussed. Therefore, in this study, it is claimed that if these requirements are not provided, the discussion of logic multiplicity will be meaningless.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Logic Multiplicity: Synergy vs. Conflict

According to Lindberg (2014), one of the key dimensions of institutional theory is the concept of institutional logics which is defined by Friedland and Alford (1991) as, “a set of material practices and symbolic constructions - which constitutes its organizing principles” (p. 248). The studies of institutional logics have focused on the practices, assumptions, values and beliefs that shape the actions and behaviors of institutions (Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury, 2012) to identify the logics behind them (Lindberg, 2014). While Friedland and Alford (1991) see the capitalist market, bureaucratic state, democracy, nuclear family, and Christian religion as the major institutions, relatively new studies (e.g. Dunn and Jones, 2010; Thornton, 2004; Thornton and Ocasio, 2008) stated them in a more general context as markets, corporations, professions, states, families, and religions. Each of these institutions has its own distinct logics and
characteristics and they represent a different belief system or worldview. In most cases, organizations have been affected by various institutions and these may cause the competition or coordination between multiple logics (Besharov and Smith, 2014; Lindberg, 2014).

Many scholars have reached the conclusion that multiple logics in practice is very common for any kind of organization but a dominant logic within a field usually shapes the actions (e.g. Lounsbury, 2007; Besharov and Smith, 2014; Lindberg, 2014). Previous studies on the issue referred to different consequences about having logic multiplicity in an organization; for instance, on the one hand, Tracey, Phlips and Jarvis (2011) see logic multiplicity as a significant threat to the organization and claim that it will cause the death of the organization; on the other hand, Jay (2013), and Kraatz and Block (2008) see it as an opportunity to make organizations more enduring, sustainable and innovative. It may help the organization to create synergy or find itself under the mess of conflicts. Besharov and Smith (2014) also joined the discussion and they claimed that logic multiplicity may help some organizations to become more successful while it may result in conflict and complexity for others. The reasons behind this situation were not clear and hence Besharov and Smith (2014) have come with a theoretical framework to explain it. This framework divided logic multiplicity into four different sections based on their degree of centrality and compatibility. These sections are a) contested (extensive conflict), b) estranged (moderate conflict), c) aligned (minimal conflict) and d) dominant (no conflict). While high centrality and compatibility between logics of the organization places it in the aligned part; low centrality and compatibility bring it to estranged section. High centrality with low compatibility represents contested and low centrality with high compatibility represents dominant organizations in terms of logic multiplicity (Figure 1). While institutional complexity is high for the organizations in the contested section; for the organization of dominant section is low.

**Types of Logic Multiplicity Within Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High centrality</th>
<th>Low centrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contested</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive conflict</td>
<td>No conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estranged</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate conflict</td>
<td>No conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Besharov and Smith’s (2014) Framework
As it seen above, organizations have reacted differently to logic multiplicity depending on their specific characteristics such as identities and structures (see also: Battilana and Dorado, 2010; Dunn and Jones, 2010; Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta and Lounsbury; 2011). Greenwood et al., (2011) also claimed that the responses of organizational actors to the institutional complexity represent their association with the organization: If the actors interiorized the organization identity; they support the new institutional logics which are compatible with them while they resist the different institutional logics challenging the current identity of the organization (Greenwood et al., 2011).

The statements above have showed that logic multiplicity of an organization can be either an important opportunity to create synergy or the threat of stuck in the middle of conflicts and the way transforms a threat to an opportunity goes through the level of conflicts based on the degree of centrality and compatibility, and the commitment of individuals in the organizations. They are important statements and approved with many other studies. However, in this study, it is claimed that these are not always adequate because they seem to have overlooked some important facts which are the violence of common goals among different interest groups of organization and independence of the organization. Our claim is that the level of conflicts becomes a matter if there is a low degree of violence of common goals because this will be an obstacle to creating synergy. Organizational actors resist the new logics challenging with their existing logic(s) when they can take decisions independently. In other words, these are certainly vital issues but they do not matter until providing the independence of the organization to be able to conduct such a study because the decisions taken are, in fact, under the control of other organizations or institutions. This is a significant factor to be realized first; like Maslow's hierarchy of needs, you can move away after you satisfied the first level, otherwise not.

Although they do not look at the issue as hierarchical, Özen and Öztürk (2016) emphasized that the only factors affecting the individual behaviors are not institutional logics but also the social networks of individuals and the environment of their organizations such as political, religious or ethnic networks. If an organization has an important political link or network, its priority will probably be the success against opponents because they are not fully rational in this context. On the other hand, as an important number of studies (e.g. Buğra, 2015; Çolpan and Hikino, 2008; Hoskisson, Johnson, Tihanyi and White, 2005; Khanna and Palebu, 2000; Tezel, 1982) stated that the organizations in the developing countries are under the significant effect of governments or ruling parties in the country and hence their decisions and reactions have been also affected and their success are also “partly” dependent to their relationship with the governments. Therefore, this study aims to show how the success of and conflicts in an
organization do not depend on having a single logic or logic multiplicity and the prevailing logics in the field. To do this, the universities which change the university rector in 2016 have been focused and these universites are classified into two groups: dependent and independent universities. Dependent universities are the universities that are relatively young and they do not a complete “working” system, and dependencies to people are high in this kind of universities. Independents are the universities that have a specific characteristic and try to protect this characteristic and they have completed its institutionalization process or at least, have reached a certain maturity level. Table 1 shows the whole list of these universities in terms of our focused universities.

**Table 1: Dependent and Independent Universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Universities</th>
<th>Independent Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen</td>
<td>Akdeniz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardahan</td>
<td>Atatürk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artvin Çoruh</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartın</td>
<td>Boğaziçi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batman</td>
<td>Cumhuriyet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitlis Eren</td>
<td>Çukurova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çankırı Karatekin</td>
<td>Dicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gümüşhane</td>
<td>Dokuz Eylül</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakkâri</td>
<td>Ege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İğdır</td>
<td>Fırat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey</td>
<td>Gazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırklareli</td>
<td>Gaziantep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilis 7 Aralık</td>
<td>İnönü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli</td>
<td>ITÜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaniye Korkut Ata</td>
<td>Karadeniz Teknik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siirt</td>
<td>Ondokuz Mayıs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalova</td>
<td>ODTÜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trakya</td>
<td>Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Until July 2016, the rector of universities in Turkey was determined according to the results of the rector elections. One of the three candidates who received the most votes in the elections was assigned as rector by the President of the Republic but then the law has changed and elections have been abolished. Now, the President of the Republic can assign any candidate irrespective of whether the candidate is a university member. An election represents the idea and belief of the electorates and if a candidate gets the highest votes, this candidate comes to power. Otherwise, normally, the supporters of this candidate resist the situation occur and now, under new conditions a candidate from outside the institution may experience the resistance towards him or herself. In this context, if a rector with the most votes will not assign as the rector, this situation must cause problems. However, we claim that when such situations occur in a dependent
university, this does not cause any problem in terms of the university success, the number of academic and social activities organized and conflict and so on. On the contrary, if this situation occurs in an independent university, then this may cause significant problems.

### 2.2 Higher Education System and Prevailing Institutional Logics in the Field

Turkish Higher Education system has been affected by many traditions or schools of thought in the last century. Üsdiken (2004) has specified these traditions and schools as:

- **a)** French dominance – until the early 1930s,
- **b)** German dominance – between 1930s and 1950s, and
- **c)** American dominance – from 1950s to present.

Due to the influence of the various schools and traditions, Turkish education system has become a system which is under the influence of multiple logics. With each new dominance, various multiple logics which are effective in the dominant country have started to be effective in Turkey as well. Moreover, these multiple logics have changed in Turkey because of the interaction with Turkish traditions. However, the centralization activities have been started in 1981 and the Higher Education Council (Yüksekokşretim Kurulu, henceforth YÖK) was established to control universities. Üsdiken and Wasti (2009) have stated that one of the important goals of YÖK was to push universities to adopt the American style administrative and educational structures. Therefore, universities have become relatively more similar to each other after YÖK although some universities have resisted to this situation and tried to differentiate itself. These “opponent” universities and the new universities that have an organic link with these universities have constituted a separate class.

In addition to statements above, universities are in a transformation process. Studies show that the universities in the USA (e.g. Gumport, 2000) and the EU countries (e.g. Jongbloed, 2015) have transformed themselves from a social institution to an industry and these claims have been supported then by many other researchers (e.g. Lamal, 2001; Sporn, 2007; Altmann and Ebersberger, 2013). The universities were already under the influence of multiple logics and with this transformation process, they have become an economic actor more than social institutions and this can cause fundamental changes and the influence of more logics. This transformation process will probably affect Turkish universities as well because the USA is still the center country for Turkish universities (Üsdiken, 2004).

Considering the effective logics in the field, Özen and Öztürk (2016) have specified three main co-existing institutional logics which are vocational, scientization and entrepreneurial. The characteristics of these logics are seen at table 2.
Table 2: The Prevailing Logics in the Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevailing Logics</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial</th>
<th>Scientization</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Premise</strong></td>
<td>Market-driven, action research</td>
<td>Scientific research</td>
<td>Professional training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>Entrepreneurs, Managers, Start-up owners</td>
<td>Generalists</td>
<td>Practitioners with managerial skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Structure</strong></td>
<td>- Practice-orientedeters on Entrepreneurship, Innovation, Technology</td>
<td>- Lower course load</td>
<td>- Higher course load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Project-based</td>
<td>- Greater discretion in program construction</td>
<td>- Rigid programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Courses on Innovation, Technology</td>
<td>- Universalistic</td>
<td>- Contextualized courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Contributing to Regional/national development</td>
<td>Research and publication</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Özen and Öztürk (2016, p.16)

Prof. Saraç who is the president of YÖK announced that the newly established universities should differentiate themselves among one of the following targets: teaching, R&D and regional development. While some of them should focus on only education, others should focus on research and technology, and others on contribution to regional development (Hürriyet, 2016; YÖK, 2016). Considering the functional emphasis of prevailing logics above, Saraç’s purpose is to motivate universities to emphasize the domination of a single logic. This leads us to think who will decide to this target, universities or YÖK? If it happens what will be changed in terms of the success of universities? Will the universities become more successful with the specialization and dominance of single logic? It is expected to see different reactions from the universities have different dominant logic due to the influence of so many different logics and transformation process. However, we expect that there will not be any significant differences between them because they are not independent. We claim that being under the influence of a single or multiple logics will not make any differences if there are not sufficient interest groups with the common goals in the universities and if the independence of the universities is not provided.

3. Prospective Theoretical Framework

To be able to establish a framework, the literature on logic multiplicity, synergy, conflict, higher education system, related laws and regulations and so on should be investigated in depth. I will propose here only a draft of the prospective framework.
The organization in section III will not be reliable sample to conduct a research about the logic multiplicity because they are dependent on another organization(s) and do not have any common goals between the sub-groups in the organization. The organizations and organizational actors can react completely different to the same issue at different times and hence they should not be investigated until they move one of other sections.

**Proposition 1:** The level of problems at dependent universities is expected to be low than independent ones when the most voted candidate is not appointed or an outsider candidate is appointed.

**Proposition 2:** Even though the dependent universities are under the influence of different institutional logics (vocational, scientization and entrepreneurial) regardless of single or multiple, there will not be any differences among dependent universities in terms of their success and innovativeness after rector changes.

**Proposition 3:** The differently oriented organizations which are under the influence of different institutional logics (vocational, scientization and entrepreneurial) will reflect different result based on their dominant logic. For instance, if an organization in section I is dominated by entrepreneurial logic, the results related to entrepreneurship will be high while the results related to scientization may be low.

**4. Empirical Context**

To be able to test these hypotheses, the determination of the criteria for the success and innovativeness of universities are a need. In the literature, the criteria for the success of universities varies according to their orientation, for instance, if it is a research-oriented university, its success measured by their outcomes such as the number of publications and
patents. On the other hand, if it is a teaching-oriented university, then their measure is the employment rate of graduates. However, in Turkey, there is not any data on the employment rate of graduates of universities. Moreover, although some steps have been taken by governments to increase research productivity of universities (e.g. Academic Incentives), there is not any established system to measure their productivity as well. Academic incentives have focused also on the quantity, not quality. Even the prestige of universities has usually depended on the language of instruction rather than research productivity (Önder and Kasapoğlu-Önder, 2011). Therefore, the number of publications in the important database such as SSCI and SCI will be used in this study in addition to academic incentives to compare the success of universities. The second need is the innovativeness of the universities and the "Entrepreneurial and Innovative Universities Index" of TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) will also be included to test this issue. Lastly, the determination of the dominant logic(s) of each university is a need and to specify these, a series of semi-structured interviews will be conducted with the deans or rectors of the universities. Also, a content analysis on published press releases will help us to specify dominant logic or logics of universities and the reaction of the university members to the new rector. In the light of this data, some basic data analysis will be used. For instance, Paired-Samples T-tests will be used to understand the differences the year before and after the rector change for each university and the Independent-sample T-test for the comparison of universities. In other words, the related quantitative and qualitative methods for each proposition will be used.

5. Conclusion

Even though the concept of institutional logic is one of the most debated issues in new institutional theory in recent times, it still needs to be studied in many ways, from the most basic to the advanced concepts. Most of the scholars working on the logic concept ignore the organizational dimensions of this concept, this is probably because institutional logic is a supra-organizational concept. In other words, there is a common assumption that all individual organizations under the influence of the same institutional logic or logics will respond in the same way to the effect of these dominant logic or logics. One of the important exceptions to this is the work of Besharov and Smith (2014) that classified and evaluated organizations according to the level of centrality and compatibility of organizations as individually. Another important study is Özen and Öztürk’s (2016) work which focused on the prevailing logics of universities in Turkey. These were important studies and solved many problematic issues of the concept but they do not focus on the degree of dependency of organizations. Therefore, this study focus on this issue: organizations’ the degree of dependency seems crucial point to take into consideration because
when an organization has been investigated, it may give extremely conflicting conclusions if it is not an independent organization because when we focus on it, we are in fact investigating some other factors behind our organization and we do not know it. To give a more concrete example, if an organization have a strong dependency on a political actor or party, it cannot be claimed that this organization takes it decision rationally and logically, its main aim may be another political reason and this seems common in many countries but especially in developing and undeveloped countries.

In other and metaphorical words, before claiming a person as guilty, we must be sure whether there is a criminal responsibility of the person. The similar situation should be valid for organizations and their dependency must be checked. The study tries to explain these issues with a sample of dependent universities and offer a framework to classify organizations based on their “criminal responsibility”. I believe that this study will show that the logic multiplicity can be an issue if the identity of organizations is not appropriate to conduct such studies.
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