



Higher Education

Governance & Policy

ISSN: 2717-8676

Volume: 3 Issue: 2

The Course of Managerialism in Turkish Higher Education: An Analysis of Quality Assurance Policies and Practices

Kadir Uysal^{1, 2*}, & Murat Peşteli³

¹Department of Sociology, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

^{2, 3}Department of International Relations, Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Türkiye

Article Type: Research Article

Corresponding Author: Kadir Uysal, kuysal@gmail.com

Cite as: Uysal, K., & Peşteli, M. (2022). The course of managerialism in Turkish higher education: An analysis of quality assurance policies and practices. *Higher Education Governance & Policy*, 3(2), 102-119. doi:10.55993/hegp.1176742

Access: <https://doi.org/10.55993/hegp.1176742>

The Course of Managerialism in Turkish Higher Education: An Analysis of Quality Assurance Policies and Practices

Kadir Uysal^{1, 2*} & Murat Peşteli³

¹Department of Sociology, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

^{2, 3}Department of International Relations, Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Türkiye

Abstract

Neoliberal policies in higher education in Türkiye started after the 1980s and manifested in managerial practices since the 2000s. This trend resulted in the commercialization of higher education and the increased managerial control over academic activity. The purpose of the paper is to study managerialism on the policies of the Council of Higher Education (Yükseköğretim Kurulu, hereafter YÖK) and its practices in universities in Türkiye. The implementation of quality assurance policies through YÖK is a key component in understanding managerialism in the university context. The paper is based on documentary analysis of quality assurance regulations as well as internal quality assurance reports of Middle East Technical University (Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, hereafter ODTÜ). Documentary analysis gave us the opportunity to track the historical course of quality assurance policies and practices. We find out that managerial policies and practices are on the rise during the last two decades in Türkiye through the requirement of quality assurance processes by YÖK, and that the reflection of YÖK requirements in university practices is variable in different managerial dimensions.

Keywords: Managerialism, Higher education, Türkiye, Quality assurance, Neoliberal university

Introduction

In early 2022, Dokuz Eylül University, one of the oldest higher education institutions in Türkiye, dismissed four academics on the grounds that they did not meet performance criteria. This incident, which was widely reported in the national press (Pehlivan, 2021, 2022; Sağol, 2022) is an exemplary case showing the managerial transformation taking place in higher education institutions. The Rectorate of Dokuz Eylül University based this decision on the failure of the four academics who are doctoral faculty members to comply with the reappointment criteria. Law on Higher Education gives higher education institutions the right to set additional measurable and auditable conditions for the reappointment of doctoral faculty members by obtaining the approval of YÖK. As a result, faculty members whose contracts were not renewed on the basis of performance criteria lost their jobs, while those who continued to work were obliged to adapt to the current system, that is, evaluation of substantive academic work by quantitative criteria. This understanding, which controls scientific activity through quantitative scales such as input-output or performance corresponds to managerialism, the final phase of transformations in university administrations all over the world.

Prior to such transformations, the idea of the university has been associated with intellectual activity since the Enlightenment. This association started to change its form following the tasking of universities with the education of the labour force by the nation-state by the turn of the 20th century, enabling the introduction of the business culture into the university setting (Veblen, 2005). Since the 1980s the business culture further penetrating academia with neoliberal policies caused major transformations in

* **Corresponding Author:** Kadir Uysal, kuysal@gmail.com

¹**ORCID:** [0000-0001-6298-017X](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6298-017X); ²**ORCID:** [0000-0003-2768-7781](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2768-7781)

(Research Article) Cite as: Uysal, K., & Peşteli, M. (2022). The course of managerialism in Turkish higher education: An analysis of quality assurance policies and practices. *Higher Education Governance & Policy*, 3(2), 102-119. doi:10.55993/hegp.1176742

Received: September 17, 2022; **Revised:** December 14, 2022; **Accepted:** December 15, 2022; **(e-)Published:** December 31, 2022

how universities are managed at the institutional, national and international levels, resulting in the prevalence of managerial thought and practices.

The penetration of business culture into the academy through neoliberal policies has resulted in the prevalence of managerial thought and practices within universities. Understood as the belief in and the practice of private sector methods within the public setting, managerialism in higher education resulted in the management of universities as business enterprises. In Türkiye, neoliberalization and the consequent managerialization of higher education followed a similar course to the global trend, with the prevalence of private sector methods increasing in universities since the 1980s. This was coupled by the effects of the Bologna process on Turkish higher education, which served to standardise academic work and resulted in the emergence of a student centered approach in the universities. A major instrument of the Bologna process over the university system in Türkiye have been quality processes. Through YÖK procedures concerning quality assurance criteria, the standardisation and privatization of academic work in Turkish universities were made possible.

In this paper, we aim at studying the course of managerial policies and practices within the university system in Türkiye. Türkiye presents an intriguing case in terms of managerialism in higher education, with a centrally controlled university system and neoliberal policies penetrating the higher education field since the 1980s. Within a political context where universities have historically been associated with political movements, Türkiye's universities are under strict government control through YÖK. This resulted in the penetration of managerialism in higher education, not through arguments of efficiency of profit from the part of universities but through the application of central policies of YÖK, crystallized in the Bologna process.

Despite the opportunity that the Türkiye case presents to study managerialism in a centrally-controlled higher education setting, a limited number of studies have been produced on managerialism within the Turkish university context. Among two studies undertaken, Sarvan and Akar's (2011) piece is showing the collegial institutional culture of Akdeniz University which did not allow managerialism to settle; Kuzu (2020), on the other hand, is focusing on the conceptual and historical evolution of the thought of managerialism. In contrast to previous studies, our paper is focusing on the origin and course of managerial policies and practices in Türkiye.

To study the course of managerial policies and practices we employ a documentary analysis method using quality assurance policy documents and publicly available yearly quality assurance reports of ODTÜ. The selection of documentary analysis, as well as quality assurance documents is due to the opportunity created in tracking the historical course of managerial policies and practices and in analysing the central control over universities through available data on policy and practice. By looking at these reports as well as at YÖK policies, we reveal the course of managerial influences in higher education policy and practices in Türkiye. Additionally, we aim at revealing how the quality policies reflect on the reported practices within universities by studying the overlaps and cleavages between documents. Finally, we discuss how quality policies and practices differ depending on different dimensions of managerialism to understand the specifics of the Turkish higher education case.

Concepts and Theoretical Background

Neoliberalism and Higher Education

Neoliberalism can be defined as a modern version of liberal thinking, taking shape in the policies of Thatcher in the UK and Reagan in the US during the 1980s. A neoliberal state is marked by privatization in sectors that are run or heavily regulated by the state such as education (Harvey, 2005). Actors in the market are responsible for their actions and wealth in terms of health, education, and well-being. This results in the retraction of the state from social policy areas and the growth of the role of the private sector in public decision-making. However, this didn't happen at the expense of state power and as a result of the retraction of the state. Harvey explains this as a radical reformulation of state institutions rather than their retraction.

Neoliberal reformulation of state institutions should be analysed by considering the different appearances of neoliberalism. Mudge (2008) makes a distinction between three worlds that neoliberalism is born out of; intellectual, bureaucratic, and political. While political and bureaucratic faces of neoliberalism reflect the changing role of the state as we conveyed from Harvey above, the intellectual world neoliberalism represents the moral neoliberal project. In its intellectual face, neoliberalism takes the market as a sacred institution and believes in its benefits over society, holding the market as the condition for attaining freedom in all aspects of life. This belief in the market as a moral compass requires the expansion of market logic onto domains that are previously accepted as public, such as higher education.

While some scholars expected the retraction of neoliberal beliefs following the 2007 crisis, neoliberal policies only changed shape and stayed even more relevant with the emergence of more authoritarian models of neoliberal practice such as the Trump administration and the recent progressive neoliberalism of the Democratic party in the US (Hursh, 2020). Under both old and new forms of neoliberalism, the effects of market logic penetrating higher education are visible in the approach to academics as human resources and to students as clients. However, there is a deeper shift beyond these effects, as the whole management and functioning of universities are formatted from a business culture perspective. For Olssen and Peters (2005, p. 324) the result is most evident in the major shift in the perception of education: 'On this model, education is represented as an input–output system which can be reduced to an economic production function'.

This is reflected in the university's institutional organization, in the move from professionalism to managerialism. Under this process called de-professionalization, the principle of autonomy is replaced with authority and control. To build such authority, the neoliberal model of university needs the presence of managers, instead of autonomous professional academics. While the advent of neoliberalism weakens the position of academics, their weakening, in turn, allows a heavier dominance of business logic through the increase of power of managers, who exert more and more control over the academic activity. This is reflected in the changing requirements of academic characteristics, with the leadership within universities turning more and more towards business-friendly academics under a neoliberal regime (Giroux, 2002).

Managerialism: Definitions and Approaches

The relationship between neoliberalism and managers is not limited to the role of managers in controlling the workforce under neoliberalism. The increased importance of managers within organizations and the emergence of managerialism predates neoliberal ideology (Burnham, 1972). Still, there are several similarities between neoliberalism and managerialism, in their theoretical roots as well as in their practicalities. This is reflected in the existence of varying views in the literature about the relationship between neoliberalism and managerialism and in the lack of agreed definitions. While some scholars adopt a practical definition of managerialism, treating it as a tool of neoliberal ideology; others treat it as a distinct ideology in itself.

Taking roots from public choice theory and new institutional economics (Peters, 2013), managerialism is defined as the emphasis on private sector practices within the public sector setting, in its simplest and most agreed-upon definition (Teelken, 2012). Among these theoretical sources, public choice theory refers to the application of economic methods to the study of public behaviours. The theory presupposes that individuals are rationally acting agents in the market who favor their self-interest and focuses on the study of the institutions of exchange between these rational actors. The theory claims that these institutions, through the actions of rational actors, result in the state of equilibrium, without any need for government intervention. Peters believes that the result of the application of public choice theory in the political field is the limitation of political relationships to non-voluntary and power involving actions only.

New institutional economics is the second theoretical source of managerialism for Peters (2013). For the proponents of new institutional economics, neither firms nor governments are not production functions, but they are governance structures. The benefit of a governance structure is that it reduces

transaction costs by finding the most efficient solutions to the problems in their respective areas. Consequently, to come up with the most efficient solutions the practice of management became closely related to the issue of the culture of governance. This not only resulted in the prevalence of governance structures in the private sector, but also in their extension to public services.

In some studies, managerial practices are defined as 'new public management' (NPM) (Bessant et al., 2015). NPM involves the application of private sector management discourses to the public sector by the use of modernization, cost-effectiveness, and efficiency arguments. However, this restricted definition of NPM disregards the ideological dimension of managerialism, based on the idea that such practices are deployed to legitimize the 'right to manage' of managers and consequently used to maintain relations of power and domination (Deem & Brehony, 2005, p. 220). Even though managers do not constitute a class, they are distinctive social groups and 'have common interests in the exercise of relations of power and domination over other employees in those settings' (Deem & Brehony, 2005, p. 231).

In this study we will adopt the approach suggested by Deem (1998), treating managerialism in an extensive scope and acknowledge its characteristic as an ideology. Deem defines managerialism as 'the adoption by public sector organizations of organizational forms, technologies, management practices and values more commonly found in the private business sector' (1998, p. 47). It is based on the belief that management, and managerialism in specific, is an objective search for efficiency, effectiveness, and excellence (Deem, 2001). When the main objective is set as the attainment of efficiency in every aspect of higher education; practices such as target setting, intrusive monitoring of effectiveness through "staff appraisal, overt measurement of employee performance and outcomes" (Deem, 2001, p. 11) become prevalent under a managerial regime.

The effects of these managerial practices become clearer in comparison to different ideas of management. Kolsaker (2008) gives a detailed overview of differences between traditional governance systems based on professionalism and collegiality and managerialism in universities. In highlighting the differences between the managerial and traditional systems, Olssen (2002, as cited in Kolsaker, 2008) provides for an ideal-type model of neo-liberal and liberal university governance. According to ideal-type models, these two governance models are marked by their differences in mode of control, management function, goals, work relations, accountability, marketing, pedagogy/teaching and research (Kolsaker, 2008). The emergence of managerial governance destructed the collegial autonomy achieved by academic professionals over their professional training, certifications of competence and conditions of work and practice (Beck & Young, 2005).

In the contrast between managerial and collegial ideals, some scholars found positive developments in the introduction of managerialism during the 1990s. Henkel (1997) mentions the positive effects the performance measurement systems had on the teaching quality by focusing on student experience. Similarly, Deem (1998) mentions that due to gendered organizational cultures of collegial universities in the UK, some women may support the advent of managerialism, with the expectation that it will create a culture of equality based on the claims of objectivity and scientific approach of managerial thought. Despite these optimistic views of managerialist practices, studies undertaken during the 2000s revealed that managerialism did not result in the shift of power within the male dominant collegial cultures (Davies, 2003). On the contrary, studies showed that gender equality is a managerial strategy to maintain consent and that managerialism has an inherent patriarchal nature (Archer, 2008).

According to other scholars, managerialism has not only replaced collegiality but also succeeded in the bureaucratic management approach. Barberis (2012), in his conceptual piece, describes managerialism in contrast to bureaucratic management. He suggests that the major difference between two is the absence of parameters and guiding spirits that bureaucratic management has in managerialism. This absence results in managerialism to be very susceptible to become self-serving, and an end itself. Barberis goes on to define five main characteristics of managerialism, as an effort to present an ideal type. The first character is change, which originates from the belief that change is good for an organization and that managers are drivers of change. The second is control, which places the managers

in a higher power position in comparison to professionals, through mechanisms to monitor and scrutinize the professional work undertaken. The third is dissemination, concerning the dissemination of the management message through changes in the language. The fourth is leadership, in order to support the change agenda within the organization. Final and the fifth characteristic is achievement, which stands for an emphasis on the outcomes rather than the processes through the use of performance indicators and measuring tools.

A Conceptualization of Managerialism in Higher Education

As given in the above section, literature on managerialism hosts numerous empirical studies in different national higher education contexts on the effects that managerialism had on scientific community, academic work and the quality of teaching. However, there are very few attempts to conceptually define managerialism despite the great need for it given the existence of several connected and inter-related concepts given in the previous section. The most comprehensive efforts to provide for an ideal type of managerialism are undertaken by Kolsaker (2008) and Shepherd (2018). Kolsaker's effort focuses on the contrast between traditional and managerial modes of governance by defining eight areas for comparison. Despite having an impressive level of detail of practices this proposal overlooks the general components of managerialism as well as underlying beliefs pertaining to those components. Shepherd's effort, on the other hand, defines both general characteristics and underlying beliefs of managerial dimensions.

Looking at various existing practical definitions of managerialism, and benefiting from Kolsaker and Shepherd's ideal types, we set out to make our own conceptualization, to achieve clarity in our study, and to apply it to the case of Higher Education in Türkiye. In terms of defining the components of managerialism, we mainly benefited from Shepherd (2018), who defines six characteristics of managerialism and their underlying beliefs. After carefully contrasting those characteristics with our data, we decided to combine two dimensions and define managerialism in five main dimensions for the Turkish higher education case (see Table 1). To define practices in relation to those five dimensions and their respective underlying beliefs, we benefited from Kolsaker's (2018) ideal type. By combining managerial dimensions in Shepherd's work which have very approximate scopes and by adding their most visible practical revelations benefitting from Kolsaker, we propose 5 dimensions of managerialism in higher education (See Table 1).

Table 1. Dimensions of managerialism in higher education

Managerial Dimension	Underlying Belief	Practices
Increased Control and Regulation of Academic Work by Managers	Management is a discrete function	Strengthening of line management function, adoption of human resource management techniques, student satisfaction orientation
Ethos of Enterprise and an Emphasis on Income Generation	Private sector methods are superior	Adoption of a business-like approach, competition between departments, branding of university, PR activities
Goal of Meeting Socio-Economic Needs	Universities' role is to solve social or economic needs and educate the labour force	Teaching according to labour market needs, government and business involvement in research
Rational Approach to Management	Management is rational and value-neutral	A shift from inputs and processes to outputs and outcomes, logical and rational decision making, measurement and quantification of outputs.
The Establishment of a Management Culture	Management is a good thing and it is universally applicable	Appointment of business people to posts within universities, increased authority of managers, development of management culture based on entrepreneurship and leadership

Among these dimensions, the first four represent practical manifestations of managerialism and are treated as a tool of neoliberal ideology used in organizational settings. The fifth dimension is defined as the ideological representation of managerialism as it involves power relations and reflects the interests of managers as a class.

Materials and Methodology

Neoliberalism, Managerialism and Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Türkiye

Before moving to the emergence of managerialism in universities in Türkiye, we start by describing the general conditions of higher education in the country. These conditions are directly linked to the neoliberal transformation process that started in the 1980s. In the period between 1960-1980, an economic model based on import substitution and planned development was implemented in Türkiye. This model entered into a phase of crisis towards the end of the 1970s (Öniş, 2004) and in response, a stabilisation and structural adjustment programme was introduced in cooperation with international organizations on January 24, 1980. (Şenses, 2016). Through this programme, the neo-liberal transformation in Türkiye was implemented with the encouragement and support of the IMF and the World Bank, constituting one of the first examples of the Washington Consensus in the world.

For the neo-liberal transformation to be implemented smoothly, political actors who were active before 1980 were suppressed by the military intervention of September 12, 1980 (Erol et al., 2016). Seen as the source of anarchy and discontent during the 1970s, the universities were also in need of strict control along with the political actors. For the members of junta, universities has to be institutions that are rational, sterile, and free from the messiness of ideological struggles as a reflection of a technocratic endeavour (Erol et. al., 2016). YÖK, as a central body controlling and regulating the higher education system, was established in 1981 in order to achieve these ends, eliminating autonomous status of universities.

In the reorganization of higher education, two guiding principles were adopted; hierarchical organization and introduction of market mechanisms (Ergur, 2003). In terms of the establishment of hierarchical structure, YÖK and the central appointment of university rectors played a vital role. Introduction of market mechanisms, on the other hand, was achieved under the guise of standardising university education and administration. In other terms, it is possible to argue that YÖK was one of the most critical institutions in the realisation of neo-liberal transformation in higher education institutions in Türkiye (Coşar & Ergül, 2015).

The establishment of Foundation Universities in Türkiye marked an important step in marketization of higher education in Türkiye. This paved the way for the emergence of private universities, on the basis that public higher education institutions were inefficient and globally uncompetitive (Birler, 2012, p. 140). The effects of the marketization of higher education are reflected in many aspects of university life. Major consequences of these effects were; commercialization on the morality of academicians (Nalbantoğlu, 2003), precarization, and deskilling of academic labour (Vatansever & Yalçın, 2015), neoliberalising subjectivities of academic workers (Budak, 2017) and transformation of the role of academic institutions for meeting market needs (Uzunyayla & Ercan, 2011).

Apart from these major consequences, the marketization of higher education in Türkiye also introduced the concept of quality assurance in the university setting. This emergence of quality assurance mechanisms, which is a consequence of the intrusion of market logic and managerialism into higher education (Beckmann & Cooper, 2013), is a relatively new phenomenon in universities in Türkiye. Limited and isolated efforts on establishing quality assurance in higher education institutions in Türkiye in the second half of the 1990s (Tekeli, 2009), remained non-institutionalized up until Türkiye participated in the Bologna Process as a part of the EU accession goal of the country.

In 2001, Türkiye officially participated in the Bologna Process. The Bologna Process was regarded by various scholars as the most recent example of the state's quest to implement neoliberal reforms (Coşar

& Ergül, 2015, p. 103). Officially, it aims at the generation of comparability of different university systems in terms of qualities and standards. As a result, several institutions were established within YÖK to achieve quality assurance and development in higher education institutions. With the Regulation of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions in 2005, YÖK introduced a requirement for universities to undertake 'evaluation and improvement of the quality of education and training, research activities and administrative services' (YÖK, 2005). To achieve this end, The Commission of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions' (YÖDEK) was established which prepared the Guidance of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions. In accordance with the Guidance prepared by YÖDEK, each higher education institution is required to prepare annual self-evaluation reports on quality practices. To coordinate quality activities within the higher education institution, the regulation requires all universities to establish their own Academic Evaluation and Quality Improvement Committee (ADEK), which would evaluate internally to what degree the mission and vision of the institution are achieved and the quality and standards are met.

The quality organization in higher education undertook a change with the introduction of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Regulation that entered into force in 2015 (see Table 2). The regulation took the requirements of quality management systems into the next and more institutionalized level. The name of the YÖDEK changed to The Higher Education Quality Council of Türkiye (YÖKAK). To replace the Guidance of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions in line with the new regulation, YÖKAK published an Institutional Self-Evaluation Directive. Also with 2015 Regulation, Academic Evaluation and Quality Improvement Committee (ADEK) was replaced with Quality Commission. This change of regulation provides for a convenient opportunity to analyse the course of quality policies in higher education in Türkiye.

Table 2. Development of the Organization of Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Türkiye

	2005	2015	Notes
Regulations	Regulation of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions	Higher Education Quality Assurance Regulation	Legal framework of quality assurance and development was first established by regulation of 2005. In 2015, new regulation replaced the previous one
Central Institutions	The Commission of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions (YÖDEK)	The Higher Education Quality Council of Türkiye (YÖKAK)	In line with 2005 regulation, YÖDEK was established within YÖK in order to organize the quality assurance in higher education institutions. With 2015 Regulation, YÖDEK was replaced with YÖKAK
Guidelines	Guidance of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions	Institutional Self-Evaluation Directive	In 2005, YÖDEK prepared the guidance of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development. In 2015, the 2005 guidance replaced by Directive prepared by YÖKAK
Organisations at University level	Academic Evaluation and Quality Improvement Committee (ADEK)	Quality Commission	Each higher education institution established their own quality assurance committees. In line with 2005 guidance, ADEK was established within universities. With 2015 directive, ADEK was replaced with Quality Commission

Methodology

The study is based on documentary analysis of university self-evaluation reports, as well as policy documents. The opportunity to access publicly available and regular data about universities' activities was the first reason to use quality reports and policies. Secondly, we wanted to look at the role of quality processes in the neoliberal and managerial turn in universities, which is studied extensively in the literature, especially within the context of the Bologna Process. By looking at the quality reports, we aimed at capturing the course of managerial practices and comparing it with the course of quality policies set out for universities. We treated enactments and reports as sources documenting policy processes and their practices (Karppinen & Moe, 2012). In doing this, we are not claiming objectivity of policy documents or reports; on the contrary, we accept that similarly to data created by the researcher, data created by others and analysed by the researcher is bound with the intentions of the author and subjectivity of the researcher. While we are aware of the limitations that documentary analysis presents in this case such as the differences between quality reports and actual quality implementations, we believe that the credibility of the documents such as policies or university self-evaluation reports narrating the actual implementation of policies mitigates this limitation. Moreover, although university reports may not inform us fully about the policy implementation, as stated by Saarinen (2008), policies and reports give us a fairly good idea of the practices by creating and supporting those practices.

In our quest to reach self-evaluation reports of universities, we initially browsed websites of relevant units of each of 73 universities, which were founded by 2002 and still operational as of August 2020. While reports after the publishing of the 2015 regulation were available for most universities, previous reports were made available online only by ODTÜ. In 2005, the drafting of yearly self-evaluation reports on quality processes became mandatory for all universities along with the requirement of making these reports publicly available. Based on this requirement we contacted the remaining 72 universities by e-mail to access the reports. Pre-2015 reports were shared by only Gazi and Trakya Universities. However, these reports were missing data and the quality of the content was not enough for a healthy analysis of our research question. As a result of our quest to access self-evaluation reports, we had only reports of ODTÜ for our required time-span and in our required data quality and availability. Accordingly, we selected ODTÜ as the case for our analysis, based on data availability and data quality constraints. We also considered the representative quality of our study in this selection as ODTÜ combines the technical university status with a strong social sciences tradition.

Based in Ankara, the capital and the second most populated city in Türkiye, ODTÜ is one of the oldest and most credible universities in the country, being founded in 1956. The founding purpose of the university was to contribute to the development of Türkiye and Middle East countries by educating specialists in social and especially in natural sciences (ODTÜ, 2011). The first departments founded were architecture and mechanical engineering. Despite being a technical university by the foundation, focusing on science, technology, research, and development, ODTÜ always had a strong social sciences research heritage as well. Currently ODTÜ offers 107 masters and 69 doctoral programmes in both social and natural sciences. It is a university in public university status and it has English as the primary language of education. ODTÜ had more than twenty-nine thousand students as of 2019. We consider that the technical university status as well as public university status of ODTÜ may affect the outcomes of this study by having an influence on the managerialist policies and practices at ODTÜ. However, considering the effect of YÖK, assimilating and closely controlling universities in all statuses in Türkiye, the representative character of the ODTÜ case becomes stronger and the study of the ODTÜ case from the point of managerialism becomes indicative for the general case of Turkish higher education.

Among the reports made available by ODTÜ, we included 2005, 2012, 2015, and 2019 reports (see Table 3) in our analysis, following the starting and ending points of quality process periods of YÖK, due to the change in the reporting format in 2015 and the unavailability of reports between 2013 and 2014. We also included policy documents within the scope of central quality processes in our analysis. Two regulations issued by the YÖK were included: Regulation of Academic Evaluation and Quality Development in Higher Education Institutions dated 2005 and Regulation of Higher Education Quality Assurance dated 2015 (see Table 2). Guidance and directive issued by relevant bodies for the use of universities in their self-evaluation processes were also included; Guidance of Academic Evaluation and

Quality Development in Higher Education version 1.1 dated 2007 issued by the YÖDEK, and Institutional Self-Evaluation Directive version 2.0 dated 2019 issued by YÖKAK (See Table 2).

Table 3. Evaluation Reports

2005	2012	2015	2019
ODTÜ-Self Evaluation Report	ODTÜ-Self Evaluation Report	ODTÜ-Internal Evaluation Report	ODTÜ-Internal Evaluation Report

In the analysis of the documents, Nvivo software was used, based on the codes created in line with the proposed conceptualization of managerialism above. These codes were the five dimensions of managerialism given in Table 1. For every practice related to five codes, we constructed a map of indicators based on our data. In total we had 46 indicators related to 21 practices of 5 codes. During the coding, a protocol was created to ensure coherence between coders. For each code keywords were determined in line with the most visible practices of managerial dimension of the given conceptualisation. These keywords were analysed using word frequency analysis and then initial analysis was verified by content analysis looking at the contexts of each keyword.

Findings

Increased Control and Regulation of Academic Work by Managers

The increased control of academic work by managers is based on the underlying belief that management is a discrete function, which should be left to managers instead of experts or professionals, independent of the work undertaken (see Table 1). In this view, a manager can manage all kinds of work, without possessing any knowledge on the work to be managed. In a university setting, increased control of academic work by managers may manifest in various ways. As given in Table 1, usual practices of this managerial dimension are: strengthening of line management function, adoption of human resource management techniques and student satisfaction orientation.

While the Student-centered approach, introduced through the Bologna process in Türkiye, takes the learner in the forefront of all education processes, it also opens the door for managerial practices, by promoting quantified, outcome-oriented and target-based approach to educational processes. This is mainly realized through the deployment of students as customers. As customers, students not only buy education as a service but also have to be pleased and satisfied by the deliverers of this service, academics. To ensure the satisfaction of the student-customers, student control instruments over academic work such as student evaluation surveys are introduced. This was undertaken in many universities around the world, as shown by Harris (2005) in the context of Australia and by Henkel (1997) in the context of the UK. Our data shows that this is also the case for Türkiye, evident in the dominant existence and of student-centered control mechanisms of academic work.

In this context, the analysis of policy documents shows a shift from the target-based approach in the management of academic work to a more student-centered approach in the control of academics. While the 2007 Guidance of YÖDEK describes in detail the process to determine the departmental targets, and how these targets will translate into personal targets of academics in the relevant departments without any reference to student satisfaction, the 2019 Directive is student satisfaction oriented, with the student-centered education counted among the criteria for the quality assurance processes (YÖKAK). Additionally, the presence of certificates of academics with regards to student-centered education is counted among the proofs for the best practice for educational approaches and techniques in the Directive. This focus is even more intensified with the student feedback system mentioned as a separate requirement for achieving maturity in the education sub-chapter of the document.

ODTÜ self-evaluation reports demonstrate parallel results to the shift in the quality policy documents. This shift is reflected in the increased focus on student-centered education approaches and tools. The

word frequency analysis shows this increased focus, with the words ‘student satisfaction’ used almost five-fold more in the 2019 report compared to the 2005 report.

While the 2005 report mentions both performance evaluation criteria and class evaluation surveys for students, the student-centered approach is not very developed at that stage. The 2012 report follows a similar approach with mentions of student satisfaction surveys and the goals to improve education quality and assessment and evaluation tools as well as evaluation of university processes through a student-centered approach lens. With the introduction of the new reporting format in 2015, we see a more developed student-centered approach along with a connection between student evaluation and performance management of academics. The naming for student-centered processes is changed from 'Student Centered Education' (ODTÜ, 2006, p. 17; 2013, p. 19) to 'Student Centered Learning, Teaching, Assessing and Evaluating' (ODTÜ, 2016, p. 32). Parallely, the number and scope of the satisfaction surveys for academic activity are increased considerably, with the introduction of new surveys directed to alumni, mid-term surveys, surveys on academic advising, surveys for systems of assessment and evaluation methods used in classes, and the publishing of results of student feedback for academics within the campus.

The 2019 self-evaluation report follows the same pattern. The report mentions; class workload survey for students, a new system of 6 parallel student satisfaction surveys, feedback form placed on the university website, seminars and training for academics on student-centered class design, and targeting 'active role of students in the implementation of the programs' (ODTÜ, 2019, p. 19). Moreover, the report points to a practice establishing clear links between student satisfaction and performance evaluation, with the results of class evaluation surveys becoming a criterion in the appointment, grading, and promotion of academics under the control of the manager. Overall, looking at the progress of the reports from 2005 to 2019, in parallel to the progress of the quality policy documents, an increase in the weight of student-centered approach is evident and this approach became an essential tool to control academic work by managers.

Rational Approach to Management

The underlying belief for the rational approach to management is that unlike other forms of government, management is rational, value-neutral and objective (see Table 1). According to this belief, this is the reason why management is the most efficient form of government. As given in Table 1, this dimension of managerialism may manifest in practices such as a shift from inputs and processes to outputs and outcomes, logical and rational decision making and measurement and quantification of outputs. In the context of Turkish higher education and ODTÜ, a rational approach to management is most visible in the emphasis on outputs and quantification practices.

2007 Guidance and 2019 Directive display similar approaches, with elements such as ‘strategic approach’, ‘targets’, ‘performance indicators’, and ‘quality’ dominant in both documents. However, using word frequency analysis in both documents, we witnessed that the usage of the word ‘output’ increased more than twofold in the 2019 Directive. This reflects the increased output orientation between 2007 and 2019, with the inclusion of program, learning, and lecture outputs, instead of an emphasis on the outputs of strategic planning and self-evaluation processes emphasized in the 2007 Guidance. Despite this increase in the output orientation, the documents display fairly similar approaches to rational management.

In parallel to what we observed in the study of the 2007 Guidance and 2019 Directive, the analysis of ODTÜ self-evaluation reports reveals a rise in the managerial dimension of a rational approach to management. This is most evident in the dramatically increased focus on outputs similarly to the legislation. The word frequency analysis of ‘output’ results in a three-fold increase between 2005 to 2012, a twelve-fold increase from 2012 to 2015, and a one and half-fold increase between 2015 and 2019 in the usage of the word. While all reports are marked by an emphasis on strategic planning and quality assurance approach, they differ in their level of intensification of the rational approach. 2005 and 2012 reports mention the determination of department and program outputs and unit performance indicators.

In the 2015 report, apart from the enlargement of output orientation to newer areas, we witnessed a major change in the establishment of an information management system, which aims to define and standardize all processes, measure performances and match these with university strategic goals and targets. The intensification of the rational management approach continues with the 2019 report, which further expands output orientation with the connection of research outputs to unit performance criteria and efforts to improve outputs of university projects. Overall, we conclude that the increased emphasis on outputs in the policy documents is well reflected in the ODTÜ self-evaluation reports, however with a difference of an additional focus on standardization, measuring, and strategic approach through the establishment of a new information management system.

Establishment of a Management Culture

Establishment of management culture is undertaken based on the underlying belief that management is a good thing for all possible situations and that it is universally applicable (see Table 1). This dimension of managerialism is manifested in practices such as; appointment of business people to posts within universities, increased authority of managers within the university and development of a management culture based on managerial values of entrepreneurship and leadership. Our documentary analysis of the cases of Turkish higher education and ODTÜ reflects varying results between different aspects of managerial culture. While there is a significant change in the development of aspects of management such as leadership, regarding issues such as the shift of authority from academics to managers or separation of academic and managerial work, the analysis did not yield any significant result.

One of the major changes between the two policy periods in the quality assurance in higher education in Türkiye is the increased emphasis on leadership and quality assurance culture in the 2019 Directive. The word frequency analysis results in the 7-fold increase of the use of ‘leadership’ from 2007 to 2019. The 2007 Guidance mentions the qualification of leadership approaches under the evaluation of administrative requirements. However, the leadership issue is much more developed in the 2019 Directive, with the establishment of leadership and quality assurance culture becoming a requirement for the self-evaluation activity of universities. The best practice offered by the 2019 Directive includes the adoption of a quality culture and leadership approach by all units and processes within the higher education institution. To achieve leadership and quality assurance culture, the institution is required to have approaches and mechanisms to measure the leadership features of its managers and its institutional culture.

Looking at the 2005 and 2012 self-evaluation reports of ODTÜ, issues such as leadership training for students emerge. While there is no evidence of a crucial change between the reports of 2005 and 2012, there is a major shift in the establishment of managerial culture after the 2015 report, which marks the introduction of new Regulation in the same year. The emphasis on leadership training is repeated after 2015. However, the analysis of 2015 and 2019 reports uncovers the expansion of such practice. The word frequency analysis shows that the word ‘leadership’ has a slight increase. However, the use of the word ‘manager’ shows a dramatic increase of almost four-fold between 2015 and 2019.

This increase is in line with the content of the report, with the 2012 report introducing management training for administrative personnel, and leadership and management training for academic personnel. Also, the emphasis is placed on the increase of managerial skills for administrative managers, and the increase in the managerial performance of the institution. The 2019 report displays an even more advanced focus on leadership and managers, with the introduction of a new management theory establishing a hierarchy of three management layers and connecting university missions and goals to the related management layers.

Overall, we conclude that the rising managerial culture through increased focus on leadership in the quality policy documents is reflected in the ODTÜ reports, coupled with an additional emphasis on management skills for various staff and institutions within the university.

Universities Meeting Socio-Economic Needs

According to the proponents of the managerialist view, universities' role is to solve social or economic needs and educate the labour force. This dimension of managerialism is manifested in practices of teaching according to labour market needs and government or business involvement in research activities (See Table 1). In many countries, higher education policies are determined by economic or development goals. In the UK, as conceptualized by Bernstein as 'regionalisation' of higher education (as cited in Beck & Young, 2005), the trend of making demand-led calculations to design higher education institutions has been popular since the late 20th century. This is also the case for Turkish higher education and is evident especially in the case of ODTÜ, owing to its status as a technical university.

Our analysis of quality policy documents reveals a significant increase in this regard. 2007 Guidance sets out a general framework for universities to address social problems and underlines the need for universities to establish relations with society, NGOs, businesses, and public bodies. The 2019 Directive takes a similar approach but develops and demands universities to institutionalize this requirement. This is reflected in the word frequency analysis, with the ten-fold increase of the use of 'stakeholder' from 2007 to 2019. More importantly, in the 2019 Directive, the vast majority of the required sub-headers of the self-evaluation process include proofs to demonstrate the participation of stakeholders in the policy-making processes in the university, including the process of program and class output determination. This is intensified with the fact that the 2019 Directive points out to universities the ways for more detailed organizational measures to include stakeholders into their processes, such as the calculation of student workload with regards to internship and business-university partnership programs as well as alumni monitoring methods.

ODTÜ self-evaluation reports from 2005 to 2019 reveals a significant increase in the level of institutionalization of universities meeting socio-economic needs. Word frequency analysis of ODTÜ reports results in a significant increase in the use of the word 'stakeholder'. While the frequency stayed constant between the 2005 and 2012 reports periods, after the introduction of the new Regulation in 2015, we witness a four-fold increase in the 2015 report, followed by a seven-fold increase in the 2019 report compared to the 2005 report. This can be linked to the increased emphasis on the role and participation of stakeholders with the introduction of new Regulation in 2015.

In parallel to what word frequency analysis displays, the content of the reports indicates an expansion in the role of external stakeholders in all of the activities of ODTÜ as well as an institutionalization of partnerships with public and private actors. The partnership initiatives are already extensive in the 2005 report. The report describes projects based on encouraging academic theses supporting industry needs, considering national needs and development goals in the design of academic programs, the high share of projects in research activities, and the presence of stakeholders in the consulting bodies of research centers. In the 2012 report, these findings are expanded with further initiatives aiming to; training researchers for industry needs, and developing partnerships for research centers.

The institutionalization of stakeholder relations takes a big step with the 2015 report with a new emphasis on the participation of internal and external stakeholders in most processes of the university and introduction of new offices and project initiatives aiming to offer paid services to industries, support to project writing and funding efforts and expanded career support activities for students. The increase in the business and public partnership offices and projects continue in the 2019 report with further institutionalization on issues such as; the discussion of the project, budget, and staff issues with external stakeholders; increased labour market support for students and graduates; increased project funding support such as financial or project consultancy support; and increased partnership protocols with public and private institutions.

In ODTÜ reports, we observed an increase in the stakeholder emphasis and cooperation with regards to private and public institutions in accordance with the course of quality policy documents. The fact that some of the above-mentioned initiatives are present in all reports from 2005 to 2019 at ODTÜ, may be explained by the fact that ODTÜ is a technical university. However, while ODTÜ places high

importance on partnerships with public and business institutions, it is also known for its excellence in social sciences. Therefore, the increasing institutionalization of stakeholder participation at ODTÜ can be connected to the changing requirements by the quality policy documents as described above.

Ethos of Enterprise

Ethos of the enterprise dimension of managerialism can be traced to the belief that private sector methods are superior, even in the public service setting (See Table 1). In the university context, this managerial dimension can be seen in practices such as the adoption of a business-like approach, competition between departments, branding of university and activities related to public relations. Our analysis of policy documents shows no significant change between 2007 and 2019 from the part of YÖK in terms of requirements from universities regarding the ethos of enterprise. Both documents are marked by similar requirements about the focus on effectiveness and productivity with no significant shift. The results of the documentary analysis of ODTÜ self-evaluation reports reveal a similar picture. We did not observe a significant shift in terms of the university's emphasis to generate income. In 2005 and 2012 reports, this emphasis is located in the offering of paid services to public and private bodies as well as subcontracting some of the services of the university to private firms.

In the 2015 report, there are some added efforts to generate income such as the founding of a technology transfer office, which aims to commercialize the results of research activities of the university. Also, initiatives to support patenting efforts of academics and to improve resource efficiency are introduced. These efforts are expanded with the adoption of a new management system based on the Japanese economic growth model and efforts to promote paid services for public and private institutions in the 2019 report. These can be commented as a similar trend to what was observed in the YÖK's quality processes, with the continuation and slight increase of income-generating activity with no significant shift involved. However, a different claim and a potential area of further study may link this lack of high emphasis on the ethos of enterprise and income generation to the public university status of ODTÜ, which frees the university from profit orientation.

Results and Discussion

When we look at the quality policy documents in Türkiye and its practices in the self-evaluation reports of ODTÜ, we noted the following points:

- Looking at the quality policy documents between 2005 and 2019, we find a significant rise in the managerial characteristics of quality-related practices required from universities
- Quality policies in Turkish higher education undertook a major shift in 2015, with increased institutionalization of managerial practices required with the new Regulation adopted
- This increase in the managerial requirements in policy is well reflected in the managerial practices of universities, as shown by the ODTÜ case
- The levels of change in practice and conformity to policy in different dimensions of managerialism are variables, dependent on the specifics of the university context

More specifically, in three of the five managerial dimensions, as we set out in our conceptualisation of managerialism, both the policy and the practice show a significant increase in the managerial aspects. These are; increased control of academic activity by managers through the increase of student-centered approach; establishment of a management culture through the increase in the emphasis on leadership; rational approach to management through a stronger focus on output orientation. In two of these three dimensions, namely, the rational approach to management and the establishment of management culture, we noted an even stronger increase in managerial practices of ODTÜ in comparison to policy requirements. Firstly, this picture hints at the dominant role of quality policies in the increased managerialisation of university practices in Türkiye. With the dominant role of the state within the university system, both political control and managerialization of higher education were made possible.

The two dimensions of managerialism where ODTÜ is revealed to be more managerial than YÖK policies indicate that university priorities are also important in managerial activity. The rise of managerialism in Türkiye is not only imposed by policy actors but also was adopted by universities, such as the case of ODTÜ. The fact that a public university without the aim of income generation such

as ODTÜ is implementing managerial practices beyond policy requirements demonstrates the prevalence of managerial culture even in academic settings.

Henkel (2005) shows how the concept of ‘strategic research’ was introduced and accordingly various forms of cooperation between private sector and universities were formed resulting in the dominance of business sponsorship in academic research in the UK higher education context. Increased partnership with businesses is an occurrence for all universities around the world, including Türkiye, as shown in our analysis of policy documents. However, ODTÜ reports show us that the importance put on business and state partnership is even more advanced than YÖK policy requirements. It is safe to assume that the high emphasis put on the role of ODTÜ in meeting socio-economic needs, is the result of its technical university status.

On the ethos of the enterprise dimension, we saw that both the policy and ODTÜ practice did not show a significant shift. This is contrary to the global trend, as shown in many studies, including the study conducted by Henkel (1997) on 6 UK universities, showing significant move to university as a corporate enterprise. The fact that in Türkiye YÖK policies are set for both private and public universities and that ODTÜ is a public university is a consideration which can possibly explain this contradiction. In any case the low emphasis on ethos of enterprise in YÖK and Turkish universities requires further study.

Out of the five dimensions of managerialism, we noted that four dimensions that are related to neoliberal ideology are more relevant for the Türkiye case. The fifth dimension; the establishment of a managerial culture, which refers to managerialism as a distinct ideology, is only relevant with the increased leadership focus within the institutional culture of universities. We conclude that the practical aspects of managerialism are stronger than its ideological aspects for the case of higher education in Türkiye.

The study of the course of managerial policies and practices in the case of Türkiye demonstrates the important role of central control in the global move to the managerial university. In a political setting where universities are seen as potential sources of social disorder, the belief in the supremacy of private sector methods can be imposed centrally and may further be deployed as a tool to increase central control through quality assurance policies. The consequences of this managerial control is a crucial topic to further investigate, especially regarding the academic identity. There are several studies undertaken on academic subjectivities in managerial times in various higher education systems (Davies & Petersen, 2005a, 2005b; Archer, 2008). However, for the case of Turkish higher education, apart from the study conducted by Budak (2017), there is an apparent need for studies exploring how managerialism acted on the subjectivities of the academics and the resulting resistance and coping mechanisms.

References

- Archer, L. (2008). The new neoliberal subjects? Young/er academics’ constructions of professional identity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(3), 265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930701754047>
- Beck, J., & Young, M. F. D. (2005). The assault on the professions and the restructuring of academic and professional identities: A Bernsteinian analysis. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(2), 183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569042000294165>
- Beckmann, A., & Cooper, C. (2013). Neoliberal globalisation, managerialism and higher education in England: Challenging the imposed “order of things”. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 8(1), 5.
- Bessant, S. E. F., Robinson, Z. P., & Ormerod, R. M. (2015). Neoliberalism, new public management and the sustainable development agenda of higher education: History, contradictions and synergies. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(3), 417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2014.993933>
- Birler, Ö. (2012). Neoliberalization and foundation universities in Turkey. In K. Inal & G. Akkaymak (Eds.), *Neoliberal transformation of education in Turkey: Political and ideological analysis of educational reforms in the age of AKP* (pp. 139-150). Palgrave Macmillan.

- Budak, Ö. (2017). Searching for authenticity and success: Academic identity and production in neoliberal times. In H. Ergül & S. Coşar (Eds.), *Universities in the neoliberal era: Academic cultures and critical perspectives* (pp. 41-59). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burnham, J. (1972). *The managerial revolution: What is happening in the world*. Praeger.
- Coşar, S., & Ergül, H. (2015). Free-marketization of academia through authoritarianism: The Bologna Process in Turkey. *Alternate Routes Critical Social Research*, 26, 101.
- Davies, B. (2003). Death to critique and dissent? The policies and practices of new managerialism and of “evidence-based practice”. *Gender and Education*, 15(1), 91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0954025032000042167>
- Davies, B., & Petersen, E. B. (2005a). Intellectual workers (un)doing neoliberal discourse. *Critical Psychology*, 13, 32.
- Davies, B., & Petersen, E. B. (2005b). Neo-liberal discourse in the academy: The forestalling of (collective) resistance. *LATISS: Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences*, 2(2), 77. <https://doi.org/10.1386/ltss.2.2.77/1>
- Deem, R. (1998). “New managerialism” and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0962021980020014>
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060020020408.10>
- Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of “new managerialism” in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980500117827>
- Ergur, A. (2003). Üniversitenin pazarla bütünleşmesi sürecinde akademik dünyanın dönüşümü [Transformation of academic world during the integration process of university and the market]. *Toplum ve Bilim*, (97), 183.
- Erol, M., Ozbay, C., Turem, U., & Terzioğlu, A. (2016). The making of neo-liberal Turkey: An introduction. In C. Ozbay, M. Erol, Z. U. Turem, & A. Terzioğlu (Eds.), *The making of neoliberal Turkey* (pp. 1-13). Ashgate.
- Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.72.4.0515nr62324n71p1>
- Harris, S. (2005). Rethinking academic identities in neo-liberal times. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(4), 421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510500238986>
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Henkel, M. (1997). Academic values and the university as corporate enterprise. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 51(2), 134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2273.00031>
- Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher Education*, 49(1-2), 155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-2919-1>
- Hursh, D. (2020). Editor’s introduction: The end of neoliberalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, 18(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210319899776>
- Karppinen, K., & Moe, H. (2012). What we talk about when we talk about document analysis. In N. Just & M. Puppis (Eds.), *Trends in communication policy research: New theories, methods and subjects* (pp. 177-194). Intellect.

- Kolsaker, A. (2008). Academic professionalism in the managerialist era: A study of English universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(5), 513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802372885>
- Kuzu, Ö. H. (2020). Yükseköğretimde işletmecilik anlayışı [Business logic in higher education]. In M. Sağır (Ed.), *Yönetimde değişen çevreye uyum mekanizmaları [Adaptation mechanisms in management to changing environment]* (pp. 285-314). Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Mudge, S. L. (2008). What is neo-liberalism? *Socio-Economic Review*, 6(4), 703. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwn016>
- Nalbantoğlu, H. Ü. (2003). Üniversite A.Ş.de bir “homo academicus”: “Ersatz” yuppie akademisyen [A “homo academicus” in the University Corp.: “Ersatz” yuppie academician]. *Toplum ve Bilim*, (97), 7.
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500108718>
- Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi. (2006). *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi 2005 Yılı Özdeğerlendirme Raporu [Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Self-Evaluation Report 2005]*. Accessed: https://adek.metu.edu.tr/sites/adek.metu.edu.tr/files/odtu_ozdegerlendirme_raporu_2005.doc
- Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi. (2011, April 29). *Tarihçe [History]*. Accessed: <https://www.metu.edu.tr/tr/tarihce>
- Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi. (2013). *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi 2012 Yılı Özdeğerlendirme Raporu [Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Self-Evaluation Report 2012]*. Accessed: http://adek.metu.edu.tr/sites/adek.metu.edu.tr/files/odtu_ozdegerlendirme_raporu_2012.docx
- Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi. (2016). *2015 Yılı Kurum İçi Değerlendirme Raporu [Institutional Internal Evaluation Report 2015]*. Accessed: <http://www.archive2016.metu.edu.tr/system/files/odtu-kidr-01072016.pdf>
- Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi. (2020). *2019 Yılı Kurum İçi Değerlendirme Raporu [Institutional Internal Evaluation Report 2019]*. Accessed: https://kidr.metu.edu.tr/tr/system/files/kidr_2019_1.pdf
- Öniş, Z. (2004). Turgut Ozal and his economic legacy: Turkish neo-liberalism in critical perspective. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 40(4), 113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200410001700338>
- Pehlivan, N. (2021). Performans kışkacı: DEÜ’de akademisyenler işsiz kalma riski ile karşı karşıya [Performance pressure: Academics in DEÜ are face to face with unemployment risk]. *Gazete Duvar*. Accessed: <https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/performans-kiskaci-deude-akademisyenler-issiz-kalma-riski-ile-karsi-karsiya-haber-1545763>
- Pehlivan, N. (2022). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi’nde akademisyen kıyımı başladı [Firing academics started in Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi]. *Gazete Duvar*. Accessed [February 7, 2022]: <https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/dokuz-eylul-universitesinde-akademisyen-kiyimi-basladi-haber-1552115>
- Peters, M. A. (2013). Managerialism and the neoliberal university: Prospects for new forms of “open management” in higher education. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, 5(1), 11.
- Sağol, B. (2022). Dokuz Eylül’de performans kışkacı [Performance pressure in Dokuz Eylül]. *Birgün*. Accessed: <https://www.birgun.net/haber/dokuz-eylul-de-performans-kiskaci-376132>
- Saarinen, T. (2008). Position of text and discourse analysis in higher education policy research. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(6), 719. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802457090>
- Sarvan, F., & Akar, N. Y. (2011). An evaluation of new managerialism in Turkish higher education: A case study on strategic planning at Akdeniz University. In H. Gümrükçü & H. Epskamp (Eds.), *Bologna Process and Turkey: Realization of the European Higher Education Area* (pp. 388-430). Yorum Basın Yayın.

- Şenses, F. (2016). Turkey's experience with neoliberal policies since 1980 in retrospect and prospect. In C. Özbay, M. Erol, A. Terzioğlu, & U. Turem (Eds.), *The making of neoliberal Turkey* (pp. 15-32). Ashgate.
- Shepherd, S. (2018). Managerialism: An ideal type. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(9), 1668. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1281239>
- Teelken, C. (2012). Compliance or pragmatism: How do academics deal with managerialism in higher education? A comparative study in three countries. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(3), 271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.511171>
- Tekeli, İ. (2009). Türkiye'de üniversitelerin YÖK sonrasındaki gelişme öyküsü [Development story of universities in Turkey after YÖK]. In T. Çelik & İ. Tekeli (Eds.), *Türkiye'de üniversite anlayışının gelişimi II (1961-2007) [Development of university idea in Turkey II (1961-2007)]* (pp. 55-225). Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi.
- Tight, M. (2019). The neoliberal turn in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 73(3), 273. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12197>
- Uzunyayla, F., & Ercan, F. (2011). Türkiye'de eğitim sistemine yönelik yeni talepler ve yeni aktörlere sınıfsal bir bakış [A class perspective on new demands and new actors for the education system in Turkey]. In F. Ercan & S. K. Kurt (Eds.), *Metalaşma ve iktidarın baskısındaki üniversite [Commodification and university under power]* (pp. 197-221). Sav Yayınları.
- Vatansever, A., & Yalçın, M. G. (2015). 'Ne ders olsa veririz' akademisyenin vasıfsız işçiye dönüşümü ['We can teach any topic' transformation of academician into unskilled worker]. İletişim Yayınları.
- Veblen, T. (2005). *The higher learning in America*. Cosimo.
- Yükseköğretim Kalite Kurulu. (2019). *Kurum iç değerlendirme hazırlama klavuzu [Guideline for the Preparation of Self-Evaluation Report]*. Accessed [September 15, 2020]: https://api.yokak.gov.tr/Storage/AnnouncementFiles/09-12-2019/87/KiDR_Surum_2.0_09102019.pdf
- Yükseköğretim Akademik Değerlendirme ve Kalite Geliştirme Komisyonu. (2007). *Yükseköğretim kurumlarında akademik değerlendirme ve kalite geliştirme rehberi [Guideline for academic evaluation and quality development in higher education institutions]*. Accessed [September 15, 2020]: <http://www.yodek.org.tr/yodek/files/7aa12f8d2582deb44d4249c7aa4a2020.pdf>
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2005). *Yükseköğretim kurumlarında akademik değerlendirme ve kalite geliştirme yönetmeliği [Regulation for academic evaluation and quality development in higher education institutions]*. Accessed [September 15, 2020]: <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2005/09/20050920-9.htm>
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2015). *Yükseköğretim kalite güvencesi yönetmeliği [Regulation for quality assurance in higher education]*. Accessed [September 15, 2020]: <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2015/07/20150723-3.htm>

---o---o---o--- **Article Notes** ---o---o---o---

The authors of the study declared the following points within the framework of the “COPE-Code of Conduct and Best Practices Guidelines for Journal Editors”:

Funding: No funding was received from any institution or organisation for this research.

Acknowledgement: We are thankful to Denis Strebkov, Hasret Dikici-Bilgin, Cemil Boyraz for valuable corrections and comments, to Roman Abramov for fruitful discussion, to students of Academic Practice Research Seminar within Comparative Social Research Masters Programme at HSE for their helpful discussion.

Ethical Clearance: This research was carried out through open-accessed official documents and reports; therefore, no requirement for ethical approval process.

Author Contributions: Both authors contributed to this study equally.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests: The authors have no potential conflict of interest regarding research, authorship, or publication of this article.