
Academic inbreeding as a hiring policy: Capturing the voices of academics from Turkey

Nihan Demirkasımoğlu
Hacettepe University, Turkey
Hilal Buyukgoze*
Hacettepe University, Turkey

Abstract

This paper explores the phenomenon of academic inbreeding in Turkey's higher education through the experiences of academics. Using purposive sampling, 16 academics were interviewed through semi-structured questions, and descriptive and content analysis were employed. Results suggest that there are some commonalities yet some differences in the perspectives of academics. There exists a good agreement on the idea that the limitation of inbreeding practice would be legitimate, yet, inbred academics consider inbreeding as useful and reasonable whereas non-inbred describe it inevitable and problematic. Participants identified the main motives of inbreeding in Turkish academia as provincialism, academic nepotism, eastern culture, and institutional culture and traditions. Each theme is discussed based on both narratives and related literature, and implications are presented.

Keywords: academic inbreeding, inbred academics, non-inbred academics, immobility, higher education.

* Hilal Buyukgoze

Department of Educational Sciences, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

Email: buyukgoze@hacettepe.edu.tr

Introduction

Higher education (HE) systems are increasingly diversifying all over the world (Song, 2019). In this process, professors are expected to adopt dynamic and participatory approaches to produce and disseminate information (Horta et al., 2010). While studying the correlates of scholarly productivity, researchers have focused on the concept of academic inbreeding (e.g. Horta, 2013), which refers to a recruiting process by which universities immediately employ their graduates as academics after graduation (Horta et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2014). Eliot (1908), who served the longest as the president of Harvard University assessed inbreeding as “... natural, but not wise, for a college or university to recruit its faculties chiefly from its graduates” and warned universities against the grave dangers of this practice. Since then, researchers (e.g. Eisenberg & Wells, 2000; Wyer & Conrad, 1984) have paid attention to this phenomenon, investigating its impact on higher education institutions (HEIs), often referring its dark side with several metaphors such as academic incest and endogamy.

The academic inbreeding literature can be classified under two themes: scientific production and institutional dynamics (Gokturk & Yildirim-Tasti, 2020). For the first theme, because of its notorious image, hiring new and competent academics is often seen as a welcome change, as it offers an ideal opportunity to provide new blood to the HE system. However, when the stay of willing and talented inbreds becomes questionable, it is a serious challenge (Pan, 1993). Yet, academic inbreeding has some benefits to the alma mater institution, such as increasing organizational maintenance and coherence, declaring confidence in the quality of the department’s program, and hiring the academics in a quicker and cheaper way. Since prior studies mostly concentrated on productivity aspect of the inbreeding phenomenon via quantitative methods, organizational aspects of academic inbreeding remain neglected.

There exist diverse practices and motives behind inbred appointments throughout the world (Yudkevich et al., 2015). For instance, the USA is the top choice for higher level education around the world and it has rather low levels of inbreeding in HEIs. Likewise, the UK is the second leading destination for those intended to pursue tertiary education abroad, with a consistently small number of inbred academics (Sivak & Yudkevich, 2012). However, Argentina, China, Japan, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, Ukraine, Spain, Portugal, and Mexico appear to apply and rely selectively on academic inbreeding in hiring academics broadly (Horta 2008; Horta et al., 2011; Yudkevich et al., 2015). Therefore, discussions are navigated by and focused on the uncompetitive nature of inbreeding, and the incessant impact on universities (Gorelova & Yudkevich, 2015). For some practical and strategic reasons, many of the HEIs in Turkey prefer employing their graduates as academics as well. Along with the recent debates on quality improvement in Turkey’s HE, the issue of academic inbreeding has emerged as a phenomenon of particularly unexplored practice. In this context, this qualitative study is timely in opening up the largely understudied potential of inbreeding in Turkey from the lenses of inbred and non-inbred academics. Based on the interviews

conducted with selected academics working at dominantly inbred and non-inbred faculties, it has the potential to provide a comparative perspective and discussion based on 'two sides of the same coin.' Also, it has the potential to reveal and lead to a better understanding of the multifaceted nature and dimensions of academic inbreeding since it does not limit the research questions by being concerned only with scientific productivity.

Conceptual framework

The concept of inbreeding refers to the production of genetically closely related individuals or organisms, and thus the reproduction of similar or common traits in biology (Chinyere & Harrison, 2016). This concept is used to imply a similar production process of academic culture in HE, with the term academic inbreeding, which is also called institutional or intellectual inbreeding (Horta et al., 2010), implying its pathological effects on scholarly output. Horta (2013) suggests five possible categories of academic career taxonomy, as follows:

- (1) Pure-inbreds: Inbreds that have always spent their learning and academic career in the same university.
- (2) Mobile-inbreds: Inbreds that have either spent some time researching or teaching at another university during their doctoral or postdoctoral work before being employed at their alma mater.
- (3) Silver-cordeds: Academics who received their PhD degree at the same university, but started their academic career in another university.
- (4) Adherents: Academics who moved only once in their academic careers from the university that granted their PhD to the university that granted them their first academic appointment.
- (5) Non-inbreds: Academics who had no previous connection with the university at which they currently work.

As Horta's (2013) taxonomy is often cited in the recent HE conceptualizations and applicable to academic career taxonomy of academics in the Turkish HE system, our study favours it to treat and better understand the phenomenon of academic inbreeding.

Since inbreeding has become a concern in HE systems, it is viewed as a manifestation of particularism and parochialism, and inbred academics are considered to be less exposed to new ideas and techniques, which leads to a lower level of scientific productivity and creativity (Hargens & Farr, 1973). Hargens and Farr (1973) found that U.S. inbred academics from the different fields at the most eminent universities are less productive than their non-inbred colleagues. Inbred academics in Mexico were found to be 15% less productive in terms of scientific publications in the fields of natural sciences, engineering, and technology (Horta et al., 2010). Morichika and Shibayama (2015) displayed that the effects of inbreeding on academic productivity differ by university, department or laboratory, and whether

academics are pure-inbred or silver-corded in different departments of Japanese universities. This study also revealed that inbred academics have changed their research topics less frequently throughout their careers, which could be detrimental to creativity.

Some researchers (e.g. Dutton, 1980; Horta, 2013) explored the relationship of mobility with scientific productivity. For example, Dutton (1980) proved that immobility is a more remarkable indicator of research interest, and Horta (2013) showed that academic mobility in the early stages of the career was decisive in influencing academic behavior and scientific productivity. Another study found that inbred academics are cited less frequently (Eisenberg & Wells, 2000). İnanç and Tuncer (2011) demonstrating that academics' productivity is negatively affected in the departments where academic inbreeding rates are high in four technical universities in Turkey.

Academic inbreeding is not always considered to be a dangerous breakdown of institutional metabolism, and may be useful at least in some cases. Gorelova and Lovakov (2016) empirically displayed that academic inbreeding does not have a significant effect on publication activity among Russian academics. Further, they reported that pure-inbreds are more productive in publishing than the adherents. A study with U.S. academics concluded that scholarly productivity of inbred and non-inbred academics did not show any significant difference (Wyer & Conrad, 1984). Horta et al. (2010) also reported that inbreeding has a function of protecting organizational stability and institutional identity in Japanese universities. Other researchers reported several benefits of inbreeding on corporate culture and organizational commitment from different country contexts such as China, Russia and Portuguese (Tavares et al., 2021). More recently, Shibayama (2022) evidenced that inbreeding can be a double-edged sword depending on the PhD supervisors' orientation towards originality, since this characteristic is likely transferred to their mentees. More specifically, academics' orientation to produce original knowledge is found to be more dependent on the supervisor's practices than inbreeding (Shibayama, 2022). Tyurikov et al (2021) produced a model of academic inbreeding that minimizes the potential drawbacks of this practice while protecting talented home-grown academics. Their model is mainly based on preserving the talented in an institution's own graduates by providing rich research facilities and enhancing student motivation.

As recent research findings display, the consensus tends to the negative sides of academic inbreeding, focused on its effect on scholarly productivity. This perspective is challenged by some benefits such as organizational commitment, teaching, and service to society (Wyer & Conrad, 1984). Some authors favor inbreeding on the grounds that employing a university's own graduates continues the academic traditions special to a specific academic culture (Chinyere & Harrison, 2016), for example, securing organizational and individual stability through the reproduction of institutional tradition by empowering senior academics (Gokturk & Yildirim-Tasti, 2020).

Based on these grounds, this paper aims to investigate the phenomenon of academic inbreeding through the perspectives and experiences of participants from a largely inbred and a largely non-inbred academics from Turkey through these research questions:

- (1) What selection criteria are applied in the selection and promotion of academics?
- (2) How do academics evaluate academic inbreeding as a hiring policy?
- (3) What are the reasons for preferring inbred academics in hiring processes?
- (4) How do academics evaluate formal policies that restrict inbreeding?

Academic inbreeding in Turkey

Academic inbreeding is common in Turkey, especially in state universities. The practice is less common in the developing universities (as the group of relatively newly established institutions are called in Turkey), and non-profit foundation universities. The main reason for this exception is that they have no doctoral programs and thus the university employs research assistants from other universities as their prospective assistant professors after graduate education.

In Turkey, there is a highly-centralized public administration structure. The procedures and principles of the appointment and promotion of academic staff in HEIs are explained in the Higher Education Law, which has no statement restricting or encouraging inbreeding in HEIs. However, it is stated that "HEIs can determine additional conditions in an objective and auditable quality by obtaining the approval of the Council of Higher Education (CoHE), taking into account the differences between scientific disciplines, exclusively to increase scientific quality" (Higher Education Law, article 23/c; p. 5361). The CoHE is the highest authority regulating academic, institutional and administrative processes in higher education authorized by the Turkish Constitution with articles 130 and 131. All higher education institutions in Turkey have been gathered under the umbrella of the CoHE. It is mainly responsible for the strategic planning of higher education, the coordination between universities, and most importantly establishing and maintaining quality assurance mechanisms (YÖK – *History in English*, n.d.).

The hiring process for academic positions seems transparent in terms of the Higher Education Law and universities' administration processes, since job advertisements state that positions are open to anybody. Nevertheless, in practice, there is a strong tendency even for most of the long-established Turkish universities to hire their graduates. They can specify special conditions referring to the Higher Education Law, suggesting they will favor the academic work of the inbred academics. This practice is known as *promoting from inside* despite formally being open to applications from outside the university. On the other hand, in 2017, the head of CoHE at that time declared for the first time that the inbreeding of academics is a problem for higher education institutions at the national level and that an action should be taken in terms of hiring policy as follows (<https://www.hitit.edu.tr>):

“Although a research assistantship is the most important stage of the academic career process, in the current situation, a significant portion of research assistants continue their entire careers in the institution where they are research assistants. This situation, which means inbreeding, adversely affects the performance of both the individual and the institution... A performance-oriented approach will be adopted.”

This declaration is regulated in “The Law-Making Amendments to Some Laws and Statutory Decisions for Development of Industry and Support of Production” (2017). The same law restricts the appointments of research assistants at the university where doctoral degree is granted as follows (article 38):

“Assignments to research assistant positions in higher education institutions... up to 20% of those who have completed their doctorate or proficiency in arts education can be appointed to assistant professor positions within the framework of performance-based criteria determined by the senates of the institutions where they completed their doctorate or proficiency in arts education and approved by the Higher Education Council.”

However, inbreeding in Turkish academia has been the dynamo of academic appointments and promotions historically, and it does not have a long-standing notoriously negative image as in the US and western higher education. Therefore, in terms of hiring policies, it has not been on the agenda as an issue to be regulated by CoHE and/or the universities. Besides, it is relatively newly seen as problematic and to be the subject of research for the Turkish higher education.

Despite the increasing attention to the topic of inbreeding in Turkish academia, the current very limited number of studies are mostly designed as literature reviews (e.g. Basak, 2013; Kozikoğlu, 2016) or quantitative studies (e.g. İnanç & Tuncer, 2011) to investigate its relationship with academic productivity. Rare studies (Gokturk & Yildirim-Tasti, 2020) were designed qualitatively to allow in-depth and thick descriptions related to the inbreeding phenomenon in Turkish academia, thereby neglecting examination of its multiple aspects. Based on a comprehensive literature review, Balyer and Ömür (2018) summarized the factors that lead universities to inbreeding: a) The most qualified researchers are their own and those who can best adapt to their own culture are their own graduates, b) University bureaucracies avoid risk by employing their own graduates as a mechanism to maintain their current order, c) Universities’ desire to maintain their academic prestige by preserving their institutional culture, d) Employing their own graduates is a practical option in terms of time, energy and finance, in the face of the geographical features of the universities or the obstacles created by the dominant mother tongue, e) The lack of a free labor market in the academic labor markets, especially in developing countries, coupled with the fact that the faculty members are civil servants, the number of doctoral graduates is quite limited, a lack of mobility in society and business life, a weak belief in faculty selection systems, and the influences of the country's national language policy. This detailed summary indicates

that academic inbreeding is a multifaceted phenomenon that goes beyond research productivity and it seems to be a subject that deserves in-depth analysis touching upon other aspects of higher education. Understanding these inextricably linked factors in the context of academic inbreeding may be possible through understanding the whole rather than parts of the whole in a qualitative design, as Forchuk and Roberts (1993) suggested.

As the analytical framework to guide this study, we adopted theory triangulation in formulating the research questions, as suggested by Denzin's (1989) systematology, in which the starting point is "approaching data with multiple perspectives and hypotheses in mind" (p.239-240). According to him, different theoretical perspectives could be used together to allow wider knowledge production. As demonstrated thus far, the dynamics and a range of consequences of inbreeding literature portrayed conflicting evidence, resulting in criticism or support of the maintenance of this career recruitment practice as a hiring policy in HE systems. To this end, we followed three frameworks: 1) Horta's (2013) taxonomy in defining the cases and participants as inbred or non-inbred, 2) Horta's (2013) conceptual framework that scientific productivity is influenced by the mobility of academics, and thus, policies are needed to limit inbreeding, 3) Wyer and Conrad's (1984) note that scholarly productivity of inbred and non-inbred U.S. academics was not significantly different. Considering all these possibilities, we employed a qualitative case study to understand the perspectives embedded in their institutional and cultural contexts as being inbred and non-inbred habitants.

Methodology

This study was designed as a holistic case study, based on the investigation of the inbreeding phenomenon in two bounded contexts. A case study is "a research approach that is used to generate an in-depth, multi-faceted understanding of a complex issue in its real-life context" (Crowe et al., 2011, p. 1). Yin (2003) states that case study is used to investigate the holistic and meaningful features of real-life events, such as academics' life cycles, organizational and administrative processes, and when the case is sensitive to contextual circumstances. Here, the phenomenon of academic inbreeding was examined in-depth, focusing on two state universities, one preferring inbred academics while the other preferring non-inbreds. Case studies are particularly very appropriate for finding answers to "how and why questions about a contemporary set of events" (Meyer, 2001, p. 330). Since this research seeks answers for "How do academics evaluate academic inbreeding as a hiring policy?", "What are the reasons (why) for preferring inbred academics in hiring processes?", and "How do academics evaluate formal policies that restrict inbreeding?" from the perspectives of academics, case study is an appropriate methodology.

Cases and participants

While identifying the cases, the CVs of the academics working in four education faculties were examined through the official websites, and academics of these two faculties were determined to have the lowest and highest inbred rates. Qualitative data was collected from two public universities located in a big city in Turkey, where there were eight public universities (at the time of the study), four of which had education faculties. Among these four education faculties, the inbreeding ratios of departments of educational sciences varies between 31% and 70%. We selected the departments that had the highest and lowest ratios of inbred academics on the grounds that they may typically represent two different institutional dispositions related to the investigated phenomenon and its reflections to academia. Both of the faculties are considered among the most prestigious and well-established faculties across the country. The term “academics” is used to refer the people teach and/or do research at a university or college. It is at the same time used to refer diverse terms as faculty and faculty members in the literature. Within this research, the term “faculty” is only used to refer to the “faculty of education” as an institution. The term “department” is used to refer the sections of the faculty of education with several divisions. For example, “educational sciences” is a department while measurement and evaluation, educational administration and educational programs and instruction are the examples of divisions located under the department of educational sciences.

Case 1: Large-scale (70%) inbred recruitment. The university/ department does not have a formal policy restricting inbreeding for appointment and promotion criterion at the time of this study, but experience at a university was scored among optional activities.

Case 2: Large-scale non-inbred recruitment. This department (at the same time, university) has a formal policy in hiring academics to prevent inbreeding, especially pure-inbreeding. The university has a Criteria for Appointment and Promotion that mandates that candidates who will work as academics at this university should have received a doctorate degree from a well-known university abroad, or if they have received a doctorate degree from a domestic university, they must attend a "academic production process" at a recognized university, research or application institution abroad for at least two semesters.

A total of 16 academics, eight participants from each faculty were included in the study, at which point data saturation occurred (Guest et al., 2006). Following Horta's (2013) taxonomy, the characteristics of the participants interviewed are presented in the Table 1 below.

Table 1 Participant characteristics

Participant	Taxonomy	Gender	Age	Experience	Post-doc study (abroad)
P1-MI	Mobile-inbred	M	67	40	8 months
P2-MI	Mobile-inbred	M	55	18	2 years
P3-PI	Pure-inbred	F	37	2	No
P4-PI	Pure-inbred	F	60	30	No
P5-AD	Adherent	M	48	17	No
P6-PI	Pure-inbred	M	38	4	No
P7-NI	Non-inbred	M	41	8	No
P8-PI	Pure-inbred	F	40	9	No
P9-AD	Adherent	F	37	2	No
P10-AD	Adherent	F	40	6	No
P11-AD	Adherent	F	37	6	No
P12-AD	Adherent	M	42	7	No
P13-AD	Adherent	M	48	17	No
P14-AD	Adherent	F	50	13	No
P15-AD	Adherent	M	56	16	No
P16-AD	Adherent	M	49	20	No

The representation of each department among the participants was also considered. One academic was invited from each department from both cases. To achieve this, in some departments, more than one academic was invited and interviewed. The third criterion in the selection of the interviewees was the representation of academics of different academic titles (assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor). Finally, while academics from each department were being invited to participate, an invitation had first been sent to the department and division heads, since they are one of the jury members in the appointment process in Turkey.

Data collection

A semi-structured interview form was developed by the researchers. A pilot interview was conducted with a non-participant academic to ensure clarity and understandability of the questions. The main interview questions contained one knowledge and five opinion questions. Data were collected by the researchers through face-to-face interviews. All the participants were ensured anonymity, and confidentiality. Ethical approval for the current study was granted by the Ethics Committee (Hacettepe University, No: 35853172-600). All interviews were voice recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data analysis

Descriptive and content analysis techniques were used to analyze the data. Since two interview questions complemented each other and overlapped, the answers to these questions were combined and analyzed under the same theme.

Rigor

There are different criteria of rigor commonly associated with the nature of qualitative approach. As Leninger stated (1990) even if it might not be possible to apply all of these standards in a given study, at least one “criterion of consistency” and “one of truth value” should be addressed. One of the validation strategies used in qualitative research is triangulation to increase the consistency of the results. Noble and Heale (2019) define triangulation as a strategy for boosting the validity and trustworthiness of qualitative research findings. Triangulation can be performed through several ways, such as using additional methods, different sorts of data, multiple theoretical perspectives and involving more than two researchers (Flick, 2009). In this study, all the transcripts were examined by both researchers individually and in isolation from each other to ensure researcher triangulation. Denzin (2009) suggests that this sub-type of triangulation is useful for controlling researcher biases. In the first round of the data analysis, one of the researchers analyzed the data set separately for inbred and noninbred academics as two case studies (case one and case two). The second researcher adopted an integrated content analysis while at the same time comparing and contrasting the perspectives of inbred and non-inbred academics. In the second round, two researchers agreed to consider the two cases in a holistic approach as a strategy of participant triangulation (Denzin, 2009), in which sampling should allow comparison across groups. By adopting this strategy, researchers attempted to integrate the voices of inbred and non-inbred academics from different local contexts and angles as well as employing Horta’s (2013) taxonomy as sub-types (pure-inbreds, mobile-inbreds, silver-cordeds, adherents and non-inbreds) of academic inbreeding. In our sample there is no silver-corded among the participants. Direct quotes were used to achieve credibility and validity. In presenting the direct quotes, participants were coded with abbreviations such as P1-MI (mobile-inbred) and P2-PI (pure-inbred).

Results

The findings were analyzed under five main themes based on the research questions and interview questions that are designed to understand the phenomenon of academic inbreeding, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Systematic of the findings

Interview Questions	Themes
1. In your department, what kind of criteria are taken into consideration when selecting and appointing faculty, if there are candidates from inside and outside of your institution? (RQ1)	1. The criteria for selecting academics.
2. What do you think about the appointment of research assistants as faculty members within the same HE institution after their Ph.D. degree completed? (RQ2)	2. Academics' perspectives related to inbreeding
3. What are the reasons for preferring inbred academics in selecting and appointing faculty? (RQ2)	5. Impact of inbreeding on academics' performance and the institution
6. What do you think about the academic performance of inbred and non-inbred faculty members? And, how do these reflect in your institution? (RQ2)	
3. What are the reasons for preferring inbred academics in selecting and appointing faculty? (RQ3)	3. Reasons why inbreeding is preferred
4. How would you evaluate the limitation of employing inbred faculty members via legal regulations? (RQ4)	4. Views on the limitation of inbreeding by legislation
5. What kind of a balance should be sought between the inbred and non-inbred academics' employment? What are your suggestions? (RQ4)	

The criteria for selecting academics

Both inbred and non-inbred participants have similar opinions about the quality and potential contribution of academics in terms of selection criteria (Table 3).

Table 3 The criteria for selecting academics

Inbred department	Non-inbred department
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualification: objective criteria, academic performance, merit • Knowledge of a candidate's performance • Potential contribution to the department • Its own alumni • Personality traits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualification: highest score • Having a master's or doctoral degree abroad • Potential contribution to the department • Being experienced in different academic circles

As presented in Table 3, while the inbred department gives priority to its graduates, the non-inbred department hires academics who have their graduate degrees abroad. In the non-inbred department, this is not a preference but is obligatory. In the inbred department, to have previous knowledge about personality traits and prior performance (contribution

to their institution) of the academics is valued as much as a person's academic performance. For example, P1-MI (mobile-inbred) stated that the candidate can only be advantageous in the case of equality with these words:

If someone with a very different performance comes, you make that decision according to objective criteria... any restrictions, such as the subject of the thesis or something else, are specified in the vacancy requirements. The department would be pleased if the academic is the one with whom they are familiar, but it doesn't go through a process of bias to prevent an unknown academic. But in the case of equality, I prefer the person I know, whose performance and personality I already know.

A non-inbred adherent academic (P16-AD) describes their approach as follows:

Our appointment criteria are very clear and written. If the applicant has a higher score, s/he is hired. It's that simple. But if we are really looking for an academic who will teach on a certain subject then we try to hire that academic, this situation can be justified. Otherwise... everyone hears it, and you'll be really humiliated in the department, like 'What? Are you trying to hire your guy?'

While the criteria for selecting and promoting academics appear objective and performance-based, they may be managed in favor of insider candidates, depending on the preferences of departments. In addition, the similarity in the inbred department can be seen as a reason of preference and a requirement for the continuation of academic culture, while academics in the non-inbred department consider it as a problem in corporate culture. In other words, both pure-inbred, mobile-inbred and non-inbred adherent interviewees stressed the potential contribution of the prospective academic to the university. Nevertheless, the inbred participants prioritized the previous strong ties with the institution and institutional loyalty. Horta and Yudkevich (2016) argue that such kind of academic hiring practices hampers knowledge production and the advancement of the HEIs. Further, academic inbreeding is assumed to create a limited scientific environment in which to conduct interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary studies, since it hinders questioning and leading to new insights and ideas (Horta et al., 2010).

The non-inbred adherent participants, however, agreed that transparent and competitive recruitment, higher academic qualifications, international research networks, recruitment of the best candidates, and international masters and/or doctoral research are the main criteria in identifying internal or external candidates. Altbach et al. (2015) emphasize the importance of the internationalization of academics and students to face increasing pressure on university

rankings and polishing institutional profiles worldwide, yet, inbred academics are claimed to fail to have universal awareness and ability to cooperate with the international academic community. Dutton (1980) also claims that inbred academics lack capabilities in maneuvering in the national and international academic marketplace, and achieve lower levels of academic success due to their immobility. Parallel with the quotes of the non-inbred adherent academic provided above, the open recruitment process was found to reduce academic inbreeding by enabling competition for the available vacant positions and diversifying the candidates to a greater extent (Horta et al., 2011). Bearing on the data, this theme suggests that pure-inbred, mobile-inbred and non-inbred adherent academics differ in implementing recruitment criteria.

Academics' views on inbreeding

Participants find inbreeding both right and wrong, while some think that it should be evaluated according to the conditions (Table 4).

Table 4 Academics' perspectives related to inbreeding

Inbred Department	Non-Inbred Department
<i>Reasons for finding inbreeding right</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to employ qualified academics • Desire to employ the trusted academics • It is a well-functioning practice • Need for maintaining the academic culture 	<i>Cannot be considered right or wrong</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on the performance of the insider • Acceptable at a certain rate (e.g. 15-20%)
<i>Reasons for finding inbreeding wrong</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventing fresh blood coming to the department • Causing academic blindness 	<i>Reasons for finding inbreeding wrong</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perpetuating problems in the current culture • Monophenism, uniformity • Resembles an incest relationship • Urbanization of the university (localization)

As shown in Table 4, inbred academics appraise inbreeding positively while non-inbred and adherent academics bring severe criticism. Some academics stated that inbreeding is especially necessary for the protection and maintenance of academic culture. The non-inbred academics criticized inbreeding for causing academic blindness and localizing the university, despite also having some positive elements.

One of the academics (mobile-inbred) expressed these disadvantages repeated by different participants (P1-MI), 'A doctoral student can continue this culture without changing it. And if there is a problem in that culture, those problems can also be transferred to the future.' Another adherent academic stated that non-inbreeding prevents academics from being indebted to each other (P12-AD), 'It prevents people's need for each other, because no one is anyone's master or doctoral student, so the academics see you as a colleague rather than a former student.' One academic stated that inbreeding "urbanizes" the university since the academics

could not get away from the influence and power of the senior professors (P15-AD). Another non-inbred adherent academic likened inbreeding to incest and stated that it is a problematic approach (P16-AD):

It is something like an *incestual relationship*. Just as we expect our children to establish their worlds after a certain age, to live their reality... When you continue with the people you raised, blood breaks down somewhere. Therefore, it becomes a repetitive system that cannot renew itself. Therefore, it is one of the most harmful things for academia.

Some academics avoided evaluating inbreeding as right or wrong, asserting that it is more appropriate to handle inbreeding with its positive and negative aspects, and to focus on one's performance. However, there was a general agreement among inbred adherent academics that academic inbreeding may be necessary for the maintenance of institutional tradition and culture. Preserving institutional culture and traditions is a critical driver of academic inbreeding, as reported by İnanç and Tuncer (2011) as well. Further, there appears to be a positive association between academic inbreeding and trust-based personal relationships, based on pure-inbred and mobile-inbred academics' opinions. Yudkevich et al. (2015) also pointed out that inbreeding perpetuates the institutional or departmental culture and relationships already existing in the institution whilst reproducing the power dynamics. However, some pure-inbred academics claimed that inbreeding may be problematic for HEIs because it may create particularism and limit new ideas in academia. This argument agrees well with Altbach et al.'s (2015) findings, which suggest that inbreeding may foster particularism in contrast to universalism.

Further, non-inbred adherent academics emphasized that academic inbreeding cannot be considered as completely problematic or useful, and therefore it should not be ended by decree, yet a limited number of academics concerning merit-based recruitment may be allowed by the HEI administrations. However, it is important to note that non-inbred participants widely expressed that inbreeding may bring homogeneity, encourage hierarchical relationships within the institution, cause localism and particularism, and transfer of existing culture to prospective academics.

Given the variety of issues raised by the non-inbred adherent academics, it seems that inbreeding takes hold of several dynamics in organizations. Horta and Yudkevich (2016) propose that inbreeding produces homogeneity pursued by organizational stability, that is, inbred-oriented institutions are seized by organizational traditions, long-established norms, values, and habits. Correspondingly, the hierarchy may be fundamentally entrenched within the department due to the perennial power relations tied strongly between senior professors and newly hired junior academics (Gokturk & Yildirim-Tasti, 2020; Horta et al., 2011). Finally, participants placed a particular emphasis on localism, which is argued to be related to academic inbreeding (Sivak & Yudkevich, 2012). Localism in higher education generally

involve the local circulation of the faculty, publishing with a local social network in local/national journals, and meeting the need for the human resource from local communities (Gorelova & Yudkevich 2015; Horta, 2013). Therefore, localism inevitably provokes the reproduction of local professional norms scheming the teaching and research activities comprehensively (Sivak & Yudkevich, 2012). Concomitantly, localism cause isolation from external norms and practices, lacking a broader intellectual community and outlook necessary for achieving academic development (Dutton, 1980). Overall, localism damages the HEIs and produces flaws, creating increasingly competitive and accountable academic environments and organizational climates.

Reasons for preferring inbreeding

Both inbred and non-inbred academics believe that inbreeding is preferred for cultural reasons and the tendency to maintain order (Table 5).

Table 5 Reasons for preferring inbreeding

Inbred department	Non-inbred department
Cultural reasons: The predominance of feudal relations in Turkish culture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal relationships being decisive • Favoritism and nepotism • Partisanship • Having similar ideologies • Being close to administration 	Cultural reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern and Muslim culture (people feel strong and safe in a particular group) • Nepotism
Desire to maintain the current academic culture	Desire to work with people who will not threaten the built-in order
Desire to choose people who can work compatible	Desire to retain power and establish dominance over academics
See outsiders as a risk or threat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unwanted difference or innovation: to protect and maintain the same mentality • Not facing resistance, not choosing people who can force the order and challenge it • Staying inside the comfort zone
Respect for the academics' past work for the institution	When there is an open position, the people in the close circle are informed

As shown in Table 5, inbreeding is preferred mainly for cultural reasons like protecting current academic culture and the status quo. An adherent participant (P11-AD) reported a difficulty in announcing their vacant position as follows:

A vacancy for an assistant professor was given to our department, we made use of all the resources, but we could not access lots of people. Whom could

we reach? People we know. It may be due to this. ... Of course, people around that university hear this news.

Cultural reasons come to the fore both for inbred and non-inbred faculties likely due to the fact that Turkish culture is imbued with feudal attributions, and feeling safe in groups has been referred to as pathological aspects of insider feeding. The participants addressed these pathological and detrimental aspects of inbreeding, linking feudal qualities with Turkish culture and also the eastern culture. For example, a mobile-inbred academic (P2-MI) uttered,

Turkey is still a society that tries to conduct business with feudal relations. So, our data sources are oral culture, our observations and personal. I'm not saying it should be a measurement or not. I'm not saying that is wrong. But that is the case. If people are going to work with someone, they want to work with whom they want, not with the student who gets the highest grade. And I, for my part, would like to work with the person I believe I can work with, not the person who got the highest grade. Because the validity and reliability of the tools that lead to that grade are always controversial. But the validity of these changes when you are employees and managers of a public system. There should also be acceptable criteria, standards, and values.

Another non-inbred adherent participant emphasized the practices of the eastern culture as follows (P16-AD):

For me, the most important thing is that it is an eastern culture and a Muslim country.... Either you're on me or you're not... Second, people can see themselves academically strong in the groups. I mean, for some reason, they cannot do an individual study. For example, they are afraid to express their opinion, not even to express their academic opinion in environments where they do not feel safe... I've seen these examples... Once, our friend became head of the department... for example, a former faculty comes and says, 'do this like this.' The job descriptions are obvious. If the academic is in that position, they will do their duty, whether they are your student or not. But it's controlling... it's like sectarianism... communities of practice... these are a community.

Inbreeding is considered as a legitimate practice to meet the need for faculty in a short time, to respect the experience and time of the internal candidate within the institution, to have the opportunity to recognize and observe highly-academically-oriented students during their graduate studies in the home university, and to be able to inform only the immediate

circle when a vacancy is available. However, interviewees mostly considered inbreeding motives as damaging to the institution due to the risk of exacerbation in personal relationships, remaining in the comfort zone, preference to familiar persons/graduates, provincialism, academic nepotism, particularism, parochialism, maintenance of institutional culture, home-grown norms and traditions. Indeed, these motives of inbreeding are closely related, and often happen at the same time in an institution, causing and affecting each other.

Provincialism generally emerges in the academic promotion patterns in highly inbred-oriented HEIs (Cattaneo et al., 2019). Likewise, particularism inevitably promotes institutional parochialism. In this way, personal or in-group-membership oriented recruitment dominates hiring practices, leaving almost no chance of being hired for external candidates (Dutton, 1980; Gorelova & Lovakov, 2016). These issues especially demonstrate a negative impact on both academics' and institution's scientific achievement and improvement, solidifying institutional proximity (Horta et al., 2010).

Conservatism is also observed and supported in inbred institutions (Dutton, 1980), resulting in isolation from the rest of the academic world. That is, conservative practices and values are praised and encouraged, jeopardizing institutional vitality, such as maintenance of established traditions, already existing institutional culture, and remaining in the comfort zone (Pan, 1993). Similarly, eastern culture values and characteristics were claimed to be among the markers of inbreeding in Turkish HE. Eastern cultures are basically identified as collectivistic cultures, where tight social bonds and links and belonging to large groups are valued based on and in exchange for loyalty (Darwish & Huber, 2003). Building on this argument stated by the participating pure-inbred, mobile-inbred and adherent academics, Turkey's collectivistic culture may be considered among the potential motives of inbreeding in its HEIs, as well. However, in a recent study, Horta (2022) claims that academic inbreeding is still observed in developed higher education systems as the United States and the United Kingdom.

The practice of inbreeding in academia also leads to heterogeneity in institutions. Power owners and central professors in the departments determine and form the accepted type of academics, and foster the reproduction of the same identities, approaches, ideas, and even ethnicities within the departments. That is, the chief principles of academia—diversity, equity and inclusiveness—are neglected concomitantly (Horta, 2003; 2022).

Views on the limitations of inbreeding by legislation

The views of the participants on the limitations of inbreeding are presented in the Table 6 comparatively.

Table 6 Views on the limitation of inbreeding by legislation

Inbred department	Non-inbred department
<i>Should be limited (to an extent)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided that the tenure of the academics is secured • Mobility opportunities should be developed • Provide a different perspective 	<i>Should be limited (to an extent)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But not enough to solve the problems caused by inbreeding in Turkey. • May inhibit the culture of allegiance. • May not be essential for elite universities but may be required in the provinces
<i>Should not be limited</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But it should be encouraged • It causes reactions • Not humane • The university should decide • There is no scientific evidence to support such a limitation 	<i>Should not be limited</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But it should be encouraged

As shown in Table 6, inbred academics think that inbreeding should not be restricted, while the non-inbred adherent academics dominantly think that it should be limited. A mobile-inbred participant (P1-MI), who advocated restricting inbreeding to a certain extent, stated that the university should encourage the academics to gain different experiences:

At certain stages of an academic career, such things should be encouraged at home or abroad. Put it in the legislation, but also provide support... These are good things for a university, of course. The university should encourage this but the position should be secured when they return to their home institution (P1-MI).

Another academic expressed that there is no guarantee that the non-inbred academics will always be better, and even that they may not be able to adapt to the culture of the institution, and may harm it. However, an adherent non-inbred participant (P11-AD) stated that it would be appropriate for each university to set a limitation:

Academic inbreeding is perceived as a bad thing. It has a negative reputation. There is no such thing that every candidate you receive from inside will be good, and vice-versa... or you can get such candidates from outside that it can spoil the culture of the institution. That's a bad thing then. So maybe the criteria we're looking for in a new candidate should be clear. But on paper, I think every university should have a numerical limit. Especially in a country like Turkey, where the rules are not very applied. I think it is important that there is a legal obligation to make decisions at the policy level.

The majority of participants emphasized that it would be reasonable both to promote and limit the number of inbred academics by decree, based on various justifications. For example, a mobile-inbred academic (P1-MI) claims that inbreeding should be preserved and consolidated, if not reinforced, via the possibility of having people who might have benefitted from a limited span of time abroad. Non-inbred adherent academics highlighted that such limitations could end or dwindle away the prevalence of culture of the submissiveness within the institution. As Tavares et al. (2015) stated, inbreeding would be less likely to emerge in an institution where loyalty to diverse (insider or outsider) groups is not welcomed and appreciated. On the other hand, inbred academics confirmed limiting the practice of inbreeding on account of immobility, consolidation of academic staff, and lower levels of innovation that inbreeding brings in. Similar results were also reported by Horta et al. (2010) and İnanç and Tuncer (2011).

Indeed, although the Higher Education Law explains the procedures and principles of appointment and promotion of faculty members in HEIs, there is no specific regulation restricting or encouraging inbreeding in HEIs. Yet, within this law, it is stated that 'HEIs can require additional objective and auditable criteria, taking into account the differences among scientific disciplines, in order to increase scientific quality exclusively, by taking approval of the COHE in appointments and promotions' (article 23/c). Therefore, based on this statement, we could expect HEIs to restrict or prevent inbreeding formally through respective criteria. As yet, however, the number of HEIs that have limited or prevented academic inbreeding is rather low.

Participants who were against the idea of setting a limitation to inbreeding as a hiring policy commented that it would be unfair to restrict the practice, and therefore would draw a serious reaction from inbred-oriented HEIs. Indeed, universities could suffer from hiring external candidates due to legal restrictions if the internal candidate is superior to the external one (Horta & Yudkevich, 2016). Another essential idea mentioned was not to employ decree regulations to prevent inbreeding at the national level, but to encourage academic mobility by relaxed regulations at the institutional level. Likewise, interviewees in Horta and Yudkevich's (2016) study also stressed that eliminating inbreeding through law would be harmful, which would most probably involve mandatory mobility of academics, and damage the research path and career trajectory of the academics. Yet, regulations to limit the practice of academic inbreeding are assumed to have substantial potential in terminating the proliferation of inbreeding (Horta et al., 2011; Pan, 1993). Similar regulations introduced in the Russian HE system are acknowledged, however, there is an important caveat to bear in mind: their effects are not clear yet. In China, top universities and an increasing number of universities do not allow the employment of their Ph.D. graduates any more to eliminate the negative impacts of inbreeding (Altbach et al., 2015), as well.

Aligned with the rise of audit culture and competition around the world, the higher education sector in Turkey has also adapted new public management to enhance academic performance and efficiency. As yet, however, these intended policies have not been reflected

in human resource and talent management in practice enough. These transformations seem to take a longer time to be implemented efficiently both in university management practices and nation-wide academic labor, as in international HELs.

Impact of inbreeding on academics' performance and the institution

Participants' opinions on the impact of insider recruitment are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7 Impact of inbreeding on academics' performance and the institution

Inbred department	Non-inbred department
<p>There is a difference in performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of those coming from outside the education faculty is higher (bachelor's degree is meant). • The insider gets unnecessarily tied to its roots. • Outsiders are more productive and project-oriented, but dropped out of academics for 5-15 years due to vicious conflicts. 	<p>There is a difference in performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A non-inbred academic can bring a different perspective while teaching • A non-inbred academic can contribute to the development of international connections and joint projects.
<p>There is no difference in performance but;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A non-inbred academic has no debt to anyone. • Non-inbreds do not put their hands under the stone. • Non-inbreds can see themselves as guests. 	<p>There is no difference in performance but;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-inbreds' international connections are stronger. • Non-inbreds can publish more internationally. • Non-inbreds hesitate more and they do not see themselves as real members. • Non-inbreds are more emotional and have a bond of loyalty. • Non-inbreds are more visible in community service. • Non-inbreds have higher self-sacrifice and belonging in serving the institution.

Non-inbreds differ in their qualities, such as introducing students to different perspectives, being more productive, project-oriented, and having strong international connections. One pure-inbred participant stated (P3-PI):

It seems to me that if the academics coming from different disciplines are a little higher... or I think they're more open-minded... an academic who has graduated from the faculty of education and becomes an academic at the same university unnecessarily depends on their roots (they say so) and their history. This dependence has no contribution to academic performance... I also see that as the time spent in that department increases, this difference decreases and the academics try to resemble their colleagues. They cannot escape, so they start to turn into the people they criticize. This kills efficiency.

Another adherent participant in a non-inbred department emphasized that non-inbreds have stronger international connections (P16-AD):

Academics with a Ph.D. from abroad have better international networks... these people write projects easier, they do their job better with international scholars in an easier way. They go to international conferences much more... But the academics who grew up in Turkey find it enough to go these conferences once every five or 10 years. They mostly go to national conferences. Both are important. But the international network is very important. Science is not something that can be done alone.

Non-inbred academics are considered not to embrace their jobs in the institution as much as those who are from within the institution, with the words no debt to anyone (P6-PI) and like a guest (P2-MI). A mobile-inbred academic said:

Here, for things to go right, another dynamism is needed in terms of both bureaucratic and relational aspects. The university also needs an internal mechanism. In that internal mechanism, the university's graduates, that is, the inbreds, especially the ones having undergraduate and graduate degrees, have a very strong connection with the university. You have research, you teach, you are overworked, but you are willing to make such a sacrifice. I observe this higher in inbred academics... For example, since I did not graduate from here, there is no such area of sacrifice for me, because I do not create such a thing in my mind. I will do research, I will do very well, I will do research and teaching, I will be good with my students, that's it. I do not have a motivation like loyalty. But there is for inbred academics. Maybe there are other such motives for them. But this is the most obvious I have observed so far.

Some of the participants both from inbred and non-inbred academics stated that there was no substantial difference between inbred and non-inbred academics' productivity and performance. Yet, research has proven that inbred academics are less productive than their non-inbred colleagues (Dutton, 1980; Eisenberg & Wells, 2000; İnanç & Tuncer, 2011). Inbred and non-inbred participants also agreed upon the idea that inbred colleagues have higher levels of institutional commitment. This result appears to tally with Altbach et al.'s (2015) research that inbred academics spend time on teaching and administrative duties that make them more visible among their colleagues, as they do not have an intention to leave the institution, so they do not invest their efforts in research and publishing.

Inbred and non-inbred participants were consistent about non-inbred academics' superiority in participating in international knowledge networks, engaging in international

collaboration projects, and publishing in international peer-reviewed journals. Similar results were obtained by Sivak and Yudkevich (2012). Also, non-inbred academics were claimed to value cooperation at the international level more than their inbred colleagues, whereas inbreds prefer publishing in local university journals and nationwide academic journals (Gorelova & Lovakov, 2016). One last main category that emerged within the current theme was inbred and non-inbred academics' claim that non-inbred academics are not involved in some institutional culture patterns, such as mentoring and hierarchical relationships, that emphasize institutional hierarchy and loyalty over academic quality and collegial relationship. Non-inbred academics might be quite often less willing to be involved in long-established yet unfair power structures, some departmental projects, and routines. In this way, they would be referred as a visiting academic in their department from the inbred academics' standpoint, as reported by Horta et al. (2011).

In sum, these highlighted dynamics, issues, and concerns associated with and attributed to the impact of inbreeding on the institutions and academics' performance under these themes present a thorough overview of participating academics regarding the phenomenon of academic inbreeding from different perspectives in Turkish higher education, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1 enables us to understand the main characteristics of inbreeding as perceived by academics from different academic climates. The findings also suggest that inbreeding cannot only be restricted to the HEIs; instead, the impact of the wider context (e.g., institutional and contextual factors, nation-wide policies) should also be taken into consideration for accurate implications about the extent of academic inbreeding in practice. That is, the phenomenon of academic inbreeding should be approached at multiple organizational levels.

Conclusion

This paper extended the usual way of investigating academic inbreeding beyond scholarly productivity, stressing the organizational commitment and organizational stability aspects as a necessity for higher education institution's sustainability. This, in turn, suggests a promising positive reflection on academic culture that is different from the prior studies, which concentrated on its relationship with scholarly productivity.



Figure 1 Themes and sub-categories

Inbred academics perceived inbreeding as a way of maintaining academic culture, whereas non-inbred adherent academics perceived inbreeding as a problem for organizational culture. Taken together, the presence of inbreeding at certain levels is considered important for maintaining the organizational culture. Cultural characteristics emerged as the prominent causes of inbreeding. Despite the empirical research proving the damaging effects of academic inbreeding, this research adds its positive aspects such as providing better opportunity to observe the academic candidate and to employ qualified academics as it enables long-term observation about an academic's performance. However, the results of the study also suggest that academic inbreeding in HEIs leads to the reproduction of power relations, ignoring the principles of diversity, equity and inclusiveness at higher education level. Further, one of the main contributions of this study lies in demonstrating the importance of societal and contextual factors to understand the prevalence and appropriateness of the phenomenon for the HEIs.

Inbred academics have an advantage of embracing diverse perspectives in lectures, having strong international connections, being project-oriented, and more productive in terms of international scientific publications. Although the procedures and principles of appointment and promotion of academics in HEIs are not restricted or encouraged in the Turkish Higher Education Law, claiming strict limitations on hiring policies needs more strong evidence including the developing universities. Indeed, the centralized higher education system in Turkey, and thus the ability within the Turkish COHE to make a fast decision would make it fundamentally easier to navigate the path forward regarding of academic inbreeding, once the higher education stakeholders make a nation-wide decision on handling the issue.

HE administrators, especially university rectors, should take this issue to their agenda related to the recruitment policies to achieve human resources and talent management parallel to their organizational goals and strategic plans. It would be early to draw any solid conclusions on the data obtained here to set general hiring policies limiting or encouraging this practice, since our study is limited by a relatively small sample size owing to its qualitative nature. As a result, in Turkey we need more evidence-based research capturing a wide range of scientific disciplines and departments from both newly developing and long-established universities.

In sum, this study could act as a reference point providing a comparative standpoint based on a wide variety of ideas, perspectives and arguments stated by the inbred and non-inbred academics. Consequently, issues and concerns raised here could be addressed and examined critically taking into consideration the contemporary patterns in international HE.

References

- Altbach, P., Yudkevich, M., & Rumbley, L. (2015). Academic inbreeding: Local challenge, global problem. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 16, 317-330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-015-9391-8>
- Balyer, A., & Ömür, Y. E. (2018). Analyzing inbreeding in universities in terms of academic freedom. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 7(2), 307-325.
- Basak, R. (2013). An ethical issue-academic incest: Maintaining *status quo* in higher education. *IJTASE*, 2(4), 28-32.
- Cattaneo, M., Malighetti, P., & Paleari, S. (2019). The Italian brain drain: Cream and milk. *Higher Education*, 77, 603-622. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0292-8>
- Chinyere, A-P., & Harrison, E. (2016). Inbreeding in Nigerian universities: Merits and challenges. *International Journal of Capacity Building in Education and Management*, 2(4), 65-74. <http://journals.rcmss.com/index.php/ijcbem/article/view/236/212>
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 11(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100>
- Darwish, E., & Huber, G. (2003). Individualism vs collectivism in different cultures: A cross-cultural study. *Intercultural Education*, 14(1), 47-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1467598032000044647>
- Denzin, N. K. (2009). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Routledge.
- Dutton, J. (1980, April, 7-11). *The impact of inbreeding and immobility on the professional role and scholarly performance of academic scientists*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, Boston.
- Eisenberg, T., & Wells, M. (2000). Inbreeding in law school hiring: Assessing the performance of faculty hired from within. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 2, 369-388. <https://doi.org/10.1086/468077>
- Eliot, C. (1908). *University administration*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. SAGE.
- Forchuk, C., & Roberts, J. (1993). How to critique qualitative research articles. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research Archive*, 25(4), 47-56.
- Gokturk, D., & Yildirim-Tasti, O. (2020). The role of academic inbreeding in building institutional and research habitus: A case study from Turkey. *Higher Education Policy*, 35, 178-198. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-020-00201-1>
- Gorelova, O., & Lovakov, A. (2016) *Academic inbreeding and research productivity of Russian faculty members*. Higher School of Economics Research Paper No-32.
- Gorelova, O., & Yudkevich, M. (2015). Academic inbreeding: State of the literature. *Academic inbreeding and mobility in higher education: Global perspectives*. Palgrave- MacMillan.

- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>
- Hargens, L. L., & Farr, G. M. (1973). An examination of recent hypotheses about institutional inbreeding. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1381-1402.
- Higher Education Law. <https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/the-law-on-higher-education.pdf>
- Hitit University. (n.d.). T.C. Hitit Üniversitesi. <https://www.hitit.edu.tr/duyurular/2017/7/2/yuksekogretimdeki-bazi-duzenlemelere-iliskin-yok-baskanligindan-yapilan-aciklama>
- Horta, H. (2008). On improving the university research base: Technical University of Lisbon case in perspective. *Higher Education Policy*, 21, 123-146. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300177>
- Horta, H. (2013). Deepening our understanding of academic inbreeding effects on research information exchange and scientific output: New insights for academic based research. *Higher Education*, 65(4), 487-510. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9559-7>
- Horta, H. (2022). Academic inbreeding: Academic oligarchy, effects, and barriers to change. *Minerva*. ePub ahead of print. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-022-09469-6>
- Horta, H., Sato, M., & Yonezawa, A. (2011). Academic inbreeding: Exploring its characteristics and rationale in Japanese universities using a qualitative perspective. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(1), 35-44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-010-9126-9>
- Horta, H., Veloso, F., & Grediaga, R. (2010). Navel gazing: Academic inbreeding and scientific productivity. *Management Science*, 56(3), 414-429. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1090.1109>
- Horta, H., & Yudkevich, M. (2016). The role of academic inbreeding in developing higher education systems: Challenges and possible solutions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 113, 363-372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.039>
- İnanç, O., & Tuncer, O. (2011). The effect of academic inbreeding on scientific effectiveness. *Scientometrics*, 88, 885-898. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0415-9>
- Leininger M. (1990). Ethno-methods: The philosophic and epistemic bases to explicate transcultural nursing knowledge. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 1(2), 40-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104365969000100206>
- Kozikoğlu, İ. (2016). Academic inbreeding: A conceptual analysis. *International Journal of Social Science*, 49, 349-357. <https://doi.org/10.9761/JASSS3660>
- Lee, D., Kim, S., & Cha, S-H. (2014). Evaluating the effectiveness of research centers and institutes in universities: Disciplines and life cycle stages. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 11(1), 119-137. <http://doi.org/10.22804/kjep.2014.11.1.006>
- Meyer, C. B. (2001). A case in case study methodology. *Field Methods*, 13(4), 329-352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X0101300402>
- Morichika, N., & Shibayama, S. (2015). Impact of inbreeding on scientific productivity: A case study of a Japanese university department. *Research Evaluation*, 24(2), 146-157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvv002>

- Noble, H., & Heale, R. (2019). Triangulation in research, with examples. *Evidence-based Nursing*, 22(3), 67-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ebnurs-2019-103145>
- Pan, S. (1993). *A study of faculty inbreeding at eleven land-grant universities* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Iowa State University.
- Shibayama, S. (2022). Development of originality under inbreeding: A case of life science labs in Japan. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 76(1), 63-75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12315>
- Sivak, E., & Yudkevich, M. (2012). University inbreeding: An impact on values, strategies and individual productivity of faculty members. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1996417>
- Song, S-Y. (2019). New patterns of governance in higher education: Predictors of the shift toward academic capitalism. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 16(1), 21-44.
- Tavares, O., Cardoso, S., Carvalho, T., Sousa, S., & Santiago, R. (2015). Academic inbreeding in the Portuguese academia. *Higher Education*, 69(6), 991-1006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9818-x>
- The Law-Making Amendments to Some Laws and Statutory Decisions for Development of Industry and Support of Production. (2017). <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2017/07/20170701-21.htm>
- Tyurikov, A. G., Kunizheva, D. A., Voevodina, E. V., & Gruzina, Y. M. (2021). The impact of the university environment on the development of student research potential: Implementing inbreeding in an open innovation environment. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12359>
- Wyer, J., & Conrad, C. (1984). Institutional inbreeding re-examined. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(1), 213-225. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1162362>
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. SAGE.
- Council of Higher Education. (n.d.). *History of the council of higher education*. <https://www.yok.gov.tr/en/institutional/history>
- Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P., & Rumbley, L. (2015). *Academic inbreeding and mobility in higher education: Global perspectives*. Palgrave-Macmillan.