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Introduction

Industrial design (ID) is a fairly young and largely unknown profession in Turkey. Although significant developments have taken place in the field of ID in the past 15 years, the scope of scholarly attempts to analyze the sociological meaning of designing in the Turkish context is extremely limited. By and large, the studies that have investigated the professional development of ID in Turkey have focused on educational and economic aspects and have overlooked sociological dimensions. ID activity is largely obscured behind a curtain of mystification created mostly by the superficial “curiosity” of the popular media.

We use boundary work and professional ideology as salient concepts for understanding the ongoing professionalization process of Turkish industrial designers, who are developing professional identities and striving for recognition in the larger culture. Literature on the sociology of professions typically depicts professional groups as “interest groups” whose goal is “establishing and maintaining a privileged position” and autonomy in society and the labor market. To achieve this goal, every professional group—especially in younger professions—engages in various struggles with other stakeholders, such as the State, other professional and non-professional groups, and the general public. These struggles entail boundary work wherein industrial designers construct a professional ideology to demarcate professionals from non-professionals and their professional turf from that of other professional domains. Thus, professionalism is not an essential quality but an ongoing ideological process of boundary construction and maintenance.

This paper relies on 20 semi-structured interviews conducted with key players (i.e., ideologues) of the Turkish ID scene to analyze these boundary-work processes. We found that the positive collective identity of Turkish industrial designers is built on a formulation of negative others. These negative others are ideological antagonists that are pushed to the “other” side of the demarcation line. Negative others are especially dominant in the professional ideology of Turkish industrial designers because the perceived threats from these antagonists shape the collective consciousness.
However, the construction of these others is an ambivalent process in which they also become ideological “friends.” We also demonstrate that professional ideology plays a pivotal role in producing, reproducing, and legitimizing claims of professionalism.

**Boundary Work and Professional Ideology: A Conceptual Framework**

If a profession is indeed a special type of privileged occupation that “has been given the right to control its own work,” it follows that every profession strives to monopolize a specific domain of expert knowledge. Such monopolization requires a boundary construction and maintenance process that distinguishes experts from nonexperts. Furthermore, professionals are engaged in endless jurisdictional disputes with other professionals who compete for dominance over the same terrain of knowledge. This is a battle to secure scarce social resources that are vital for the long-term survival of occupational groups.

A professional ideology forms the socio-cognitive basis of boundary work. As the “basis of social representations” of a specific group, a professional ideology serves three purposes that generate distinctions between in-group and out-group. First, a professional ideology defines the membership criteria for a certain group so that it can exclude “others.” The notion of otherness is typically created through a marginalization process by applying certain labels, such as “pseudo,” “deviant,” and “amateur.”

Second, when a profession strives to expand its jurisdiction, professional ideology “heightens the contrast between rivals.” Third, professional ideologies formulate scapegoats to blame when professionals need to escape from the repercussions of their own actions.

This non-pejorative conception of ideology is very different from the pejorative classical approaches that are often attributed to Marx, Engels, and their contemporary followers, such as Lukacs, Gramsci, and Althusser. From this perspective, ideologies are false beliefs that obscure real social situations and thus serve to delude others. This pejorative notion of ideology is epistemological in the sense that it contrasts ideology with knowledge. In contrast, our use of the term professional ideology is neutral and sociological insofar as it serves to bind individuals to specific social groups’ collective interests. Professional ideologies entail truth and falsity simultaneously.

**Context of Industrial Design in Turkey**

Not all professional groups develop strong ideologies. Boundary work and hence professional ideologies become sharper when there is a perceived social threat from other social groups or from the labor market.
ID education started in Turkey in a rather peculiar fashion—before the actual need in industry materialized.\textsuperscript{14} When ID programs initially emerged in the 1970s, the Turkish economy, under a strict domestic market orientation, was governed according to the Import-Substituting Industrialization (ISI) policy. In such a market, where neither competition nor serious investment in technology and R&D occurred, the differentiation and competitive advantage provided by ID was unnecessary.\textsuperscript{15}

The first generation of Turkish industrial designers therefore had virtually no opportunity to work in their own fields. They became academics, completely abandoned their profession, or had to switch to allied fields, such as interior or graphic design, where competition was fierce. Only a few found chances actually to work in their own field.\textsuperscript{16} The frustration experienced by the first generation of industrial designers contributed to a bitterness toward industry and education that resonates even today.

Although the ISI policies ended after the military coup in 1980, the transition to liberal economic policies did not change a great deal for industrial designers during the 1980s. Not until the late 1990s did ID education and the need for the services of industrial designers both begin to expand. Increasing liberalization of the economy, coupled with Turkey’s entrance to the customs union with the European Union, both intensified the competition in the domestic market and caused exports to expand dramatically.

Meanwhile, expansion of ID education brought new problems. Although the 2000s witnessed a dramatic expansion in the number of design schools and undergraduate students, the actual demand for ID professionals lagged far behind.\textsuperscript{17} This oversupply of industrial designers dragged wages down and created a highly competitive labor market in a business environment where local enterprises did not fully comprehend or perceive design’s contribution to their competitive advantage. Moreover, a deep dissonance has resulted from the cultural rift between the culturally conservative owners of small- to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which form the bulk of Turkish industry, and the industrial designers, who typically express more progressive perspectives in society. The culturally modernist roots of ID education have further widened the gap between industrial designers and SME owners.\textsuperscript{18}

### Data and Method

To explore the boundary work and resulting professional ideology of industrial design, we conducted semi-structured interviews with 20 Turkish industrial designers who work and live in Istanbul, the economic and cultural capital of Turkey.\textsuperscript{19} According to van Dijk, no member of an interest group can possess a complete ideology.\textsuperscript{20} Nonetheless, elite members—who can also be

\textsuperscript{14} Er, “The State of Design.”

\textsuperscript{15} Er, “A Creative Convergence of Modernity, Globalization and Tradition.”

\textsuperscript{16} Er, “The State of Design”; and Er, “A Creative Convergence.”

\textsuperscript{17} Between 2000 and 2014, the number of degree-granting undergraduate programs in ID in Turkey had grown from 6 to 25.

\textsuperscript{18} Er, “A Creative Convergence.”

\textsuperscript{19} The original sample included 14 industrial designers. After the initial coding process, we went back to the field and collected data from six more respondents.

\textsuperscript{20} Van Dijk, Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach.
defined as the ideologues—tend to possess a more elaborate and articulate version of their group’s ideology because they play active roles in producing, reproducing, and expressing ideology in the public sphere. For this reason we used judgment sampling in selecting the interviewees. Also called purposive sampling, this technique enables a researcher with a deep knowledge of his/her population of interest to purposefully target certain “atypical” respondents. Because we are both active members of the Turkish ID community and thus have a fairly profound knowledge of our population of interest, judgment sampling proved to be a reliable method for selecting our respondents. Our sample comprised six academicians, seven in-house designers, and seven freelance designers.

Based on our conceptual frameworks, we created a semi-structured interview protocol that included questions such as: How do you define ID and industrial designer in Turkey? Are there any differences between the things you feel you should do vs. what you actually are expected to do in the context of professional work? What do you think about the public perception of ID in Turkey? What is the biggest threat for ID in Turkey?

The interviews varied in length from two to three-and-a-half hours. They were audiotaped, transcribed verbatim, and coded to allow comparisons to be made within and between interviews. Most of the respondents were interviewed in their work environments; this setting gave us unique, first-hand insights regarding their professional lives and relationships, which are compiled as field notes.

Research Findings: Antagonists and Shifting Boundaries
Our analysis of the boundary work of Turkish industrial designers revealed that the collective identity of Turkish industrial designers is largely shaped by perceived threats from four ideological antagonists. These negative others, insofar as they contribute to the generation of a positive self-image, become the locus of their professional ideology. The perceived threats from these antagonists contributed to the formation of a blurry boundary that separated industrial designers from nonprofessionals and from other professionals. The boundary is blurry because industrial designers’ relationships to these antagonists is not simply a one-way threat perception but rather an ambivalent love–hate relationship.

The first and perhaps the most prominent ideological antagonist is the industry. From this perspective, the industry is a negative other that fails to recognize the significance of the ID profession and the “outstanding skills and talents of Turkish industrial designers” (FD3). Oblivious to innovation and plagued

22 They had 5 to 35 years of professional experience and held at least a bachelor’s degree in industrial design. The mean age for the sample was 42 years old, and 9 of the 20 participants were female industrial designers.
23 In this section, we used direct quotes from certain respondents only when these quotes reflected a larger consensus within our sample. This strategy ensured that we discerned larger patterns and not idiosyncrasies. Any exceptions are noted in the text.
24 In the everyday parlance of industrial designers in Turkey, the industry connotes a number of different terms; thus, it is a fuzzy term. It can mean the client, the workplace, the capital, or the companies who employ industrial designers.
25 Throughout the rest of this paper, all respondents are referred to by title and a number to protect their anonymity. Academics are identified with codes A1-6, in-house designer with codes IHD1-7 and freelance designers with codes FD1-7.
by a lack of design culture, clear vision, and necessary organizational abilities, these companies should be educated by “missionary” industrial designers. As one designer (IHD2) put it:

There is no design culture but a big ignorance. Visionary companies do not exist in Turkey. Worse than that, firms do not know how to work with designers. No matter how professional and sophisticated our approaches are, we always have to put up with huge gaffes. It is all because of those ignorant people who control the money and the power.

The problem becomes even more complex because of the “distorted definition” of ID in the Turkish context, which is based on an “unconscious” perception largely produced by the ignorance of the industry. This distorted definition oscillates between two extremes. Either industrial designers are seen as mere “technicians” who are capable only of using certain computer-aided design (CAD) packages, or ID is perceived as a form of visual art that is associated only with creating “fanciful,”(IHD3) “aesthetic,”(A6) and “charming”(A5) forms. One academician (A5) articulated the latter as follows:

Contrary to a profound approach that tries to identify the latent needs of the consumers, Turkish firms focus on those little “visual innovations.” Therefore, industrial designers generally work on the stylistic qualities of the products and endeavor to make them more “beautiful.” What does beautiful mean?

Whatever the definition, the result is the same: Novel or “conceptual” products that inherit “real” design innovations cannot be implemented. Turkish industrial designers have the skills and the potential to design products that can “really change the world”(FD1 only). Yet this is only a wishful utopia given the current perception of design and the nonvisionary, conservative client base.

In contrast to this perspective, the industry also is an inevitable partner, a comrade for whom all sorts of sacrifices should be made. In this second view, ID is a key component to ensure healthy economic growth and a dramatic increase in exports. Novel products and services with added value are the most effective means to survive and thrive in the competitive context of the knowledge economy. Hence, one of the primary goals of Turkish industrial designers is to provide competitive benefits to the national industry and economic benefits to their society at large. Industrial designers are also responsible for creating a world vision that can integrate Turkish companies—especially SMEs—into the global
economic system. Such a profound transformation can be made possible only by the holistic and interdisciplinary character of the ID profession, which has the potential to bridge the various gaps between the different functions in a company.

The tension between these two extremities constitutes a deep fissure in the shared mental realm of Turkish industrial designers. However, this tension is not the only turbulence that contributes to the ambivalent identity and fuzzy boundaries of the profession. The paradoxical image of the Turkish industry is mirrored by the equally problematic conception of the second ideological antagonist, the general public.

The general public also is characterized as both ignorant and unconscious: “No one knows what industrial designers exactly do” (FD2). Once this negative rendering is formulated, it is immediately transformed into a salient component of the positive self-identity: If the public is ignorant and unconscious, then the industrial designers should embark on a cultural mission to educate the “uninformed masses.” The aim of this “education process” is twofold: First, the people should be told what ID is so that “design culture” can flourish in Turkey. Second, and more importantly, the respondents see themselves as responsible for “improving the public’s taste.” Although the interviews revealed a consensus concerning the prominence of this “mission,” how such an ambitious agenda might be actualized was not clear. For some participants, educating the public is possible only by creating a coherent design discourse, whereas for others, it is a matter of “doing the job properly” (FD2). If industrial designers design “elaborate and quality products” (A1 and A6) that express “certain aesthetic values,” (IHD4) masses can be educated without an extra effort. That is, an improved material culture will automatically bring about better taste in the public (A4 and A5). It is the industrial designer’s duty and responsibility to always be one step ahead of the public. As professionals whose job is to “foresee the future,” (IHDS) industrial designers should not design for the current conditions but for an ideal society that they long for (IHD2). According to one academician (A3):

> Every single person who occupies a responsible position must work toward improving the society. For me, no politician, no leader, or no designer has the luxury to ask the public what they want. There is no question in that. For instance, if we ask the people: “Shall we open up the North Istanbul forests for settlement?” 98.8% will definitely say yes. Will you do it? No, definitely not! You must not do what the public wants. You must not give in to them. You can go to the public, yes, but only for raising their expectations and tastes to a higher level.
At this point, consider again Abbott’s concept of jurisdiction. Abbott observed that “in claiming jurisdiction, a profession asks society to recognize its cognitive structure through exclusive rights.” This aspect of the boundary work is crucial, given that boundary construction and maintenance typically require external legitimizing bodies. Abbott identifies three spheres in which a jurisdictional claim to legitimization can take place: the legal system, public opinion, and the workplace. At present in Turkey, no government-enforced licensure mechanism is in place for ID or industrial designers that can secure for it a monopoly in the labor market. Thus, industrial designers push their jurisdictional claims in the remaining two arenas, public opinion and the workplace. This move is rather paradoxical because the industry (read “the workplace”) and the public are both postulated as ideological antagonists.

Industrial designers overcome this problem with a strategic yet equally paradoxical maneuver: by creating *alter personae* that lurk beneath the visible surface of the antagonists. We have already shown that, in the case of the industry, the *alter persona* materializes in the form of a comrade. Another alter persona who resides within the vague notion of the general public is the *user*. The user is foremost a court of appeal to determine the legitimacy of industrial designers’ claim to professionalization. She or he also is one of the most basic reasons industrial designers exist. More often than not, industrial designers see themselves as the advocates of the user in the new product development processes. Ignoring the inherent dilemma is impossible. By definition, the user is a part of the “unconscious public.” How, then, can industrial designers trust the user as the audience for the claim to jurisdiction?

The third, and perhaps the most interesting, ideological antagonist is the “designer.” From a boundary-work perspective, this figure is especially noteworthy because knowing where it actually stands is difficult to determine. It occupies the gray area between the professional and the non-professional realms. The designer is a complex “other” that has three alter personas: *star designer*, *self-styled designer*, and *incompetent industrial designer*. Distinctions among these three personas are not clear; significant overlaps can occur. For example, a star designer can also be a self-styled designer without the proper university education, and an incompetent industrial designer can become a star.

The industrial designer is a self-sacrificing “silent hero” who seeks higher goals and strives to produce “real” ID work for the betterment of the Turkish society and industry. The self-styled designer, meanwhile, is a self-seeking, self-absorbed individual with a lot of money and spare time, according to FD4 and thus is effectively on the other side of the professional
boundary. His or her only motive is to become a famous and popular “star designer.” The star designer typically has high visibility in the public eye, whereas the silent industrial designers, who “do the real work,” (IHD4) are largely behind the scenes. This dynamic especially infuriates the “real” industrial designers, who, in fact, long for more public visibility and recognition.

Nourished by the superficial perspective of the populist, mainstream media and the powerful yet erroneous imagery produced by fashion designers, the “unconscious public” perceives the designer as a “half-mad eccentric that brings color and joy to our lives through wonderful little objects” (A3). This peculiar figure is capable of performing “hocus-pocus tricks with a slight gesture of a hand” (IHD1). The “so-called design press,” which desperately needs “glamorous stars,” contributes to the making of this strangely popular yet misleading representation. A2 describes the star designer this way:

A designer, as it is perceived, is a person who lives in a certain circle. That specific person does not care about the manufacturability of the things she designs. Her only concern is to underline her name and become famous. What does this individual do? She takes the centuries-old tulip-shaped tea glass or the water pipe, and—without even thinking why—turns them into robot-like, makeshift things, which bear no real design elements or designerly concerns. Moreover, these people live in certain regions of Istanbul and, if you ask me, are very far from the realities of the real world and the society they live in. They are so much alike to Servet-i Fünun poets.27 I cannot call them artists. I cannot call them industrial designers. First, [they] design chairs that cannot be sat on, and then glasses no one can drink from. They continuously participate in activities that occur in a small circle. To add the finishing touches, find some crazy shoes and outfits that no one knows where they can be purchased…. In fact, they are trying to form a high society of design. I cannot call it design elite as elite is something good, something advanced. [Italics added.]

Where industrial designers use systematic and well-disciplined design methods and processes to move toward well-defined goals, the self-styled designer is an individual who acts on “impulse” and mere “inspiration.” Although some industrial designers are “talented,” even without a proper university education, a legitimate diploma draws a sharp line between the self-styled designers and industrial designers. Accordingly, ID education provides individuals with the necessary discipline, systematic approach, rigorous design methods, and, most importantly, designerly ways of thinking. Therefore, a diploma is not only a token of technical

27 Servet-i Fünun was a late nineteenth-century avant-garde Ottoman literary movement that championed the idea of “art for the sake of art.” The followers of this movement were frequently criticized for their perceived disconnect from the everyday realities of the Ottoman era.
competence but also a sign of dedication that bestows upon industrial designers significant responsibilities toward the society they live in. However, this credentialist approach is not reflected by the labor market structures because industrial designers are not protected by a legal licensing mechanism.

Another factor that obfuscates the “reality” and contributes to the distorted image of ID in public is the so-called “design fairs” that have been organized under different names (e.g., “ADesign Fair” and “Istanbul Design Week”) since 2003. These fairs were denounced as “dangerously misinforming” (FD2, FD3, FD5, A1, A2, A4) by the vast majority of the respondents. Originally initiated as part of an ongoing effort to bring industrial designers and representatives of the industry together to establish business relationships, they became “circuses” in which design, arts, crafts, and “a large number of other anomalies” were presented in a chaotic, almost “surreal” environment (IHD4). A few representatives of the industry who were unfortunate enough to visit these fairs began to think that all industrial designers are “worthless, crazy eccentrics” (A4):

What do those people who participate in design weeks or who appear in the popular media say? “We were sitting and thinking with some friends and suddenly a marvelous idea has appeared. We immediately went to the nearby grocery store and picked up two orange crates and put one on top of the other... At home, we had some ping-pong balls... We cut them in half and glued them over our crates.... It became so comfortable to sit on. Also we bought two hinges from the hardware store across the street. So we had a marvelous chair with foldable legs! Then we painted it with orange, and green and blue and red.... There it was!” If this rubbish appears in the popular design media with headlines such as “colorful dimensions of design,” then it becomes impossible to mention a serious design activity.

According to our respondents, this situation is further exasperated by some industrial designers’ own incompetencies. A significant number of Turkish industrial designers lack the necessary skills and professional knowledge to operate successfully in the challenging conditions of the labor market. Most new graduates and even some “experienced” industrial designers are not capable of solving their clients’ complex technical problems. Because most SMEs do not have engineering departments or the appropriate know-how to undertake successful new product development processes, Turkish industrial designers must be equipped with the engineering skills and knowledge that are needed to offer a full range of solutions (IHD1, IHD2, IHD4, FD3, and FD5). Most firms
do not have the interface to bridge the gap between conceptual ideas and production constraints. Therefore, Turkish consultants and in-house designers must provide not only traditional “industrial design services” but also a full set of product development skills (A3).

Many firms who worked with “incompetent” industrial designers had to deal with “tremendous production problems” (FD7). After having lost time, money, and other valuable resources, these companies have become extremely skeptical about ID as a profession. Some firms abandon the idea of working with designers after such incidents (FD2 and IHD7).

Who is responsible for this mediocrity? The non-academic respondents suggested that “mediocre industrial design education” is chiefly responsible for this situation. Note that, when asked about their own education, academicians also thought that it was not sufficient. Several industrial designers criticized ID education because it failed to provide a realistic picture of what industrial designers do. IHD4 reported that “most of our professors did not design a single object themselves in their entire career; they could not draw a realistic picture of the profession. Everything was theoretical.” Collaboration with industry as a component of the education is scarce. Technical know-how regarding production techniques, mechanical design, and materials—if it is taught at all—is superficial and does not prepare students for the “harsh realities” of the “real world”: “We were only trained in the soft, conceptual side of design. We lacked the necessary technical knowledge” (IHD6).

Our respondents showed a consensus on one point: Industrial designers are special people, and a large majority of the students do not have the necessary talents and traits to become industrial designers (IHD6). The ambiguity starts at this very point, in that the definition of this so-called talent differed from respondent to respondent. Some equate it with the ability to draw and visualize, while others talk about “world vision,” “aesthetic perception,” “creativity,” or “three-dimensional thinking.” The vagueness of these terms serves an ideological purpose. In line with Gieryn’s conceptualization of professional ideology, elites can bend these concepts to create scapegoats; they escape from unpleasant repercussions of professional activities because nobody knows exactly what they mean.

The fourth and the final antagonist is the engineer. Looking through the lens of Gieryn’s boundary-work and Abbott’s jurisdictional disputes clarifies why engineers are seen as negative others. Industrial designers are generally in direct contact with engineers at workplaces, which is one of the three chief arenas in which claims to professional jurisdictions take place. Although

---


Design Issues: Volume 32, Number 1  Winter 2016
members of the two disciplines are supposed to collaborate in new product development processes, the differences between the *ethoi* of the two professions are common themes in the literature.30

In industrial designers’ eyes, the dominant depiction of engineers is rather pejorative. They are resistant to change, innovation, or anything that falls outside of their narrow, limiting perspective. Their routines are endless repetitions of “mental and technical templates” that they have used for a very long time and that they never want to change. An engineer’s mind is always focused on problem solving. Hence, they tend to perceive innovations, new proposals, and creative ideas as “big problems.” As a result, the perspective of designers regarding engineers is that “they always want to sabotage your creative ideas. That is not their fault; it is their education that makes them so” (IHD10). Engineers are prone to preferring easy solutions, at the expense of more elegant, “design-driven competitive advantages that can eradicate our foreign competitors” (A6). In contrast to the idealistic industrial designers who dream of changing the world, engineers try to manipulate and control ID processes to “literally standardize everything” (IHD9). What makes them even worse, from the designers’ viewpoint, is their derogatory and devaluing attitude toward industrial designers and their expertise. For most engineers, the profession of ID is unnecessary because engineers can design products in a better and more efficient way.

Because engineering is an older area of expertise, companies do not value industrial designers’ perspective as much as they value that of engineers. “When engineering takes the reins, products may be of the highest quality. Unfortunately, such products are far from being innovative, [and are] devoid of sound concepts” (FD5). ID departments had to make a lot of compromises to “gain a foothold” in many companies; as a result, they face “grave difficulties” in changing their hierarchical positioning and prestige within the corporate structures. To do so, industrial designers must be well equipped with relevant technical skills and state-of-the-art knowledge regarding production techniques (A1).

Similar to the dichotomous depictions of the industry and the general public, the dominant pejorative conception of the engineer also carries a positive alter persona. Engineering is a “neighbor profession” (IHD5) that has to collaborate closely with industrial designers for mutual benefit. As products become more complicated, the whole design and production process requires more than just a few individuals. Such “integrated product development” processes, in which various disciplines cooperate toward common goals, is the new dominant phenomenon in research and development (A5). Despite the natural and essential contradiction between the professions of industrial design and engineering, this
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conflict is a “necessary evil” and the driving force behind many innovations. The so-called “wars” between these two disciplines are a part of a “long-forgotten past” (IHD6).

Of course, condemning the engineering profession as a whole is a significant injustice. Although some engineers are “really resistant to every single change or new proposal,” (FD1) designers also work with “many open-minded, creative engineers who try countless different methods to bring your concepts into reality.” In addition, just as stubborn engineers might insist on using certain methods, “countless stubborn industrial designers” also choose to remain unaware of the constraints of production and of industry in general (FD1).

Conclusion
We have argued that Turkish industrial designers construct a positive self-identity by creating four ideological negative-others. These four antagonists—the industry, the general public, the designer, and the engineer—form a kernel around which designers construct a professional ideology. Construction of antagonists is part of a larger boundary work that involves boundary construction and maintenance. This boundary work separates industrial designers from non-professionals and draws a demarcation line that distinguishes ID from other professions. However, the boundary is fuzzy, largely as a result of the dual character of the four ideological antagonists. Each one carries within it one or more positive alter personas. For example, the industry can be both a capricious, ignorant client without proper taste and, conversely, the raison d’etre of industrial designers. The existential dualities inevitably lead to an almost schizophrenic collective consciousness and an uneasy in-betweenness.

This situation exists partly because ID education emerged before the materialization of the actual need for ID services in Turkey and partly because of a recent oversupply of industrial designers to an unsophisticated ID labor market. Furthermore, industrial designers, their clients, and consumers typically come from very different social and cultural backgrounds. In Turkey, the consumers and clients are typically—although not always—culturally conservative; meanwhile, industrial designers come from the ranks of more liberal-leaning urbanites. The culturally modernist roots of ID education in Turkey intensify this social and cultural dissonance. That industrial designers constantly feel threatened and underappreciated, both in the workplace and in the public arena, is a natural consequence.

Apart from these contextual factors, we also suspect a universal element in the professional ideology of Turkish industrial designers. As Wang and Ilhan have demonstrated, design professions do not command well-defined, codified, and protected

knowledge bases, which leaves them more open to jurisdictional disputes from other professionals and non-professionals. In other words, the domain of designing is an ambiguous domain itself, and its shifting boundaries increase the challenges of defending it against outsiders.

Our research raises some important areas for further inquiry. An obvious next step is to compare the boundary work of Turkish industrial designers to that of industrial designers working in other countries. This comparison will allow us to determine the role of contextual and universal factors in the formation of professional ideologies in industrial design. A second possible venue of research is to analyze professional ideologies of other design professions, such as architecture and interior design, to identify similarities and differences.