

A FIELD STUDY ON TOP MANAGEMENT TRAINING  
POTENTIALS OF TURKISH UNIVERSITIES

B. AYDEM ÇİFTÇİOĞLU<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT**

*The main aim of higher education institutions and education systems is to give the technical, practical, behavioral knowledge and skills necessary for business life in order to have a successful professional career. When evaluated in this context, one of the top career steps or titles that individuals can reach in their professional life in commercial business is to be the general manager (CEO) of a company. In this context, for many young people who are at the beginning of their career or who are try to choose a profession, the way and methods that the general manager or CEO of a commercial enterprise tracks are treated as role models. The educational backgrounds of the CEOs, the methods they follow in their career steps, and the positions they work on the way to the CEO, inspire many high school students in their choice of department in universities as well as universities preferences. It is an important university ranking index followed by students from the "Alma Mater Index" created by David Matthews of Times Higher Education to facilitate university choices according to the employment performance of the universities graduates of the students. Main aim of this study, it to investigate Turkish universities senior manager training performance with Alma Mater Index methodology among Fortune Turkey 500 Big Turkish Companies listed firms' general managers.*

**Key Words:** Universities, Career, Fortune 500, CEO, professional education.

**Jel Code:** M1, A2, M 0

---

<sup>1</sup> Ass. Prof, Uludag University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Science, Business Administration Department, e-mail: aydemaydemir@uludag.edu.tr

## TÜRK ÜNİVERSİTELERİNİN ÜST DÜZEY YÖNETİCİ YETİŞTİRME POTANSİYELLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR SAHA ÇALIŞMASI

### ÖZ

*Yükseköğretim kurumlarının ve eğitim sistemlerinin temel amacı, bireylerin başarılı bir mesleki kariyere sahip olabilmeleri için iş yaşamında gerekli olan teknik, pratik, davranışsal bilgi ve becerileri kazandırmaktır. Bu kapsamda değerlendirildiğinde ticari iş yaşamında, bireylerin meslek hayatlarındaki ulaşabilecekleri en üst kariyer basamaklarından ya da unvanlarından biri, bir şirketin genel müdürü (CEO) olmaktadır. Bu kapsamda, kariyerinin başında olan ya da meslek tercihinde bulunmak üzere olan pek çok genç için, ticari işletmelerde genel müdür ya da CEO unvanında bulunan bireylerin izledikleri yol ve yöntemler rol modeli olarak ele alınmaktadır. CEO'ların eğitim geçmişleri, kariyer basamaklarında izledikleri yöntemler ve CEO'luga giden yolda çalıştıkları pozisyonlar özellikle meslek ve gelecek tercihlerini kurgulama çabasında olan pek çok lise öğrencisine üniversite ve üniversitelerdeki bölüm tercihlerinde ilham vermektedir. Öğrencilerin mezunlarının istihdam edilebilirlik performansına göre üniversite tercihlerini kolaylaştırmak amacıyla Times Higher Education'dan David Matthews tarafından oluşturulan "Alma Mater Index" aday öğrenciler tarafından takip edilen önemli bir üniversite sıralama indeksidir. Söz konusu endeks Fortune 500 listesinde yer alan şirketlerin CEO'larını ve üst düzey yöneticilerini mezun oldukları üniversite ve bölüm bazında mercek altına alarak üniversiteleri, üst düzey yönetici yetiştirme performansına göre sıralamaktadır. Bu çalışmada söz konusu endeks dikkate alınarak Türk üniversitelerinin yönetici yetiştirme performansları, 2017 Fortune 500 Türkiye sıralamasında yer alan firmalarındaki genel müdürlerin mezun oldukları üniversiteler ve bölümler açısından incelenmiştir.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Üniversiteler, Kariyer, Fortune 500, Yönetici yetiştirme, Genel Müdür.

## INTRODUCTION

The most important concepts that define the 21st century conditions are the concepts of change and competition. Aktan (2007) describes the dynamics of those changes as globalization, information society, new technologies, state reforms, increased competition, higher education demand and rapid population growth in underdeveloped and developing countries. The author explains that the dynamics of change have a very serious impact on the teaching methods and tools of the higher education sector in the presentation, financing, organization and management of the services. Education is increasingly seen by governments as a major contributor to national wealth and economic development. In addition, the increasingly competitive external environment has called for continuous improvement of countries' quality assurance standards and international criterion of their education systems. In this scope performance and quality issues have become the serious criteria's for higher education institutions.

In the related literature, it is observed that the performance of the universities and the quality of the education service they have offered are tried to be measured by many different parameter and measurement methods. It was important issues for universities to measuring their performance or taking great degrees from rankings among universities in order to gaining their revenues. Scope of domestic and international student's mobility, which has been increasing due to globalization, has brought competition from the local scale to the global scale among the universities. In this context, many universities provide different opportunities for their target domestic and international students who are looking for higher education institutions. Especially the researchers and students in developing countries are interested in the developed countries and the universities in these countries. In order to maintain a high standard of teaching and research, catering for the needs of domestic and international student audiences universities have to provide market-based strategies for competing or positioning with in the world higher education market.

The numerical size of the higher education market in the world is estimated at approximately 2.5 trillion dollars. Where it was assumed that 15 percent of this market, is built by schools in the United States

(Aktan, 2007). According to British council higher education report internationally mobile student's number has risen from 800,000 in the mid-1970s to over 3.5 million in 2009. The major origin countries for internationally mobile tertiary students include China, India, South Korea, Germany, Turkey and France where USA is still most popular destinations for students going abroad. It was also reported that Total global tertiary enrolments are forecast to grow by 21 million between 2011 and 2020, or 1.4 per cent per year on average. (British council-higher education report 2012) Hence based on those numbers higher education systems compete with each other based on quality of education, campus areas, fellowship opportunities', social facilities, variety of departments or academicians, opportunities of employment and so on.

58

İİBF Dergi  
35/2  
Aralık  
December  
2016

Besides the student number, universities also compete with each other with quality of education in order to attract high qualify students to their universities. Quality of higher education measures and referred to in many different parameters such as research, analysis, assessing acceptability, recruitment, appointment procedures and academic staff profile (Parri, 2006: 109) where quality of education institutions mostly related with consumers/students satisfaction (Petruzzellis and Romanazzi, 2010). On the other hand examining the most important functions of higher education is to teaching students where this function also defined as "value added" (a measure of the difference between students' achievement at the beginning of a program of study and their achievement at the end) function of those institutions (Ramsden, 1991: 130). Based on quality assessments of university consumers' perspective, core mission of universities is to ensure comprehensive knowledge in many areas to its students in order to train our future leaders (Duvall, 2003: 64). In this framework main aim of this study is to investigate Turkish Universities' leadership training performance for the business world.

## 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1.1. Concept of Higher Education

Higher education is an optional final stage of formal learning that occurs after completion of secondary education, often delivered at universities, and other institutions of higher learning (Anselin, et.al 1997). The history of higher education is distinct from other forms of

*A Field Study on Top Management Training Potentials of  
Turkish Universities*

education, with some universities being among the oldest learning institutions in the world. The development of universities and higher education more generally, over the course of the last millennium is closely tied to religion (Rashdall, 1895). It was assumed that the idea of university started in Europe in 10th century where the first university was established in 1088 in Bologna/Italy (Bonomini et.al., 1994). Most universities were founded from pre-existing schools (Anselin, et.al 1997). The oldest institutions of higher learning founded in the mid-12th century were Paris, Oxford and Cambridge in Europe (Dmitrishin, 2013). Now a days according to Countries arranged by Number of Universities in Top Ranks, there are 26368 universities as of 2017. Besides this numbers, role and performance of the universities have been debating. In the modern world, universities have two purposes to equip students with advanced skills useful in the workplace and to further human knowledge and understanding of the world and its future (Langer et.al, 2001; Rowley, 2000; Cortese, 2003). Hence many different higher education institutions around the world are carrying out activities to educate students with different specialties and to bring them to the business world and society. In this context, universities are in a race with each other in order to realize their mission and attract the most qualified students. Universities compete with each other with many parameters such as educational qualities, opportunities offered to students, tuition fees and so on in order to legitimize themselves in the eyes of the target groups. In this context, many different measurement methods are used to evaluate the performance of the universities in the related literature.

There are many different systems for evaluating universities. These systems can be international and national. Some of the well- known international systems are; The Times Higher Education - QS World University Rankings, Shanghai Jiaotong University Academic Ranking of World Universities, Newsweek Top 100 Global Universities index, (Webometrics: World Universities' Ranking on the Web, G-Factor International University Rankings, Professional Ranking of World Universities and so on (Saka and Yaman, 2011: 73). Those ranking systems continuously repeated each year to display the best universities for students and other entitles.

On the other hand an important choice factor for the students who will prefer the university is the job opportunities after graduation and the chance of graduates to be successful in business life where most of

families as well as students main reason for registering to high quality universities is to their assumption about prepared them to business life for successful professional career (Ajibola et.al 2017; Lee and Chatfield 2010, Hyun et.al 2012, Shahid et.al 2012). A survey which is conducted by Connor and his colleagues on school students noted that the most important personal reasons cited for going to university were, listed as to have a professional career', to improve my job prospects', 'to gain entrance to a well-paid career (Connor et. Al., 1999: 12). Thus it is very important issue for students as well as university or higher education institutions to enhancing students' employability (Watts, 2006: 6).

60

İİBF Dergi  
35/2  
Aralık  
December  
2016

## 1.2. Career Management

The success career or career development concepts are mostly defined in human resource literature by the term occupation or the level of competence in business world, succession of job held, activities occupational and other constitute a life pattern or a sequence of experience in the world of work with objectives and consequences (Sears, 1982: 137). Thus career could be defined as one's whole occupation. In relate literature professional, occupation and career words used as interchangeable terms. The profession is defined as ones job efforts a certain period of time in order to earn earnings for continue the vital activities (Lee et al., 2000: 800) where occupation defined as the whole of the work that the individual has graduated and studied and has pursued throughout his career (Hall, 1968). According to human resource management perspective Career or career development is the series of activities or the on-going/lifelong process of developing one's career or professional life. On the other hand career success is identify by Hogan, Chamorro-Premuzic, and Kaiser (2013) as the terms of occupational prestige and financial attainment (Hogan et. Al, 2013: 4). Career development is the process that forms a person's work identity. It is a significant part of human development and spans over the individual's entire lifetime. Based on career development literature ones typical career stage or career success occurred in the process of establishment, advancement and maintenance stages (Mount, 1984: 340). However with the transition to knowledge work, the importance of using talents and continuing to develop, expand, and refine one's skills, abilities, and talents are essential components of career and personal success that directly impact employability. Hence there are several Modern career theories

*A Field Study on Top Management Training Potentials of  
Turkish Universities*

(boundless career model, career mobility and embeddedness model, protean career model..) identified for to address how workers at different career stages are likely to differentially define what career success means. (Olson and Schultz, 2013: 17-18).

Based on individuals career management process in Business life or in business activities one of the best career of ones' occupational development is to becoming a chief executive officer (CEO) of a company (Wai and Rinderman, 2015: 102). In a short mean CEO is the person who plans the future of the company. Coe's creating and implementing a strategy to achieve the goals of the executive board where it could be identify as managers of managers. In administrative science disciplines choice of true strategies and implementation of these strategies is a very important issues for executive board and organizational lifecycles. CEO role behavior would also suggest that CEOs use their power and the dominant coalition to develop and maintain the corporate strategy. Hence choosing true CEO who is responsibility is to set strategies and implement them have vital importance for organizations survival (Smith and White, 1987: 263). On the other hand Being CEO means a very challenging journey, they have past great career paths. Unless an individual is the founder of firm, CEO's have to take well qualified educations and have an adequate job or sectorial experience, they have own some sort of special and specified qualifications such as inter-personal communication skills, own business network, role model personal characteristics, technical knowledge, practical and analytical intelligence...so on. However besides personal features if we compare the qualifications of CEO's educational background is assumed as the initial or main factor that shows the potential of one's to become CEO. Hence the main purpose of this study is to investigate Turkish CEO's educational backgrounds.

As it mentioned before there are many different systems existing for evaluating universities. In the sense of administrative science or promise of having a good or success career for candidates is the ranking list of Times Higher Education institution's "The Alma Mater Index". This index is created by David Matthews of the Times Higher Education. This index shorted Universities based on their number of graduation students which are working as a CEOs of Fortune 500 listed companies. Based on Alma Mater Index of Times Higher Education, the main aim of this research is to investigate well-known

Turkish companies CEO's graduate backgrounds hence this study is a kind of descriptive field research that displays Turkish universities senior management training performance. In this context, it is also aimed to make a distinction about the universities and education systems which carry individuals with high administrative levels in Turkey.

## 2. METHOD

Based on the research purpose it was conducted a qualitative field research on 500 Turkish firms who are listed in 2017 Fortune 500 Turkey list where Fortune Turkey's 500 biggest companies list performed each year by annual sales revenues of the companies.

The universe of the research constitutes the 500 companies CEO's which companies listed 2017 Fortune Turkey List. However in field research we could only reach 300 companies CEO'S personal information's hence sample of this research consist of 300 CEO's of Turkish companies that indexed at Fortune Turkey rank.

In field research we performed two stage web-page analyzes. Firstly it was identified listed companies and their CEO's named from the companies' official web pages and on Turkish Public Disclosure System (KAP) which is given latest authorized notifications and financial or non-financial statements of Turkish Firms.

In second stage it was carried out a deep internet search as well as to reach managers by phone call for each CEO's CVs in order to find out their educational history or backgrounds.

## 3. FINDINGS

Descriptive statistics of our sample firms and our target CEO'S demographic profiles are given in Table 1. When looking at the sectorial distribution of firms in the sample we found that most of the listed companies are joint stock companies, they have been operating in different business lines. This structure makes hard to distinct the companies sectorial distributions. In this context analyses that carried out showed that 154 companies in the sample working in manufacturing sector, 45 companies in energy, 40 firms in agriculture



*A Field Study on Top Management Training Potentials of  
Turkish Universities*

and food and 20 firms found to be active in the in construction sector where other companies operate in fields such as logistics, textile retail, mining and pharmaceuticals. While overviewing personal information's of our sample findings noted that 96,6 percent of group was composed of males, 63 percent of sample have a 11 year and more organizational tenure where CEO tenure among our sample; 43,5 percent have 1-3 year, 21,76 have 4-7 year and 20,4 % have 11 and more year CEO tenure in current firms. Our findings also noted that 17 Turkish firm prefer foreign Ceo's where 249 Turkish company choice to work with Turkish managers. (N=300)

**Table 1. CEO's Demographic Profile\***

|                              | frequency        | %        | AGE   | frequency | %     |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| <b>GENDER</b>                |                  |          |       |           |       |
| FEMALE                       | 10               | 3,3      | 75-67 | 8         | 7,27  |
| MALE                         | 290              | 96,6     | 66-61 | 24        | 21,82 |
| total                        | 300              |          | 60-55 | 25        | 22,73 |
| <b>ORGANIZATIONAL TENURE</b> | <b>frequency</b> | <b>%</b> | 54-49 | 25        | 22,73 |
| 1-3 YEAR                     | 22               | 16,92    | 48-43 | 24        | 21,82 |
| 4-7 YEAR                     | 16               | 12,31    | 42-37 | 4         | 3,64  |
| 8-10 YEAR                    | 10               | 7,69     |       |           |       |
| 11 AND OVER                  | 82               | 63,08    |       |           |       |
| total                        | 130              |          |       |           |       |
| <b>CEO TENURE (in firm)</b>  | <b>frequency</b> | <b>%</b> |       |           |       |
| 1-3 YEAR                     | 64               | 43,54    |       |           |       |
| 4-7 YEAR                     | 32               | 21,77    |       |           |       |
| 8-10 YEAR                    | 21               | 14,29    |       |           |       |
| 11 AND OVER                  | 30               | 20,41    |       |           |       |
| total                        | 147              |          |       |           |       |

\* Despite the fact that the names of the company managers were reached within the scope of the study, some personal information could not be obtained. In this context, some sub-totals in the tables may be incompatible with each other.

While reviewing CEO'S education background information unfortunately we have 137 unreachable data (missing data) for graduated university and 219 missing data among master degrees information's of CEOs (n=300), results showed that only 165 (n=300) of managers have graduated degree from university where 81(n=300)

## B. AYDEM ÇİFTÇİOĞLU

have master degree and 4 of them also have doctoral degree. Hence our results indicate that 54, 3 percent of our sample have graduated from university where only 27 percent have master degree. Our results also indicate that 13, 49 percent of our Coe's taking bachelor degrees at foreign countries like in America and sort of European countries where 86, 5 of them taking university degree at Turkish Universities. Distributions of our sample manager's university degrees among Turkish Universities are given on Table 2.

**Table 2:** Distribution of CEO's Graduated Universities

| UNIVERSITY NAME                            | CITY            | Frequency  | %            |
|--|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| ANKARA UNIVERSITY                          | ANKARA          | 9          | 6,38         |
| ATATÜRK UNIVERSITY                         | ERZURUM         | 1          | 0,71         |
| ANADOLU UNIVERSTY                          | ESKİŞEHİR       | 5          | 3,55         |
| <b>BOGAZICI UNIVERSITY</b>                 | <b>İSTANBUL</b> | <b>26</b>  | <b>18,44</b> |
| BILKENT UNIVERSITY                         | ANKARA          | 8          | 5,67         |
| CUMHURİYET UNIVERSITY                      | SIVAS           | 1          | 0,71         |
| CUKUROVA UNIVERSITY                        | ADANA           | 1          | 0,71         |
| DOKUZEYLUL UNIVERSITY                      | İZMİR           | 3          | 2,13         |
| FIRAT UNIVERSITY                           | ELEZIG          | 2          | 1,42         |
| GAZI UNIVERSTY                             | ANKARA          | 5          | 3,55         |
| GAZIANTEP UNIVERSITY                       | GAZIANTEP       | 1          | 0,71         |
| HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY                       | ANKARA          | 3          | 2,13         |
| <b>İSTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY (ITU)</b> | <b>İSTANBUL</b> | <b>25</b>  | <b>17,73</b> |
| <b>İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY</b>                 | <b>İSTANBUL</b> | <b>17</b>  | <b>12,06</b> |
| MILITART ACADEMY                           | ANKARA          | 2          | 1,42         |
| KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY             | TRABZON         | 2          | 1,42         |
| MARMARA                                    | İSTANBUL        | 1          | 0,71         |
| <b>MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNİVERSITY</b>    | <b>ANKARA</b>   | <b>15</b>  | <b>10,64</b> |
| SABANCI UNIVERSTY                          | İSTANBUL        | 1          | 0,71         |
| ULUDAG UNIVERSTY                           | BURSA           | 5          | 3,55         |
| YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNİVERSİTY                | İSTANBUL        | 8          | 5,67         |
| <b>Total</b>                               |                 | <b>141</b> |              |

As it seen on Table 2, 18,4 percent of our managers graduated in Boğaziçi University its followed with Istanbul Technical University (17,7 %), İstanbul University (12,05 %) and Middle East Technical University (10,63%). In terms of graduated faculty or department of our sample, 63 of our managers graduated from Social sciences

*A Field Study on Top Management Training Potentials of  
Turkish Universities*

faculties where 86 of the CEO's taking their university degree from Science and Technology faculties (Table 3).

**Table 3.** Ceo's Graduated Faculty Distributions

| University degree from Social Science Faculties | Frequency | %     | University degree from Science and Technology Faculties | Frequency |              |
|---|-----------|-------|---|-----------|--------------|
| Business Administration                         | 30        | 20,13 | Computer engineering                                    | 2         | 1,34         |
| Economics                                       | 17        | 11,41 | Medical faculty   | 3         | 2,01         |
| Finance   | 3         | 2,01  | <b>Economics and mechanical engineering</b>             | 1         | 0,67         |
| Public finance                                  | 2         | 1,34  | Electric and Electronic engineering                     | 16        | 10,74        |
| Political science                               | 5         | 3,36  | Industrial engineering                                  | 9         | 6,04         |
| Tourism department                              | 2         | 1,34  | Physical engineering                                    | 1         | 0,67         |
| International relation                          | 3         | 2,01  | Food engineering  | 1         | 0,67         |
| Literature                                      | 1         | 0,67  | Civil engineering                                       | 9         | 6,04         |
| Education                                       | 1         | 0,67  | Industrial engineering                                  | 2         | 1,34         |
| Total   | 63        | 42,28 | Chemical engineering                                    | 2         | 1,34         |
|   |           |       | Mining engineering                                      | 2         | 1,34         |
|   |           |       | <b>Mechanical engineering</b>                           | <b>24</b> | <b>16,11</b> |
|   |           |       | Math  | 1         | 0,67         |
|   |           |       | Metallurgical and materials engineering                 | 4         | 2,68         |
|   |           |       | architecture  | 1         | 0,67         |
|   |           |       | General engineering                                     | 4         | 2,68         |
|   |           |       | Petroleum and natural gas engineering                   | 2         | 1,34         |
|   |           |       | Textile engineering                                     | 1         | 0,67         |
|   |           |       | Aircraft engineering                                    | 1         | 0,67         |
|   |           |       | <b>Total</b>  | <b>86</b> | <b>57,71</b> |

Data collected from internet and on phone call showed that CEO's who were graduated from social science faculties are mostly (47,62 %) have business administration degree and where 27,9 percent of Ceos were graduated from mechanical engineering department which is taking higher score among other departments among Science and Technology Faculties. I was also performed additional analyzes have been carried out to determine the success status of the universities in terms of social and scientific sciences. Finding are given on Table 4. As it is observed on Table 4, the university that train or develop senior managers in the field of social science is Istanbul University. Istanbul University have 16 CEO's who have social science university degree in Fortune Turkey list where its followed 13 senior manager with

**B. AYDEM ÇİFTÇİOĞLU**

Boğaziçi University and 7 CEO with Ankara University. In terms of university graduates from Science and technology faculties of CEO's, it was seen that Istanbul Technical University have an 24 engineers as a CEO in Fortune Turkey ranking where Boğaziçi University have 13and METU have 10 alma matter in Fortune's list.

**Table 4.** Distributions of Universities based on among social and Scientific Sciences

| GRADUATED FROM SOCIAL SCIENCES FACULTIES |            | GRADUATED FROM SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FACULTIES |            |
|--|------------|---|------------|
| UNIVERSITY NAME                          | CEO NUMBER | UNIVERSITY NAME                                 | CEO NUMBER |
| ANKARA UNIVERSITY                        | 7          | ANKARA UNIVERSITY                               | 2          |
| ATATÜRK UNIVERSITY                       | 1          | BILKENT UNIVERSITY                              | 2          |
| ANADOLU UNİVERSTY                        | 5          | BOGAZICI UNIVERSITY                             | 13         |
| BOGAZICI UNIVERSITY                      | 13         | CUMHURİYET UNIVERSITY                           | 1          |
| BILKENT UNIVERSITY                       | 6          | CUKUROVA UNIVERSITY                             | 1          |
| DOKUZEYLUL UNIVERSITY                    | 1          | DOKUZEYLUL UNIVERSITY                           | 2          |
| GAZI UNIVERSITY                          | 3          | FIRAT UNIVERSITY                                | 2          |
| HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY                     | 1          | GAZI UNİVERSTY                                  | 2          |
| İSTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY (ITU)      | 1          | GAZIANTEP UNIVERSITY                            | 1          |
| İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY                      | 16         | HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY                            | 2          |
| MILITART ACADEMY                         | 1          | İSTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY (ITU)             | 24         |
| MARMARA UNIVERSITY                       | 1          | İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY                             | 1          |
| MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNİVERSİTY         | 5          | MILITART ACADEMY                                | 1          |
| SABANCI UNIVERSITY                       | 1          | KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY                  | 2          |
| ULUDAG UNİVERSTY                         | 4          | MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY (METU)         | 10         |
|  |            | ULUDAG UNIVERSITY                               | 1          |
|  |            | YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY                     | 8          |

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Main aim of this research is to investigate the Turkish firms chief executive based on their graduated universities in order to set the Turkish universities performance on business life. Our findings showed that the university that had the greatest number of chief executives is Boğaziçi University which has 26 alma mater where The University that follows it closely with İstanbul Technical University. Data also shows that most of the top managers have business administration (n=30) and mechanical engineering (n=24) university degree. The most interesting finding of this study is that 63 company choice their chief executives from in the field of social sciences especially from administrative science background where 86 firm prefer technical qualifications like engineers as a CEO. The findings of the study show that some universities are prominent in certain issues. For example Boğaziçi University have 26 alma maters in our CEO list where half of these managers graduated from social, half of them graduated from technical faculties. Hence it is possible to say that the University of Boğaziçi is successful in the education of both social and scientific sciences. Whereas İstanbul University is prominent in the field of social sciences, while İstanbul Technical University (ITU) stands in front of the work carried out with the graduation degrees given in the field of engineering.

Findings of this research is the partly similar with the related rankings of international institutions. For example the list of Center for World University Ranking (CWUR) which was set the world's top 1000 universities in 2016, listed 10 Turkish universities. In this list, METU positioning at 525<sup>th</sup> in ranking, where İstanbul University 652. İstanbul Technical University 700. and Boğaziçi University ranked 813. According to sub-country ranks of this report the alumni employment ranking is listed in order to Hacettepe, Ege, Dokuz Eylül, Gazi, Bilkent, Boğaziçi and İstanbul Technical university (<http://cwur.org/2016/turkey.php>). In another study, Turk universities co-existed with other universities around the world. Higher education rating agency Times Higher Education (THE) 2016-2017 World University Ranking 18 universities from Turkey took place. In this ranking, Sabancı university took place at 334, Bilkent university at 353 where Boğaziçi university ranking at 407 as well as İstanbul Technical university set between 501 through 600. However those ranking systems did not adequately focus on alumni

employment of universities based on senior manager hence findings of this research provide new view to students as well as other entities for developing their career in business world.

There some limitations of this research; main limitation is size of our sample, we can only reach 300 firms however we could only reach a very limited information's of the chief executives where most of the reachable personal information's are very short , insufficient and we try to fill missing data by phone call with who wants to support this study. Hence the data tablet that prepared for this study is not completely filled for each manager where for same CEO's no data or partly data entry is provided for all parameters of this study. In this context, some sub-totals in the tables may be incompatible with each other. Moreover for these identified findings to be validated, further studies are required. As this study was conducted on 300 Fortune Turkey listed companies where further studies could be enlarge this sample and take consider other parameters. This should be borne in mind while interpreting the findings of this study.

*A Field Study on Top Management Training Potentials of  
Turkish Universities*

## REFERENCES

Aktan, Can Coşkun (2007). Yükseköğretimde Değişim: Global Trendler ve Yeni Paradigmalar. C. Can Aktan (Ed.), Değişim Çağında Yükseköğretim (s. 1-43). İzmir: Yaşar Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Ajibola, Mayowa; Emeghe, I. J.; Oluwum, A. O.; Oni, A. S. (2017). "A Study on Students' Choice of Programme in the University". *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 7(1), 137-144.

Anselin, Luc; Varga, Atilla; Acs, Zoltan (1997). "Local Geographic Spillovers Between University Research and High Technology Innovations". *Journal of Urban Economics*, 42(3), 422-448.

Bonomini, Vittorio; Campieri, C.; Scolari, MP. (1994). "The Age-Old Spirit of Nephrology from the Oldest University in the World". *American journal of Nephrology*, 14(4-6), 361-364.

Connor, Helen; Burton, Rub; Pearson, R; Pollard, E; Regan, J. (1999). Making the Right Choice How Students Choose Universities and Colleges, [https://intouniversity.org/sites/all/files/userfiles/files/IES%20%20Making%20the%20Right%20Choice%20\(summary\).pdf](https://intouniversity.org/sites/all/files/userfiles/files/IES%20%20Making%20the%20Right%20Choice%20(summary).pdf) (10/02/2018).

Cortese, Anthony, D. (2003). "The Critical Role of Higher Education in Creating A Sustainable Future". *Planing for Higher Education*, 31(3), 15-22.

Duvall, Betty (2003). "Role of Universities in Leadership Development". *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2003(123), 63-71.

Dmitrishin, Alexander (2013). Deconstructing Distinctions. The European University in Comparative Historical Perspective, Entremons. *Upf Journal of World History*, No 5, 1-18.

Hall, Richard, H. (1968). "Professionalization and Bureaucratization". *American Sociological Review*, 33(1), 92-104.

Hogan, Robert; Chamorro-Premuzic, Tomas; Kaiser, Robert, B. (2013). "Employability And Career Success: Bridging The Gap Between Theory and Reality". *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 6(1), 3-16.

Hyun, Kyung, Chatfield; Lee, So Jung; Chatfield, Robert, E. (2012) The Analysis of Factors Affecting Choice of College: A Case Study of University of

Nevada Las Vegas Hotel College Students. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 24(1), 26-33.

Langer, Markus; Ziegele, Frank; Hennig-Thurau, T. (2001) Hochschulbindung-Entwicklung eines theoretischen Modells, empirische Überprüfung und Ableitung von Handlungsempfehlungen für die Hochschulpraxis, Abschlussbericht zum Kooperationsprojekt Hochschulbindung, Hannover, available at: [http://www.che.de/downloads/hs\\_bindung\\_bericht0105.pdf](http://www.che.de/downloads/hs_bindung_bericht0105.pdf) (accessed at: 16.08.2017).

Lee, Kibeom; Carswell, Julie, J.; Allen, Natalie (2000). "A Meta-Analytic Review of Occupational Commitment: Relation With Person and Work-Related Variables". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 799-811.

70

İİBF Dergi  
35/2  
Aralık  
December  
2016

Lee, So Jung; Chatfield, Hyun, Kyung. "The Analysis of Factors Affecting Choice of College: A Case Study of UNLV Hotel College Students. [https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1288&context=gradconf\\_hospitality](https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1288&context=gradconf_hospitality) (05/05/2018).

Mount, Michael, K. (1984). "Managerial Career Stage and Facets of Job Satisfaction". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 24(3), 340-354.

Saka, Yavuz; Yaman, Süleyman (2011). Üniversite Sıralama Sistemleri; Kriterler ve Yapılan Eleştiriler. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 1(2), 72-79.

Shahid, Hassan; Shafique, Owais; Bodla, Omair, H. (2012). "What Factors Affect a Students' Choice of University of Higher Education". *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(10), 64-67.

Sears, Susan (1982). "A Definition of Career Guidance Terms: A National Vocational Guidance Association Perspective". *The Career Development Quarterly*, 31(2), 137-143.

Smith, Mark; White, Michael, C. (1987). "Strategy, CEO Specialization, and Succession". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(2), 263-280.

Olson, Deborah, A.; Shultz, Kenneth, S. (2013). "Employability and Career Success: The Need for Comprehensive Definitions of Career Success". *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6(1), 17-20.

Parri, Janne (2006). "Quality in Higher Education". *Management*, 2(11), 107-111.



*A Field Study on Top Management Training Potentials of  
Turkish Universities*

Petruzzellis, Luca; Romanazzi, Salvatore (2010) "Educational Value: How Students Choose University: Evidence from an Italian University". *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(2), 139-158.

Ramsden, Paul (1991). "A performance Indicator of Teaching Quality in Higher Education: The Course Experience Questionnaire". *Studies in Higher Education*, 16(2), 129-150.

Rashdal, Hastings (1895). *The University of Europe in the Middle Ages*. Paris, France: Clarendon Press.

Rowley, Jennifer (2000). "Is Higher Education Ready for Knowledge Management?". *International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(7), 325-333.

Wai, Jonathan; Rinderman, Heiner (2015). "The Path And Performance of A Company Leader: A Historical Examination of The Education and Cognitive Ability of Fortune 500 Ceos". *Intelligence*, 53, 102-107.

Watts, A. G. (2006). "Career Development Learning and Employability, Learning and Employability Series 1 And 2". The Higher Education Academy publishes.

The Analysis of Factors Affecting Choice... (PDF Download Available). Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261728173\\_The\\_Analysis\\_of\\_Factors\\_Affecting\\_Choice\\_of\\_College\\_A\\_Case\\_Study\\_of\\_University\\_of\\_Nevada\\_Las\\_Vegas\\_Hotel\\_College\\_Students](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261728173_The_Analysis_of_Factors_Affecting_Choice_of_College_A_Case_Study_of_University_of_Nevada_Las_Vegas_Hotel_College_Students) [accessed May 26 2018].

British Council Report 2012: The shape of things to come: higher education global trends and emerging opportunities to 2020. [https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/the\\_shape\\_of\\_things\\_to\\_come\\_-\\_higher\\_education\\_global\\_trends\\_and\\_emerging\\_opportunities\\_to\\_2020.pdf](https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/the_shape_of_things_to_come_-_higher_education_global_trends_and_emerging_opportunities_to_2020.pdf).

The Guardian (2012) Graduate Employment: By Skill, Subject and Graduation. The Guardian, 6 March 2017.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2012/mar/06/graduate-employment-low-skill-jobs>

## ÖZET

Yükseköğretim kurumlarının ve eğitim sistemlerinin temel amacı, bireylerin başarılı bir mesleki kariyere sahip olabilmeleri için iş yaşamında gerekli olan teknik, pratik, davranışsal bilgi ve becerileri kazandırmaktır. Bu kapsamda değerlendirildiğinde ticari iş yaşamında, bireylerin meslek hayatlarındaki ulaşabilecekleri en üst kariyer basamaklarından ya da unvanlarından biri, bir şirketin genel müdürü (CEO) olmaktır. Bu kapsamda, kariyerinin başında olan ya da meslek tercihinde bulunmak üzere olan pek çok genç için, ticari işletmelerde genel müdür ya da CEO unvanında bulunan bireylerin izledikleri yol ve yöntemler rol modeli olarak ele alınmaktadır. CEO'ların eğitim geçmişleri, kariyer basamaklarında izledikleri yöntemler ve CEO'luga giden yolda çalıştıkları pozisyonlar özellikle meslek ve gelecek tercihlerini kurgulama çabasında olan pek çok lise öğrencisine üniversite ve üniversitelerdeki bölüm tercihlerinde ilham vermektedir. Zira ilgili yazında lise öğrencilerinin üniversite tercihlerini etkileyen faktörlerin tespitine yönelik olarak yürütülen pek çok çalışmada, üniversite tercihinde üniversitelerin sahip oldukları fiziksel ve akademik olanakların yanı sıra mezuniyet sonrası istihdam edilebilirlik oranlarının önemli bir parametre olduğu bulgusuna ulaşılmıştır. Öğrenciler mezuniyet sonrası işverenler tarafından eğitim ve teknik bilgi açısından tercih edilen üniversitelerden mezun olmayı başarılı bir iş yaşamının ve kariyer gelişiminin önemli bir ön koşulu olarak değerlendirmektedirler. Söz konusu bulgu özellikle genç nüfusun fazla olduğu coğrafyalarda daha da belirgin hale gelmektedir.

Üniversitelerin mezunlarının iş dünyasında işverenler tarafından iş gören seçiminde bir tercih nedeni olması, özellikle iş yaşamında iyi bir kariyer beklentisi içerisinde olan pek çok öğrenci ve aileleri tarafından oldukça hassas bir performans ölçütü olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Bu kapsamda öğrenciler ve aileleri ilgili üniversitelerden mezun olan öğrencilerin hangi kurumlarda hangi pozisyonlarda çalıştıklarını ilgiyle takip etmektedirler. Bahsi geçen ilgi bağlamında pek çok üniversite ve kurum tarafından yürütülen mezunların istihdam edilebilirlik oranlarını, mezunlarının çalıştıkları şirketleri ve mezunların çalıştıkları pozisyonları inceleyen ve takip eden araştırmalar yürütülmektedir. Öğrencilerin mezunlarının istihdam edilirlilik performansına göre üniversite tercihlerini kolaylaştırmak amacıyla Times Higher Education'dan David Matthews tarafından oluşturulan "Alma Mater Index" aday öğrenciler tarafından takip edilen önemli bir üniversite itibar sıralama indeksidir. Söz konusu endeks Fortune 500 listesinde yer alan şirketlerin CEO'larını ve üst düzey yöneticilerini mezun oldukları üniversite ve bölüm bazında mercek altına alarak üniversiteleri, üst düzey yönetici yetiştirme performansına göre sıralamaktadır. Bu çalışmada söz konusu endeks dikkate alınarak Türk üniversitelerinin yönetici yetiştirme performansları, 2017 Fortune 500 Türkiye sıralamasında yer alan firmalarındaki genel müdürlerin mezun oldukları üniversiteler ve bölümler açısından incelenmiştir. Araştırma

*A Field Study on Top Management Training Potentials of  
Turkish Universities*

bulguları, araştırmanın yürütüldüğü örnekleme yer alan Türk işletmelerinde genel müdür olarak çalışan profesyonellerin ağırlıklı olarak Boğaziçi üniversitesi ile İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi mezunu olduğu yönündedir. Bulgular ayrıca örnekleme dahil edilen yöneticilerin işletme bölümü ve makine mühendisliği bölümü mezunu olduklarını göstermektedir. Araştırma kapsamında elde edilen en ilginç bulgu ise firmaların ağırlıklı olarak teknik ve fen bilimleri bölümlerinden mezun olan bireyleri üst düzey yönetici olarak tercih etmeleridir.

73

İİBF Dergi  
35/2  
Aralık  
December  
2016

