İctimaiyat
Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi | Journal of Social Sciences

Yazar(lar) / Author(s)

Arzu Akkaya Hükümen (iD)
Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Yönetimi A.B.D., İstanbul-Türkiye.
e-posta: akkayaarzu.aa@gmail.com.
(Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding author)

Prof. Dr. Erkan Tabancalı (iD)
Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, İstanbul-Türkiye.
e-posta: tabancali@gmail.com.

Power, Neoliberalism, and Higher Education Administration[a]

Abstract

It is essential to address power relations on the grounds of power and to discuss how power penetrates institutions, especially human life, in the context of neoliberalism to analyze higher education administration in the twenty-first century. In the current society, where various aspects are emphasized with descriptions such as information society, post-modernist, or neoliberal, practices in universities are also affected by social dynamics and how power operates. Therefore, examining changing forms of social and power relations is critically important to analyze administrative practices in higher education institutions. Based on this, this study aims to examine the concepts of biopolitical power and neoliberal governmentality in particular to explore how power operates in higher education institutions and how individuals and societies are organized and governed concerning economic policies and life policies, and to provide a fundamental perspective for studies conducted in higher education on this subject. This research attempted to present a comprehensive analysis of the literature by giving the theoretical foundations of the subject. In this context, the policy changes that took place and the reflections of neoliberalism on academic identity were also mentioned. This study aimed to thoroughly examine the literature by providing the theoretical underpinnings of the topic.

Keywords: Power, Forms of Power, Neoliberalism, Higher Education, Administration.

İktidar, Neoliberalizm ve Yükseköğretim Yönetimi

Öz

Yirmi birinci yüzyılda yükseköğretim yönetimine ilişkin çözümleme yapabilmek adına güç ilişkilerini iktidar zemininde ele almak ve neoliberalizm ekseninde iktidarın kurumlarda ve özellikle insan hayatında nüfuz etme biçimlerini tartışmak önem arz etmektedir. Özellikle bilgi toplumu, post-modernist veya neoliberal gibi betimlemelerle çeşitli yönlerinin vurgulandığı mevcut toplumda, üniversitelerdeki pratikler de toplumsal dinamiklerden ve iktidarın işleme biçimlerinden etkilenmektedir. Dolayısıyla, değişen toplumsal ilişkilenme biçimlerini ve iktidar ilişkilerini irdelemenin yükseköğretim kurumlarındaki yönetim pratiklerini çözümlemek için kritik öneme sahip olduğu düşünülmektedir. Buradan hareketle, bu çalışmada, özellikle yükseköğretim kurumlarında iktidarın nasıl işlediğini ve bireylerin ve toplumların ekonomi politikaları ve yaşam politikalarıyla ilişkili olarak nasıl düzenlendiğini ve yönetildiğini çözümleyebilmek amacıyla özellikle biyopolitik iktidar ve neoliberal yönetimsellik kavramlarının incelenmesi ve bu konuda yükseköğretimde yapılan çalışmalar için temel bir bakış açısı sunulması amaçlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda, gerçekleşen politika değişikliklerine ve neoliberal yansımaların akademik kimliğe yansımalarına da değinilmiştir. Kısaca, bu araştırmada, konunun teorik temelleri verilerek literatüre dair kapsamlı bir analiz ortaya konmaya çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İktidar, İktidar Biçimleri, Neoliberalizm, Yükseköğretim, Yönetim.

Yazar Katkı Oranları/ Author Contributions

Çalışmanın Tasarımı/Conceiving the Study	Yazar-1 (%60) - Yazar-2 (%40)
Veri Toplama/Data Collection	Yazar-1 (%70) - Yazar-2 (%30)
Veri Analizi/Data Analysis	Yazar-1 (%70) - Yazar-2 (%30)
Makale Yazımı/ Article Writing	Yazar-1 (%60) - Yazar-2 (%40)
Gönderim ve Revizyon/Submission and Revision	Yazar-1 (%60) - Yazar-2 (%40)

---

[a] This study was derived from the doctoral thesis prepared by the first author, a doctoral student at Yıldız Technical University, under the supervision of the second author.

1. Introduction

Neoliberalism is defined as a theory of political economic practices that proposes human welfare can best be advanced by maximizing entrepreneurial freedoms within a framework of strong institutional structures (Harvey, 2005). It has positioned itself within higher education by gradually turning public institutions into corporations competing to increase levels of academic excellence by meeting the requirements of a homogeneous, independent, global university model (Altbach & Salmi, 2011; Ginsberg, 2011; Newfield, 2008; Paradeise & Thoenig, 2015; Walsh, 2013; Ward, 2012). The neoliberal restructuring and change process has increasingly begun to affect higher education, and higher education institutions have expanded their areas of responsibility and duties compared to the past (Henkel, 2005; Whitchurch & Gordon, 2010). Specifically, the neoliberal transformation in academia has gradually changed the functioning of universities by adopting private sector principles such as competition, efficiency, measurable outputs, accountability and effectiveness (Aprile et al., 2021; Ball, 2012; Dougherty & Natow, 2019; Sutton, 2017). Correspondingly, studies on higher education show that a global movement aiming to transform the role of higher education institutions is observed (Bosanquet, Mantai, & Fredericks, 2020; Gordon & Zauniddin, 2020; Hazelkorn, 2011; Troiani & Dutson, 2021). Because universities play a vital role in the state's efforts for economic development (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), neoliberal policies pursued by states directly impact higher education institutions. Consequently, neoliberalism could easily find a place within higher education institutions, as it slowly yet steadily causes universities to comply with global market standards that transform them into ideal research institutions (Butler & Spoelstra, 2014; Ward, 2012).

On the other hand, as Foucault (1990) claims, neoliberalism is a form of biopolitical power that combines the security mechanisms of governmentality and disciplinary practices to create a field of power. Based on this, neoliberalism is accepted as an economic and political philosophy that aims to transform individuals into active economic subjects who invest in their human capital, limit themselves in the name of private capital, and eliminate external political and subjective areas incompatible with capitalism. This transformation is facilitated through a general system of power that affects the legal, political, economic, administrative, social, and subjective aspects of society. Ultimately, it can be stated that neoliberalism seeks to create a workforce and population more compatible with economic rationality and the interests of private capital. Accordingly, the biopolitics of neoliberalism aims to transform human life into economic capital and pathologizes those who fail in the system. Thus, it places the responsibility for failure on the individual. This helps to weaken the potential for resistance against the economic and social order and turns individuals into "successful economic subjects" or "unsuccessful economic subjects" who must hold themselves accountable. Along the same line with these, it is claimed that liberal theory shifted its focus to the principle of competition and inequality in the 19th century. Accordingly, the transformation to neoliberal governmentality is explained by adopting competition, governmentality, and entrepreneurship (Foucault, 2015). In addition, the basis of the laissez-faire ideology has remained the same. However, in competition and neoliberal governmentality, the individual, homo economicus, is not a part of nature but an active agent who constructs institutions and rules with rationality (Gürkan, 2016).

As for neoliberal governmentality and education, the penetration of neoliberal governmentality into educational institutions was made possible by the collaboration of states with private capital companies in shaping education and drawing legal frameworks to promote economic growth and competition with other countries (Foucault, 2017; Peters, 2006). The concept of governmentality, which refers to the management of education as a political tool, is vital for understanding how education, economic practices, and actions work (Olssen, 2006). Governmentality involves managing people and their actions through the order of things, the most appropriate arrangement, techniques, and methods of directing human behavior (Gillies, 2008). For instance, the primary purpose of the surveillance mechanisms in this system is to normalize behaviors and thoughts through hierarchization, homogenization, and exclusion. The control ideologies promoted in educational organizations emphasize efficiency, effectiveness, high standards, and quality to discipline and refine the body and mind. This process results in normalization, integration, surveillance, ranking, separation, exclusion, division, and classification. These techniques function as mechanisms of power employed to establish and sustain order within educational organizations (Chandler, 2009).

When it comes to the penetration of neoliberal governance and practices into higher education institutions, there is a widening literature that it has fundamentally reshaped their structure and purpose (Altbach & Salmi, 2011; Ginsberg, 2011; Newfield, 2008; Paradeise & Thoenig, 2015; Ward, 2012). Related studies demonstrate that competition, measurement, ranking, and similar processes aimed at increasing efficiency and effectiveness in the market have been transferred to the higher education context. Consequently, these mechanisms have converted higher education into a neoliberal enterprise defined by the commodification of knowledge and the corporatization of the university (Giroux, 2014). Universities have sought to adapt to market conditions in this competitive environment by employing governance mechanisms. These are referred to as "new managerialism," "new public management", or "neoliberal governmentality," which are considered to have turned academics into economic subjects (Deem, 2003; Deem & Brehony, 2007; Keisu & Carbin, 2014; Olssen & Peters, 2005). Moreover, these new governance forms observed in universities have necessitated the monitoring and surveillance of academics through formal and measurable performance systems (Deem, 2001), leading to feelings of insecurity among academics (Gill, 2016) and causing them to perpetually self-monitor (Deem, Hillyard & Reed, 2007). It is worth putting forward the related literature and theoretical background to delve into neoliberal effects on higher education administration and have a deep insight into the implications of current higher education practices on academics. Accordingly, this study starts with the forms of power and its transition to neoliberalism, then highlights how power processes in higher education institutions through neoliberalism, and ends with reflections on academics. This article mainly addresses the following questions:

- How has power evolved throughout history?
- How does biopolitical power permeate contemporary higher education institutions?
- What are the reflections of neoliberal power mechanisms on higher education?
- What are the reflections of neoliberal power mechanisms on academics?

Thus, this study examines the transformations of power and how new tools of power manifest in higher education. Limited to a literature review, the study primarily aims to explain

neoliberalism, conceptualized as biopolitics, and its implications for higher education institutions and academics, which are inherently social institutions, considering recent studies.

2. Forms of Power and Neoliberalism

Power operates through different methods or techniques during various periods. In feudal times, it functioned through rituals and spectacles, as well as via taxes, plunder, or war. In the classical era, it persisted through sovereign authority, where control was exerted by the ruler over their subjects. In the 17th and 18th centuries, power manifested by influencing individuals' bodies, movements, attitudes, and behaviors (Foucault, 2011). With the development of capitalism in the 17th century and the perception of humans as economic beings, power continued to operate through the human body. Through elements like medicine, education, punishment, and military service, power trained and individualized individuals' bodies, enhanced their competencies in specific areas and enabled interaction with the economic system.

On the other hand, the unique power dynamics of the 18th century aimed at controlling and directing individuals. Accordingly, power sought to regulate demographic events like birth and death (Koca, 2014). However, with the rise of capitalism and modernism, power started using new forms of control focused on regulating and managing life. Presently, society functions as a control-based society, where power dynamics revolve around security rather than discipline. This form of power, concentrating on regulating bodies and populations and involving practices like medicine, education, and punishment, is termed biopolitical power (Foucault, 2015a). Thus, from the perspective of neoliberal governance, biopolitics/biopower characterizes the transition from the classical period to modern society (Koca, 2014). Similarly, as Han (2018) states, the society of discipline, composed of prisons, hospitals, reformatories, garrisons, and factories, no longer reflects contemporary society. The 21st-century society is centered on success and performance, and the high walls of the discipline society now appear as relics. They are memories from a society defined by prohibitions and commands.

Foucault, on the other hand, who describes neoliberalism as a "rational power" constructed on specialized techniques related to the political anatomy of the body, states that in modern societies, power operates through regulating and managing life processes, making it impossible for individuals to be entirely autonomous or entirely enslaved (Ball, 2017). Foucault (2007) describes biopolitics as "various and multiple techniques to ensure the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations." Rose and Miller (1992) characterize biopolitical techniques as initiatives aimed at "knowing and managing the existence/capital, health, and happiness of the population." Lemke (2011) states that in neoliberalism, biopolitical processes manifest not as discipline and surveillance but as regulation and control. Different perspectives on the concept exist due to its strong premise: The assertion that power aims to employ all techniques and mechanisms to define the boundaries of life's possible and actual dimensions, seeking not to kill but to enable life. This new approach to power relies on a decentralized network of power relations that includes repressive and productive, positive practices (Foucault, 2003).

Biopolitical power, grounded in the neoliberal order, constructs and reproduces the scope and boundaries of life by managing individuals' relationships with resources, the tools they use in production, their behaviors, and thoughts (Coşkun, 2016; Koloş, 2016). In biopolitical power,

the object of power is not the body but the individual as a whole, focusing on integrating the individual's needs, welfare, and desires within the state framework to make human life governable (Cruikshank, 1999). Rather than fixing individual bodies in artificial spaces, biopolitical power manages, secures, and controls the lives of populations impacted by collective processes like birth, death, disease, and productive activities. The concept of biopower represents the governance of life by integrating individuals' needs, welfare, and desires within the realm of administration. It influences not only the physical body but also the individual's subjectivity. In this context, the focus of governance is the individual; however, in reality, governance extends to individuals' interactions with resources, production methods, behaviors, and thought processes (Coşkun, 2016; Cruikshank, 1999; Foucault, 2018).

Biopolitics entails the politicization of biological life, where modern society must manage not only individual bodies but also the dynamics of the social body for economic and social advancement. This involves managing the population as a labor force and productive and consumptive capacity (Arpacı, 2011). In biopolitics, power must now know the entire population and individual bodies. In this regard, the lives of disciplined and obedient bodies, whose capabilities have been enhanced through education and adherence to norms, become increasingly significant. The population serves the need to produce, monitor, and ensure that industrial production and labor continue, which is a vital element of the liberal system. Thus, to maximize productivity, the production cycle must rely on a stable and manageable workforce (Revel, 2006). Based on this, the transition toward neoliberal governance characterized by principles of competition, governance, and entrepreneurship was brought to the forefront by Foucault (2014). Accordingly, the concept of governance is characterized by the complex interaction between power, knowledge, and subjectivity in modern societies.

Furthermore, power is a relationship that shapes and regulates social relations, institutions, and individuals rather than a fixed entity. Power defines the process of subject formation and the limits of possible actions, not merely a law that suppresses or forbids the subject. In this regard, power is not only located in state institutions or other traditional authority domains; it is dispersed throughout society, operating through various forms of governance such as discipline, normalization, and self-regulation. According to Foucault, the active agent of liberal governance is regarded as homo economicus that is not a natural being but an individual with reason and psychology, constructing institutions and rules based on personal rationality. The behavior and choices of the constructed subject are managed as part of social market policies. While classical liberalism necessitates that public administration operates according to the market structure and *laissez-faire* (let it happen) principles derived from competition rather than exchange, neoliberal governance aims to let the state operate in the name of market laws. The market is seen as a tribunal established against state administration to analyze non-economic behaviors using economic rationality and measure the effectiveness of public power in market language. For example, policies on crime and punishment have been formulated using analyses that measure the cost-benefit calculation of crime, arranging penal codes to reduce crime rates and permit certain crime levels (Gürkan, 2016). Whereas the state is managed according to the nature of the market in classical liberalism, active governance technologies build individuals and states based on market principles in neoliberal governance (Foucault, 2015a).

In *Psychopolitics*, Han (2019) acknowledges Foucault's analysis of neoliberal governance while suggesting that psychopolitics in a neoliberal order better explains the biopolitical processes of discipline society. He argues that biopolitics, which signifies power functioning through the body in disciplinary societies, transforms into psychopolitics, representing power that affects the soul in the neoliberal order. Therefore, the target of the neoliberal order has shifted from the body to the soul, with biopolitics transforming into psychopolitics (İnce, 2020). Although Han (2019) discusses an evolution from Foucault's biopolitics to psychopolitics, it cannot be concluded that biopolitical practices have not entirely been replaced by psychopolitical ones. The goal of producing healthy, competitive, and entrepreneurial individuals continues to operate through the body. Today, the fact that biopolitics functions through individuals regulating their power applications on their bodies differentiates this process from Foucault's biopolitics (İnce, 2020). Accordingly, although Han (2019) claims that the primary focus of neoliberalism has shifted to the soul, it can still be said that Foucault's concept of subjectification through the body continues through various practices (İnce, 2020).

As for the neoliberal state, it adopts the market order as the sole organizing principle of society. Unlike welfare, corporatist, or nationalist states, the market is defined by competition, and this order must be established politically (Biebricher & Vogelmann, 2017; Dardot & Laval, 2022; Hayek, 2013). Based on this, it can be stated that the neoliberal state is responsible for transforming society into a competitive market and individuals into entrepreneurs. The state also exhibits an entrepreneurial character and aims to increase accumulation by reducing its costs (Boukalas, 2023). As for the construction and protection of a market society, the state establishes a constitutional framework to create a market society with elements such as the priority of private property, competitive markets, and monetary stability (Jessop, 2019). At the same time, it uses education, pressure and coercion together to shape the entrepreneurial subjectivities of individuals (Dardot & Laval, 2022). To summarize, the neoliberal state is a structure that shapes society only through the market order, and the market must be politically established by being defined by competition. In this context, the state is responsible for transforming society into a competitive market and individuals into entrepreneurs. It combines constitutional framework, education, pressure and coercion to achieve this.

3. Neoliberal Implications on Higher Education

The neoliberal transformation that universities have undergone has brought an understanding that adapts to market demands instead of a structure that focuses on individual and social needs. This change has been effective in many areas, from curriculum to academic performance criteria, and institutional evaluation based on criteria such as total quality management. Knowledge production has shifted towards understanding efficiency, performance and benefit rather than scientific concerns (Morrison, 2001; Tekeli, 2003). This process has accelerated under the influence of market advocates and adaptation policies in developed and developing countries (Buenfil Burgos, 2000).

At this point, it is significant to mention the historical analysis of universities, including their fundamental philosophies, to comprehend the neoliberal reflections on universities. According to Wissema's (2009) classification, universities have been considered to have been over three generations. First-generation universities (medieval universities) emerged in the Middle Ages and took shape as structures where students and educators came together in a social context. Second-generation universities are known as Humboldt Type Universities and have adopted

the understanding of scientific freedom, autonomy, and "science for science's sake." Structures such as the University of Berlin have established the modern foundations of research and education and have become models for many countries. Third-generation universities prioritize entrepreneurship, international competition, cooperation with industry and the private sector, and provide economic benefits in addition to traditional education and research. These transformations have radically changed the roles of universities for science and society, evolving into a market-oriented structure (Wissema, 2009). Today, universities are positioned as entrepreneurial and competitive institutions that produce knowledge and contribute to economic development.

According to Wissema (2009), the transformation in science is an important element of the crisis that reshapes the university structure. Social change redefines the value of knowledge, bringing multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research and technological developments to the forefront. The importance of tacit knowledge for production, especially in research activities, has increased. However, the high costs of competitive knowledge production have created a financing need beyond university budgets, and this situation has led universities to commercialization by encouraging collaboration with industry. Thus, universities have become entrepreneurial organizations, become part of national competition, and positioned themselves as economic and cultural forces (Memiş, 2013). In parallel, neoliberalism, as an ideology and set of economic policies, seeks to promote the free market, reduce the state's role, and encourage individual entrepreneurship and responsibility (Harvey, 2005). Alongside this, as many studies suggest, neoliberalism is not merely an economic model; it is also a political project aimed at transforming all aspects of society, including social relations, values, and subjectivities, by promoting competition and market logic (Brown, 2015; Dardot & Laval, 2018; Dean, 2010; Foucault, 2015a). This suggests that neoliberalism creates a normative way of living, feeling, and thinking, prioritizing competition, free-market principles, and individualism rather than social welfare and solidarity. This norm dictates that individuals live within a generalized competitive environment, promotes economic competition among societies, and organizes social relations according to market rules. Dardot and Laval (2018) argue that this neoliberal norm transforms everything, including the individual. With an emphasis on individual responsibility and self-reliance at the heart of neoliberal thought, individuals are now expected to govern themselves as enterprises within a competitive market. This way, neoliberalism shapes people's values and behaviors and develops a normative lifestyle. In summary, as governing rationality, neoliberalism promotes a normative way of living, feeling, and thinking and emphasizes individualism, competition, and the free market, transforming all aspects of human existence. This norm, emphasizing individual responsibility and confidence central to neoliberal thought, instructs individuals to live in a generalized competitive environment and imagine themselves as enterprises (Dardot & Laval, 2018). Thus, neoliberalism can be seen to manifest as a biopolitical or psychopolitical force that succeeds in penetrating individuals' bodies and souls.

Examining power relations in today's neoliberal society reveals a control society that operates on the axis of security rather than discipline (Ömür, 2021). Power relations have transformed into a regulatory power encompassing both disciplinary and biopolitical forms of power. This transformation signifies not a replacement or chronological rupture of power relations by control but a completion, incorporating elements of disciplinary power into a more effective form known as regulatory power (Coşkun, 2016). Security mechanisms, the fundamental

governance tools, primarily secure population-related processes (Foucault, 2016). In this regulatory power mode, which Bidet (2016) calls as a society of security, power shifts from focusing on discipline and control of the body to managing and controlling life.

As for the permeation of governance into educational institutions, it has been facilitated by states collaborating with private capital companies in shaping education and establishing legal frameworks to promote economic growth and competition with other countries (Foucault, 2017). The concept of governance, which refers to managing education as a political tool, is essential for understanding the functioning of educational and economic practices and actions (Olssen, 2006). This is because governance includes managing people and their activities through organizing things, optimal regulation, techniques, and methods to guide human behavior (Gillies, 2008). Likewise, the ideology adopted by educational organizations seeks to make individuals observable, controllable, and manageable through techniques such as aligning, grouping, labeling, and categorizing. Thus, power practices based on security and surveillance in governance turn educational management into a domain of authority, similar to the state's governance mode.

Moreover, surveillance serves as a tool to establish control without force, instilling individual discipline (Foucault, 2017). For instance, management actions are related to the normalization process, functioning through setting standards and homogenizing individuals' behaviors, attitudes, and thoughts. Consequently, through approaches facilitating control and surveillance in the management of modern educational institutions, administrators and teachers typically implement educational policies and practices through techniques like surveillance, regulation, categorization, and labeling, using them as tools of normalization and exclusion. However, in addition to these, the related literature attributes excellent significance to making these power relations visible and for educational administrators to develop a critical and democratic approach toward educational policy and practice (Gore, 1995; Maxcy, 1991; Olssen, Codd & O'Neill, 2004; Shenker, 2008).

The higher education literature reveals discussions indicating that the rise of surveillance-focused management in higher education has changed the nature, organization, and form of higher education. Accordingly, higher education institutions are described with various labels, such as corporate university (Giroux, 2002), entrepreneurial university (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Taylor, 2014), and neoliberal university (Ball, 2012; Ball, 2015; Connell, 2013; Connell, 2016). In control societies, similar to the regulation, control, and organization of processes, the influence of these processes in education has led to a new discipline process involving measurable outcomes like accountability, accreditation, and quality management (Power, 1994; Shore & Wright, 1999). For example, university ranking systems, viewed as neoliberal reflections of the control society, have become a fundamental component of university management in the higher education market (Marginson, 2007). Considering that both state and foundation universities compete in a ranking race within the higher education market, it is likely that a significant portion of this burden is placed on academics as one of the institution's stakeholders. Academics are expected to make extra efforts in conducting research, experimentation, and publishing.

Furthermore, individual achievements of academics are positioned within a status hierarchy based on their value toward institutional prestige. Consequently, academics as institutional "units" (Bottrell & Manathunga, 2019), particularly in foundation universities, face

circumstances where they are hired as temporary, short-contract academics at the lowest tier of the hierarchy to achieve the university's strategic goals. Furthermore, transforming higher education into surveillance-focused institutions raises concerns regarding department heads' obstruction of academic autonomy and the decreasing importance of teaching compared to research, which yields measurable and monitorable outcomes (Chalmers, 2011; Ek et al., 2013).

3.1. Neoliberal Transformation of Higher Education Policy in Turkey

In the existing literature, comprehensive analyses have been made on the marketization and neoliberalization of higher education in Turkey (Aslan, 2014; Coşar & Ergül, 2015; Fırat & Akkuzu, 2015; Memiş, 2013; Parson & Steele, 2019). The analyses mentioned similar processes such as the 1980 military coup, privatization, the establishment of foundation universities, the transformation in management and evaluation systems, etc. These factors initiated, affected, and accelerated the neoliberalization process of higher education in Turkey (Aslan, 2014; Coşar & Ergül, 2015; Fırat & Akkuzu, 2015; Memiş, 2013; Parson & Steele, 2019; Pusztai & Szabo, 2008). During the military coup process, factors including privatization, the establishment of foundation universities, and changes in management and performance evaluation systems came to the fore (Aslan, 2014; Coşar & Ergül, 2015; Memiş, 2013). With neoliberal policies, higher education financing after 1980 went beyond public resources and turned to private ones. International actors such as the IMF, the World Bank, the EU, and the OECD contributed to the neoliberal transformation process in Turkey; in particular, the privatization of education and the reduction of public expenditures were targeted within the framework of the "structural adjustment reforms" of the World Bank and the IMF. Global regulations such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) made in 1995 aimed to restructure public services such as education and health and to make these services gain an international character. This transformation reduced the role of the nation-state in social services and caused the state to be positioned only as a regulator and facilitator (Aslan, 2008; Keskin, 2003).

According to Kwiek (2001), the overlap of neoliberal policies with the historical development of capitalism has weakened the nation-state and the welfare state. The weakening of the nation-state has decreased the state's obligation to provide public services and to its gradual withdrawal from using public resources by assuming a regulatory and facilitating role in these services. The concrete effects of these policies in the field of education in Turkey began to be seen from the 1990s. While the majority of the income of state universities is provided by the public budget, the budget share has decreased over the years and the ratio of revolving fund income and student contribution fees has increased. As of 2021, it has been observed that 180 universities have various sources of income from revolving funds, consultancy, projects, and research, and only 19 universities do not generate income from the central budget (YÖK, 2022). This process has evolved towards a model encouraging universities to generate income.

Moreover, Turkey's efforts to adapt to the neoliberal global climate were institutionalized in both economic and social dimensions with the decisions of January 24, 1980 and the 1982 Constitution. The institutionalization of this structure at the university level began with the Higher Education Law No. 2547, which came into force on November 11, 1981. While the higher education system before 1980 operated irregularly due to lack of coordination, this law brought all higher education institutions together under a centralized structure. Academies and

educational institutes were transformed into universities and faculties of education, and vocational schools and conservatories were affiliated with universities. In addition, the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) was established, and all higher education institutions' administrative, academic and financial supervision was given to YÖK (YÖK, 2007). These regulations ensured a centralized structure in higher education and formed the institutional infrastructure of the neoliberal transformation.

Privatization in higher education in Turkey has also increased with practices such as state universities opening branches abroad and international joint programs. This process, which began with METU opening a branch in Northern Cyprus in 2000, continued with ITU and Çukurova University opening branches in the 2012-2013 academic year, and these branches gained private university status, adding an international dimension to the privatization process (McBurnie, 2000). Another important change that paved the way for the neoliberalization of higher education institutions is granting the right to establish higher education institutions to foundations. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) explain the spread of the private university model, particularly with the increase in demand for higher education at a global level and the rise of neoliberal tendencies. There have also been developments in Turkey that support the establishment and spread of private universities. The increase in the number of private, non-profit educational institutions that are accepted as foundation universities constitutes an example of the increasing privatization in Turkish higher education institutions. The first example of foundation universities, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, was founded under the leadership of the then YÖK President, (Aslan, 2008).

Higher education in Turkey has expanded rapidly under the influence of neoliberal transformations. Between 1981 and 1991, the number of students enrolled in four-year programs increased fivefold, from 41,574 to 199,571. In the same period, academic staff increased from 20,917 to 34,469 (Şimşek, 2022). This situation reveals the impact of commercialization and the growth in higher education. In addition, in Turkey, the aim was to restructure the management of higher education institutions, and the concept of total quality management and "governance" were included in the education system since the 1990s. Governance refers to a model in which the private sector and civil society organizations also have a say in the management of public institutions, and these changes have accelerated commercialization and commodification in higher education. With the IMF and World Bank-supported Structural Adjustment Policies (SAP), public expenditures allocated to education have decreased, and commercialization in universities has accelerated. While the routine work of universities is carried out by external actors, commercial activities such as technoparks, fee-based courses and certificate programs have become a part of essential education services (Ercan, 1996).

The importance of university-industry collaboration has been emphasized and encouraged in YÖK reports. In the "Action Plan for the Development of University-Industry Collaboration" prepared in 2021, studies supporting university-industry collaboration, establishing technology transfer offices, workplace-focused education and training qualified individuals were targeted (YÖK, 2021). The report recommends that universities develop policies in line with the needs of industry and collaborate on priority business areas.

Torres (2008) argues that the main agenda of neoliberalism in education is to privatize and localize public education, determine the standards of education, develop standard tests to

measure academic success, and introduce an understanding of accountability based on a narrow range of results. It is also possible to see the widespread use of accreditation and accountability practices in Turkish higher education. Regulations have been made through quality controls to increase marketization and competition. As a representation of universities' education in terms of national and international quality, audit processes such as accreditation, total quality management, and various performance evaluation systems are considered the outputs of neoliberalism in Turkish higher education. With the establishment of the Higher Education Quality Board on July 23, 2015, accreditation, quality assurance systems, and external evaluation activities have accelerated. All these practices seem compatible with the accountability policies brought by neoliberal policies (Balyer & İşcan, 2020).

Another area where the effects of neoliberal policies at the higher education level can be seen is the change in employment patterns. These policies rapidly increase the number of workers working under different conditions than the standard employment relationship. The standard employment relationship generally refers to a relationship in which the worker works full-time and benefits from legal security. The duration of this type of employment is not limited (Temiz, 2004). The first full-scale attempt to reverse the standard employment relationship in the public sector was the Draft Law on Public Personnel. The draft paved the way for flexible employment patterns such as "part-time work, temporary work, and fixed-term work" in public institutions. According to Slaughter and Leslie (1997), the current changes in universities are as significant as the changes that occurred in academic professions in the last quarter of the 19th century, and globalization is destabilizing the working patterns of the university profession that have developed in the last century. One of the reasons for this is that universities, in their efforts to achieve success at a global level, are turning to reducing education costs to compete with increasing competition and decreasing public resources. In such a period, universities need to employ contracted, part-time academic staff and a relative salary decrease (Welch, 2002).

In the neoliberal period, universities have been transformed by institutionalization and commercialization processes. In addition, understandings that prevent the free flow of scientific knowledge and transform education into a commercial commodity have emerged (Miyoshi, 2000; Giroux, 2011). While the functions of universities such as critical thinking, public debate and social justice are weakened, they risk turning into a structure focused on training fast and cost-effective experts (Ball, 2012). Educators and theorists emphasize that universities should remain advocates of democratic learning and social values, and argue that higher education should be protected against corporatization and commercialization processes (Giroux, 2010). This transformation has replaced the social and cultural functions universities have undertaken throughout history with the economic dimension of knowledge.

3. 2. Reflections of Neoliberal Practices on Academic Identity

As a political and economic paradigm, neoliberalism has also influenced universities, leading to significant transformations within them (Apple, 2006). Universities, referred to as "neoliberal universities," have increasingly been defined as self-interested, entrepreneurial institutions providing education and research services. On the other hand, academics in these universities are seen as managed knowledge producers. According to this, academics must adhere to predefined organizational processes and justify their work through quantitative measurements (Hadley, 2015). The transformation that neoliberalism has caused by emphasizing measurability, efficiency, and quantity in academic pursuits, replacing traditional academic

ideals with institutional norms, and prioritizing competition and economic rewards over intellectual inquiry and freedom has been brought to the forefront of recent literature (Ball, 2012; Clarke & Knights, 2015; Van Houtum & Van Uden, 2022; Shields & Watermeyer, 2020). While current debates regarding neoliberalizm-influenced changes in higher education in the literature, on the other hand, transformations in the identity of academics, who are one of the main actors in the university, have also been attributed significant important in recent studies (Billot, 2010; Bottrell & Manathunga, 2019; Whitchurch & Gordon, 2010).

The concept of academic identity is found complex and defined in various ways because of its layered nature within the literature (Archer, 2008; Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Feather, 2016; Fitzmaurice, 2013). Despite this, common to most identity frameworks is the principle of agency, the idea of identity as an ongoing individual project, which refers to the power to influence one's life and world (Fitzmaurice, 2013; Germov & Poole, 2015). Academic identity, as a multifaceted, dynamic, and relational structure, not only encompasses the academic's a unique history and moral and conceptual framework but is also shaped by the disciplinary and institutional contexts that act as two powerful elements (Billot & King, 2017; Clarke et al., 2013). Therefore, an identity trajectory emerges from the mediation between the individual's agency and the structures surrounding him/her (Jawitz, 2009; Nixon, 2015); it is because each academic creates a unique balance by being active or passive, struggling or giving up, adapting or opposing what is presented to him/her (Arasa & Calvert, 2013). People show reflexivity by considering their social context about their subjective self and ultimately determine their course of action under the circumstances (Archer, 2007). Archer's theory is therefore helpful for understanding the intertwined influence of structure (the neoliberalized university) and agency (the individual self and reflexivity of academics) in the (re)construction of academic identity, as academic identity develops through the juxtaposition of the individual academic (their agency) and the environmental forces surrounding them (structure) (Drennan et al., 2017). The concept of academic identity in this study also acknowledges both context-dependent and individual, built over time and within specific environments including academic field, national and institutional regulations, dominant ideologies, faculty standards, established practices, and teaching traditions (Anikina et al., 2020). Identity is continuously (re)constructed and negotiated within the social context, examined through the dynamic interactions between individual agency and social structures (Fitzmaurice, 2013; McLean & Price, 2017; Whitchurch, 2013). Academic identities are also constructed through negotiations with academic institutions and relationships (Henkel, 2005; Winter, 2009).

Within higher education, there are views that external factors significantly influence the nature of academic work and the academic profession itself (Gair et al., 2021; Macfarlane, 2016). According to recent research, neoliberal ideologies -including marketization and massification- are changing governance models, university structures, and identities by advancing managerial and institutional values (Bennett et al., 2016; Dickinson, Foweler & Griffiths, 2022; Winter, 2009). Therefore, the institutional frameworks in which academic identities are established have changed due to neoliberal shifts (Bennett et al., 2016; Elkington & Lawrence, 2012; Winter, 2009). According to studies, these shifts in the neoliberal agenda in higher education include promotion criteria prioritizing research accomplishments, unequal workloads based on research output, and hiring practices favoring research backgrounds due to research productivity (Ek et al., 2013; Elkington & Lawrence, 2012). Some studies suggest that academics have been affected by this change since they feel compelled to conform to

institutional expectations rather than their own identities (Bozzon et al., 2017; Smith, 2017). Furthermore, institutions, professors, and students face financial strains due to the neoliberal language of efficiency and competitiveness, contributing to a fractured professional identity defined by the aforementioned competing demands (Luka et al., 2015; Walkerdine, 2006). To illustrate more specifically, studies show that the emerging competitive environment causes self-destruction among academics, impacts their creativity, and transforms their identities. Moreover, ranking in higher education is also tied to individual academics, creating a different type of academic capitalism within these institutions. Although individualized competition is not a new phenomenon in higher education, ranking individuals increases competition among academics, disrupts collaboration, and leads to negative emotions like academic stress as their roles and responsibilities expand (Ball, 2012; Epstein, 2019; Lynch, 2010).

The issues academics discuss are quality management, accountability, and university auditing practices. The controversy in these practices is because the factors determining quality teaching or research in higher education institutions are measured or controlled by various criteria when they should be related to the efforts of academics (Anderson, 2006; Newton, 2000; Teelken, 2012). Moreover, control and auditing are provided through the practices of the self by implementing panoptic surveillance regimes (Bentham, 1995; Foucault, 2017), which include surveillance, accountability, and auditing regimes that make every academic feel that they are constantly being watched and judged. Accordingly, although quality assurance aims for better service delivery, it is seen as a subtle panoptic power mechanism that exercises control and surveillance over the academic labor process (Worthington & Hodgson, 2005). Moreover, there are views that this system makes academics feel under constant surveillance and produces academics who are self-monitoring and self-monitoring rather than requiring external forms of coercion (Davies & Bansel, 2005). Consequently, changes and transformations are seen in academics' identities, roles, and emotions, and they become both the subject and the object of accountability (Nocella II, Best & McLaren, 2010).

As research-oriented recruitment and institutional pressures rise, academics' identities are expected to increasingly reflect neoliberal values, leading to a redefined academic identity in higher education (Dugas et al., 2020; Jaschik, 2016; Elkington & Lawrence, 2012). A significant consequence of this is the division between academics who embrace the "new managerialism" to enhance their academic identity and those who oppose it because they believe it conflicts with their desired identity (Tran, Burns, & Ollerhead, 2017; Winter, 2009; Ylijoki, 2014). This division in roles of academics demonstrates broader identity conflicts, as evolving roles and neoliberal impacts lead academics to prioritize research over teaching, creating tensions around which aspects of their professional responsibilities to emphasize (Ayers, 2005; Dugas et al., 2020; Levin & Aliyeva, 2015; Pick et al., 2017). As a result, diverse characteristics and strategies in academic identities may emerge from this dynamic process.

There are also various views that neoliberalism has had effects such as job insecurity, competition, loss of some rights, and the jeopardization of academic autonomy in higher education and that these have made academics vulnerable to state policies of neoliberalism (Chatterjee & Maira, 2014; Faucher, 2014). In particular, the fact that academics work as employees who provide educational services to customers and that sufficient time is not allocated to academic studies, which are seen as unpaid labor, is among the essential characteristics put forward by those who discuss the idea of a neoliberal university (Biner,

2019; Breu, 2014). Accordingly, universities have changed their relationships with academics, and therefore, changes have occurred in contracts and employment conditions (Bauder, 2006; Ivancheva et al., 2019); education has become privatized, and educational activities have begun to be seen more as "business training", and academics have begun to be seen as "academic entrepreneurs" (Giroux, 2002). Studies have shown that disadvantaged academics, in particular, are forced into precarious roles with short-term and low-paid contracts, leading to fragmented and displaced lives (Ivancheva, 2015); this trend has been affecting postgraduate students, researchers, and early-career academics globally since the late 1990s (Leathwood & Read, 2020; Percy & Beaumont, 2008).

As a result of increased institutional constraints and research-oriented hiring, which are projected to make academics' identities more neoliberal, a redefining of academic identity in higher education is anticipated (Elkington & Lawrence, 2012; Jaschik, 2016). One crucial effect is the separation between academics who resist the neoliberal reflections in higher education because they feel it contradicts their intended identity and those who welcome it to strengthen their academic identity (Winter, 2009; Ylijoki, 2014). According to Ayers (2005), Levin & Aliyeva (2015), and others, academics give more importance and value to research than teaching due to changing roles and neoliberal influences. This division in academic roles reflects broader identity conflicts surrounding different aspects of their professional responsibilities.

Considering the above, neoliberalism has transformed universities into entrepreneurial and profit-driven institutions, leading academics to conform to institutional expectations and justify their work with quantitative measures. This system, in which competition, efficiency, and measurability are prioritized, has undermined academic freedom and creativity, while individualized competition has diminished collaboration and led to stress and identity crises. Accordingly, academics' identities and roles have been transformed because of quality management and surveillance practices, whereas job insecurity and loss of academic autonomy negatively affected professional satisfaction.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Neoliberalism is not only an ideology or economic policy but also a governing technique that produces subjectivity within power relations (Foucault, 2015a). Neoliberalism promotes a new form of subjectivity through an 'enterprise society' that encourages competition, precariousness, inequality and individualization. Thatcher famously stated that the main aim of neoliberalism is to change hearts and souls, emphasizing its ethos beyond economic mechanisms (Thatcher, 1981). To reach this aim, neoliberalism has impacted education, leading to a new disciplinary process, including accountability, accreditation, and quality management (Bennett et al., 2016; Dickinson et al., 2022; Winter, 2009). Power relations within educational institutions affected by the transition to a control society operate through mechanisms such as surveillance and self-regulation. In this context, multiple and intersecting forms of power and control that shape educational practices and outcomes should be considered in comprehensively analyzing administrative activities in twenty-first-century higher education institutions. This requires an approach that attends to how power operates through various institutions, discourses, and practices and critically engages with the social, economic, and political contexts that shape educational opportunities and outcomes.

As Foucault (2003, 2017) emphasizes, education is a space where power relations are implemented. Rather than a neutral process of knowledge transfer, education is a space where individuals' beliefs and behaviors are shaped and is also seen as a space where individuals can challenge these power relations. The penetration of neoliberal ideology into educational and higher education institutions necessitates the analysis of these contexts within the framework of power dynamics because power operates not only through large institutions but also through micro-powers at every level of social relations and uses various management techniques and tools such as surveillance, control, and other governing methods to regulate individuals' lives. For instance, surveillance and control mechanisms accepted as power tools of neoliberalism regulate individuals physically and mentally, shaping their identities and ensuring that they adapt to norms. Foucault (2007) calls this process biopower and states that biopower maintains social hierarchy and capitalist relations of production by controlling individuals' lifestyles. In modern societies, this power represents the transition from law-based to norm-based systems and uses mechanisms to categorize and control people's behaviors.

As an example of mechanisms controlling and categorizing in higher education, quantitative-focused evaluation systems also resonate strongly in the related literature. These mechanims emphasize the importance of national and international league tables and rankings, and quantitative performance management policies tend to reduce academic research to abstract publication "scores" in journal ranking systems (Kallio et al., 2016; Tourish & Willmott, 2015). However, the reduction of the individual to a set of quantitative criteria has been criticized in the literature (Dillard & Ruchala, 2005). Some studies have also shown that this situation leads to predominantly instrumentalizing and coercive performance evaluation, auditing and accountability policies, which can lead to a closed, anxious and defensive work environment in academic work (Alvesson & Spicer, 2016; De Vita & Case, 2016). While surveillance and categorization practices in themselves cause distrust and constant self-monitoring among academics (Deem, Hillyard, Reed, & Reed, 2007; Gill, 2016), quantitatively focused monitoring systems also lead to worse outcomes. Quantitative evaluations of academic activities, which lead to a one-sided acceptance of academic work, often negatively affect academics' mental well-being. Related studies have revealed that participants have to cope with feelings of shame, anger, failure, loss of self-confidence, and even clinical depression, burnout, and suicidal tendencies (Knights & Clarke, 2014; Ruth et al., 2018; Smith & Ulus, 2020).

These processes have led to an identity crisis and transformations in academics' identities in the context of neoliberal implications in higher education (Bennett et al., 2016; Elkington & Lawrence, 2012; Walkerdine, 2006; Winter, 2009). Academics face pressure for teaching and research, administrative duties, and individual achievement. Universities' competitive and market-driven structures constantly expect more performance from academics, viewing individual achievements as an instrument that increases institutional prestige. This situation generates a conflict between academics' professional identities and the identities imposed by universities (Bozzon et al., 2017; Smith, 2017). In the same line with this, Desierto and De Maio (2020) and Horta et al. (2019) cite the negative impacts of competition on academic freedom, research quality, and institutional purpose drift. Shore (2010) also discusses how these pressures cause academic identity issues as they try to manage the duality of pure research and government-driven agendas.

Dugas et al. (2020) claim that identity constraints on academics in organizations established in beliefs that degrade qualitative processes and outcomes in the pursuit of quantified economic efficiency have wide-ranging consequences. This refers to the continual changes that characterize academic life, which is influenced by the external world and neoliberal ideas that commodify education. Furthermore, this structure, where surveillance and competition come to the fore, has increased individualism and the need for constant self-promotion among academics. In this context, a new profile of an academic has emerged: one who takes risks, assumes responsibility, is competitive, and adopts a moral understanding based on continuous improvement. However, this process has seen individual failures as the individual's responsibility, excluding those who failed, leading to a loss of identity, security, and autonomy. This transformation has also increased the administrative and academic burdens on academics. Mechanisms such as ranking competitions have weakened academic cooperation and negatively affected creativity. The expansion of academics' research, teaching, and administrative responsibilities has forced them to take on more flexible and multiple identities, but in this process, their identity and autonomy crises have deepened (Ayers, 2005; Davies & Bansel, 2005; Nocella II et al., 2010).

As a result, neoliberal effects on higher education have transformed into a structure that can harm academic autonomy and creativity while creating identity conflicts and professional dissatisfaction for academics. While this process focuses on academics' responsibilities, it may also jeopardize academic work, leaving them under intense competition and surveillance.

5. Implications for Further Studies and Policy-Makers

Based on the related literature, this study suggests that the neoliberal implications in higher education have changed academia. This change reoriented higher education toward market-driven goals like accreditation, accountability, and quantifiable performance. As a result of this, monitoring and control systems are used to manage academics' professional lives. Although these methods aim to guarantee efficiency and responsibility, the related literature suggests that they have also resulted in severe problems, such as identity crises and a decline in academic autonomy. Accordingly, the atmosphere encourages individuality and competitiveness, which has led to the emergence of an academic, who values risk-taking and competition but frequently suffers from identity problems, insecurity, and a loss of autonomy. Taking this into account, the implications based on the discussion and conclusion of this study are as follows:

Implications for Further Studies:
- Studies can concentrate on identifying resistance tactics and how academics navigate their identities within biopolitical frameworks. By studying how academics deal with these demands, frameworks for promoting advocacy and resilience in higher education may be found.
- Studies that contrast alternative systems prioritizing academic freedom and cooperative behaviors with neoliberal governance models may provide insightful information. One way to do this is to examine how accountability is managed in less market-driven institutions without compromising academic autonomy.
- Researchers may investigate how academics negotiate their identities within biopolitical frameworks and find techniques. Understanding how academics handle and confront

these constraints may give frameworks for promoting resilience and advocacy in higher education.

- By addressing these issues, studies can better understand neoliberalism's consequences on higher education and provide practical ways for mitigating its adverse effects while encouraging conditions that encourage academic innovation and cooperation.

Implications for Policy-Makers (Higher Education Institutions):

- Accountability and quality concepts in higher education can be reevaluated, and pressures on academics should be reduced by prioritizing qualitative and collaborative criteria. Performance evaluation systems can be redesigned by considering qualitative work such as teaching and contribution to the community.
- Policies can be created or reinforced to protect academic autonomy and allow for the development of intellectual diversity and creativity.
- Bureaucratic burdens on academics can be reduced and performance evaluations can be simplified. The criteria for appointment for professorial staff can be balanced and include fewer quantitative items.
- The balance between economic benefits and social values in education and research can be provided.
- It can be ensured that academic decisions are based on scientific values rather than market-oriented decisions.
- It can be ensured that public benefit projects and social awareness programs are developed.

References

Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (Eds.). (2011). The road to academic excellence: The making of world class research universities. World Bank Publications.

Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2016). (Un) Conditional surrender? Why do professionals willingly comply with managerialism. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 29(1), 29 45.10.1108/JOCM-11-2015-0221

Anderson, G. (2006). Assuring quality/resisting quality assurance: Academics' responses to 'quality' in some Australian universities. Quality in Higher Education, 12(2), 161–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320600916767

Anikina, Z., Goncharova, L., & Evseeva, A. (2020). Constructing academic identity in the changing Russian higher education context: Preliminary perspectives. Higher Education Research & Development, 39(5), 855–868. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1704690

Apple, M. W. (2006). Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality. Taylor & Francis.

Aprile, K. T., Ellem, P., & Lole, L. (2021). Publish, perish, or pursue? Early career academics' perspectives on demands for research productivity in regional universities. Higher Education Research & Development, 40(6), 1131–1145. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360. 2020.1804334

Arasa, J. N., & Calvert, M. (2013). Negotiating professional identities in higher education in Kenya: Dilemmas and priorities of faculty. Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 18(4), 402–414. https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2013.847232

Archer, L. (2007). Social diversity and democracy in higher education in the 21st century: Towards a feminist critique. Teaching in Higher Education, 12(5-6), 635-653. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701595325

Archer, L. (2008). Younger academics' constructions of authenticity, success, and echnologies identity. Studies in Higher Education, 33(4), 385-403. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802211729

Arpacı, M. (2011). Biyo-iktidar ve karnavalesk beden: Foucault ve Bakhtin'in beden kavramsallaştırmalarının karşılaştırılması [Unpublished master's thesis]. Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University.

Aslan, G. (2008). Türkiye üniversitelerinde neoliberal değişim: Öğretim üyelerinin kavram ve uygulamalara ilişkin değerlendirmeleri [Yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi]. ProQuest. https://www.proquest.com/docview/3073248691?pqorigsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses

Aslan, G. (2014). Neoliberal transformation in Turkish Higher Education System: A new story of a turning point: Draft proposition on the higher education law. Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 12(2), 255-283. http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/9-JCEPS122-guas-FINAL14-July-2014.pdf

Ayers, D. F. (2005). Neoliberal ideology in community college mission statements: A critical discourse analysis. The Review of Higher Education, 28(4), 527–549. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2005.0033

Ball, S. J. (2012). Performativity, commodification and commitment: An I-Spy guide to the neoliberal university. British Journal of Educational Studies, 60(1), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2011.650940

Ball, S. J. (2015). Living the neoliberal university. European Journal of Education, 50(3), 258-261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12132

Ball, S. J. (2017). Foucault as educator. Springer.

Balyer, A., & İşcan, B. (2020). Neoliberal eğitim politikaları. İ. Kocabaş (Ed.), Eğitim ekonomisi içinde (ss. 391-416). Asos.

Bauder, H. (2006). The segmentation of academic labour: A Canadian example. ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies, 4(2), 228– 239. https://acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/view/735

Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. Teaching and Teacher Education, 20(2), 107-128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001

Bennett, R., Hobson, J., Jones, A., Martin-Lynch, P., Scutt, C., Strehlow, K., & Veitch, S. (2015). Being chimaera: A monstrous identity for SoTL academics. Higher Education Research & Development, 35(2), 217–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1087473

Bentham, J. (1995). The panopticon writings. Verso Books.

Bidet, J. (2016). Foucault'yu Marx'la okumak. (Z. Cunillera, Trans.). Metis.

Biebricher, T., & Vogelmann, F. (Eds.). (2017). The birth of austerity: German ordoliberalism and contemporary neoliberalism. Rowman & Littlefield.

Biner, Z. Ö. (2019). Precarious solidarities: "Poisonous knowledge" and the academics for peace in times of authoritarianism. Social Anthropology, 27(S2), 15-32. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12701

Billot, J. (2010). The imagined and the real: Identifying the tensions for academic identity. Higher Education Research & Development, 29(6), 709-721. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2010.487201

Billot, J., & King, V. (2017). The missing measure? Academic identity and the induction process. Higher Education Research and Development, 36(3), 612– 624.https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1288705

Bosanquet, A., Mantai, L., & Fredericks, V. (2020). Deferred time in the neoliberal university: Experiences of doctoral candidates and early career academics. Teaching in Higher Education, 25(6), 736–749. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1759528

Bottrell, D., & Manathunga, C. (Eds.). (2019). Resisting Neoliberalism in Higher Education Volume I. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95942-9

Boukalas, C. (2023). A state without a future: Neoliberal despotism, crisis-fighting, and government through fear. Journal of Political Power, 16(3), 322–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2023.2298966

Bozzon, R., Murgia, A., Poggio, B., & Rapetti, E. (2017). Work–life interferences in the early stages of academic careers: The case of precarious researchers in Italy. European Educational Research Journal, 16(2-3), 332-351.

Breu, C. (2014). The post-political turn: Theory in the neoliberal academy. In J. Di Leo & U. Mehan (Eds.), Capital at the brink: Overcoming the destructive legacies of neoliberalism (p. 241–258). Open Humanities Press, Michigan Publishing.

Brown, W. (2015). Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution. Zone Books.

Butler, N., & Spoelstra, S. (2014). The regime of excellence and the erosion of ethos in critical management studies. British Journal of Management, 25(3), 538-550. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12053

Chalmers, D. (2011). Progress and challenges to the recognition and reward of the scholarship of teaching in higher education. Higher Education Research & Development, 30(1), 25-38. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2011.536970

Chandler, A. M. L. (2009). Agent and subject of discipline: How novice teachers experience techniques of power [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nevada]. Digital Scholarship. http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/2293383

Chatterjee, P., & Maira, S. (2014). The imperial university: Race, war, and the nation-state. In P. Chatterjee & S. Maira (Eds.), The imperial university: Academic repression and scholarly dissent (p. 1–50). University of Minnesota Press.

Clarke, C. A., & Knights, D. (2015). Careering through academia: Securing identities or engaging ethical subjectivities?. Human Relations, 68(12), 1865-1888. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715570978

Clarke, M., Hyde, A., & Drennan, J. (2013). Professional identity in higher education. In B. M. Kehm & U. Teichler (Eds.), The academic profession in Europe: New tasks and new challenges (pp. 7–21). Springer.

Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. Critical Studies in Education, 54(2), 99-112. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2013.776990

Connell, R. (2016). What are good universities?. Australian Universities' Review, 58(2), 67-73. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1113441.pdf

Coşar, S., & Ergül, H. (2015). Free-marketization of academia through authoritarianism: The Bologna process in Turkey. Alternate Routes, 26, 101–124. https://alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/22314/18106

Coşkun, B. (2016). Bir iktidar modeli olarak neoliberal yönetimsellik ve neoliberal özne [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Bilgi University.

Cruikshank, B. (1999). The will to empower: Democratic citizens and other subjects. Cornell University Press.

Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2018). Neoliberalizm. (G. Elliott, Trans.). Politika Press.

Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2022). Bitmeyen kâbus: Neoliberalizm demokrasiyi nasıl ortadan kaldırıyor (F. Keskin, Trans.). Sel Yayınları.

Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2005). The time of their lives? Academic workers in neoliberal time(s). Health Sociology Review, 14(1), 47–58. http://dx.doi.org/10.5172/hesr.14.1.47

De Vita, G., & P. Case. (2016). 'The Smell of the Place': Managerialist Culture in Contemporary UK Business Schools. Culture and Organization, 22(4), 348–364. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 14759551.2014.971122.

Dean, M. (2010). Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society. Sage.

Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, New managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important?. Comparative Education, 37(1), 7–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060020020408

Deem, R. (2003). Gender, organizational cultures and practices of manager-academics in UK universities. Gender, Work & Organization, 10(2), 239–259. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.t01-1-00013

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2007). Management as ideology: The case of 'New Managerialism' in higher education. Oxford Review of Education, 31(2), 217–235. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03054980500117827

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., Reed, M., & Reed, M. (2007). Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities. Oxford University Press.

Desierto, A., & De Maio, C. (2020). The impact of neoliberalism on academics and students in higher education: A call to adopt alternative philosophies. Journal of Academic Language and Learning, 14(2), 148-159. https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/731

Dickinson, J., Fowler, A., & Griffiths, T. L. (2022). Pracademics? Exploring transitions and professional identities in higher education. Studies in Higher Education, 47(2), 290-304.

Dillard, J. F., & Ruchala, L. (2005). The rules are no game: From instrumental rationality to administrative evil. Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal 18(5), 608–630. https://doi. org/10.1108/09513570510620475.

Dougherty, K. J., & Natow, R. S. (2019). Analyzing neoliberalism in theory and practice: The case of performance-based funding for higher education. Working Paper No:44. London: Centre for Global Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education.

Drennan, J., Clarke, M., Hyde, A., & Politis, Y. (2017). Academic identity in higher education. In J. C. Shin & P. N. Teixeira (Eds.), Encyclopaedia of international higher education systems and institutions (pp. 1–6). Springer.

Dugas, D., Stich, A., Lindsay, E., Harris, N., & Summers, K. (2020). 'I'm being pulled in too many different directions': Academic identity tensions at regional public universities in challenging economic times. Studies in Higher Education, 4(2), 312–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1522625

Ek, A. C., Ideland, M., Jönsson, S., & Malmberg, C. (2013). The tension between marketisation and academisation in higher education. Studies in Higher education, 38(9), 1305-1318. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.619656

Elkington, S., & Lawrence, L. (2012). Non-specialism and shifting academic identities: A sign of the times? Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 49(1), 51–61. 10.1080/14703297.2012.647783

Epstein, I. (2019). Affect theory and comparative education discourse. Bloomsbury.

Ercan, F. (1996). Yüksek Öğretimde Yeniden Yapılanma Eğilimlerinin Ekonomi Politiği, İktisat Dergisi, 357.

Faucher, K. X. (2014). Alienation and precarious contract academic staff in the age of neoliberalism. Confero: Essays on Education, Philosophy and Politics, 2(1), 35-71. http://dx.doi.org/10.3384/confero.2001-4562.141007a

Feather, D. (2016). Defining academic—Real or imagined. Studies in Higher Education, 41(1), 110–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.914921

Fırat, A., & Akkuzu, I. (2015) The commodification process of higher education and the changing nature of academic labour in Turkey. Critique 43(3–4), 375–393. https://doi.org/10.1080/03017605.2015.1099849

Fitzgerald, T. (2015). Critical university studies: Contestation and resistance in the neoliberal university. Routledge.

Fitzmaurice, M. (2013). Constructing professional identity as a new academic: A moral endeavour. Studies in Higher Education, 38(4), 613–622. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.594501

Foucault, M. (1990). The Uses of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality Volume 2. Vintage.

Foucault, M. (2003). The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception. Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2007). Cinselliğin tarihi. Ayrıntı.

Foucault, M. (2011). Büyük kapatılma. (I. Ergüden, & F. Keskin, Trans.) Ayrıntı.

Foucault, M. (2014). Özne ve iktidar (4th ed.). (I. Ergüden, & O. Akınhay, Trans.). Ayrıntı.

Foucault, M. (2015). İktidarın gözü (4th ed.). (I. Ergüden, Trans.). Ayrıntı.

Foucault, M. (2015a). Biyopolitikanın doğuşu. (A. Tayla, Trans.). İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Foucault, M. (2016). Güvenlik, toprak, nüfus (F. Taylan, Trans.). İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Foucault, M. (2017). Hapishanenin doğuşu (7. ed.). (M. A. Kılıçbay, Trans.). İmge.

Foucault, M. (2018). Toplumu savunmak gerekir (8. ed.). (Ş. Aktaş, Trans.). Yapı Kredi.

Gair, S., Zuchowski, I., Beddoe, L., & Tangata, T. K. T. (2021). Open Access publishing: A key enabler to research impact, informed practice and social justice. Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education, 22(2), 25-38.

Germov, J., & Poole, M. (Eds.). (2020). Public sociology: An introduction to Australian society. Routledge.

Gill, R. (2016). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neoliberal academia. Feministische Studien, 34(1), 39–55. https://doi.org/10.1515/fs-2016-0105

Gillies, D. (2008). Developing governmentality: Conduct and education policy. Journal of Education Policy, 23(4), 415-427. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930802054388

Ginsberg, B. (2011). The fall of the faculty: The rise of the all-administrative university and why it matters. Oxford University Press.

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. Harvard Educational Review, 72(4), 425–464. 10.17763/haer.72.4.0515nr62324n71p1

Giroux, H. (2010). Challenging the military-industrial academic complex after 9/11. Policy Futures in Education, 8(2), 232-237. 10.2304/pfie.2010.8.2.232

Giroux, H. A. (2011). On critical pedagogy. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Giroux, H. (2014). Neoliberalism's war on higher education. Haymarket.

Gordon, R., & Zainuddin, N. (2020). Symbolic violence and marketing ECRs in the neoliberal University. Journal of Marketing Management, 36(7–8), 705–726. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2020.1733047

Gore, J. M. (1995). After postmodernism: Education, politics and identity and school life. In Smith, R. & Wexler, P. (Eds.), Foucault's poststructuralism and observational education research: A study of power relations. Taylor & Francis.

Gürkan, C. (2016). Foucault'da neoliberal yönetimselliğin tarihsel boşlukları: Erken neo-klasik iktisat ve kamusal seçim teorisi. Felsefelogos, 20(63), 87-106. https://www.academia.edu/download/55177849/Gurkan__Foucault__neoklasik__kamusal_tercih.pdf

Hadley, G. (2015). English for academic purposes in Neoliberal Universities: A critical grounded theory. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Han, B.-C. (2018). Siddetin topolojisi (3. ed.). (D. Zaptçıoğlu, Trans.). Metis.

Han, B.-C. (2019). Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and new technologies of power. Verso Books.

Harvey, D. (2005). A brief history of neoliberalism. Oxford University Press.

Hayek, F. A. (2013). Law, legislation and liberty. Routledge.

Hazelkorn, E. (2011). Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world class excellence. Palgrave Macmillan.

Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. Higher Education, 49,155–176. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-2919-1

Horta, H., Jung, J., Zhang, L. F., & Postiglione, G. A. (2019). Academics' job-related stress and institutional commitment in Hong Kong universities. Tertiary Education and Management, 25, 327-348. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-019-09039-8

Ivancheva, M. (2015). The age of precarity and the new challenges to the academic profession. Studia Europaea, LX(1), 39–47. http://hdl.handle.net/10197/6522

İnce, A. (2020). Bir iktidar aracı olarak eğitim: Michel Foucault'nun eğitime ilişkin görüşleri. Turkish Studies – Education, 15(3), 1927-1938. https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.23030

Jaschik, S. (2016, April 4). The shrinking Ph.D. job market. Inside Higher Education. https://shorturl.at/vtaPV

Jawitz, J. (2009). Academic identities and communities of practice in a professional discipline. Teaching in Higher Education, 14(3), 241–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510902898817

Jessop, B., 2019b. Ordoliberalism and neoliberalisation: governing through order or disorder. Critical Sociology, 45 (7–8), 967–981. doi:10.1177/0896920519834068

Kallio, K.M., Kallio, T.J., Tienari, J., & Hyvoenen, T. (2016). Ethos at stake: Performance management and academic work in universities. Human Relations 69(3), 685–709. 10.1177/0018726715596802

Keisu, B. I., & Carbin, M. (2014). Administrators sor critical cynics? A study of gender equality workers in Swedish higher education. NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 22(3), 204–218. 10.1080/08038740.2014.916346

Keskin, N. (2003, 18-19 Aralık). Eğitimde reform, Kamu Yönetimi 1.Ulusal Kurultayı, İnönü Üniversitesi.

Kinman, G. (2014). Doing more with less? Work and wellbeing in academics. Somatechnics, 4(2), 219-235. https://doi.org/10.3366/soma.2014.0129

Knights, D., & Clarke, C.A. (2014). It's a bittersweet symphony, this life: Fragile academic selves and insecure identities at work. Organization Studies, 35(3), 335–357. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613508396

Koca, B. T. (2014). Biyopolitika, güvenlik ve Frontex'in Türkiye-Yunanistan sınırındaki rolü. Göç Dergisi, 1(1), 57-76. https://doi.org/10.33182/gd.v1i1.548

Koloş, U. (2016). Foucault, iktidar ve hukuk: Modern hukukun soybilimi. Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kwiek, M. (2001). Globalization and higher education. Higher Education in Europe, 26(1), 27-38.

https://doi.org/10.1080/03797720120054157

Leathwood, C., & Read, B. (2020) Short-term, short-changed? A temporal perspective on the implications of academic casualisation for teaching in higher education. Teaching in Higher Education, 27(6), 756-771. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1742681

Lemke, T. (2011). Biopolitics. New York University Press.

Levin, J. S., & Aliyeva, A. (2015). Embedded neoliberalism within faculty behaviors. The Review of Higher Education, 38(4), 537-563. 10.1353/rhe.2015.0030

Luka, M. E., Harvey, A., Hogan, I., Shepherd, T., & Zeffiro, A. (2015). Scholarship as cultural production in the neoliberal university: Working withing and against 'deliverables'. Studies in Social Justice, 9(2), 176–196. http://dx.doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v9i2.1138

Lynch, K. (2010). Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education. Arts Humanities in Higher Education, 9(1), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022209350104

Macfarlane, B. (2016). From identity to identities: A story of fragmentation. Higher Education Research & Development, 35(5), 1083–1085. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1222648

Marginson, S. (2007). The public/private division in higher education: A global revision. Higher Education, 53, 307-333. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-8230-y

Maxcy, S. (1991). Educational leadership: A pragmatic perspective. Bergin & Garvey.

McBurnie, G. (2000). Pursuing internationalization as a means to advance the academic mission of the university: An Australian case study. Higher Education in Europe, 25(1), 63-73. 10.1080/03797720050002215

McLean, N., & Price, L. (2017). Identity formation among novice academic teachers–a longitudinal study. Studies in Higher Education, 44(6), 990-1003. http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1405254

Memiş, P. (2013). Neo-liberal değişim sürecinin akademisyenlerin çalışma hayatına etkisinin bir vakıf üniversitesinde örnek olay yöntemi ile incelenmesi [Doktora Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi]. YÖK Tez Merkezi. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Miyoshi, M. (2000). The university and the "global" economy: The cases of the United States and Japan. The South Atlantic Quarterly, 99(4), 669-696. https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/4/article/30682

Newfield, C. (2008). Unmaking the public university: The forty-year assault on the middle class. Harvard University Press.

Newton, J. (2000). Feeding the beast or improving quality? Academics' perceptions of quality assurance and quality monitoring. Quality in Higher Education, 6(2), 153–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/713692740

Nixon, J. (2015). Introduction: Identities in transition – Perspectives, reformations and trajectories. In L. Evans & J.

Nixon (Eds.), Academic identities in higher education: The changing European landscape (pp. 1–28).

Bloomsbury.

Nocella II, A. J., Best, S., & McLaren, P. (2010). Academic repression: Reflections from the academic industrial complex. AK.

Olssen, M. (2006). Understanding the mechanism of neoliberal control: Lifelong learning, flexibility and knowledge capitalism. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 25(3), 213-230. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370600697045

Olssen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A-M. (2004). Education policy: Globalization, citizenship, democracy. Sage.

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), 313–45. 10.1080/02680930500108718

Ömür, Y.E. (2021). Neoliberal özne inşasının ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki gerçekleşme sürecine ilişkin beşerî sermaye söylemlerine dayalı bir çözümleme [Doctoral thesis, Ankara University]. YÖK Tez Merkezi.https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Paradeise, C., & Thoenig, J-C. (2015). In search of academic quality. Palgrave MacMillan.

Parson, L., & Steele, A. (2019) Institutional autonomy and academic freedom in Hungary: A historiography of Hungarian higher education. College and University 94(4), 10–23. https://www.proquest.com/openview/db0877a1a2cf44beee806631f3a815b0/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1059

Percy, A., & Beaumont, R. (2008). The casualisation of teaching and the subject at risk. Studies in Continuing Education, 30(2), 145-157. https://doi.org/10.1080/01580370802097736

Peters, M.A. (2006). Neoliberal Governmentality: Foucault on the Birth of Biopolitics. In S. Weber, & S. Maurer (Eds.), Gouvernementalität und Erziehungswissenschaft (pp. 37-49). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-90194-7_2

Pick, D., Symons, C., & Teo, S. (2017). Chronotopes and timespace contexts: Academic identity work revealed in narrative fiction. Studies in Higher Education, 42(7), 1174–1193. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1085008

Power, M. (1994) The audit explosion. DEMOS.

Pusztai, G., & Szabó, P. C. (2008) The Bologna process as a Trojan horse: Restructuring higher education in Hungary. European Education, 40(2), 85–103. http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/EUE1056-4934400205

Revel, J. (2006). Michel Foucault: Güncelliğin bir ontolojisi. (K. Atakay, Trans.) Otonom.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). Globalizing education policy. Routledge.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the State: Problematics of government. British Journal of Sociology, 43(2), 173- 220. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01247.x

Ruth, D. (2008). Being an academic: Authorship, authenticity, and authority. London Review of Education, 6(2), 99–109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14748460802184998

Shenker, S. (2008). Applying Foucault's "archaeology" to the education of school counselors. Educational Studies, 44(1), 22-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131940802224997

Shields, R., & Watermeyer, R. (2020). Competing institutional logics in universities in the United Kingdom: Schism in the church of reason. Studies in Higher Education, 45(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1504910

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1999). Audit culture and anthropology: Neoliberalism in British higher education. The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 5(4), 557–575. https://doi.org/10.2307/2661148

Shore, C. (2010). Beyond the multiversity: Neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university. Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, 18(1), 15-29. 10.1111/j.1469-8676.2009.00094.x

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L.L. (1997). Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university. Johns Hopkins University Press. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED409816

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. Organization, 8(2), 154–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508401082003

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education. The Johns Hopkins University Press. https://www.press.jhu.edu/books/title/3283/academic-capitalism-and-new-economy

Smith, J. (2017). Target setting, early-career academic identities and the measurement culture of UK higher education. Higher Education Research and Development, 36(3), 597–611. 10.1080/07294360.2017.1288708

Smith, C., & Ulus, E. (2020). Who cares for academics? We need to talk about emotionalwell-being, including what we avoid and intellectualize through macro-discourses. Organization 27 (6), 840–857. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508419867201

Sutton, P. (2017). Lost souls? The demoralization of academic labour in the measured university. Higher Education Research & Development, 36 (3), 625–636. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1289365

Şimşek, H. (2022). Türkiye'de vakıf üniversiteleri: Genç bir sektörün anatomisi. Seçkin.

Thatcher, M. (1981). Economics are the Method; the Object is to Change the Heart and Soul (Interview). Sunday Times, News UK.

Taylor, Y. (2014). The entrepreneurial university – Engaging publics, intersecting impacts. Palgrave Macmillan.

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), 271–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.511171

Temiz, H. E. (2004). Eğreti istihdam: İşgücü piyasasında güvencesizliğin ve istikrarsızlığın yeni yapılanması. Çalışma ve Toplum, 2(2), 55-80. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ct/issue/71791/1155133

Torres, C. A. (2008). Education and neoliberal globalization. Routledge.

Tourish, D., & Willmott, H. (2015). In defiance of folly: Journal rankings, mindless measures and the ABS guide. Critical Perspectives on Accounting 26, 37–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa. 2014.02.004.

Tran, A., Burns, A., & Ollerhead, S. (2017). ELT lecturers' experiences of a new research policy: Exploring emotion and academic identity. System, 67, 65-76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.04.014

Troiani, I., & Dutson, C. (2021). The Neoliberal University as a Space to Learn/Think/Work in Higher Education. Architecture and Culture, 9(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/20507828.2021.1898836

Van Houtum, H., & Van Uden, A. (2022). The autoimmunity of the modern university: How its managerialism is self-harming what it claims to protect. Organization, 29(1), 197-208. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420975347

Walsh, S. N. (2013). Counterrevolution and repression in the politics of education: At the midnight of dissent. Lexington Books.

Walkerdine, V. (2006). Workers in the new economy: Transformation as border crossing. Ethos, 34(1), 10-41. 10.1525/eth.2006.34.1.010

Walsh, S. N. (2013). Counterrevolution and repression in the politics of education: At the midnight of dissent. Lexington Books.

Ward, S. C. (2012). Neoliberalism and the global restructuring of knowledge and education. Routledge.

Welch, A. (2002). Going Global? Internationalizing Australian universities in a time of global crisis. Comparative Education Review, 46(4), 433-471. 10.1086/343120

Whitchurch, C. (2013). Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of third space professionals. Routledge

Whitchurch, C., & Gordon, G. (2010). Diversifying academic and professional identities in higher education: Some management challenges. Tertiary Education and Management, 16(2), 129-144.https://doi.org/10.1080/13583881003757029

Winter, R.P. (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 3(2), 121–131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13600800902825835

Wissema, J. G. (2009). Towards the third generation university: Managing the university in transition. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Worthington, F., & Hodgson, J. (2005). Academic labour and the politics of quality in higher education: A critical evaluation of the conditions of possibility of resistance. Critical Quarterly, 47(1–2), 96–110.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0011-1562.2005.00617.x

Ylijoki, O. (2014). University under structural reform: A micro-level perspective. Minerva 52(1), 55–75. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43550268

YÖK. (2007). Türkiye'nin yükseköğretim stratejisi. https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/Turkiyenin-yuksekogretim-stratejisi.pdf

YÖK. (2021). Üniversite-sanayi iş birliğinin geliştirilmesi eylem planı. https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/2021/universite-sanayi-isbirliginin-gelistirilmesi-eylem-plani.pdf

YÖK. (2022). Türlerine göre birim sayıları raporu. https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/