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Abstract:
In this paper, the human resources practices that are adopted by the Istanbul Stock Exchange listed companies in the corporate governance adoption process are studied. The corporate governance structure which is developed by Capital Market Board in Turkey, presents certain human resources management practices to the firms. Consequently, CMB, as an environmental actor, effects the decisions of firms concerning human resources management. The aim of this study is to discuss the interaction between firms and CMB in the framework of resource dependence theory.
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Özet:
Bu çalışmada, İMKB 100 listesinde yer alan firmaların kurumsal yönetim uyum sürecinde benimsedikleri insan kaynakları yönetimi pratikleri incelenmektedir. Türkiye’de SPK tarafından öncülüğü yapılan kurumsal yönetim modelli belirli insan kaynakları yönetimi pratiklerini firmalara sunmaktadır. Dolayısıyla bir çevresel aktör olarak SPK, firmaların insan kaynakları yönetiminin ilişkin kararlarını etkilemektedir. Amacı, firmalar ile SPK arasındaki bu etkileşimi kaynak bağılılığı kuramı çerçevesinde tartışmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İnsan kaynakları yönetimi, kaynak bağılılığı kuramı, kurumsal yönetim, sermaye piyasası kurulu, Türkiye
1. Introduction

The question of “what” are the motives that direct the organization behavior and “how” this organization behavior occurs constitute the traditional discussion axis of the organization theory. The literature on the human resource management (HRM), being not independent from these discussions, tries to explain which HR practices the organizations choose and why.

It has been observed that on the development process of the HRM concept; firstly the difference of HRM from the industrial relations and personal management are emphasized, secondly the models that help to determine and measure the basic activities of HRM are being developed (Guest, 1987; 1991). As the HRM gains “strategic” attribute, HRM’s relation with organizational strategy and organizational performance is tried to be explained as a whole.

The researches focused on the individual practices in the field of HRM took a large place at the literature especially during the 1980s. In other words, how personal selection process, training and performance appraisal systems as well as the compensation packages will be activated and how they will be related with the organizational strategy have been researched (Wright and McManus, 1992). Since the beginning of 1990s the significant part of the researches has been discussing the HRM’s relation with the organizational strategy (Miles et al., 1978; Miles and Snow, 1984; Schuler and Jackson, 1987; 1989; Sparrow and Pettigrew, 1988; Lengnick-Hall, 1988; Grant, 1991; Schuler, 1992; Arthur, 1992; Lado and Wilson, 1994; Wright, et al., 1994; Mueller, 1996; Child, 1997; Barney and Wright, 1998; Ferris et al., 1999; Wright, et al., 2001; Colbert, 2004). On the other hand, the question of at what level and in what way the HRM has effect on organizational performance (productivity, financial indicators, etc.) constitute one of the hottest discussion subjects of the literature (Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Delaney and Huselid, 1996; Wood, 1999; Pauwe and Richardson, 2001; Guest, 2001; Youndt and Snell, 2004). However there are discussions and findings over the suspicious structure and results of the mentioned relations (Keenoy, 1991; 1993; Legge, 1995; Pauwe and Richardson, 2001).

The predominant opinion in the HRM researches, especially the ones based on US, argues that different choices are made at the conception of the HRM in line with the different requirements of the organization strategy. Though how rational this selection is a matter of discussion. Whether or not the managers are fully informed about the strategy they follow and the human resource it requires; whether or not they can completely determine the consistency between strategy and human resources; which factors are influential on the conception of HRM besides the proposed rationality, are the points that have not been completely clarified yet (Aktouf, 1992; Townley, 1993). There are also studies carrying analysis out of the strategic management approaches and discussing the possible contribution of distinct theories into the field (Jackson and Schuler, 1995; Wright and Mc Mahan, 1992).

The developments at the organization theory during the last couple of years have considerably influenced the HRM resources. Especially in the researches held outside US, in Continental Europe and the Far East Countries, the impact of the political and social system as well as industrial relations’ legal and traditional framework, trade associations and the other organization forms, relations between organizations upon the organizations’ various HR practices are being investigated (Dobbin and Sutton, 1998; Björkman and Lu, 2001; Williamson, 2000; Hasegawa, 2001; Jenkins and Klarsfeld, 2002; Williamson and Cable, 2003; Boselie et al., 2003; Horgan and Mühlau, 2003; Chow, 2004; Bender, 2004; Webster and Wood,
In these researches, it is possible to notice that in addition to the rational determinants such as scale and technology, determinants considered regarding the technical or institutional external environment become come to the fore. In other words, from the middle of 1990s the focus of researches related to the HR practices has shifted from internal variables to external variables and determinants.

Liberal economic policies prevailing in the international field, globalizing financial markets as well as crises and scandals creating global impacts, all appear as macro developments affecting organization’s behavior beyond national borders. This situation also changes the actors with whom the enterprises are in relation or have interdependency. The corporate governance (CG) paid attention by several global actors, regulatory institutions, financial institutions and the academicians also comprise one of the factors influencing organizational behavior at international level. Bringing different regulations about the enterprises within the framework of the CG principles creates an appropriate field to examine the organizational behavior and relations between the environmental actors that determine this behavior. That’s to say, at the analysis of the environment and the relations between the actors and organizations about the organizational behavior; corporate governance comprises an appealing observation field.

Based on this thought, this study will focus on the CG model especially because of the regulations that CG brought into HR practices and examine the relations of the Capital Markets Board (CMB) which is the leading board of this model in Turkey with the companies listed in Istanbul Stock Exchange. As CMB is the most important regulatory board over the critical fund source like financial markets, the aim of this study is to determine in what way CMB can influence the HR practices of the companies that carry dependence relations with itself. To put it differently, this study seeks to examine the impacts of interaction between organizations by taking into consideration the formation of HR practices from the perspectives of Resource Dependence Theory (RDT), instead of the orthodox approach at HRM.

Therefore, at the first part of the study, RDT is introduced and the basic assumptions of the theory regarding the organization-environment relation are presented. After that, the embrace of HR practices by the organizations is evaluated from the perspective of RDT. Lastly, having introduced the CG model and progress of CG in Turkey, the research findings which aim to determine how CG implementations developed with the impact of CMB lead the HR practices are presented.

2. Resource Dependence Theory

In the 50s and 60s, there was an agreement in general on the contingency theory. Then beginning from 1970s the approaches trying to understand and explain the organizations’ behavior started to become various (Üsdiken and Leblebici, 2001). The main subject of the contingency theory is the conception of organizational structures. This subject, having taken consideration since the beginning of 1900s, is re-examined by the contingency theory on a scientific base and organizational structures are accepted to be dependent variable shaped by internal and external contingencies. With the contingency theory, RDT also shares a tendency which was important and new for those years. Both approaches take the researches on organizations further from being just focused inside of the organization and put emphasis on the environment for the organizations (Üsdiken, 2007). RDT has been revealed as a whole integrated by the seminal study of Pfeffer and Salancik in 1978. The main emphasis of the theory is the idea that dependence relations between the organizations and the other actors around its operation areas would be influential on the organizational structure and behavior. In other words, resource dependence theory is about how organizational environments affect and constrain organiza-
A good deal of organizational behavior, the actions taken by organizations, can be understood only by knowing something about the organizations’ environment and the problem it creates for obtaining resources. What happens in an organization is not only a function of the organization, its structure, its leadership, its procedures or its goals, but also a consequence of the environment and the particular contingencies and constraints deriving from that environment (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003:3). RDT views organizations as being embedded in networks of interdependencies and social relationships (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976; Granovetter, 1985; 1992).

Yet, what is understood from “being embedded in a social context” differentiates in two ways according to institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Scott, 1987; 2001; Dimaggio and Powell, 1983). Firstly, from the point of view of RDT, organizations are formed not only by the social expectations and institutional pressures. That’s to say, in the view of environment conceptualization not only the institutional environment but also the technical environment must be taken into consideration (Smircich and Stubbart, 1985). In order for organization to survive, different environmental factors, such as suppliers, customers, state, regulatory institutions, which provide physical and financial sources, knowledge or man power to organizations, are being effective on the structure and behavior of the organizations. In other words the difference is that institutional theory tended to emphasize social rules, expectations, norms and values as the source of pressures on organizations to conform, rather than the patterns of transactions and exchanges that formed the focus for resource dependence (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003). The second important difference is related with the meaning that RDT has added up to the organizational action. The theory examines the organizations with a different action approach than the institutional theory. Strategic choice and managerial discretion (Child, 1972; 1997) take a more important place at RDT. Parallel to the criticisms about the institutional theory that it does not give enough emphasis on the interest and power concepts, the organizations have been ascribed a more active role against the environmental pressures (Dimaggio and Powell, 1983; Dacin, et.al, 2002). That’s to say, organizations will not only obey the demands and the pressures coming from the environmental actors, but also will try to direct and change these demands. Thus, the idea of strategic action varying in a wide spectrum ranging from obeying the environmental pressures to resisting to those pressures is accepted (Oliver, 1991; 1997).

It is necessary to focus on two different concepts in order to explain RDT. Those concepts that are related to each other are “interdependence” and “resource”. The key concept in RDT to explicate the organizational behavior is the term called interdependence. That dependence emerges between the organization and the environmental factors which present the necessary sources or the inputs for organization in order to continue its activities. Besides that the dependence also influences the organizational conception and behavior. Considering these sources, the management and organization theories aim at understanding how these sources are utilized in the inner processes of the organization rather than examining what these sources are, or how they have been received.

Therefore, RDT analyzes organization-environment relation in three fields. These are: environmental effects on organizations, organizational efforts to manage environmental constraint and effects of environmental constraint on internal organizational dynamics. It is argued that pressures emanated from external environment are determining the decisions taken within the organization. But it is also set forth that organizations try to lead interdependence by means of various actions such as mergers, acquisition, joint ventures, lobbying, composition of board of directors etc. According to RDT, there is a
connection between external interdependence and internal organizational processes, and this connection is mediated by power. Specifically, those people or subunits which could best cope with critical organizational uncertainties came to have relatively more power inside the organization and used that power to ensure that their view of what should be done, including who should succeed to various positions, prevailed (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003).

Environment is important in this theory because it consists of the actors which supply the sources that organization needs in order to survive. So to speak, what makes environment significant for the organization is that relations set up for supplying resource can create dependence condition. Dependence in the relations of organization with its environment is based on two conditions. First, how important is dealing with an environmental actor (such as customer) or a source subject to this deal, for the organization. The source (for example a production unit, fund) or the deal (for instance a product produced by the organization to be bought by a customer) have two non-independent determinants. Those are: the proportion of the deal in the organization’s inputs or outputs, and how indispensable this source is for the organization to maintain its activities. The second condition creating dependence is that choices in supplying critical sources are limited (Üsdiken, 2007:85). Once the number of actors holding these sources decreases, dependence relation between organization and its environment increases. The dependence relation formed on the basis of the necessary resource carries a mutual quality. How balanced the dependence relation for the sides would be is determined by the above mentioned conditions. In addition, the power difference among actors also necessitates including the concept of “power” into this analysis. The side with less dependence forms the strong side in the dependence relation (Üsdiken, 2007:86). For instance, the organizations in the field of defense industry or construction companies that are working with the government bids are more dependent to state and state regulations. Besides, the state holds the power in this relation (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003).

Awareness of the enormous concentrated power of large organizations has made them targets for many who want to control or use that power. Industrial organizations are not merely economic entities that produce goods cheaply. They are places in which people work. They are polluters of the environment, source of military and economic power, creators and distributors of wealth, and places in which the statuses of persons become defined through work (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003:93). In the current dense environment, efficiencies are no longer the solution to organizational problems, for the efficiencies have created interdependencies with other organizations, and these interdependencies are the problem. The dominant problems of organization have become managing its exchanges and its relationships with the diverse interests affected by its actions. Because of the increasing interconnectedness of organizations, inter organizational effects are mediated more by regulation and political negotiation than by impersonal market forces. Negotiations, political strategies, the management of organization’s institutional relationships, these have all become more important (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003:94).


Researches carried out on the basis of RDT in HRM literature help to explain the dependence relations as well as the factors at both organizational and interorganizational levels that affect organizations while selecting HR practices and application forms. For that reason, the determinants of the relations between HRM and organizational performance, contextual characteristics shaping the constraints of managerial choice (Kinnie, et.al., 2005), selection and adaptation of wage system (Pfeffer and Cohen, 1984; Pfeffer and Langton, 1988; Pfeffer and Blake, 1987; Barringer and Milchovich, 1999; Tremblay et.al., 2003) can be explained on the
basis of RDT. Especially researches held by Preffer and his colleagues, though their subsequent impacts being limited, have brought the theory into the HRM literature. Thus, it will be beneficial to express a case which would also attract the leading figures of the theory in terms of creating a thought provoking about the HRM researches on RDT (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003:3).

“The student had worked in a fast-food restaurant near the campus, University of Illinois, was concerned about how the workers (himself) were treated. Involved in what he was studying the student read a great deal about self actualizing, theories of motivation, and the management of human resource. He observed at the restaurant that workers would steal food, make obscene statements about the boss behind his back, and complain about the low pay. The student’s analysis of the situation was a concise report summarizing the typical human relations palliatives: make a boring, greasy work more challenging and the indifferent management more democratic. The student was asked why he thought management was unresponsive to such suggestions. He considered the possibility that management was cruel and interested only in making a profit (and the operation was quite profitable). He was then asked why the employees permitted management to treat them in such a fashion-after all, they could always quit. The student responded that the workers needed the money and that jobs were hard to obtain.”

Most of the HRM researches tend towards analysis at organizational level and focus on how an HR practice is used at organizations, and especially what kind of impacts they create over organizational performance (Capelli, 1985; Purcell and Gray,1986; Capelli and McKersie, 1987; Legge, 1995). That’s to say, they focus on the question of what are the internal variables that determine the HR practices. However, especially beginning from the 2000s, researchers started to tend to link the HRM researches with the organization theory and to analyze the reasons beyond HR practices. In addition to this, researches also started to shift their level of analysis from organization to inter-organizational field, specifically focusing on the effects of institutional environment. On the other hand, the question about the impacts of the organization’s environment on the selection of HR practice and practices themselves has been the main topic studied in the researches carried in the European countries rather than the ones in the US (Guest, 1987;1991;2001; Abrahamson, 1991;1993; March, 1994; Legge, 1995; Westphal et.al.1997; Gooderham,et.al.,1999; Boselie et.al.,2003; Subramony, 2006). However, it seems that RDT perspective has not taken a considerable share in the HRM field.

Once looked from the RDT perspective, in order to understand selection and implementation of HR practices, it is necessary not only to focus on the internal relations and the concept power at organizational level as solvent variables, but also to evaluate the result of the interdependence relations between the organization and external environmental actors. That perspective requires re-questioning the hypothesis which only focuses on the human and human resource system at the strategic selection and considers the human and human resource system as a source creating competitive advantage for the organization. At this point, there emerges a wide range of hypotheses regarding what can be the factors that lead some organizations to embrace specific HR systems. Even it is possible to set the basic research question from the opposite way. For instance, how can we explain why the large-size enterprises or holdings which have considerable success and large market shares in their sectors for ten years do not have any HR system except just keeping simple personnel records? Is there a correlation between quality action and application to quality award models once HR systems are set? Or, is it possible to find out a concurrence between an enterprise going public or exchanging stocks in stock market and choosing certain HR practices?

Moving from this finding, it is possible to expect that CG as an internationally accepted arrangement model and the associations which suggest CG to organizations will have impact on the HR practices as much as the
level of their interdependence relation with the organizations. Therefore, it would not be enough to accept and examine the human resource regulations of organizations only as competitive strategies or as choices emerged according to internal and external conditions of labor market. In other words, what the organizations did related to human resource cannot be explained only by micro analysis at organizational level. The HR practices of organizations can become more understandable with an equation in which external environment and interdependence relations of actors in this environment with organizations are included.

3. Corporate Governance in Turkey and Capital Markets Board

Corporate governance (CG) is defined as the set of mechanisms—both institutional and market-based—that induce the self-interested controllers of a company (those that make decisions regarding how the company will be operated) to make decisions that maximize the value of the company to its owners. Or, to put it another way: "Corporate governance deals with the ways in which suppliers of finance to corporations assure themselves of getting a return on their investment" (Dennis and McConnell, 2003).

The concept of corporate governance relates to the separation between ownership and the power to make decisions in large corporations (Jeffers, 2005). The governance mechanisms that have been most extensively studied in the U.S. can be characterized as being either internal or external to the firm. The internal mechanisms of primary interest are the board of directors and the equity ownership structure of the firm (Dennis and McConnell, 2003).

It denotes the way in which key decisions are taken, the extent to which interest groups or “stakeholders” are in a position to influence corporate decisions. Along with the usual classification of financial systems into two groups, the bank dominated and the capital market dominated, two models of corporate governance have been identified.

These are the “shareholder” model (external control exercised by shareholders) and the “stakeholder” model (internal control exercised by various parties having an interest in the company — banks, industries, employees, public institutions). Between the two models described there exists in reality a variety of possibilities according to the relationship of forces in place in the company, and also according to the legal and regulatory environments that affect more or less the strong concentration of equity capital among the shareholders (Jeffers, 2005:224).

The system of governance existing in the firm will approximate one or the other of these two concepts, either by prioritizing maximization of the market value or preserving the coherence of all the partners.

The shareholder model type is typical of the Anglo-Saxon countries. The U.S. and the U.K. fit into this category, although there are differences between the two countries. According to this model, firms are set up to maximize shareholders’ wealth and the main criterion of performance is usually their market value (Jeffers, 2005:224). This approach associates corporate governance with the principal-agent theory. Paid managers are all-powerful, as opposed to dispersed shareholders. The level of information enjoyed by these corporate leaders and shareholders is completely unequal, and the costs for the principals (the shareholders) to act in relation to their agents (the managers) can run quite high. Control of the action of the corporate leaders is exerted through external market mechanisms.

In the stakeholder model type the capital structure of the public corporations is characterized by the presence of a small number of major stockholders, who hold controlling blocks of shares.Traditionally, these stockholders (banks in Germany, public or private financial institutions, and industrial corporations in France) protect the managing teams in place from the treat of hostile takeover bids. The activities of the company are guided on the basis of mechanisms in which players with privileged ac-
cess to information exert their influence on corporate decisions. They are insiders. Although Berle and Means (1932) are usually presented as the first theoreticians of the shareholder model, in fact it was the first expressions of the stakeholder perspective that could be found in their writings when they defended the concept that employees, suppliers, customers and members of the communities in which the firms are located also have stakes in the firm. The creation of shareholder value is not the only goal assigned to the managers, who are more inclined than in the shareholder model type to humor the interests of various parties involved with the company (banks, public shareholders, employees, etc.). The view of the corporation in continental Europe recognizes a public interest in how large firms are managed. In most of these countries, corporations are considered not just to be private associations of shareholders. They are seen as having obligations not just to their shareholders but also to society at large (Jeffers, 2005:225). Actually, if we understand by corporate governance the system by which companies are controlled directly or indirectly by shareholders and other stakeholders, the resounding recent scandals of corporate mismanagement on a worldwide scale (Enron, Worldcom, Vivendi, Parmalat) make it impossible to present either one of the two models as ideal (Jeffers, 2005:226). In this context, corporate governance reforms (in combination with the liberalizing reforms associated with economic globalization) in effect represent a new development strategy for third world countries. The most basic questions that arise with respect to this situation are what the prospects for this new development model are and whether alternatives should be considered (Reed, 2002).

When analyzed the CG’s adventure in Turkey, it is seen that a model based on the principles of OECD is presented to companies by Capital Markets Board (CMB). CMB sets the exigencies of the model, how to evaluate enterprises in the framework of this model and practice bases through issuing “Corporate Governance Principles”. When CMB is assessed as external environmental actor from RDT perspective since expressed above, it holds a position being effective and dependable on fund sources for organizations. According to RDT, a source has two determinants related to each other. These are: the proportion of source within the input and output of organization and how indispensable this source is for organization to continue its activities. The second condition that creates the dependency is that choices are limited in the supply of the critical source (Üsdiken, 2007:85). As the number of actors who hold the mentioned source around the organization decreases, the dependency relation between the organization and its environment increases. CMB is the highest level regulatory institution of the country regarding the acquisition of the funds which is one of the most critical sources for the companies traded on the stock market. The Board has impact on the organizations’ behavior by expressing some of the acquisitions of CG both for organizations and for the nation. CMB has the authority to supervise and regulate the participation to fund sources as well as apply sanction on organizations. CMB with these specialties can be regarded as an actor appropriate for RDT to be conceptualized. Hence, the regulations requested by CMB are decisive on organizations’ behavior. Many principles accepted about corporate governance, at the areas anticipated by the model- one of these areas is related to HRM- lead organizations to behave along with an appropriate model.

Turkey’s contextual characteristics also influence the relationship between CMB and organizations. Especially from 1950s onwards, the State protected the entrepreneurs from international competition and supported them through various economic instruments. Thus, the State led the growth of a private sector where family controlled business groups are predominant. However, the legal regulations and economic policies always keep the state on the agenda of the organizations as both the source of uncertainty
and the business partner (Buğra, 1994). In this framework, starting from 1980s, liberalization policies and the transition period to market economy also brought problems and their solutions specific to local conditions. In 1980s, a profound shift in philosophy occurred in Turkey concerning the role of the State in economic affairs. The new economic strategy aimed at decreasing both the scale of public sector activity as well as the degree of state intervention in the operation of the market (Öniş, 1992;1995; Öncü and Gökçe,1991). In this period, liberalization policies in national economy, impacts of globalization and intense privatization efforts have become macro factors, which also influenced organizational behavior. According to research about the top 100 companies listed on the Istanbul Stock Exchange, ownership of Turkish companies is highly concentrated, families being the dominant shareholders. The separation of ownership and control among Turkish companies is mainly achieved through pyramidal ownership structures and the presence of big business groups (Demirağ and Serter, 2003). In other words, the dominant role of family ownership and the risks as well as structural problems that macro economic factors bring along make CMB and its regulation on fund sources more critical.

The World Bank, Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and Global Corporate Governance Forum (GCGF) which is formed by the representatives of these two organizations, are the leading institutions in the world. Regulations in many countries have been analyzed and basic fundamentals suggested and accepted in the world, especially the “OECD Corporate Governance Principles” published in 1999, as well as the local conditions of Turkey have been taken into consideration while the CMB model was being formed (Kurumsal Yönetim İİikerleri, 2005). “OECD Corporate Governance Principles”, which also guided to the model in Turkey, was set by the governments, related international institutions and representatives of private sector in the OECD Council Meeting at ministerial level held in 27-28 April 1998. “OECD Corporate Governance Principles”, at the same time, is accepted to be one of the “Twelve Key Standards for Sound Financial Systems” by the Financial Stability Forum (FSF). On the other hand, the World Bank/IMF Reports on the Observance of Standards and Codes-ROSC sets the basis of CG (Kurumsal Yönetim Derneği Araştırmabeitsi, 2004).

Corporate Governance Principles published by CMB hold a very similar approach with the OECD Principles. In OECD model, there are six focal parts: mainly as CG framework, the rights of shareholders and key ownership functions, the equitable treatment of shareholders, the role of stakeholders in CG, disclosure and transparency, and the responsibilities of the board (OECD Report, 2004). On the other hand in CMB model, Corporate Governance Principles are examined within five main parts as CG principles compliance statement, shareholders, public disclosure and transparency, stakeholders, board of directors (Kurumsal Yönetim İİikerleri, 2005).

In its report CMB defines its expectations from corporate governance as;

“Bewaring that a capital market which does not take part in international financial system cannot contribute sufficiently to the economic development of the country, Capital Market Board sets the corporate governance principles which will be applied firstly by companies opened to public as well as by all of the joint-stock companies functioning both in private and public sectors. Capital Market Board argues that application of corporate governance principles and supervision of this application is crucial for forming the Turkish capital markets as a part of global liquid system as well as increasing possibilities to supply fund from international financial markets...Structuring Turkish capital market as part of the global liquid system and increasing possibilities of supplying fund from international financial markets carry importance both for our co-
The idea that bad management is one of the reasons behind financial crises and scandals in companies, has put the significance of the concept of good corporate governance into forefront.” (Kurumsal Yönetim İlkeleri, 2005).

According to CMB, international investors find CG as important as financial performance in their companies. This issue gets more significant in taking investment decisions for the countries that require reform. In addition to that, investors are ready to pay more for the companies which have good CG. Good CG provides many benefits both for companies and the country. From the point of view of companies; having CG with high quality implies lower cost of capital, increase of financial potentials and liquidity, easier to resolve the crisis, not to be isolated from financial markets as a well-governed company. From the point of view of a country; a good CG stands for increase of country’s image, prevention of investment flowing abroad (preservation of investment within country), increase of foreign investments, strengthening competitiveness of the economy and the financial markets, handling crises with less reimbursement, more effective separation of sources, achieving and sustaining higher standards of living (Kurumsal Yönetim İlkeleri, 2005).

As stated by CMB, the studies in the field of corporate governance noticeably highlights that there cannot be a single valid CG model for every country. Therefore a new model that will be formed has to consider the conditions unique to the country as well. However, in addition to this, concepts of equality, transparency, accountability and responsibility need to be taken as must (obligatory) notions in all generally accepted international CG approaches (Kurumsal Yönetim İlkeleri, 2005).

CMB underlines that principles are primarily set for the publicly held listed companies. Yet, it is considered that other listed companies and institutions in both public and private sectors can find an application domain for these principles. CMB does not set CG as an obligation, though it stresses that functions of companies in this issue will be monitored (Kurumsal Yönetim İlkeleri, 2005).

“Whether principles will be fulfilled or not is up to will. However, it is required to explicate in the Annual Report and explain to public whether these principles are fulfilled or not, if not the reason of this, whether there is a plan to change companies management practice within the line of these principles because of the conflict of interest that emerged due to not implementing these principles. Rating institutions that rate corporate governance will determine the level of implementation of these principles in accordance with the regulations set by CMB”

As above mentioned, CMB does not keep corporate governance implementations as prerequisite, yet makes it compulsory to explain the functions in this issue. CMB tries to send a message to the companies that they are being monitored through this way. According to the results of a research held by Corporate Governance Association, considerable number of companies in sampling does bewares of the CMB Corporate Governance Principles (71%) and regards these principles as beneficial to improve transparency and effectiveness in the markets (74%). 90% of the publicly held companies’ representatives agree that these principles will help to develop transparency and effectiveness in the markets. In addition, according to same research results, most of the companies (97%) support that long-term success can be achieved by satisfying stakeholders. On the other hand, it is stated that only 65% of companies have written formal company policy about stakeholders and only %60 of companies have formal ethics code. Besides that, 79% of companies explicate their practices about stakeholders in their annual reports (Türkiye Kurumsal Yönetim Haritası, 2005).

As seen from these data, although the his-
tory of corporate governance practices led by CMB is very short, it presented a considerable spread among companies in Turkey. At this point, it is necessary to remember different views on spread of managerial techniques and practices. Many of the approaches in organization theory argue on the basis of strategic choice theory that spread of innovations is part of rational choice of organizations (Montanari, 1978; 1979; Beckert, 1999; Ang and Cummings, 1997). It is also important to examine spread of CG, which emerges by the directions of CMB, among Turkish companies from the view of corporate spread mechanisms. On the other hand, another crucial question is how effective companies use the regulations, they declared to have, in their daily practices. At this point, it is necessary to examine in depth whether there is a decoupling or not (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). In other words, whether or not the regulations on corporate governance is just written on the paper and not implemented, whether or not these regulations have an effect to change daily practices of company are the questions that need to be considered beyond just focusing on company’s declarations.

Same questions are valid for regulations set regarding the human resource management practices in the framework of corporate governance. On the other hand, from the perspective of RDT, CMB as a strong environmental actor becomes a figure that can influence HR systems of companies besides their strategic choices. Therefore, it is necessary to study which principles CG regulations set by the direction of CMB in Turkey determine in the field of human resource management.

3.1. The Role of Stakeholders in Corporate Governance and Regulations on Human Resource Management

In CMB model, HRM practices required from companies are placed in the title of “Stakeholders”. Regulations of CMB that are expected about the employees in the model of CG set as following (Kurumsal Yönetim İlkeleri, 2005):

- The principle of providing equal opportunity to people at equal conditions while preparing career planning and forming personnel selection and recruitment policy is fulfilled.
- Criteria about personnel recruitment is set as written and these criteria are fulfilled in practice.
- Workers are treated equally in training, promotion etc. Education plans are made and education policies are set in order to enable workers to enhance their knowledge, skill and visions.
- To create employee commitment, ideas and views are exchanged with employees by arranging meetings on issues such as financial facilities of the company, career, training, health etc.
- Employees or their representatives are informed about decisions related to employees or developments that interest employees.
- Job description and distribution, performance as well as rewarding of employees in the company are determined by managers and announced to employees.
- Efficiency and other significant factors are taken into consideration while setting the wages and other benefits that will be given to employees.
- Safe working environment and conditions are provided for employees and those conditions as well as environment are constantly improved.
- Opinions of related unions are taken while making decision on changes related to employee personal rights, working environment and, conditions.
- Measures are taken in order to prevent race, religion, language and gender discrimination among employees as well as to protect employees from physical, psychical and emotional maltreatment inside the company.

As understood from the principles of the model, regulations related to all systems and processes about human resource manage-
ment, such as personnel recruitment, selection, training, career planning, compensation and rewarding, communication, protection of employee personal rights, workers’ health, job safety and prevention of discrimination, are envisaged in the framework of CG.

In a research held by CMB on 303 companies traded in ISE, 56% of the companies placed in ISE 30 answered the question “Is there a mechanism to regulate employee commitment?” as yes. Similarly, 76% of companies in the sampling express to have specific set criteria for personnel recruitment and promotion mechanism. 82% of companies admit that they have training programs to increase knowledge and skills of employees. 74% of companies explain that they arrange information meetings for employees about compensation, career, training, health etc. 77% of companies express to have performance and rewarding criteria for employees (SPK Araştırma, 2004).

As underlined by the results of this research, organizations considerably take an interest in CMB model. The rest of this study focuses on the detailed analysis of what kind of answers organizations give to HRM practices within the frame of CG model.

4. Method

The aim of this research is to determine how the corporate governance model of the CMB being the top institution at the financial market regulations in Turkey influences the HR practices of the listed companies. It is supposed that the position of CMB as an environmental factor that determines the acquisition of funds which are critical sources for companies creates a dependency relation and power balance between the Board and companies. In this framework, the regulations CMB requires through corporate governance model are expected to create a determining effect on HRM as well.

4.1. Sampling

This research includes the first 100 companies listed in Istanbul Stock Exchange (ISE 100) in Turkey. The annual reports of 96 companies out of the 100 which were explained to public in 2005 and 2006 have been reached via internet. Therefore, this research focuses on the analysis of the information given in the “Corporate Governance Consistency Report” part of the annual reports.

4.2. Data Collection

The information given under the headline of “Stakeholders” in the corporate governance consistency reports of the companies listed in ISE 100 forms the data set of this research. The content analysis has been applied to the text parts in the reports which include statements about the regulations on HR practices (Silverman, 2000). Each HR practice envisaged by the model has been coded by a specific word and determined by the researcher in the 96 annual performance reports. Every determination related to the each practice is evaluated through “exist”, “not exist” and “no information”. By this analysis, it is aimed to find out how many HR practices expected by CMB are regarded and realized by the companies.

4.3. Results

In CMB corporate governance model, commitment of employees is considered, in a wider perspective, as the participation of stakeholders. Especially it is questioned in what ways the shareholders can influence the management decisions. Commitment of employees does not imply that employees will join the companies’ decisions together with the top managers. Instead it is questioned whether or not there are communication channels that allow employees to deliver their opinions and problems to directors. The meaning loaded by the companies to the concept of “commitment” seems more like taking ideas of employees and informing them.

In this framework, CG model sets it necessary that the employees should be informed about the changes related to them and com-
pany in general. 82 out of 96 companies in the sampling express that they inform their employees regularly. This notification, as it is declared in the reports, is made mostly via intranet, by regular bulletins and meetings. 8 of the companies explicate that they do not have any information mechanism for employees while 6 of the companies do not make any statement about this issue in their reports.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee information</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 of the companies in the sampling state that they have regulations for enabling employees’ commitment. While 33 companies express they do not make any policy about this issue, 19 of them do not give information about commitment. This means that approximately 50% of the companies do not have any declared policy on this issue. Commitment of employees, as mentioned above, is realized through tools such as participation to meetings, team works, employee satisfaction survey, suggestion systems. There is no example for participation to decision-making.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee commitment</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 of the companies express that they periodically evaluate the satisfaction of their employees via surveys. There is no data in corporate governance consistency reports of the rest 71 companies concerning whether or not they apply a satisfaction survey.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee satisfaction surveys</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestion systems, which are considered to be another tool for enabling commitment of employees, are being applied in the 20 out of 96 companies in the sampling. It is stated that there exists a system that forwards the suggestions of employees to the higher administrative bodies. It is also underlined that having considered the suggestions, the owners of the suggestions which are accepted are rewarded. However there is no explanation in the reports regarding the type of awards, or which employees the suggestion system is available. Satisfaction surveys and suggestion systems, compared to other HR practices, are limitedly outspreaded among companies.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee satisfaction surveys</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another practice considered to be crucial in CMB model and taken into consideration in terms of participation of employees is the selection of HR representative. Selection of HR representative is an activity that consistency occurs at the lowest level among companies. At the model it is underlined that it is necessary to assign an HR representative who will represent employees as opposed to company management. Yet among the companies listed in the ISE 100, only 13 of them state the existence of such representative. 26 companies express there is no representative, while 57 companies do not give any information about this issue in their reports.
The findings regarding the union representation is consistent with the low level unionization in Turkey. Only 20 out of 96 companies have labour union and the representatives of these unions work in the companies. 2 companies declare that they do not have union representatives, while 74 of them do not give information about whether there is union representative or not.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human resource representation</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59,38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other data that could be interesting in terms of Turkey’s context is about discrimination. In CG model of CMB it is considerably highlighted that equality should be taken as core factor regarding the employees’ decision and discrimination should not be used. According to the data taken from corporate governance consistency reports, none of the 96 companies have recorded any complaint about discrimination. While 47 companies declared that there is no declared complaint, 46 companies give no information in their corporate governance consistency reports in this subject. From this table it is not correct to tell that there is no discrimination. Instead this table demonstrates that it is necessary to evaluate in depth and comparatively the discrimination concept and the declaration behavior both of which differentiate from culture to culture.

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union representative</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77,08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another activity most of the companies in the sampling declare to have is the existence of a written HR policy. 88 out of 96 companies state to have a written HR policy. Seven companies proclaim not to have any written HR policy. Only one company in its report does not give any information regarding this subject. Existing HR policies are mostly explained in the corporate governance reports. One of the underlined points in the policies is that the HR policies prepared in written and distributed to all employees are determining in decisions about whole HR systems and are applied to all employees without any exception. Second point is that the way the aim of the policies to create what kind of an HR profile is being explained demonstrates great similarity. Most of the companies target at having employees who are “participatory, creative, open to develop himself, eager to learn, improving its performance constantly and bound to his company”. It is observed that HR policies, which aim at improving its employees as a source of competitive advantage and which should be formed in line with strategy of organization, do not comprise any expression of unique. The HR policies, which are supposed to be based on discriminating formulation as a result of strategic choice of organizations, in fact consist of quite astonishingly similar expressions.

### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints about discrimination</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51,04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human resource policy</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another similarity occurs in the existence of performance appraisal and training systems. More than half of the companies in the sampling express to have regularly set training programs and they declare that they give importance to the career development of their employees. Expressions like “investing to human” or “human resource as the most important investment” are often used in the related reports. Especially companies in banking and automotive sectors do have such systems. It is possible to underline that training and performance appraisal systems based on talents are also widespread among companies.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance appraisal system</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and development system</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

In order to explain the question “which HR practices do organizations choose and why” it is not enough to focus only on the analysis and variables at organizational level. It is also necessary to include the technical and corporate context in which organizations function as well as the relation between organizations into the analysis. RDT explains the relations between organizations and impact of this relation upon organizational behavior with the terms called “interdependency” and “power”. According to this theory, the relationship that organizations get into with the other environmental actors and organizations in order to realize an operation or to acquire a source, produces a symmetric or asymmetric dependency relation. Organizations can also generate solutions by making structural, relational or behavioral changes in order to shape this dependency relation for the sake of their interest and targets.

It is not possible to see the whole picture if the HRM choice and behavior of organizations is examined independent from the relations between the organizations. For instance, it is also crucial to evaluate the impact of regulations which are supported by many economic actors in the world, such as application process to the quality control models, joint ventures among companies or corporate governance, on the HRM. Organizations within this web of relations are led to adopt several HR practices such as carrying out team work, enabling participation of employees, improvement of talents, evaluating employee satisfaction. Only the variables at organizational level, for example the determinants like strategy, scale or technology, are inadequate to explain which HR practices become prevalent and why.

In this study, the corporate governance reports of the companies which are operating in Turkey and listed in ISE 100 were examined. The aim of this study is to find out how the corporate governance model suggested by the CMB influences the HR practices of the organizations since the CMB is the highest regulatory and supervisory board upon the acquirement of the fund sources by the finance markets, so the organizations. CMB with its authority and relationship which it creates with the organizations regarding the fund sources is a board that has the dependency relation predicted by the RDT. The Board suggests to the organizations a corporate governance model and declares to follow the activities in this field and takes this model as the preliminary study about the binding regulations for the future. Therefore this corporate governance model suggested by the CMB puts forth a series of demands.
and expectations regarding several issues.

The findings of the research show that almost all of the 96 companies that corporate governance consistency reports have been examined made declaration to CMB about HRM. Informing employees, enabling participation of employees and forming a written HR policy are the widespread practices among the companies in the sampling. Having a union representative parallel to the level of unionization is one of the lowest accepted practices. Regarding the discrimination which is specifically emphasized in the CMB model, none of the companies in the sampling declared to have a recorded event. Employee satisfaction survey and suggestion systems are also among the relatively less widespread practices among the organizations.

Another finding of the research with secondary quality is the similarity that comes into place especially in the formulation of HR policies or in the definitions of employee’s profile that organization desires. It is possible to expect regulations like corporate governance model which are half-dependent regarding certain group of organizations to have an impact of unification on the HR practices. This approach is contradictory with the basic arguments of resource based theory and orthodox strategic human resource management theory, since the studies based on these arguments is edited upon a human resource assumption, which has unique qualities and provides competitive advantages to organizations, and the way to reach this assumption. Yet some clues are found that HR practices get similar to one another with the impact of relationship between organizations. This reminds that the studies about the reasons of adopting HR practices or spread of these HR practices should be more versatile and fed by different theories.

Needless to say that corporate governance model suggested by CMB is not the only reason to adopt specific HR practices. Monitoring the impact of CMB through corporate governance model via longitudinal researches would provide more accurate results.

However despite the short history of the corporate governance in Turkey, it is observed that almost all of the organizations examined have annually reported the information about HR practices in line with the CMB demands. Thus this shows that guidance in this field have been considered by the organizations. In some of the examined reports, it is stated that preparations about training, performance appraisal or compensation systems have been continuing and these systems will be effectuated soon. This declaration of intention can also be accepted as an indicator of compliance with the demands shaped by the corporate governance model.
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