



## ORGANISATIONAL DEMOCRACY STUDIES IN TÜRKİYE: A REVIEW OF POSTGRADUATE THESES

### TÜRKİYE'DE ÖRGÜTSEL DEMOKRASİ ÇALIŞMALARI: LİSANSÜSTÜ TEZLERE YÖNELİK BİR İNCELEME

Nihal Arda AKYILDIZ<sup>1</sup>

#### Abstract

This study aims to examine the postgraduate theses on organisational democracy by content analysis. Forty-one theses from 1993-2023 in the National Thesis Centre of the Council of Higher Education (YOK) were analysed. Most studies in master's theses were conducted in 2022 and in doctoral theses in 2019-2020. It was determined that the most frequently studied variables in master's theses were organisational democracy, democracy, organisation, organisational commitment; in doctoral theses, organisational democracy, democracy, organisational opposition, perception of organisational democracy. It was found that 89,66% of master's theses were quantitative, and 6,90% were mixed method; 75% of doctoral theses were quantitative, and 25% were mixed method. It is understood that Geçkil and Tikici's (2013) Organisational Democracy and Meyer-Allen's (1993) Organisational Commitment Scales were used to measure organisational democracy in master's theses prepared with quantitative method. In doctoral theses, Geçkil and Tikici's (2013) Organisational Democracy, Basım and Şeşen's (2006) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, and Kassing's (2000) Organisational Opposition Scale were used. Master's theses on organisational democracy (n= 15) were prepared in the public sector, and doctoral theses (n= 6) were prepared as mixed. While 34,48% of the master's theses were prepared in the Departments of Educational Sciences and Business Administration, 58,33% of the doctoral theses were prepared in the Department of Business Administration. The study is expected to provide new perspectives to researchers by revealing the developments in the field of organisational democracy in Turkey.

**Keywords:** Democracy, Organisation, Organisational Democracy, Content Analysis and Graduate Theses.

#### Öz

Çalışmada, örgütsel demokrasi konusunda yapılmış olan lisansüstü tezlerin içerik analizi ile incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) Ulusal Tez Merkezinde yer alan 1993-2023 yıllarına ait 41 tez analiz edilmiştir. Yüksek lisans tezlerinde en fazla çalışma 2022 yılında, doktora tezlerinde 2019-2020 yıllarında yapılmıştır. Yüksek lisans tezlerinde en sık çalışılan değişkenlerin örgütsel demokrasi, demokrasi, örgüt, örgütsel bağlılık; doktora tezlerinde ise örgütsel demokrasi, demokrasi, örgütsel muhalefet, örgütsel demokrasi algısı olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Yüksek lisans tezlerinin %89,66'sı nicel, %6,90'ı karma yöntemle; doktora tezlerinin %75'i nicel ve %25'i karma yöntemle yapılmıştır. Nicel yöntemle hazırlanan yüksek lisans tezlerinde örgütsel demokrasiyi ölçmek için Geçkil ve Tikici (2013)'nin Örgütsel Demokrasi, Meyer-Allen (1993)'in Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeğinin kullanıldığı anlaşılmaktadır. Doktora tezlerinde ise Geçkil ve Tikici (2013)'nin Örgütsel Demokrasi, Basım ve Şeşen (2006)'in Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ile Kassing (2000)'in Örgütsel Muhalefet Ölçeğinin kullanıldığı anlaşılmaktadır. Örgütsel demokrasi konulu yüksek lisans tezlerinin (n= 15) kamu sektöründe, doktora tezlerinin ise (n=6) karma olarak hazırlanmıştır. Yüksek lisans tezlerinin %34,48'i Eğitim Bilimleri ve İşletme Anabilim Dalında hazırlanırken doktora tezlerinin %58,33'ü İşletme Anabilim Dalında hazırlanmıştır. Çalışmanın Türkiye'de örgütsel demokrasi alanındaki gelişmeleri ortaya koyarak araştırmacılara yeni bakış açıları kazandırması beklenmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Demokrasi, Örgüt, Örgütsel Demokrasi, İçerik Analizi ve Lisansüstü Tezler.

<sup>1</sup>Assoc. Prof., Balıkesir University, Faculty of Architecture, nihalaradaa@hotmail.com, 0000-0003-1948-188X

## Genişletilmiş Özet

Demokrasi, özünde katılımcılığı ve eşitliği destekleyen bir yönetim biçimi olduğu için sadece kamu yönetiminin değil, kurumların politikalarının da şekillenmesine yardımcı olmaktadır. Bu yönüyle işyerlerinin yönetimini de şekillendiren demokrasi, örgütler için bir fikir olmaktan öte bir gereklilik haline gelmiştir. Bu nedenle örgütsel demokrasi konusu, örgütsel faaliyetlerin düzenlenmesi, uygulanması ve değiştirilmesindeki potansiyeli ile birçok bilimsel çalışmaya konu olmuştur.

Bu bağlamda, kapsamlı bilimsel araştırmalara katkı sağlayan önemli bir bilgi kaynağı olarak kabul edilen lisansüstü tezler, örgütsel demokrasi perspektifine ışık tutmak amacıyla araştırma evreni olarak seçilmiştir. Türkiye'de 'örgütsel demokrasi' konusunda yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin içerik analizi yoluyla değerlendirilmesi, çalışmanın araştırma konusu olarak kabul edilmiştir. Temel amaç, Türkiye'de örgütsel demokrasi üzerine yapılan akademik çalışmaların genel durumunu ortaya koymak, olguya ilişkin gelişmeleri tespit etmek ve elde edilen bulgular ışığında gelecek araştırmalara yön verebilecek önerilerde bulunmaktır. Bu araştırma kapsamında aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt aranmıştır. Türkiye'de örgütsel demokrasi üzerine yapılan lisansüstü tezlerin:

1. Üniversite dağılımı ve türüne (yüksek lisans / doktora) göre dağılımı nedir?
2. Üniversitelere ve bölümlere göre dağılımı nedir?
3. Yayın yılı ve yayın diline göre dağılımı nedir?
4. Örneklem özellikleri ve sektörel dağılıma göre dağılımı nasıldır?
5. Metodoloji ve ölçüm araçları / ölçeklerine göre dağılımı nedir?
6. Diğer bağımlı / bağımsız değişkenlere ve konularına göre dağılımı nedir?
7. Örneklem bilgilerine göre dağılımı nedir?
8. Nicel yöntem için tercih edilen analizlere göre dağılımı nasıldır?

Bu çalışmanın araştırma sorularına verilen yanıtlar aracılığıyla Türkiye'de örgütsel demokrasi çalışmalarındaki eğilimlerin belirlenebileceği düşünülmüştür. Örgütsel demokrasinin çalışıldığı lisansüstü tezlerin 'araştırma problemini incelemek için uygun olan tüm kategoriler açısından incelenmesini' sağlamak amacıyla araştırma içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılarak incelenmiştir (Aksoy Kürü ve Aksoy, 2021: 104). Genel olarak toplam sayılar üzerinden yapılan değerlendirmeleri ortaya koyan göstergeler sunulmuştur. Bu bağlamda, bu araştırma; araştırma probleminin tanımlanması, araştırma evreninin belirlenmesi, veri girişi, verilerin analizi ve yorumlanması aşamalarından oluşmaktadır.

Çalışma kapsamında, konu özelinde yapılan ilk içerik analizi çalışması olması nedeniyle YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi üzerinden erişime açılan lisansüstü tezlerin tamamı değerlendirmeye alınmıştır. "Örgütsel demokrasi" anahtar kelimesi ile 09.10.2023 tarihine kadar hazırlanmış tezlere ulaşılmış, böylece 41 lisansüstü tez değerlendirmeye dâhil edilmiştir. 1993-2023 yıllarına ait 29 yüksek lisans ve 12 doktora tezi olmak üzere toplam 41 tezin bulguları içerik analizi yöntemi ile analiz edilmiştir. Çalışmada; "örgütsel demokrasi" konulu lisansüstü tezlerin üniversite dağılımı, bölümler, yayın dili, yayın yılı, örneklem özellikleri, sektörler göre dağılımı, yöntem, ölçme araçları, değişkenler, örneklem bilgilerinin yanı sıra, nicel yöntem için tercih edilen analize göre dağılımı açısından incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Araştırma sonucunda, yüksek lisans tezlerinde en çok çalışılan yılın (n=8) 2022, doktora tezlerinde ise 2019 ve 2020 (n=3) olduğu görülmektedir. Yüksek lisans tezlerinde en sık çalışılan değişkenler, örgütsel demokrasi (n=24), demokrasi (n=7), örgüt (n=4), örgütsel bağlılık (n=4); doktora tezlerinde ise örgütsel demokrasi (n=12), demokrasi (n=4), örgütsel muhalefet (n=3) ve örgütsel demokrasi algısıdır (n=2). Yüksek lisans tezlerinin %89,66'sı nicel, %6,90'ı ise karma yöntemlerle hazırlanmıştır. Doktora tezlerinin ise %75'i nicel, %25'i karma yöntemlerden oluşmaktadır. Nicel yöntemle hazırlanan yüksek lisans tezlerinde örgütsel demokrasiyi ölçmek için Geçkil ve Tikici (n=12) tarafından geliştirilen Örgütsel Demokrasi Ölçeği ile Meyer-Allen (n=3) tarafından geliştirilen Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeği'nin kullanıldığı anlaşılmaktadır. Doktora tezlerinde ise Geçkil ve Tikici'nin Örgütsel Demokrasi Ölçeği (n=7), Basım ve Şeşen'in Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Ölçeği (n=2) ve Kassing'in Örgütsel Muhalefet Ölçeği (n=2) kullanılmıştır. Örgütsel demokrasi konulu yüksek lisans tezlerinin (n=15) kamu sektöründe, doktora tezlerinin (n=6) ise özel sektör ve kamu sektöründe hazırlandığı tespit edilmiştir. Yüksek lisans tezlerinin %34,48'inin Eğitim Bilimleri ve İşletme Anabilim Dalı'nda, doktora tezlerinin ise %58,33'ünün İşletme Anabilim Dalı'nda hazırlandığı görülmektedir. Bu anlamda çalışma, lisansüstü çalışmaların azlığına dikkat çekmeyi ve konuya olan ilgiyi artırmayı amaçlamıştır. Tüm araştırmacıların kendi disiplinlerindeki gelişmelerin güncel seyrini çalışmalar ışığında takip edebilmelerini sağlayan bu tür içerik analizi çalışmalarının farkındalık yaratmak adına yapılması önerilmektedir.

Çalışma aracılığıyla, gelecekte yapılacak araştırmalara yeni bakış açıları kazandırılması ve uygulamacılara fayda sağlanması da umulmaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra örgütsel demokrasi konusunda Türkiye'de hangi alanlarda boşlukların yer aldığı, hangi bakış açılarının göz ardı edildiği belirlenerek ulusal alanyazına katkı sağlanması beklenmektedir.

## INTRODUCTION

The understanding of democracy, which has been affected by political, social, cultural, and economic developments in the modern period, affects organisational life in parallel. Democracy dates back to ancient Greece and is derived from the words 'demos' meaning people and 'kratos' meaning sovereignty (Han & Garg, 2018: 1089; Safari et al., 2018: 75; Schmidt, 2002: 13). Democracy is the most widespread state system and political form of government in modern societies due to political and economic developments, as it is a form of government that supports participation and equality in its essence. This management paradigm continues to shape not only public administration but also the policies of organisations. For this reason, democracy is no longer an idea but a necessity in organisations (Diener, 2011). It is known that in countries where participation in management is intense and the co-management model is applied, it shapes organisational policies and influences not only political science but also many other disciplines such as organisational activities (Harrison and Freeman, 2004: 49). In fact, many countries in the European Union make numerous legal arrangements to establish democracy at the organisational level (Clegg, 1951; Seçer, 2009: 22).

Organisational democracy, which takes reference from the perspective of participation in organisational decisions of democracy, has been the phenomenon that has the potential to provide the best opportunity for participation in issues such as organising, implementing, and changing organisational activities (Cheney et al., 1998: 39). The concept, which has been the subject of many scientific studies, has been an important field of study where the obligations, contributions, and expectations from organisations are discussed. In the literature, the concepts of organisational democracy and 'industrial democracy' have been used in close proximity to each other. For this reason, the poor working conditions that emerged with the factoryisation that became widespread with the industrial revolution made the concept of industrial democracy more visible with the right of workers to participate in decision-making processes as well as workers' rights (McCaffrey, 1972: 308). In time, it has become necessary for employees to have a say in management by participating in decisions within the organisational structure, just like in political democracy. In this context, the phenomenon of organisational democracy, which is based on an effective communication and information sharing environment, represents a 'developed organisational structure' that has the opportunity to exhibit talents by being supported by training activities (Oral Ataç and Köse, 2017: 118).

When the literature on organisational democracy, which is the application of democracy in organised structures, is examined, it is seen that many studies have been conducted especially in management science. Organisational democracy, which is frequently the subject of theoretical studies, has also been the subject of empirical studies, especially using quantitative methods. When the contents of the empirical studies are analysed, the effects of organisational democracy on organizational commitment, trust, communication, organizational climate, organizational cynicism, citizenship, turnover intention, justice, and how the perception of organisational democracy differs in terms of demographic characteristics have been examined (Weber et al, 2009; Unterrainer et al., 2011; Bhatti et al., 2012; Verdorfer et al., 2012; Chen, 2013; Kesen, 2015a; Kesen, 2015b; Geçkil et al., 2016; Verdorfer and Weber, 2016; Han and Garg, 2018; Ahmed et al., 2019). There are also studies showing that an important determinant of organisational democracy is 'organisational context'. Since the research on organisational democracy emphasises the importance of freedom of expression, it will be instructive for academics and practitioners to reveal how the concept is adapted to the Turkish context. From this point of view, the aim of this study is to reveal the general situation of academic studies on organisational democracy in Türkiye, to determine the developments related to the phenomenon, and to make suggestions that can guide future research in the light of the findings obtained. In this sense, it is thought that the examination of master's and doctoral theses on organisational democracy in Türkiye may provide clues about the general changes.

The scientific value of master's and doctoral theses of universities, with their intensive learning and knowledge transfer processes at the level of intellectual processing, is capable of making original contributions (Bourke and Holbrook, 2013: 409). From this point of view, the approach of analysing postgraduate theses, which has recently started to be frequently discussed in international and national literature, provides support for revealing trends in specific fields and analysing the extent of the "research mindset" (Pilcher, 2011: 31). The examination of postgraduate theses on a particular subject

is important in revealing the depth and prevalence of that subject at the higher education level (Gerçek and Zığaloğlu, 2023: 445). In this context, the theses containing the words '*organisational democracy*', '*organisational commitment*', '*democracy*', '*organisation*', '*organisational citizenship behaviours*' and '*organisational democracy dimensions*' among the postgraduate theses in the National Thesis Centre of the Council of Higher Education were examined by content analysis method. The distribution of the analysed master's and doctoral theses according to university distribution, departments, language of publication, year of publication, sample characteristics, distribution by sector, method, measurement tools, variables, sample information as well as the distribution according to the analyses preferred for quantitative method were also determined. Through this study, it is expected that the general situation of the postgraduate level trends related to organisational democracy in Türkiye will be revealed, new perspectives will be provided to the researchers who plan to work in the same field in the future, and the research findings obtained are expected to benefit the practitioners in Türkiye.

## 1. ORGANISATIONAL DEMOCRACY AND THE TURKISH CONTEXT

Today, the concept of democracy is not limited to states or governments, but can also be used in the context of businesses or organisations. Democracy is the use of political power by society for society itself; in other words, it is the self-governance of people (Sartori, 1996: 36; Erkal Coşkun and Altın Gülova, 2014: 233). The concept of *organisational democracy*, which is based on the democratic ideas of Rousseau and Mill, was introduced to the management literature by Sidney and Beatrice Webb in 1897 (Geçkil and Şendoğdu, 2021: 498). Organisational democracy, which has a non-authoritarian leadership style, refers to enterprises with decision-making mechanisms with worker participation or enterprises where workers manage themselves (Smith, 1976: 276). Organisational democracy, which provides the opportunity to place employees at the centre of decision-making, enables different organisation and management of enterprises (Clarke, 2011; Crane and Matten, 2005: 8).

It is also frequently stated that organisational democracy is based on the idea that employees can be included in management processes with the help of democracy practices such as mutual solidarity, dialogue, and voting (Collom, 2001: 72; Powley et al., 2004: 69; Weber et al., 2009: 1129; Harrison and Freeman, 2004: 50; Pausch, 2013: 3; Oral Ataç and Köse, 2017: 118). Organisational democracy, which is highly effective in the performance of organisational employees, is a form of management that not only aims responsibility towards the governed, but also includes the free circulation of information, equal right to participation, and representation of the governed (Ahmed et al., 2019: 205; Kerr, 2004: 84). Transparency (Vopalecky and Durda, 2017: 66), accountability (Messner, 2009: 920), participation (Battilana et al., 2018: 2), criticism (Forcadell, 2005: 271; Rostbøll, 2009: 22), equality (Kerr and Caimano, 2004: 84), justice (Greenberg, 1990: 339), and power sharing (Woods and Groon, 2009: 442), which form the basis of organisational democracy, can be listed as the enablers of organisational democracy. The fact that there are different approaches to the conceptual structure of organisational democracy in the literature, as well as the lack of a complete consensus on its components, makes it very difficult to measure organisational democracy (Coppedge et al., 2011: 247). In the literature, participation, criticism, transparency, justice, equality, accountability, and power sharing are listed as 'dimensions of organisational democracy' (Geçkil and Tikici, 2015: 45).

As a result of the literature review, it was seen that there are important studies conducted in Türkiye in recent years apart from postgraduate theses on organisational democracy. For example, Şeker and Topsakal (2010) studied the adoption of organisational democracy by teachers and administrators in primary schools. In addition to the study in which Geçkil and Tikici (2015) developed an organisational democracy scale, Geçkil and Tikici (2016) examined the perception of organisational democracy on hospital employees. Geçkil et al. (2016) examined the relationship between organisational democracy and organisational psychological capital level. Bakan et al. (2017) examined the effect of organisational democracy on intrapreneurship in hotel employees. Oral Ataç and Köse (2017) analysed the relationship between organisational democracy and organisational opposition. Işık (2017) examined the dimensions of organisational democracy with İŞKUR personnel. Naldöken and Limoncu (2019) studied the perception of organisational democracy and commitment of hospital employees. Çopur and Başkan (2020) examined the relationship between organisational cynicism and democracy in university lecturers. Özbezek and Paksoy (2022) studied the level of

organisational democracy and silence of municipal employees. Altıntaş and Özata (2023) analysed the perception levels of organisational democracy of primary school teachers. In addition to Meyer-Allen's (1993) *Organisational Commitment*, Weber et al.'s (2009) Perception of Organisational Democracy, Levine's (2007) *Organisational Democracy*, Brandes et al.'s (1999) *Organisational Cynicism*, and Kassing's (2000) *Organisational Opposition Scales*, Geçkil and Tikici (2013), Tutar et al. (2009), Bozkurt (2012), and Şeker (2010); Eryılmaz's (2010) *Organisational Alienation*; Basım and Şeşen's (2006) *Organisational Citizenship Behaviour*; Kesen's (2015) *Organisational Democracy and Organisational Identification Scales* were used. In the studies, organisational democracy has been addressed from different perspectives of quantitative and qualitative methods, but no study has been found to be examined by bibliometric analysis or content analysis in the studies included in ULAKBİM TR Index developed in accordance with international standards in Türkiye.

## 2. METHOD

In this part of the study, information on the purpose and importance of the research, definition of the research questions, determination of the research population and sample selection, data analysis and interpretation are given.

### 2.1. Purpose, Importance, and Questions of the Research

This study deals with the examination of postgraduate theses on organisational democracy in various departments. The main purpose of the study is to analyse the general trend and orientation, the methods followed, the sector and sample information, the measurement tools, and the general course of the studies in 41 thesis studies on organisational democracy in order to shed light on future researchers.

Content analysis and bibliometric analysis methods, which are frequently studied especially in fields such as industrial and organisational psychology, have recently attracted attention in academic studies in different disciplines (Akyıldız, 2023; Gerçek and Zıgaloglu, 2023). The research consists of examining the postgraduate theses in which organisational democracy has been studied by using the content analysis method in order to ensure that, as George (2003) states, 'the contents related to the subject are examined in terms of all appropriate categories in order to examine the research problem' (Aksoy Kuru and Aksoy, 2021: 104). In this study, it consists of defining the research problem for content analysis, determining the research population / sample selection, creating / defining categories, creating coding forms, followed by data entry analysis and interpretation processes.

Within the scope of this research, answers to the following questions were sought. The postgraduate theses in Turkey on organizational democracy:

1. What is the distribution according to university distribution and type (master's/doctorate)?
2. What is the distribution according to universities and departments?
3. What is the distribution according to publication year and publication language?
4. What is the distribution according to sample characteristics and sectoral distribution?
5. What is the distribution according to methodology and measurement tools/scales?
6. What is the distribution according to other dependent/independent variables and their subjects?
7. What is the distribution according to sample information?
8. What is the distribution according to the analyses preferred for the quantitative method?

Through the answers given to the research questions of this study, it is thought to determine the general situation of the trends adopted in higher education level studies on organisational democracy studies in Türkiye. In addition to determining the general situation, this study is expected to contribute to the national literature by determining in which areas there are gaps in the field of organisational democracy in Türkiye, which perspectives are ignored, or what the methodological tendencies are.

### 2.2. Determining the Population of the Study and Sample Selection

Graduate theses in the National Thesis Centre of the Council of Higher Education (YOK) constitute the population of this study. No departmental distinction was made for the relevant theses, and the sample of the study represents the entire population of the research. All of the theses subject to

the study were accessed through the thesis search engine on the website of the National Thesis Centre of the Council of Higher Education (YOK). The keyword "organisational democracy" was typed into the search engine, and the search process was carried out by selecting "all" from the field to be searched. The scanning and access to the theses was completed on 09.10.2023. In this way, 41 postgraduate theses were included in the evaluation. 12 doctoral theses and 29 master's theses were reached, and the findings of the research were obtained through these theses.

In the creation of the research categories, a way was followed to provide the opportunity for comparison. In this direction, categories were created for the data examined within the scope of the research, including the year of the theses, distribution according to universities, the methods used in the theses, the organisational democracy scales used, the most frequently studied variables, and the sectors where the applications were made. For the postgraduate theses examined within the scope of the research, a coding form was prepared by the researchers for analysis. The reason for choosing the period between 1993 and 2023 is that the first thesis on the subject was prepared in 1993, and the studies conducted until today (19.10.2023) can be analyzed. For the studies conducted on organisational democracy between 1993 and 2023, titles such as type of publication (master's/doctorate), the university where the thesis was published, the year of publication and the language in which it was prepared, the department and sector in which the study was conducted, the number of samples in the thesis, the type of organizational democracy scale preferred, the variable studied, the research design used, and the types of data analysis were created according to the theme of the research. In order to ensure the internal consistency of the master's and doctoral theses within themselves, their compatibility was calculated with the help of the formula proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) (reliability = agreement / agreement + disagreement), and the agreement in coding was found to be 96.34% with the calculation made. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), this value represents the value of '*the agreement between the coders being above 90% is acceptable for compliance adequacy*' (Aksoy Kürü and Aksoy, 2021: 105). In addition, excel and SPSS package programmes were used to present the data in the study, and descriptive statistics such as frequency/percentage were also used.

With this research, 41 postgraduate theses on organisational democracy were included in the scope of evaluation. The 12 doctoral theses were written by Benlioğlu (2021), Bozkurt (2012), Coşan Erkal (2012), Erkasap (2020), Geçkil (2013), Günden (2019), Kuşçu Karatepe (2019), Oral Ataç (2015), Topçuoğlu (2021), Turabık (2019), Yıldırım (2020), and Üst Can (2020) in alphabetical order. The 29 master's theses accessed were written by Akdoğan (2021), Akpınar (2022), Aksel (2013), Barutçu (2019), Baş (2019), Çakır Külahçılar (2021), Çopur (2018), Demirtaş (2017), Erdal (2020), Erdem (2021), Erkalıç (1993), Güçlü (2019), Güler, E. (2022), Güler, Ş. (2022), Güven (2022), Kara (2019), Kapucuoğlu (2004), Özcan (2022), Özlü Temizel (2021), Şeker (2010), Tavşancıoğlu (2022), Tokgöz (2019), Torun (2021), Uysal (2019), Yalçınkaya (2019), Yanık (2022), Yazıcı (2023), Yıldırım (2022), and Yıldız (2021). In this direction, the aforementioned theses were analysed, and the findings of the study were reached.

### 2.3. Data Entry, Analysis, and Interpretation

Within the scope of the research, Excel and SPSS programmes were used to analyse the data obtained from postgraduate theses. A classification was made on the basis of the types of postgraduate theses examined, the university where they were prepared as master's and doctoral theses, the year, the language of publication, the research method used, the type of analysis performed, the most frequently studied variable(s) with organizational democracy, and the sectors in which the theses were conducted. Frequency tables were prepared for each classification, and comparative evaluations and comments were presented.

### 3. FINDINGS

In this part of the study, the university where the postgraduate theses included in the research were prepared, the year of publication, the language in which they were published, the department in which they were prepared, the sector in which they were conducted, the method used, the preferred organizational democracy scale, the variable(s) frequently studied together, and the analyses used in

the theses prepared with quantitative method are included. The numerical distribution of postgraduate theses on 'organisational democracy' with increasing interest is given in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Theses Prepared on Organisational Democracy

Concept	Master's Thesis	(%)	Doctoral Thesis	(%)	Total
Organisational Democracy	29	70,73	12	29,27	41

According to Table 1, it is seen that the majority (70,73%) of the 41 thesis studies prepared with the concept of organizational democracy consisted of master's theses representing the majority (70,73%), as well as 12 doctoral theses.

The distribution of master's theses according to universities among the 41 postgraduate thesis studies is given in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Distribution of Master's Theses on Organisational Democracy According to Universities

University Name	Master's Thesis	(%)	University Name	Master's Thesis	(%)
Kırşehir Ahi Evran University	2	6,90	Osmaniye Korkut Ata University	1	3,45
Dokuz Eylül University	1	3,45	Van Yüzüncü Yıl University	2	6,90
Giresun University	2	6,90	Marmara University	2	6,90
Kocaeli University	1	3,45	Haliç University	1	3,45
Gazi University	1	3,45	Toros University	1	3,45
Ege University	1	3,45	İstanbul Gelişim University	1	3,45
Mersin University	1	3,45	Mehmet Akif Ersoy University	1	3,45
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Uni.	2	6,90	Beykent University	1	3,45
Başkent University	1	3,45	Sabancı University	1	3,45
Sakarya University	1	3,45	Hacı Bayram Veli University	1	3,45
Süleyman Demirel University	1	3,45	Hacettepe University	1	3,45
Anadolu University	1	3,45	Kırıkkale University	1	3,45
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>29</b>		<b>100</b>

When Table 2 is examined, it is observed that Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Giresun University, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, and Marmara University are the state universities where organisational democracy is studied the most with two theses each (6.90%). It is seen that four of the remaining 19 theses (3.45%) were prepared at foundation universities such as Haliç University, Başkent University, İstanbul Gelişim University, Beykent University, and Sabancı University, and one was prepared at Toros University, a private university.

As seen in Table 3, when the doctoral theses on organisational democracy are examined, it is understood that the highest number of doctoral theses were prepared at Celal Bayar University (16,67%), which is a state university. Of the remaining 10 doctoral theses, two of them were prepared at İstanbul Commerce University and Başkent University, which are foundation universities, and eight of them were prepared at state universities.

**Table 3.** Distribution of Doctoral Theses on Organisational Democracy According to Universities

University Name	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
Kafkas University	1	8,33
Akdeniz University	1	8,33
İstanbul Ticaret University	1	8,33
İnönü University	1	8,33
İstanbul Cerrahpaşa University	1	8,33
Hacettepe University	1	8,33
Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	1	8,33
Celal Bayar University	2	16,67
Cumhuriyet University	1	8,33
Ankara University	1	8,33
Başkent University	1	8,33
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>

According to Table 4, it can be said that the topic of organisational democracy has been addressed by researchers in Türkiye for approximately 30 years, considering the total of 41 postgraduate thesis studies on organisational democracy. Although it is seen that most studies were conducted in 2022, it is understood that the studies gained momentum in 2019 and 2021. It is seen that

one or two master's theses were conducted in most universities. In doctoral theses, it is seen that the first study was conducted in 2012; most studies were conducted in 2019 and 2020, but the number of studies stopped in 2022 and 2023.

**Table 4.** Distribution of Theses on Organisational Democracy According to Years

Year	Master's Thesis	(%)	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
2023	1	3,45	0	0,00
2022	8	27,59	0	0,00
2021	6	20,69	2	16,67
2020	1	3,45	3	25,00
2019	7	24,14	3	25,00
2018	1	3,45	0	0,00
2017	1	3,45	0	0,00
2015	0	0,00	1	8,33
2013	1	3,45	1	8,33
2012	0	0,00	2	16,67
2010	1	3,45	0	0,00
2004	1	3,45	0	0,00
1993	1	3,45	0	0,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>

The distribution of 41 postgraduate theses on organisational leadership according to the language of publication is given in Table 5. Accordingly, it is seen that only three of the 29 master's theses were published in English, and all of the 12 doctoral theses were in Turkish.

**Table 5.** Distribution of Theses on Organisational Democracy According to The Language of Publication

Publication Language	Master's Thesis	(%)	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
Turkish	26	89,66	12	100,00
English	3	10,34	0	0,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>

The distribution of the postgraduate theses on organisational democracy according to the departments in which they were studied is presented in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Distribution of Theses on Organisational Democracy According to The Department

Department of Study	Master's Thesis	(%)	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
Public Administration	1	3,45	0	0,00
Agricultural Economics	1	3,45	0	0,00
Primary Education	1	3,45	0	0,00
Education Sciences	10	34,48	1	8,33
English Business	1	3,45	0	0,00
Business	10	34,48	7	58,33
Tourism Management	0	0,00	2	16,67
Sport Management	1	3,45	0	0,00
Education Management and Policy	0	0,00	1	8,33
Health Management	1	3,45	0	0,00
Sociology	1	3,45	0	0,00
Management in Nursing	0	0,00	1	8,33
Management Information Systems	1	3,45	0	0,00
Labour Economics and Industrial Relations	1	3,45	0	0,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>

When Table 6 is analysed, it is understood that most of the master's theses were conducted in the Departments of Educational Sciences and Business Administration with 10 theses each (34,48%). As for doctoral theses, it is understood that 7 theses (58,33%) were prepared in the Department of Business Administration and 2 theses (16,67%) in the Department of Tourism Management.



**Table 7.** Distribution of Theses on Organisational Democracy According to Sector

Sector	Master's Thesis	(%)	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
Public	15	51,72	3	25,00
Private	9	31,03	3	25,00
Mixed	5	17,24	6	50,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>

The distribution of theses prepared with the concept of organisational democracy according to the sector is presented in Table 7. According to the table, it is understood that master's and doctoral theses were conducted in three different sectors: private sector, public sector, and mixed sector. In 29 master's theses, 51.72% (n=15) of them were conducted in the public sector. In 12 doctoral theses, it is seen that 50% (n=6) of the most studied sector is mixed, that is, private and public sector together.

**Table 8.** Distribution of Theses on Organisational Democracy According to The Method Used

Method Used	Master's Thesis	(%)	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
Quantitative	26	89,66	9	75,00
Qualitative	0	0,00	0	0,00
Literature Review	1	3,45	0	0,00
Mixed	2	6,90	3	25,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>

Looking at Table 8, which shows the distribution of the theses prepared with the concept of organisational democracy according to the method used, it is seen that the method mostly preferred in both master's and doctoral theses is 'quantitative method'.

**Table 9.** Distribution According to The Organisational Democracy Scales Used in Postgraduate Theses Prepared with Quantitative Method

Scale Information	Master's Thesis	(%)	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
Meyer-Allen (1993) Organisational Commitment Scale	3	6,25	0	0,00
Geçkil and Tikici (2013) Organisational Democracy Scale	12	25,00	7	21,88
Brown et al. (2005) Ethical Leadership Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Akdoğan et al. (2016) Ethical Leadership and Organisational Identification	0	0,00	1	3,13
Alkan and Arikboğa (2017) Ethical Leadership and Organisational Identification	0	0,00	1	3,13
Özdemir (2010) Organisational Opposition Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Carroll (1991) Corporate Social Responsibility Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Engelbrecht et al. (2014) Ethical Leadership and Work Commitment	0	0,00	1	3,13
Naldöken and Limoncu (2019) Organisational Democracy and Job Commitment	0	0,00	1	3,13
Kelecioğlu et al. (2006) Academic Staff Job Satisfaction Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Eryılmaz (2010) Organisational Alienation Scale	2	4,17	0	0,00
Kesen (2015) Organisational Democracy and Organisational Identification	0	0,00	1	3,13
Subaş ve Çetin (2017) Enneagram Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Vähäsantanen et al. (2019) Professional Activism Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Bolat and Bolat (2008) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Kepenek (2008) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Sigler and Pearson (2000) In-Role Performance and Out-of-Role Performance Scale	1	2,08	1	3,13
Liang et al. (2012) Psychological Trust Scale	1	2,08	1	3,13
Van Dyne et al. (2003) Organisational Silence Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Schaufeli et al. (2002) Work Integration Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Diener et al. (2010) Psychological Well-Being Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Bromiley and Cummings (1996) Short Form of Organisational Trust Inventory	1	2,08	0	0,00
Kuşçu Karatepe (2019) Political Sensitivity Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
İslamoğlu and Börü (2007) Political Behaviour Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Demirel and İskan Kubba (2014) Innovation Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00

Table 9. (Continue)

Cichy et al. (2009) Work Commitment Scale (Emotional Commitment and Continuance Commitment)	1	2,08	0	0,00
Coleman and Borman (2000) Contextual Performance Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Brandes et al. (1999) Organisational Cynicism Scale	2	4,17	0	0,00
Kassing (2000) Organisational Opposition Scale	2	4,17	2	6,25
Grandey (1999) Turnover Intention Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Basım and Şeşen (2006) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale	0	0,00	2	6,25
Petersson and Spangs (2005) Organisational Democracy Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
House and Rizzo (1972) Job Stress Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Podsakoff et al. (1990) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Levine (2007) Organisational Democracy Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Bozkurt (2012) Organisational Democracy Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Rahat and Şapira (2017) Index of Intra-Party Democracy	1	2,08	0	0,00
Karasar (2002) Scale of Teachers' Participation in School Management within the Scope of Decision Making Process	1	2,08	0	0,00
Tutar et al. (2009) Organisational Democracy Scale	2	4,17	1	3,13
Dhardwadkar and Dean (1999) Organisational Cynicism Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Ladd et al. (1982) Trade Union Commitment Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Bozkurt (2012) Academic Freedom Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Weber et al. (2009) Organisational Democracy Perception Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Gordon et al. (1980) Trade Union Commitment Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Spector et al. (2007) Job Satisfaction Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Mobley et al. (1979) Turnover Intention Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998) Employee Voice Scale	0	0,00	1	3,13
Pierce et al. (1989) Organisation Based Self-Esteem Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
Şeker (2010) Organisational Democracy Scale	1	2,08	0	0,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100</b>

According to Table 9, which includes the organisational democracy scales used by the postgraduate theses that preferred the quantitative method, it is seen that the most preferred organisational democracy scale in master's theses (n=12) is the Organisational Democracy Scale developed by Geçkil and Tikici (2013), followed by Meyer-Allen's (1993) Organisational Commitment Scale (n=3). In 7 out of 12 doctoral dissertations, the Organisational Democracy Scale developed by Geçkil and Tikici (2013) was used, followed by Basım and Şeşen's (2006) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale, and Kassing's (2000) Organisational Opposition Scale.

Table 10. Variables Studied with The Concept of Organisational Democracy (Master's Theses)

Variables Studied	Master's Thesis	(%)	Variables Studied	Master's Thesis	(%)
Organisational Democracy	24	20,34	Democratic Attitude	1	0,85
Organisational Commitment	4	3,39	Organisational Cynicism	1	0,85
Ethical Leadership	1	0,85	School	1	0,85
Trade Union	2	1,69	Mixed Method	1	0,85
Organisation	4	3,39	Communication Sector	1	0,85
Opposition	2	1,69	Intention to Quit	1	0,85
Organisational Dissent	3	2,54	Governance	1	0,85
Democracy	7	5,93	Job Stress	1	0,85
Citizenship	2	1,69	Organisation Culture	1	0,85
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour(s)	3	2,54	Managers and Teachers	1	0,85
Organisational Democracy Sub-Dimensions	1	0,85	Strategic Human Resources	1	0,85
Corporate Social Responsibility	1	0,85	Participation in School Management	1	0,85
Job Satisfaction	1	0,85	Banking	1	0,85
Instructor	2	1,69	Türkiye	1	0,85
Organisational Alienation	2	1,69	Political Parties	1	0,85
Higher Education	1	0,85	Intra-Party Democracy	2	1,69
Professional Activism	1	0,85	Participation	1	0,85
Teacher	3	2,54	Participation in Management	1	0,85

**Table 10.** (Continue)

Primary School	1	0,85	Decision Making	1	0,85
Middle School	2	1,69	Governance	1	0,85
Perception of Organisational Democracy	1	0,85	Teachers' Willingness to Participate in Decisions	1	0,85
In-Role and Out-of-Role Performance	1	0,85	Factors Limiting Participation	1	0,85
Psychological Trust	1	0,85	Trade Union Democracy	1	0,85
Psychological Well-Being	1	0,85	Trade Union Democracy	1	0,85
Organisational Trust	1	0,85	Trade Union Commitment	1	0,85
Health Workers	1	0,85	İzmir	1	0,85
Giresun	1	0,85	Corporate Democracy	1	0,85
Antalya	1	0,85	Self-esteem	1	0,85
Businesses	1	0,85	Organisation-based Self-esteem	1	0,85
Family Businesses	1	0,85	Localisation	1	0,85
Institutionalisation	1	0,85	Delegation of Authority	1	0,85
Innovation	1	0,85	Participation in Decision Making	1	0,85
Work Commitment	1	0,85	University	1	0,85
Contextual Performance	1	0,85	General High Schools	1	0,85
Decentralisation	1	0,85	Organisational Cynicism	1	0,85
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>118</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 10 shows the variables that researchers frequently work together with organisational democracy in master's theses on organisational leadership. As seen in the table, organisational democracy (n=24, %20,34), democracy (n=7, %5,93), organisation (n=4, %3,39), organisational commitment (n=4, %3,39), organizational opposition (n=3, %2,54), organizational citizenship behaviours (n=3, %2,54), teacher (n=3, %2,54), citizenship (n=2, %1,69), Variables such as Union (n=2, 1,69%), Instructor (n=2, 1,69%), Organisational Alienation (n=2, 1,69%), Opposition (n=2, 1,69%), and Intra-Party Democracy (n=2, 1,69%) were addressed by the researchers to determine the correlation, causality and differences with organisational democracy. Similarly, information on the variables that were addressed together with organisational democracy in doctoral theses is shown in Table 11.

**Table 11.** Variables Studied with The Concept of Organisational Democracy (Doctoral Dissertations)

Variable Studied	Doctoral Thesis	(%)	Variable Studied	Doctoral Thesis	(%)
Ethical Leadership	1	1,82	Nursing	1	1,82
Organisational Democracy	12	21,82	Politics	1	1,82
Work Dedication	1	1,82	Responsiveness	1	1,82
Organisational Identification	1	1,82	Scale	1	1,82
Academic Organisation	1	1,82	Higher Education	1	1,82
Explanatory Mixed Method	1	1,82	University	1	1,82
Tourism Academics	1	1,82	Instructor	1	1,82
Enneagram	1	1,82	Political Behaviour	1	1,82
Personality	1	1,82	Organisational Citizenship	1	1,82
Organisational Dissent	3	5,45	Organisational Commitment	1	1,82
Organisational Silence	1	1,82	Hotel Management	1	1,82
Democracy	4	7,27	Kapadokya	1	1,82
Opposition	1	1,82	The Relationship between Organisational Democracy and Organisational Opposition	1	1,82
Work Integration	1	1,82	White Collar Workers	1	1,82
Intention to Quit	1	1,82	Perception of Organisational Democracy	2	3,64
Job Satisfaction	1	1,82	Citizenship	1	1,82
Psychological Confidence	1	1,82	Organisational Citizenship Behaviours	1	1,82
Employee Voice	1	1,82	Academic Freedom	1	1,82
In-Role Performance	1	1,82	Workplace Democracy	1	1,82
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

According to Table 11, there are variables that researchers frequently work with organisational democracy in doctoral dissertations on organisational leadership. As indicated in the table, variables

such as organisational democracy (n=12, 21,82%), democracy (n=4, 7,27%), organisational opposition (n=3, 5,45%), perception of organisational democracy (n=2, 3,64%) were addressed many times by the researchers in order to determine the relationship, causality and differences with organisational democracy.

**Table 12.** Sample Information in The Studies

Method	Study	Smallest Sample	Largest Sample	Average Sample	Total Sample	Missing Work	Included Study	Total Work
Quantitative	Master's Thesis	71	2128	402,56	10064	0	25	25
	Doctoral Thesis	252	582	379,22	3413	0	9	9
Qualitative	Master's Thesis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Doctoral Thesis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quantitative and Qualitative (Mixed)	Master's Thesis	298	364	331	662	0	2	2
	Doctoral Thesis	410	441	646	1292	0	2	2

Table 12 shows the sampling information of the postgraduate theses on organisational leadership according to the method used. According to the table, it is understood that the smallest sample size is 71; the largest sample size is 2128, and the average sample size is 402,56 in 25 master's theses using quantitative method. It is understood that there is no master's thesis using only qualitative method. In master's theses using mixed method, the smallest sample size is 298; the largest sample size is 364, and the average sample size in two master's theses using mixed method is 331. When we look at the doctoral theses, it is understood that the smallest sample size is 252; the largest sample size is 582, and the average sample size in 9 doctoral theses using quantitative method is 379.22. It is also seen that the qualitative method is not used in doctoral theses alone. It is understood that the smallest sample size is 410; the largest sample size is 441, and the average sample size is 646 in two master's theses using mixed method. In addition, there are also studies in which the sample size is not specified.

**Table 13.** Distribution of Analyses Used in Theses Prepared with Quantitative Method

Analyses Performed	Master's Theses	(%)	Doctoral Theses	(%)
Correlation Analysis	14	9,72	4	6,25
Regression Analysis	16	11,11	7	10,94
Independent Sample t-test	12	8,33	5	7,81
Factor Analysis	16	11,11	11	17,19
Chi-Square Test	3	2,08	1	1,56
Reliability Analysis	14	9,72	1	1,56
Kruskal Wallis Test	5	3,47	0	0,00
Descriptive Statistics	10	6,94	7	10,94
Mann-Whitney U Test	5	3,47	0	0,00
One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	18	12,50	5	7,81
Pearson Correlation Test	6	4,17	3	4,69
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test	3	2,08	4	6,25
Bartlett Test	2	1,39	3	4,69
Cronbach's Alpha Test	2	1,39	7	10,94
Organisational Cynicism Analysis	1	0,69	0	0,00
Kolmogorov-Simirnov Test	2	1,39	0	0,00
Hierarchical Regression Analysis	2	1,39	0	0,00
Durbin Watson Statistic	2	1,39	0	0,00
Normality Test of Data	1	0,69	0	0,00
Sobel Analysis	1	0,69	0	0,00
Shapiro-Wilks Test	1	0,69	0	0,00
Parametric Test	2	1,39	0	0,00
Nonparametric Test	3	2,08	0	0,00
White Test	1	0,69	0	0,00
TamhaneT2 Test	1	0,69	0	0,00
Principal Component Analysis	1	0,69	0	0,00
Enneagram Test	0	0,00	1	1,56
Meta-analysis	0	0,00	2	3,13
Sphericity Sphericity Test	0	0,00	1	1,56
VFA Analysis	0	0,00	1	1,56
Sobel-Aroian-Goodman Mediation Tests	0	0,00	1	1,56
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100</b>

As seen in Table 13, One-Way Analysis of Variance (Anova) is the most common analysis in master's theses prepared with quantitative method (n=18), and Factor Analysis is the most common analysis in doctoral theses (n=11). Following this, the most frequently used analyses in master's theses are Factor Analysis (11,11%), Regression Analysis (11,11%), Reliability Analysis (9,72%), Correlation Analysis (9,72%), Independent Sample t-test (8,33%), and Descriptive Statistics (6,94%). The analyses frequently used in doctoral theses are Regression Analysis (10,94%), Cronbach's Alpha Test (10,94%), Descriptive Statistics (10,94%), Independent Sample t-test (7,81%), One-Way Analysis of Variance (Anova) (7,81%), Correlation Analysis (6,25%), and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test (6,25%).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The concept of organisational democracy, which was first introduced to the management literature by Sidney and Beatrice Webb in 1897, has attracted considerable attention in the management and organisation literature in the last 30 years due to the inevitability of the principles and rules of democracy in organisations (Kerr, 2004: 84). Considering that organisational democracy is sensitive to organisational culture and democracy, it is thought that there is a need for a detailed overview of organisational democracy studies in Türkiye. In this direction, since organisational democracy is thought to be sensitive to organisational culture and democracy, a detailed review of organisational democracy studies in Türkiye is needed. Based on the assumption that the first stop of most of the concepts transferred from the international literature to the Turkish literature will be the graduate studies produced in higher education institutions, which are the leading actors in knowledge production, graduate theses on organizational democracy in Türkiye were examined.

This study aims to examine the theses published between 1993 and 2023 on the subject of organisational democracy in postgraduate institutes in Türkiye by content analysis in order to evaluate them from a broad perspective. Before the analysis, tags/categories related to the theses were created. For this purpose, a total of 41 postgraduate theses, 29 master's theses, and 12 doctoral theses, obtained from the database of the National Thesis Centre of the Council of Higher Education (YOK), were subjected to analysis, and frequency and percentage calculations were made. Descriptive information about the identity of the postgraduate theses, type of publication (master's or doctoral thesis), year of publication, language of publication, information about the university where the theses were published, distribution of postgraduate theses according to departments, research design and method, organisational democracy scales used, number of samples according to the method used, types of data analysis, and frequently studied topics were sought to answer a total of 8 research questions. The findings obtained for each research question asked in the study were discussed and interpreted in detail, and some suggestions were made.

It is known that 29 (70,73%) of the published postgraduate theses on organisational democracy are master's theses, and 12 (29,27%) are doctoral theses. It is possible to evaluate this situation by looking at the year of publication. As a matter of fact, while the first master's thesis on organisational democracy in Türkiye was published in 1993 (Erkılıç, 1993), the first doctoral theses, (Bozkurt, 2012) and (Coşan Erkal, 2012), were published in 2012. In addition, in most of the institutes, doctoral programmes are not as common as master's programmes, and the number of individuals receiving doctoral education is not equal to the number of individuals receiving master's education. Therefore, it is normal that the number of doctoral theses is lower than the number of master's theses (Table 1). In the distribution of the examined postgraduate theses according to the universities, as stated in the table prepared for the master's theses (Table 2), it is observed that the state universities where the most number of organisational democracy theses were studied (n=2) are Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Giresun University, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, and Marmara University. Of the remaining 19 theses, four (3,45%) were prepared at Haliç University, Başkent University, İstanbul Gelişim University, Beykent University, and Sabancı University, which are foundation universities, and one was prepared at Toros University, which is a private university. It is seen that Anadolu University, which prepared the first master's thesis, produced the same number of theses as the remaining 12 universities (3,45%). As for doctoral theses (Table 3), Celal Bayar University, which is a state university, produced the first doctoral thesis on organisational democracy (16,67%). Among the remaining 10 doctoral theses, two of them were prepared at İstanbul Commerce

University and Başkent University, which are foundation universities, and eight of them were prepared at state universities.

When all postgraduate thesis studies are evaluated, it can be stated that the subject of organisational democracy has attracted the attention of individual researchers studying at postgraduate level in Türkiye for almost 30 years (Table 4). It is seen that the highest number of studies were conducted in 2022; the studies gained momentum in 2019 and 2021, and fewer master's theses were conducted in most universities in other years. In doctoral theses, it is seen that the first study was conducted in 2012; most studies were conducted in 2019 and 2020, but the number of studies stopped in 2022 and 2023. In the examinations, it was determined that a large proportion of the postgraduate theses on organisational democracy were prepared in Turkish language (89.66%) (Table 5). In addition to being a preference, it is thought that this situation is also influenced by the fact that the language of instruction in the postgraduate programmes of universities in Türkiye is in the mother tongue.

It is understood that the most common departments in which master's theses on organisational democracy are studied are Educational Sciences and Business Administration (n=10) (Table 6). As for doctoral theses, it is understood that most of them were prepared in the Department of Business Administration (n=7) and the Department of Tourism Management (n=2). In this context, the diversity in the main disciplines of the institutes affiliated to universities, student quotas, as well as the criteria related to the city or location of the students can be considered as a factor in university preferences.

When we look at the sectors (private sector, public sector, and mixed sector) in which the study population of the postgraduate theses were determined and sampled, it is seen that most of the studies for master's degree were prepared in the public sector, and most of the doctoral level studies were prepared in the mixed sector. Due to the importance of organisational democracy for both private and public sectors, it can be considered as usual that the researchers are oriented towards various sectors (public, private, and mixed). It is seen that most of the postgraduate theses collected data through participants from the education and finance sectors. Among other sectors, it is seen that participants selected from trade union, health and party employees are included in the study population. In future studies, it may be suggested to conduct research enabling the comparison of different sectors. For example, a research design comparing the expectations and sources of organisational democracy of managers and employees in the education and health sectors can be conducted.

Looking at Table 8, which shows the distribution of theses prepared with the concept of organisational democracy according to the method used, it is understood that both master's theses (n=26) and doctoral theses (n=9) mostly prefer quantitative method. In this sense, it is not a coincidence that the "quantitative research method" (Creswell, 2012), which allows the answers obtained in the research to be quickly and easily quantified and measured, was chosen. It is thought that the quantitative research method, which is faster, more practical, and relatively easier to complete, is the reason for preference. It is seen that the "qualitative research method" which has a more laborious and time-consuming structure compared to the quantitative method, which requires a holistic and interpretative design and multiple and complete handling of research data (Patton, 2002), is not used alone in postgraduate theses. Due to the nature of the subject of organisational democracy, it can be suggested to use qualitative research method as the main method, which allows the researchers to carry out more comprehensive and in-depth studies in which the participants are not limited to marking the questionnaire forms and support their studies with open-ended questions. In addition, it is seen that mixed studies (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005), in which qualitative and quantitative study data are handled together under the same study and different data sets are transformed and verified (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005), are used in master's thesis (n=2) and doctoral thesis (n=3) studies, albeit in small numbers. It is thought that the fact that the mixed method allows interpretation of data in multiple forms with both quantitative and qualitative methods should be given more importance in new thesis studies to be prepared on organisational democracy. In this sense, it is thought that qualitative and mixed research methods should be preferred more in new thesis studies due to the depth they will provide to the subject in comparison to quantitative research methods because they provide a more comprehensive, holistic, and in-depth examination of the reasons underlying the attitudes and behaviours of the subject to be analysed (Patton, 2002; Creswell, 2012; Silverman, 2013).

It is seen that there are 13 different organisational democracy scales used by some researchers by developing scales in postgraduate theses in which quantitative method is preferred among the studies on organisational democracy (Table 9). Three frequently preferred organisational democracy scales stand out. It is understood that the most frequently used scale in master's theses (n=12) and doctoral theses (n=7) is the Organisational Democracy Scale developed by Geçkil and Tikici (2013) with 7 dimensions. It is seen that the Organisational Commitment Scale developed by Meyer-Allen (1993) is addressed in master's theses (n=3) with 3 dimensions, and the 24-item Organisational Opposition Scale developed by Kassing (2000) is prepared in the same number (n=2) in master's and doctoral theses.

In the study on postgraduate theses, it is seen that the researchers have addressed at least one variable in relation to organisational democracy. It is seen that more than two variables are discussed in relation to organisational democracy predominantly in doctoral theses. It is seen that the most frequently studied variables for the determination of relationality, causality, and differences with organisational democracy in postgraduate theses are organisational democracy, democracy, organisation, organisational commitment, organisational opposition, organisational citizenship behaviours, teacher, citizenship, union, lecturer, organisational alienation, opposition, and intra-party democracy. It is seen that the relationship between organisational democracy and 118 different variables has been discussed in master's theses. In doctoral theses, the subject of organisational democracy, which is addressed with 55 different variables, has been frequently addressed by researchers to determine the relationality, causality, and differences with organisational democracy by addressing it through variables such as organisational democracy, democracy, organisational opposition, perception of organisational democracy. From this point of view, it is thought that researchers' interest in organisational democracy is evaluated in a multidimensional way, and this interest will increase in the coming years.

The sample sizes of the postgraduate theses on organisational democracy vary according to the method used (Table 12). It is seen that the sample size used in master's theses prepared using quantitative method is 71-2128, and the average sample size is 402,56, while the sample size used in doctoral theses is 252-582, and the average sample size is 379,22. In addition, it is understood that the sample size used in master's theses prepared using mixed method is 298-364, and the average sample size is 331, while the sample size used in doctoral theses is 410-441, and the average sample size is 646. It is also understood that the qualitative method alone is not found in either master's or doctoral theses. In the analysed postgraduate theses, there are also studies in which the sample size was not specified. In addition, it is also known that the samples of postgraduate theses are often educators and finance sector employees, and in a few studies, the sample consists of union members, health workers, and political party employees. Although the number of samples included in the analysis in master's theses prepared with the quantitative method is higher than the number of samples in doctoral theses, the number of samples in doctoral theses prepared with the mixed method is higher than the number of samples in master's theses. It is thought that this difference in doctoral theses prepared with mixed method is due to the fact that the duration of doctoral education is spread over a longer period of time compared to the duration of master's education, and the researchers are given the opportunity to move more easily to collect data without time constraints.

In the postgraduate theses on organisational democracy, it is seen that researchers mostly use quantitative analysis methods and different statistical package programs are used in the analysis of the collected data. Within the scope of the study, it is understood that One-Way Analysis of Variance (Anova) is used most frequently in master's theses (n=18), and Factor Analysis is used in doctoral theses (n=11) (Table 13). Following this, Factor Analysis, Regression Analysis, Reliability Analysis, Correlation Analysis, and Independent Sample t-test were used in master's theses respectively. The analyses frequently used in doctoral theses are Regression Analysis, Cronbach's Alpha Test, Independent Sample t-test, One-Way Analysis of Variance (Anova), Correlation Analysis, and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test, respectively. In addition to the SPSS programme and descriptive statistics, which provide ease of use to the practitioner, it is also seen that structural equation modelling, which analyses by examining error terms, has also been used. It can be stated that the 'scientific research methods' course, which has been implemented by the Council of Higher Education (YOK) in

postgraduate education in our country and taken as a compulsory course by postgraduate students, provides important benefits to the researchers who conduct studies.

In line with the findings, some suggestions can be made for future research. Firstly, the fact that the sample groups selected in the postgraduate theses on organisational democracy are chosen from a wide variety of sectors proves that the subject in question has a wide application area. For this reason, it may be suggested to evaluate and examine the 'level and perception of organisational democracy' comparatively for different business sectors in new studies. On the other hand, considering the fact that quantitative research method is mostly preferred in theses, but qualitative research methods are not used, studies that examine the perception of organisational democracy in more detail should be encouraged. In order to analyse the Turkish culture, its perception of democracy, and its development in organisational democracy in detail, the subject can be analysed by focusing on qualitative studies that allow in-depth interviews with managers-employees in organisational structures. However, researchers who will prefer quantitative research methods can also address the issue with different regulatory variables in order to determine in which situations organisational democracy emerges more, together with its advantages and disadvantages. In addition, new studies can be created by using mixed research methods (qualitative and quantitative) and multiple statistical analyses in academic studies.

As in many studies, there are some limitations in this study. The first limitation of the study is that the sample of the study is only the postgraduate thesis studies that can be accessed from YOK National Thesis Centre between 1993-2023 (September). Another limitation is that the content analysis method, which evaluates the data of the study, can be preferred as a verification tool in addition to other research methods, and only this method is used in the study. Another limitation of the study is that it is not possible to determine any causality relationship since the findings obtained in the study include frequencies for certain categories. On the other hand, since this is the first study on organisational democracy in the national literature, this study is both a guide and an archive for future studies to be conducted in the context of organisational democracy by revealing what the general tendency is in terms of the methods used in organisational democracy, the practices, scale diversity, scale types, and variables.

---

**Etik Beyan:** Çalışmada Etik Kurul izni alınmasını gerektiren bir yöntem kullanılmamıştır. Aksi bir durumun tespiti halinde Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisinin hiçbir sorumluluğu olmayıp tüm sorumluluk çalışmanın yazarına aittir.

**Yazar Katkı Beyanı:** 1. Yazarın katkı oranı %100'dür.

**Çıkar Beyanı:** Yazarlar arasında çıkar çatışması yoktur.

**Ethics Statement:** There is not any method requiring Ethics Committee approval was used in this study. In case of detection of a contrary situation, Beykent University Journal of Social Sciences has no responsibility and all responsibility belongs to the author of the study.

**Author Contributions Statement:** 1st author's contribution rate 100.

**Conflict of Interest:** There is no conflict of interest among the authors.

---



## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, K., Adeel, A., Ali, R. and Rehman, R. U. (2019). Organizational democracy and employee outcomes: The mediating role of organizational justice. *Business Strategy & Development*, 2(3), 204-219.
- Aksoy Kürü, S. and Aksoy, G. (2021). A review of postgraduate theses on ethical leadership. *Ardahan University IIBF Journal*, 3(2), 102-111.
- Akyıldız, N. A. (2023). Bibliometric analysis of graduate theses on biophilic design. *Urban Academy- Journal of Urban Culture and Management*, 16(2), 879-904.
- Altıntaş, M. and Özata, M. (2023). The effect of organizational democracy on organizational commitment: A research on education employees. *Ordu University Institute of Social Sciences Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 13(1), 379-410.
- Bakan, I., Kara, E. and Güler, B. (2017). The effects of organizational democracy perception on employees' intrapreneurship performance: A field study in hotel enterprises in Marmaris. *Hak-Is International Journal of Labour and Society*, 6(14), 115-138.
- Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G. M., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M. A. and Shaikh, F. M. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research*, 5(2), 192-201.
- Battilana, J., Fuerstein, M. and Lee, M. (2018). New prospects for organizational democracy? How the joint pursuit of social and financial goals challenges traditional organization a design. S. Rangan (Ed.). In *Capitalism beyond mutuality?: Perspectives integrating philosophy and social science* (pp. 256-288). Oxford University Press.
- Bourke, S. and Holbrook, A. P. (2013). Examining PhD and research masters theses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(4), 407-416.
- Cheney, G., Straub, J., Speirs-Glebe, L., Stohl, C., DeGooyer, D., Whalen, S., Garvin-Doxas, K. and Carlone, D. (1998). Democracy and communication at work: An interdisciplinary review. *Communication Yearbook*, 21(1), 35-92.
- Clarke, M. (2011). Organizational democracy, ethics and leadership: The mediating role of organizational politics. *Leadership*, 7(4), 415-433
- Crane, A. and Matten, D. (2005). What is stakeholder democracy? Perspectives and Issues. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 14(1), 6-13.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th Edition). Pearson Education-SAGE Publications.
- Collom, E. (2001). Clarifying the cross-class support for workplace democracy. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 45, 71-103.
- Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Altman, D., Bernhard, M., Fish, S., Hicken, A., Kroenig, M. Lindberg, S. I., McMann, K., Paxton, P., Semetko, H. A., Skaaning, S. E., Staton, J. and Teorell, J. (2011). Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: A new approach. *Perspectives on Politics*, 9(2), 247-267.
- Çopur, Z. and Baskan, G. A. (2020). The relationship between organizational democracy and organizational cynicism: A research on lecturers. *Journal of Higher Education*, 10(1), 61-72.
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), In *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-32). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Diener, R. B. (2011). *Positive psychology as social change*. Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg.
- Erkal Coşan, P. and Altın Gülova, A. (2014). Organizational democracy. *Management and Economics* 21(2), 231-248.
- Forcadell, F. J. (2005). Democracy, cooperation and business success: The case of mondragon corporacion cooperativa. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 56, 255-274.
- Geçkil, T., İleri, Y. Y., Kaya, Ş. D. and Karadağ, Ş. (2016). The relationship between organizational democracy perceptions and organizational psychological capital levels of physicians and nurses. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences*, 2(3), 818-835.

- Geçkil, T. and Şendođdu, A. A. (2021). The impact of perceived organizational democracy on the quality of work life: An investigation in the banking sector. *Anemon Mus Alparslan University Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 497-507.
- Geçkil, T. and Tikici, M. (2015). Organizational democracy scale development study. *Journal of Amme Administration*, 48(4), 41-78.
- Geçkil, T. and Tikici, M. (2016). Hospital employees organizational democracy perceptions and its effects on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Asian Pacific Journal of Health Sciences*, 3(2), 123-136.
- George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gerçek, M. and Zığalođlu, D. (2023). Job crafting studies in Türkiye: A review of postgraduate theses. *Optimum Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 10(2), 443-468.
- Han, K. S. and Garg, P. (2018). Workplace democracy and psychological capital: A paradigm shift in workplace. *Management Research Review*, 41(9), 1088-1116.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Harrison, J. S. and Freeman, R. E. (2004). Special topic: Democracy in and around organizations: Is organizational democracy worth the effort? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 18(3), 49-53.
- Işık, M. (2017). Perception of organizational democracy in public institutions: The case of Is-Kur Isparta provincial directorate. *Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 22, 1661-1672.
- Kerr, A. (2004). The limits of organizational democracy. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 81-97.
- Kerr, J. L. and Caimano, V. F. (2004). The limits of organizational democracy. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 81-97.
- Kesen, M. (2015a). Investigating the effects of organizational democracy and organizational identification on job satisfaction: A field study on retail industry. *International Refereed Academic Social Sciences Journal*, 19(3), 61-89.
- Kesen, M. (2015b). The effects of organizational democracy on employee performance: Mediating role of organizational identification. *Çankırı Karatekin University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 535-562.
- Manville, B. and Ober, J. (2003). Beyond empowerment: Building a company of citizens. *Harvard Business Review, Motivating People January*, 81(1), 48-53.
- McCaffrey, G. (1972). Industrial democracy. *Industrial Relations*, 27(3), 307-333.
- Messner, M. (2009). The limits of accountability. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. 34, 918-938.
- Oral Ataç, L. and Köse, S. (2017). The relationship between organizational democracy and organizational opposition: A research on white collar employees. *Istanbul University Journal of Business Faculty*, 46(1), 117-132.
- Özbezek, B. D. and Paksoy, H. M. (2022). A research on the effect of organizational democracy on the level of organizational silence. *Journal of Business, Economics and Management Research*, 5(1), 80-101.
- Pausch, M. (2013). Workplace democracy: From a democratic ideal to a managerial tool and back. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 19(1), 1-19.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & Evaluation methods*. (3rd Edition). Sage Publications.
- Pilcher, N. (2011). The UK postgraduate masters dissertation: An 'Elusive Chameleon'. *Teaching in Higher Education* 16(1), 29-40.
- Powley, E. H., Fry, R. E., Barret, F. J. and Bright, D. S. (2004). Dialogic democracy meets command and control: Transformation through the appreciative inquiry summit. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 67-80.
- Rostbøll, C. F. (2009). Dissent, criticism and transformative political action in deliberative democracy. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 12(1), 19-36.
- Safari, A., Salehzadeh, R. and Ghaziasgar, E. (2018). Exploring the antecedents and consequences of organizational democracy. *The TQM Journal*, 30(1), 74-96.

- Sartori, G. (1996). Return to the theory of democracy. Tuncer Karamustafaoğlu (Trans.). Mehmet Turan Yetkin Publications.
- Schmidt, M. G. (2002). *Introduction to democracy theories* (2nd Edition) M. Emin Köktaş (Trans.). Vadi Publications.
- Seçer, B. (2009). Industrial democracy: From workers' participation in management to worker participation. *Cement Employer Journal*, 23(6), 19-35.
- Şeker, G. and Topsakal, C. (2011). The level of adoption and implementation of organizational democracy in primary schools according to administrator and teacher perceptions. *Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice*, 11(3), 1203-1227.
- Smith, M. (1976). Barries to organizational democracy in public administration. *Administration & Society*, 8(3), 275-317.
- Unterrainer, C., Palgi, M., Weber, W. G., Iwanowa, A. and Oesterreich, R. (2011). Structurally anchored organizational democracy does it reach the employee?. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 10(3), 118-132.
- Verdorfer, A. P. and Weber, W. G. (2016). Examining the link between organizational democracy and employees' moral development. *Journal of Moral Education*, 45(1), 59-73.
- Verdorfer, A. P., Weber, E. G., Unterrainer, C. and Seyr, S. (2012). The relationship between organizational democracy and socio-moral climate: Exploring effects of the ethical context in organizations. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 34(3), 423-449.
- Vopalecky, A. and Durda, L. (2017). Principles of workplace democracy: Cases from the Czech Republic. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge*, 1(5), 62-76.
- Weber, W. G., Unterrainer, C. and Schmid, B. E. (2009). The influence of organizational democracy on employees' socio-moral climate and prosocial behavioral orientations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(8), 1127-1149.
- Weber, W. G., Unterrainer, C. and Schmid, B. E. (2009). The influence of organizational democracy on employees' socio-moral climate and prosocial behavioral orientations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 1127-1149.
- Woods, P. A. and Groom, P. (2009). Nurturing democracy the contribution of distributed leadership to a democratic organizational landscape. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(4), 430-451.