

A Critical Look at TUSIAD's Higher Education Report

Cengiz Aslan*
Ankara University

Abstract

The general, equal and free public education is inevitable for placing and improving an active democratic culture. When higher education is defined through company culture and the company culture tried to be placed into them, this leads to losing its function. According to Giroux, one of the most important figures in Critical Pedagogy, making higher education a product of the commercial culture is a barrier for the citizens who can improve and sustain the democratic public areas.

In this study, the report titled as "Higher Education in Turkey: Tendencies, Problems, and Opportunities / The observations and Suggestions based on EUA-IEP Institutional Evaluation Reports on Higher Education System" prepared by European University Association (EUA) Institutional Evaluation Program in October, 2008 is evaluated through applying the major tenets of "Critical Pedagogy". The report is prepared for the Education Sub-Group of the Social Affairs Committee Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association (TUSIAD), one of the privileged groups in Turkey. The report has been examined in accordance with the ideas of major figures within the field of Critical Pedagogy in terms of, structure (economy and administration), teaching, participation, and research dimensions. Results of the content analysis revealed some important concepts related to TUSIAD's conceptualization of education.

Keywords: Critical pedagogy, higher education, TUSIAD.

* Cengiz Aslan is Research Assistant in Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Cultural Foundations of Education, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: aslancengiz@yahoo.com

Introduction

Schools are the first public places where most of us get into systematic contact with broader society. This first contact also marks the beginning of our official story which in turn would determine our positionalities within social structure in accordance with power relations encompassing almost all aspects of it. While some experts are contending that social structure refers to the network of social relationship, others prefer to approximate it with the organization of the institutional systems. Thus the definitions of schools as one of the main building blocks of social structure vary in accordance with these differing paradigms. At the same token, schools are regarded as the transmitters of culture, an idea that connects school to the notion of acculturation. Apple (2006) states that norms, values, tendencies, and culture embedded into curriculum and school culture serve to the reproduction of society because, they are ideologically and politically constructed by the dominant elite in order to purport status quo and thus division of labour. In other words, schools are thought as the tools for shaping and constructing individuals in a way that dominant ideology wants them to be.

Beginning by the 1970s, some educators took up the challenge that there is a need for critically oriented educational practices in order to escape from the deteriorating effects of power and domination. Some of these scholars were gathered under the banner of critical pedagogy, albeit their deep intellectual differences. As Berk and Burbules (1999) put it “Critical Pedagogues are specifically concerned with the influences of educational knowledge, and of cultural formations generally, that perpetuate or legitimate an unjust status quo; fostering a critical capacity in citizens is a way of enabling them to resist such power effects”. These scholars generally tend to locate themselves within various traditions/approaches of Marxism. On the other side of the spectrum, some other scholars who also adopted critical paradigms did not subscribe to the “group of scholar” who call themselves critical pedagogues as they have some differing views about politics and ideology.

Nonetheless, both nexus espoused critique as a way of exploring educational and schooling practices. It would not be a mistake to claim that the converging point of critically oriented scholars is that there is a major link between schooling and economy (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). While on the one hand, reproduction of the society is achieved through manipulating this link (Giroux, 1983), on the other, this link is almost always exploited as it is used to legitimize the interest of corporations. In many cases, such exploitation has been done under the guise of a call for an educational reform.

Drawing upon the tenets of critical tradition in education, this paper explores and re-reads TUSIAD's (Turkish Industry and Business Association) higher education report. To achieve this end, content analysis of the report has been done. The report has been examined particularly in terms of notions of administration, economy, teaching, participation, and research.

The Report

Institutions, which would like effect on social arena, wish to influence on education as an ideological device. TUSIAD, one of the most powerful business organizations in

Turkey, also known as “the bosses’ club”, makes declarations on education from time to time with different reports and want to be an important authority on education in addition to its political functions.

Throughout its history, they get many scholars prepared reports on various aspects of social, cultural, and economic life in Turkey. It is not surprising when one reads the vision statement of the organization why they engage to conduct such reports.

TÜSİAD is a voluntary based civil society organization established by Turkish industrialists and businessmen in 1971 in order to represent the business world. TÜSİAD aims to contribute to the formation and development of a social order based on the adoption [sic] of the universal principles of human rights, freedom of thought, belief and action, a secular state of law, as well as the concepts of participatory democracy, a liberal economy, the rules and regulations of a competitive market economy and environmental sustainability (tusiad.org/tusiad/tusiads-vision/).

An organization with an aim to “form and develop social order” invited European University Association’s Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) “to analyse [sic] the seventeen evaluation reports of Turkish universities that had been conducted by IEP between 1998 and early 2007” (TUSIAD, 2008). The specific aims of the report are stated as “evaluating the internal and external conditions of Turkish higher education institutions and analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the entire sector (TUSIAD, 2008).” The report is divided into seven major sections each of which is anchoring various sub-sections. At the beginning of the report, authors provide an executive summary with *Key Points with Regard to the Higher Education System in Turkey: Autonomy and Accountability, External Governance and Diversity, Internal and External Quality Assurance, Finance and Funding, Internal Governance and Decision-Making, Relevance of Teaching Content and Research to the Needs of Society, Links with External Stakeholders*.

The overall argument revolves around the “urgency for revision” particularly at the level of leadership and management. What strikes most in the report is the emphasis on individuals’ ability and capacity to lead a major change.

University leaders must be enabled to develop their capacity for strategic thinking, for devising overarching policies and for motivating the members of the university to realize [sic] their potential. Individual success is a powerful driver, and individual satisfaction is a robust instrument for leaders with which to derive maximum application of effort as well as a readiness for consensus building among members of the university. More than in most other organizations, [sic] the success of universities relies on the creativity of its employees. Responsibility with real consequences that the leadership has the power to implement, coupled with individual commitment, initiative and innovation, are what a university environment is about, in Turkey as elsewhere (TUSIAD, 2008).

In critical tradition, however, individualism is seen as a trap set by the market to enslave the minds of people with the hope of success. In his famous book *Pedagogy of Oppressed*, Freire (2000) asserts that “[t]he pursuit of full humanity, however, cannot be carried out in isolation or individualism, but only in fellowship and solidarity; therefore it cannot unfold in the antagonistic relations between oppressors and oppressed.” Similarly, report underscores the “Lack of autonomy”, an extension of individualism, as the biggest speed bump for the development of the universities. “One observation that

appears again and again – in the literature, in the IEP review reports, from Turkish university members – sums up the main limitation to university development in the system, and this is the “lack of autonomy”. Higher Education Council, therefore, needs to revise itself as well. While acknowledging the role of YÖK (Higher Education Council) as a driving force and representative of Turkish universities, authors suggest that “[w]hat needs to change is the regulatory system that today is largely implemented by YÖK. For this to change, it is important to break away from the mind-set that is running the current system” (TUSIAD, 2008).

In short, in order to solve its problems and reach to the levels of modern European Universities, it is claimed that Turkish Universities need to adopt more liberal and individualistic approaches. In the following pages, I will try to analytically show how this idea is knitted in the report.

Method

The report entitled “Higher Education in Turkey: Tendencies, Problems, and Opportunities / The observations and Suggestions based on EUA-IEP Institutional Evaluation Reports on Higher Education System” is examined through “Content Analysis” method in order to “find out the concepts and relations of the data gathered” (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2003). The concepts and their frequencies in this study are identified through this method. A frequency analysis, which is one of the content analysis techniques, provides understanding of importance of a concept. Revealed concepts putted into order and then classified according to their frequency (Bilgin, 2006). For this analysis, “Concordance” computer program is used. Regarding the assumption that the frequency of the concepts signifies the theme of the report, the concepts and their frequencies are found out and put into a table. In the first phase of the content analysis, frequencies of the all words in the text were gathered. Later, I eliminated words other than concepts that I used for the analytic purposes. Finally, in accordance with the occurrence patterns, I looked at them through critical lenses in an attempt to construct categories of interpretation.

Findings

The Content Analysis of the Report and the Frequency

According to the Table 1, the concepts having 50 and more are listed decreasingly as: Turkey (*f* :265), Pupils (*f* :222), Quality (*f*: 221), Strategy(*f*:180), Administration (*f* :173), Rector (*f*:167), Structure/Structural (*f*:145), Autonomy (*f*:137), HEC(*f* :128), Government (*f*:119), Bologna (*f*:119), Budget/Budgeting (*f*:109), Academic (*f*: 108), Evaluation (*f*:105), Quality Assurance (*f*:105), EUA (*f*:99), Information (*f*:78), Leader (*f*:73), Finance/Financing (*f*:72), The universities funded by the foundations (*f*:68), Project (*f*:65), Support (*f*:65), Society (*f*:62), OECD(*f*:59), Income (*f*:55), Collaboration (*f*:55), Foundation (*f*:53), Course (*f*:52), governance (*f*:51). It is obvious that the concepts of “Human Resource Theory” and “Functional Theory” have both highest frequencies. Here words as autonomy, finance, income, support integrated and autonomy used not as a meaning for reflective thinking opportunities or research

universities but for “suitability to market”, “competitiveness”, agencies and leaders (Gümüş 2008,145). Also according to Güler (2003) administrative model in the report is

Table 1: The concepts and Their Frequencies in the Report

S.	Concepts	F	S.	Concepts	F
1.	Student	222	48.	Individual	25
2.	Quality	221	49.	Interdisciplinary	25
3.	Strategy	180	50.	Flexible/Flexibility	24
4.	Management/Administration	173	51.	Diplomas	24
5.	Rector	167	52.	Employment	23
6.	Structure/structural	145	53.	Agent	22
7.	Autonomy	137	54.	Technology	22
8.	Higher Education Council (HEC)	128	55.	Salary	21
9.	Government	119	56.	Performance	20
10.	Bologna	119	57.	Demand	20
11.	Budget / Budgeting	109	58.	Human resources	20
12.	Academic	108	59.	Accreditation	20
13.	Evaluation	105	60.	Cost	20
14.	Quality Assurance	105	61.	Placement	18
15.	EUA	99	62.	Harmony	17
16.	Information	78	63.	Capital	17
17.	Leader	73	64.	Scientific	17
18.	Finance	72	65.	Economy	16
19.	The universities funded by the foundations	68	66.	Balance	15
20.	Project	65	67.	Coordination	14
21.	Support	65	68.	Staff	13
22.	Society	62	69.	Culture	13
23.	OECD	59	70.	Transparency / Transparent	13
24.	Income	55	71.	Social	13
25.	Collaboration	55	72.	Guide	12
26.	Foundation	53	73.	Academician	12
27.	Course	52	74.	Science	12
28.	Governance	51	75.	Quality Culture	10
29.	Financial	46	76.	Equality/ Equal	10
30.	Fund	43	77.	Inspection	9
31.	Mission	43	78.	Freedom	9
32.	Change	42	79.	Employer	7
33.	Public Universities	42	80.	Capability	7
34.	Public	41	81.	Proficiency	7
35.	Credit	40	82.	Career	6
36.	Allocation	38	83.	Atatürk	6
37.	TUSIAD	38	84.	Values	5
38.	Authority/ Authorized	35	85.	Abilities	5
39.	Market	32	86.	Modern	4
40.	Industry/Industrialist	30	87.	Dialogue	4
41.	Standards	30	88.	Democratic	3
42.	Skills	30	89.	Democracy	2
43.	Competition	29	90.	Inequality	2
44.	Opportunity	28	91.	Global	2
45.	Lifelong Learning	27	92.	Inequality in Opportunity	2
46.	ECTS	26	93.	Human Rights	1
47.	Expertise	25	94.	Critical	1

not a democratic one although it is participatory. This model is a “whole power capital” model. Because Non-governmental organizations (NGO) are capital oriented ones in terms both of quality and quantity this solution is class oriented one giving power to the capital. The capital will be exclusive possession of a group of people instead of public. This is an anti-democratic practice. Also it could be said that the concepts in the report serves the Bologna process's aims as “ reforming universities in science and technology; preparing universities to global market and; privitalizing universities using less public resources” (Gümüş & Kurul, 2011). It serves to making privatization of the public.

The concepts having 10 and less frequencies are also listed decreasingly as: Quality Culture (10), Equal/ Equality (10), Inspection (9), Freedom (9), Employer (7), Competence (7), Proficiency (7), Career (6), Atatürk(6), Values (5), Abilities (5), Modern (4), Dialogue (4), Democratic (3), Democracy (2), Inequality (2), Global (2), Equal Opportunity (2), Inequality in Opportunity (2), Human Rights (1), Critical (1). This shows that the emphasis on the concepts of “Human Rights” (1) and “Critical” (1) is very little. In the report, it is understood that the terminology of the company culture has been highlighted and the social responsibility of the universities is seen as a market tool. In other words, this is the statement that the most important function of the universities is to train the students for the market and to work as a campaign or fabric that produces profitable tools with the new innovative technologies for market. This causes the universities to lose their public voice and prevent them to place a democratic understanding into the culture. With regard to Okçabol (2007), universities should be independent from political power in the country and of the capital in order to transmit the information produced by the universities and to present the alternative solutions by scrutinizing the social problems. Conducting the scientific research to earn money can cause science to be dominated by money. McLaren (2006) mentions that the most significant aim of the education is to create a secure world for global capitalism. The tendency of education towards entrepreneurship; i.e. privatization, and the programs regarding the companies' needs are signs of the capitalist social relations. Başkaya (1998) expresses that the universities have had a mission of making people embrace the dominant ideology and of training “staff and experts” to make the system continue. The universities, which have recently been functioned reproducing and sustaining the dominance, are the institutions where the human resource for the system has been educated. Therefore, the universities have been turned out to be the information company and the scientists are turned out to be information shop assistants.

The Administrative Dimension of the Report

In the IEP examination reports and the ideas gathered from the university staff, it is maintained that the main barrier preventing the university development is “lack of autonomy”. Moreover, it is defended that the role of HEC in the education sector is critical and so HEC should continue to play this role regarding guiding the universities in line with the current system and representing them. It is expressed what needs to be changed is the organizational system mostly designed by HEC and added that the current

mentality in the administration should also be changed, which signifies the political stance. It is acknowledged that Turkish higher education system will have a real change by defining its mission and vision and that in this mission and vision the future of the sector within the national and international society should be taken into consideration. It is also stressed that

- The centre of the change is to understand the autonomy
- The autonomy with the responsibility (which has real results based on the decisions and actions) can arrange itself
- The controls provide assurance that makes the external framework and all the actors act according to the common aims and vision.

The report involves the findings and suggestions related to the university administration as below:

- The universities need a mechanism of the “governance which provides the assurance of the benefits of the society as well as the quality assurance procedures and in which the representatives from other institutions take part in”.
- The university counselling committees involving members from outside of the university are needed to provide accountability since the system needs the external element which forces the university (TUSIAD 2008).

All of these are targeted to form the administrative dimension by combining the university and market.

According to Güler (2003) administration is giving to a triangle power which consists of NGOs, private sector and government. Also this formulation is not cover whole society excluding some sectors and damaging public. Similarly public is privatizing under the heading of regulation and this means government reforms conducted by organizations like IMF or World Bank.

The report elaborates that the university senates, as the university administration unit, are so crowded that this prevents them being functional and each rector has to construct an “administration group in the rectorate” which is hoped to provide the active and dynamic environment in his/her own university. Also, it is added that establishment of the counselling committees, having no interference of the university administration regulations, and managing the universities accordingly guarantee the accountability (TUSIAD, 2008).

It is stated that,

- the powerful academic self-governance and the selection of the deans and rectors inside the institution prevents the universities show their reactions.
- the central administration of the university does not have necessary power to affect the faculties on the strategic issues.

Hence, when the higher education system has been re-considered, the universities funded by the foundations are suggested as model institutions (TUSIAD, 2008). This request reflects the idea that “all kinds of badness bases on the public whereas the privatization is in the center of the goodness” (Apple, 2006). In the report, it is more striking that although there were sixteen public universities and one foundation (Private) university evaluated; the guidance is given based on a foundation (private) university regardless of these sixteen universities.

The privatization of the public school is turning the public property into the private one and victimizing the public income into an individual income. This means that education turns into

- an individual investment rather than a social investment;
- a means of the privileged to get the power and to solve their own problems and
- social limitation for the ones who are lack of the opportunities (Giroux, 2007).

The Dimension of Financial Condition

The report concerns that Turkish universities have the income from not only the student fee but also other financial sources and that there some advantages and disadvantages of getting this fee. It is proposed that the various financial sources for the universities provide them flexibility in the sources and the distribution of the sources. Moreover, this kind of finance drives the universities to the outside and brings about the connection between the university and the business and/or the industry, which provides the university and the market work together. Hence, this requires the university leaders and the staff trained accordingly; furthermore, the selection of the university leaders should be based on the abilities in line with this and they should also be provided the training (TUSIAD, 2008). It is defended that the university leaders should be more talent to produce and manage their own income and being more enterprising for them should be a criteria. It is pointed out that a good university and a good leader can be achieved when a connection between the university and the business world – and/or the industry world- is provided. However, the statement that the financial autonomy is referred to finding their own source for the universities shows an understanding that drives the universities to a kind of business and this opens a door to privacy in education In terms of the ones who consider the universities as a public area, the universities should be free to use the public sources assigned to them opposite to the idea that the universities' finding out their own sources (Okçabol, 2007).

In the report it is dealt with that the rectors should have the necessary capabilities to be active leaders as the heads of the university senate and the administrative committees in the process of “the governance in the institutions and their decision-making” since the universities require more professional management to provide the financial sources and the funds (TUSIAD, 2008). According to Giroux (2007), the ability of rectors in increasing the sources and connecting the academic world with the business one –rather than their intellectual abilities- signifies that the academic issues get importance regarding their own financial values in the market in the age of money and profit. This kind of process will bring about a step that produce works according to the needs of the capital and describes itself according to the more functional one instead of considering their social responsibility, common culture, common ideals, and democratic values. Regarding Giroux (2007), most universities which are dependent on money and described according to the language of the business aims at turning into a kind of the shop window of the licensed companies –through selling their campus areas to the companies- rather than dealing with the higher education issues. Additionally, nowadays the rectors are named as CEO.

The report involves that the universities funded by the foundations appeal to the needs of some students who have financial capabilities –either by their parents' support or by their own ability of getting scholarship. It is also expressed that this provides the variety in the models and alternatives in the system itself. Therefore, it is suggested that this variety should be spreaded. This suggestion leads to getting little benefit for most of the groups and deepening the existed differences in Turkey, where the inequality in opportunity is very prevalent. Moreover, the fact that the emphasis on the equality in the report is very little (f: 2) signifies how much this issue is considered. The report concerns that “the system runs on the advantage of the parents who can pay the university exam preparation courses and so it is questionable how much this is justifiable”. In addition, it is pointed out that “the gap between the number of applicants to the higher education and the placement that can be made shows a difficulty for Turkish society and when a solution is proposed, the social side of the issue should be considered”. Despite this, the suggestion on increasing the proportion of the universities funded by the foundations shows how much the social side is really regarded to counterbalance to profits and aims of these foundations.

The rise of the democratic culture is dependent on evaluating the education as a public benefit. Education is an area which the students obtain a public voice and the individuals and the social representatives can show themselves. Public higher education cannot be considered as a commercial investment or an entrepreneurship meeting the personal needs. Making higher education the product of a commercial culture is a barrier for the citizens who can improve and sustain the democratic public areas. Hoftstadter stated that the reason why higher education should be supported is not the service it provides; but the values –such as justice, freedom, equality- uttered to it in (Giroux, 2007).

The Dimension of Education

In the report it is stated that “in Turkish universities the students are not equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the needs of the market”; therefore, it is added that “some technical universities have been designed the suitable course programs to collaborate with the market by establishing the guiding councils including the stakeholders from there”. Thus, spreading them and making the university graduates equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills in order to compete with the global workforce are focused on the economy, economical income and the idea of the function, all of which are the results of the pragmatist understanding of Functional Paradigm. This shows that the mission of the university is to create the job opportunities and to train their students according to the needs of the markets With regard to İnal (1996), the universities are not the companies which should contribute into the national economy as the public organization and the anonymous companies. Universities cannot be defined the institutions supposed to train the students according to the needs of the market and to make them find a job in the market. Okçabol (2007) explained that the universities as the impulsive force of the socialization aim at “producing information (making research), transmitting the knowledge to the students at schools, and spreading and sharing the information

In the report, it is mentioned that the programs should be revised with the businessmen to have the practical and transferable skills to increase the graduates'

employment and in the long-run to make them adapt into the changing workplace (TUSIAD, 2008). It can be said that what is good for the companies is good for the country (Apple 2006). The aims of companies, ie profit will be the mainstream of universities.

Mclaren (2008) expressed that Neoliberal educationalists consider education responsible as a result of economical success; therefore, they have to take labour market and global economy into consideration. Apple (2006); moreover, stressed that the educational programs have an important place in creating the ideological hegemony of the dominant classes and social classes and recreating them". The main role of schools is to teach the ideological awareness helping the social division of labour to reproduce. As a result social relations of production are reproduced by ideological devices like educational institutions, schools, universities (Hull, 2005). Apple (2006) emphasized the relationship between the programs and the division of the labour by stating that "it is necessary to look inside the form and content of the programs if we would like to understand how the cultural dominance is processed and how the combination is created.

Public education takes significant responsibility through programs, funds, the priority of the examination, and its politics since the condition that the companies cannot guarantee the technical information, experts, the flow of the half-qualified staff by themselves becomes difficult day by day. Government is the centre of the economy through sustaining the accumulation of the capital, providing services, creating new markets as well as keeping the old ones, and employing most people in the public organizations. While the government makes the cost socialized, the profit becomes private. Whenever there is a profitable job, the fruits obtained are transmitted into the private sector (Apple, 2006).

The Dimension of Democratic Participation

In the report it is maintained that

- the university staff should be included in the strategic discussion on the roles and missions of the institutions
- all the stakeholders should be participated into identifying the clear aims and the strengths
- each individual should be motivated to contribute into this mission (TUSIAD, 2008).

All of these ideas are the suggestions which support the idea that people behave according to the expectation of their roles according to Functional Paradigm. The report also proposes that "a rectorship administration committee including the rector, the vice rectors, and the general secretariat should be established" to make quick decision since the senate is so crowded that this prevents its functioning properly by making its stakeholders outside. This suggestion means that only a few administrators get the responsibility when the troubles as a result of having wide power and responsibility and sharing the responsibility occur. Thus, this suggestion can affect the institutional integration, democratic and active participation, and taking common responsibility negatively. According to Gümüş (2008) these suggestions strengthen top-down authoritarian administration, instead of bottom-up democratic ones. In addition, it can

be said that this suggestion helps the needs of a group in the society and making the academy a market.

In the report, “powerful and academic self-governance and the selection of the rectors and the deans from the organization are considered as a barrier for the universities to react strategically in the modern society”. Also, it is stated that the central administration at the universities has lack of power to influence the faculties in the strategic issues. These both do not go along with the democratic university structure

The report deals with the necessity that the rectors should have the capabilities of being active leaders as the head of the university senate and the administration committees in the process of “the governance inside the universities and decision-making” (TUSIAD, 2008). This is making leaders in front, but this is not in line with shareholding the decisions taken by the active participation.

In the shortage of public areas supporting the democratic values, government forms an authoritative culture by making government company capital, the criticism is considered as the traitor by creating frightening culture, and media and the political parties become the part of the formal power increasingly from day to day. Neoliberal economy prevents the citizenship since it requires more harmony rather than the democratic politics and this economy supports consumption. While the public expenditure decreases, education gets out of democratic politics and political government becomes company government from day to day. This is the result of deficiency in democracy but not the result of power of Neoliberal capitalism (Giroux, 2007).

The Dimension of Researching

The 2008 OECD report suggests “being focused on the areas which have priority as changing the financial mechanisms to improve the research quality, emphasizing the significance of the use of the research, and training necessary experts”. Besides, it is proposed that “in some countries this change goes with extending the financial channels, the research funds sponsored by the business for the universities make the connection stronger by providing the inevitability and the universities are made to sensible for the needs of the industry”. These are all supported by the reporters in the higher education report. In the “World Higher Education Conference 2009” held in Paris, it is declared that “the institutions should find new ways in order to increase the researches and innovations by improving the multi-corporation with the small-and-middle-scale business between the public and private sectors as a result of the needs of the finance for researching and innovation.” Since the universities are required more financial sources, the companies provide the necessary financial support willingly. Moreover, they demand that the researches that they sponsored should be focused more. In the universities such as California University, their representatives take part in the faculty commission which decides how to divide the research funds and how to spend them. For example, in terms of a study published in 1996, 98 % of the articles written were the ones on the medicine supported by the medical companies. It is demanded that the results of the researches which show the undesired results and effects and have not been included in the articles (Giroux, 2007). The report states the idea that “the researches which have been prioritized should be focused” and “the research funds of the business become indispensable for the universities to extend the financial sources.” As a result, there is a

high risk that “most academicians can become the employees who work for the companies instead of being scientists since the borders between the public values and commercial benefits become flue” (Giroux, 2008).

Due to the fact that the public area have become more and more commercial and the government come closer to the capital, politics becomes a means of legislation rather than a means of peace and social reform. As long as the government goes away from health, education and public benefit, it becomes a police or security government in a more expertising way. Also, the government closes the ones which can be ignored by turning a kind of device which invigilates other people and arrests them. Moreover, the social politics turns into the actions inclined to crime (Giroux, 2007).

The autonomy of the universities is a crucial issue regarding the fact that they should not be affected from the authorities, their environment will become a free atmosphere and they can improve their functions in a democratic structure. Okçabol (2007) maintains that there are three main areas in an autonomous university as scientific, administrative and financial autonomy and added that academicians have the right to make scientific researches and declare them to the public and these all considered as scientific autonomy. Scientific and administrative autonomy refer to being administered without any external interference and to achieve this, there should be four essential features (Eurich 1981 in Okçabol 2007): Teaching a subject as it is, employing the academicians and their titling, conducting a research whatever she or he wants, and choosing their own students and deciding their own criteria for graduation. When autonomy in finance refers to finding the financial sources on their own for the universities, this brings about considering the universities as the business focused on the income. However, for the ones defining the universities as the public area, the university should be free to distribute the public finance given to itself in contrast to finding its own finance (Okçabol, 2007). According to Gümüş (2008) “autonomy” concept used as “nonautonomy” and controlled by priorities of political authority and representatives of capital instead of university.

Conclusion

Universities are influenced from the social structures and power relations in society where they placed. Today universities' administrative structure and scientific paradigms are changing with the effect of globalization. Turkish universities are coordinated by Higher Education Council (HEC), which founded after 1980. Sometimes HEC would be too autocratic and damages the autonomy of universities. In this report, prepared by TUSIAD, structural and administrative changes are predicted in universities. Surprisingly the report highlighted the HEC's function as “a tampon for universities to provide them an apolitical attitude” and defences its necessities for their wellbeing in the future. However, in this structure excusing the crowded structure of university senate, report suggests an “administration group” which should be constituted in each university by their rector. In this structure advisory boards, having members out of universities, (TUSIAD, 2008) reflect the aim of authority transfer to capital by rector. The university structure having target oriented administration, leadership, quality management, competition, hierarchical administration resembles an example of enterprising university (Tural, 2006).

It could be argued that the suggestions and ideas stated in the report resonate the discourses of “Functional Paradigm” and “Human Resource Theory”. The concepts repeatedly used in the report and having the high frequency support this idea. In the report Bologna concepts like lifelong learning, recognition, mobility, strategic plan, quality assurance, performance, transparency, accountability, stakeholder, agency, accreditation are used (Gümüř & Kurul 2011). This clearly indicates that the report serves Bologna Process, in which universities are harmonized with local, national and global markets.

Furthermore, the timing of TUSIAD report affirms the thesis that “in the economic crisis period, the capital shows their ability in powers” (Apple, 2006). It can be said that timing of this report helps the idea of “getting benefit of” the crisis since the discussions on Turkey’s having a crisis –having a political, economic and social instability - were at the peak at the time of the report preparation with regard to the statistical report on Turkey situation in that time.

The education scholars should re-think the social area and develop a critical language to get rid of the language made depoliticized and commoditized in the period when the citizenship becomes market based and when the youths becomes the subjects of consuming rather than of questioning and criticizing (Giroux, 2009). Likewise, Apple (2006) explained that at schools students should be equipped with critical thinking skills and that the initial task of the educationalists and the intellectuals is to get the support of people and provide the association in this area. According to McLaren (2007), the Revolutionary Critical Pedagogy should choose bettering the public life encircled by making life companied, privatized, and turning it into a company world (including company-academy cooperation) as a target for itself.

In conclusion, the universities have the traditional roles in making the society humanized and providing the priority to the concept of public. Identifying the researches basing only on the profit leads to the elimination of the most important social problems which should be taken into consideration by the universities as a public area (Giroux 2007). In a process that company culture is tried to be placed into the universities and the capital is considered similar to the needs of the society, it will be difficult to make the students adopt and internalize the democratic values. Regarding Giroux (2006), in this process, the deregulation takes the place of freedom of the citizens related to citizenship, they lose their public voice, and the society becomes the one which bases on the consumers who take their citizenship duties for granted in time.

References

- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Eđitim ve iktidar*. [Education and power]. Translated from English by Ergin Bulut. İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- Başkaya, F.(1998). Bilim, üniversite ve etik. *dođu batı*. Ankara: Cantekin Publishing.
- Bilgin, N. (2006). Sosyal bilimlerde içerik analizi, teknikler ve örnek çalışmalar. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.

- Burbules, N., & Berk, R. (1999) Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and limits. Thomas S. Popkewitz and Lynn Fendler, ed. *Critical Theories in Education*, New York: Routledge, 45-65.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and esistance in education: a pedagogy for the opposition*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H.A. (2007). *Eleştirel pedagoji ve neoliberalizm*. [Critical pedagogy and neoliberalism] Translated from English by Barış Baysal. İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- Giroux, H. A. (2008). *Eleştirel pedagojinin vaadi*. [The promise of critical pedagogy] Translated from English by Umre Deniz Tuna. İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- Güler, B. A. (2003). Devlette reform, *TMMOB Mimarlar Odası Yayınları*. Ankara.
- Gümüş, A. (2008). “EUA-TÜSIAD “Yükseköğretim sektörü” raporu: yükseköğretim işletmeciliği projesi” Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi. C 6, S 23, Yaz 2008, S. 130-163. (EUA-TUSIAD Report On “Sector Of Higher Education”: Project Of Higher Education Management). Educaiton Science Society Journal /Volume:6 Issue:23 Summer:2008 Page: 130-163
- Gümüş, A., & Kurul, N. (2011). *Üniversitelerde bologna süreci neye hizmet ediyor?*. Ankara: Eğitim Sen Yayınları.
- Harvey, D., Giroux, H.A., Apple, M., Freire, P., & McLaren, P. (2009). *Eleştirel pedagoji söyleşileri*. [Critical pedagogy dialogs] İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- Hull, S. (2005). *Anlamlandırma, temsil, ideoloji: Althusser ve post-yapısalcı tartışmalar. kitle iletişim kuramları*, Derleyen: Erol Mutlu, Ankara: Ütopya Yayınları.
- İnal, K. (1996). *Eğitimde ideolojik boyut*. [Ideological dimation of education]. Ankara: Doruk Publishing.
- McLaren, P. Rikowski, G., Cole, M. Hill, D. (2006). *Kızıl tebeşir*. [Red chalk] İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- McLaren, P. (2007). *Kapitalistler, işgalciler imparatorluğa karşı eleştirel bir pedagoji*. [Capitalists and conquerors: Critical pedagogy against empire]. Translated from English by Barış Baysal. İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- Okçabol, R. (2007). *Yükseköğretim sistemimiz*. [Our higher education system]. Ankara: Ütopya Publishing.
- Tural, N. (2006). Türkiye’de üniversiteler ve akademik yaşam: değişim ve sorunlar. eğitim üzerine 8. uluslararası konferansı Atina Eğitim ve Araştırma Enstitüsü.
- TÜSIAD Report (2008). *Türkiye’de yükseköğretim: eğilimler, sorunlar ve fırsatlar*. [Higher education in Turkey: tendencies, problems and opportunities]. İstanbul: Graphis Publishing. www. tusiad.org/tusiad/tusiads-vision
- UNESCO (2009). *Yükseköğretimin yeni dinamikleri ve toplumsal değişim ve kalkınma için araştırmalar*, [New dynamics of higher education and researches for social

change and development] Paris. Web: <http://bologna.yok.gov.tr> Retrived: 14.02.2010.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2003). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. [Qualitative research in social sciences]. Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.

About the Author

Cengiz Aslan is currently carried out his PhD study in the Department of Cultural Foundations of Education at the Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences. His studies are mainly about the educational sociology and history of education subjects.

International Journal of Educational Policies

ISSN: 1307-3842

**<http://ijep.icpres.org>
<http://ojs.ijep.info>**