

Durmaz, S. O. (2013). From the Hegemonic Production Regime to the Hegemonic Despotism: Reading the Transformation of the Teaching Profession in Turkey through Burawoy's Set of Concepts. *International Journal of Educational Policies*, 7(2), pp. 89-103.

## **From the Hegemonic Production Regime to the Hegemonic Despotism: Reading the Transformation of the Teaching Profession in Turkey through Burawoy's Set of Concepts\***

Orkun Saip Durmaz\*\*

*Ankara University*

### **Abstract**

Burawoy did not restrict the arguments about labor process with the *problematique of deskilling*, but enriched those arguments with the concept of *production regime*. In other words, He conceptualized the term of labor process with not only its economic aspects, but also with its ideological and political aspects. Therefore, the concept of production regime was conceived as a social system defined through labor process, reproduction of the workforce, competition among the firms and state policies.

In this study, neo-liberal transformation of the society is going to be taken into consideration on the base of *teachers and the teaching profession*. Although it is realized that Burawoy's set of concepts, developed by concentrating on the workplace in which production of goods had been processed, is not wholly compatible with service sector in which teachers are included, it is considered that the concept of production regime can be explanatory for teachers and their labor process. The transformation of the teachers in Turkey, which has been beginning with 1980 and continuing as a sharp process today, is going to be discussed by using Burawoy's set of concepts: *a transition from hegemonic production regime to hegemonic despotism*.

**Keywords:** *Teacher, labor process, Burawoy, relations in production, production regime.*

---

\* Data of this study were gathered from the PhD study called as *Labor Process and Re-Proletarianization: the Case of Teachers in Turkey* prepared by Orkun Saip Durmaz. This study was presented at Fifth International Social Rights Symposium in Bursa (Turkey) at 31<sup>th</sup> October-1<sup>st</sup> November 2013.

\*\* Orkun Saip Durmaz is Research Assistant in Department of Labor Economics and Industrial Relationships at Faculty of Political Sciences in Ankara University. E.Mail: orkundurmaz@gmail.com

## **Introduction**

The attempts to create a neo-liberal society did neither mean a simply technical process which was identified with transition to a more substantiated economic model nor were be able to successful in yielding a common consensus on the issue. While the actual projection of the conceptual abstraction called as commercial and financial liberalization on the social life took place as the collective actions of the petty tradesman who went bankrupt for variety of reasons or the act of throwing cash register in front of the Prime Minister, the technical concepts, such as privatization and restriction of public expenditures, were experienced by the workers whose work place was privatized as being unemployment or becoming sub-contracted employee. Similarly, the restriction of the public expenditures – that is, constraints on the social expenditures- resulted in increases in the tuition fees of the university students or widespread compulsory donations to schools by parents.

At that point, the question “why we need to study the transformation of teaching process by depending upon the concept set of Burawoy” may arise. It is necessary to be stated that this study is the first example in its approach to its subject since, we did not encounter with any other study which explains the transformation of the social position of teachers and their profession with the concept of production regime that Burawoy derived from his analysis on the intersection of the labor process, re-production, the inter-firm competition and state policies. We believe that this lack in the literature is the result of existence of very huge gap between theories and facts in the field. We will touch on why such a gap existed and how it might be narrowed down in the second section; but, for now, it is enough to state that we consider explaining facts hinging upon theories as important.

There are considerable number of national and international studies which focus on the relation between the transformation of teaching profession and neo-liberal restructuring processes. To put them briefly, while some of the studies (Apple, 2005; Rikowski, 2003; Robertson et al., 2002; Keskin-Demirer, 2012; Kurul, 2012) analyze the commercialization and marketization of education, some others focus on the teaching labor process (Reid, 2003; Thoma, 2005; Ozga and Lawn, 1988; Aksoy et al., 2013). In fact, when talking about the relationship between transformation of teaching profession and neo-liberal re-structuring, we referred to the above mentioned process. Nonetheless, we analyze the same relationship by hinging upon the concepts presented by Buroway and focusing on the economic, political and ideological relations that take place in the site of production.

### **How to Read the Capitalist Labor Process According to Burawoy?**

The contributions that Burawoy made on explaining the capitalist labor process are composed of three interrelated points: (1) In order to analyze the capitalist labor process or the capitalist’s control over labor process and worker, it is necessary to point towards the essential features of the capitalist production mode instead of examining the deskilling of the labor force. In other words, rather than

focusing on the differences which referred to the labor quality between artisanal labor and modern worker, we must take the distinctions between the capitalist mode of production and non-capitalist mode of production into account. (2) The site of production does not only correspond with the labor process; accordingly, it does not only correspond with the area where the economic relations take place. On the contrary, the site of production is not free from influences of the both ideological and political relations which are conditioned by the economic relations in the last instance and social relations which stem from the work place's own ideological and political structure (Özüğurlu, 2008:49). Accordingly, the work place is confined by politics and ideology. Burawoy (1985: 29-30) analyzes this confinement through two different concepts: the production relations and relations in production<sup>1</sup>. (3) While the production relations and relations in production cover the production and re-production relations in the work place at the micro-level, they also include inter-firm competition and the state policies at the macro-level. As a result, the capitalist control over the worker becomes multi-layered and Burawoy (1985: 8) improves the concept of production regime to explain this multi-layered control.

### **The Distinguishing Feature of the Capitalist Mode of Production**

According to Burawoy (1979:27-29), the identifying feature of the capitalist production process is that the production of surplus value is obscured within the labor process and it also being secured in that process. However, the production of surplus value in the labor process does not take place *per se* within a non-capitalist mode of production<sup>2</sup>. In a non-capitalist mode of production, the direct producer hands over his/her product to lord to whom he/she subjects and the surplus transfer takes place in this way. In a capitalist mode of production, on the other hand, the transfer of surplus begins immediately after the involvement of the direct producer in the labor process. Nonetheless, it is necessary to be stated that worker and capitalist does not encounter with each other as classes who are aware of the class antagonism in the labor process where the transfer of surplus occurs. Rather, there exist some elements which alleviated the polarization between worker and capitalist within the labor process that those, at the same time, obscure the relations of exploitations. Firstly, although worker actually encounters with his/her fellow workers or foreman whom is a worker, too, he/she comes barely across with the capitalist who purchases his/her labor force. Secondly, there exists various management methods which facilitate the competition between workers and divide and individualize them in this sense. Lastly, the bourgeois ideology as the ideology of dominant class hinders workers from being aware of a collective social entity within the work place, too.<sup>3</sup> These three reasons keep the production

---

<sup>1</sup> The concept of *relations of production* has already been adopted by the Marxist literature. The real contribution of Burawoy is the concept of relations in production through which he argues the labor process within its ideological and political aspects.

<sup>2</sup> By the non-capitalist mode of production, Burawoy mainly points towards the feudal mode of production.

<sup>3</sup> Burawoy criticizes the existing literature which analyzes the negative effects of the bourgeois ideology on the working class consciousness, for they analyze influences of the relations of production, that is the political and ideological processes, on the outside of the sphere of

of surplus value being obscured. Yet, it is not enough to keep it hidden, it is equally important to secure the production of surplus value uninterrupted in order to provide the capitalist control over worker (Burawoy, 1985:32-34). The problem of worker's dependency to capitalist arises at that point. Unlike Braverman (1974), Burawoy asserts that this dependency is not related with the control of synchronization and organization issues, which arise within the economic progress of labor process; on the contrary, it roots in the fact that worker will gain the wage which he/she must get to re-produce his/her own life only after the end of the labor process and from the hand of capitalist. As a result, since worker's wage cannot be differentiated from the production of surplus value, both worker became dependent to capitalist and the production of surplus value becomes an uninterrupted process.

### **The Relations of Production and Relations in Production**

The above mentioned distinguishing features of the capitalist mode of production are the relations within the labor process which Burawoy conceptualizes as relations in production. According to Burawoy (1985: 7-8), who comprehends the production not just through economic but also ideological and political meanings, relations in production constitute the production regime alongside with the relations of production:

I defend the thesis the process of production decisively shapes the development of working class struggle. This thesis can be sustained only if the process of production is seen to have two political moments. First, the organization of work has political and ideological effects - that is, as men and women transform raw materials into useful things, they also reproduce particular social relations as well as an experience of those relations. Second, alongside the organization of work - that is, the labor process - there are distinctive political and ideological apparatuses of production which regulates production relations. The nation of production regime or, more specifically, factory regime embraces both these dimensions of production politics.

One of the most important contributions, here, is to consider the work place not only a place where the production is maintained but also a site where the social relations and related experiences are re-produced. In other words, any production site, for Burawoy, is identified with the ideological and political elements as well as economic ones (Öngen, 1996:156). Therefore, capitalist must engage in ideological and political activities in order to maintain control over the labor process. It is necessary to control worker by oppression and/or consent that this is the particular characteristic of the capitalist labor process in general and relations in production in specific.

By keeping the argument in mind, there are two other important insights of Burawoy; firstly, the politicization of the production site. In this regard, Burawoy revised the mainstream theory since the traditional approaches which define politics as a super-structural institution outside of the labor process. Secondly, as related with the first point, Burawoy comprehends the labor process and practices of class struggles as intertwined through the concept of politics of production. On the one side, Burawoy reconceptualizes the labor process as a site of class

---

production. On the other hand, the bourgeois ideology has significant effects on the site of production with its distinguishing features as well.

struggle; he, on the other side, reestablishes the long interrupted link between labor process and working class as the revolutionary subject. On the other hand, his approach to class struggle is not confined to the boundaries of work place. When analyzing the politics of production and composing the concept of the relations in production, he does not ignore the macro-level, that is the relations of production. As the production regime regulates labor-capital relations in micro-level, which are mainly related with the organization of work, state governs the relations of production, accordingly class struggles, in macro-level (Yücesan-Özdemir, 2010:40). Furthermore, there is an indispensable link between relations in production and relations of production since as Özüğurlu (2008:49) argues: "it is impossible to perceive the economic sphere as exclusive to its own ideological and political influences and as free from the ideological and political structure of work place".

### **The Production Regimes**

There are four basic components of the production regime: the economic production process, the reproduction of the social relations within work place, the current condition of the inter-firm competition within capitalist system and the very characteristics of the state policies. Burawoy (1979) defines five different production regimes in terms of these four components.<sup>4</sup> Among those, the hegemonic production regime and hegemonic despotism matters to this study. What differs any hegemonic production regime from despotic one is the active involvement of state in the production process. The presence of social policy implementations and comprehensive social security systems curb the dependency of workers on wage, accordingly on capitalist. Moreover, the level of real wages increases to a higher level where worker may reproduce himself/herself thanks to trade unions and collective bargaining system. By intervening in the economic policies in the macro-level as well as the labor process, state restricts the inter-firm competition, especially the adverse consequences of such competition on employees. In addition, there are state's regulations in favor of workers in labor-capital relations. The workers dismissals, the unpaid overtime work or the obstruction of being organized which are the features of the despotic production regime are restricted in the hegemonic regime. All these practices require taking the worker's consent rather than exerting oppressions on them to maintain control over worker (Balkız, 2013:195). Burawoy define hegemonic despotism, on the other side, as the combination of the market despotism and hegemonic production regime and it actually refers to use of oppression mechanism by taking some previous worker's gains back during the neo-liberal era. Here, the strategy of taking consent is not wholly given up; but its scale and scope is diminished. The introduction of novelties in the information sector and automation on the production sector, the flexible work methods, the practices of human resource and total quality management which are presented as the new industrial relations solidify the worker's dependency on capitalist but, it aims to consolidate the dependency through hegemonic means (Balkız, 2013:196). In other words, worker is subjected to capitalist through his/her own self-control. There are two important

---

<sup>4</sup> The other production regimes in addition to the hegemonic and hegemonic despotic production regime are patriarchal despotism, paternalist despotism and market despotism.

features of the hegemonic despotism on the level of state policies and inter-firm competition. Firstly, the welfare state policies are whittled away to a great extent and thus, the subjection of worker's to capitalist are reconsolidated. Secondly, the measures which limited the despotic practices in work place are either abolished or diminished. In this regard, the large scale use of sub-contracting or atypical employment forms are not only applied to decrease the labor costs; those methods are also put into practice to weaken and divide workers on the site of production without resulting in a serious struggle over the administrative issues (Özüğurlu, 2008: 51).

### **The Transformation of Teaching Profession or the Re-Proletarianization of Teachers**

It would be misleading to argue that there is a direct conceptual link between the model that Burawoy has developed and the process which we call as the transformation of teaching profession and re-proletarianization of teachers. As a matter of fact, the gap between the process which we analyze and Burawoy's model is significantly large since he established his model by mainly considering the production of surplus value and transformations in traditional industrial proletariat. Accordingly, we should admit at first that this study is no more than a brief attempt to show that there is no insurmountable abyss between labor process that teachers are subjected and Burawoy's model; since, we consider that his theoretical approach which comprehends the capitalist labor process with its ideological and political aspects is useful to explain the re-proletarianization process which teachers largely experience.

### **The Production of Surplus Value, Service Sector and Teachers**

Since it has a significant place in the Burawoy's argument on the labor process, we need to briefly touch on whether the service sector in general and teaching process in particular produce surplus value. According to Marx, who does not consider commodity production just as the production of goods, "the productive labor is a kind of labor that it produce commodity and / or trains, develops, fixes and re-produces the labor force itself." (Yılmaz, 2005). Furthermore, getting their wages not from the income but from the share of capital proves that teachers involve in the production of surplus value. That means the relation of exploitation occurs. Another concept developed by Marx as related with his argument on the surplus value is the collective labor. Emphasizing on the collectivity of the capitalist labor process through his concept of collective labor, Marx asserts that (1975: 537-538):

As the collectivity of labor process becomes more obvious, the concepts of productive labor and worker become more comprehensive as the necessary result of this. In order to work productively, it is not enough to work with hand, it is required to be a part of collective labor, perform one of the functions that is demanded by it.

Reid (2003:565) touches on the particular features of the teacher's labor. Arguing that the teacher's labor is concretized on the students who constitute the future labor force, Reid asserts that teachers indirectly engage in the production of surplus value. Since, formal education is defined by the preparation of future labor force for the capitalist labor process both economic and ideological and political meanings.

Certainly, there are different approaches on whether teacher's labor produce surplus value. The reason why there is such a sub-section in this study is not to present those debates but the very fact that the production of surplus value is obscured and secured in the capitalist labor process. It is not who produced surplus value but what kind of *relations in production* to which workers are subjected enlarges the scope of Burawoy's model in terms of teaching labor process. In this regard, the obscuring and securing of the labor process as an ideological and political issue is very valid for teachers, too.

### **Teacher in the Labor Process**

To what extent Burawoy's assumption which put forth that the relations of exploitation take place in the capitalist labor process without the help of any non-economic factor but at the same time the actual labor process itself curb the severity of inherent conflicts is valid for teachers? As it might be recalled, Burawoy argues that workers and capitalist do not confront each other at the site of production and the very functioning of the labor process obscures the contradictions. When the teachers who are employed in the private schools and courses are considered, there is no direct encounter between teachers and capitalist who hire them. The employer remains an abstract identity for teacher who actually handles with the administrators in the special courses. The real employer for a teacher, employed in a private course, is the person who sits at the other side of the table when he/she signs the agreement, who is in charge of contacting with teacher in case of any problem or giving leave of absence to teachers (Ulutaş, 2013:47-48). Under such circumstances, it is expected that the confrontation occurs between teacher and administrator who run the business in the name of capitalist during the labor process; however, teachers actually confront with parents and students rather than administrators.

A teacher with whom we interviewed asserts that students and parents pretend to act as employers:

A student who comes late in class and you do not let him/her in or who does not finish his/her homework and you dismiss him/her in the class finds the courage to say that he/she is paying money to the course and thus he/she refuses to leave the class. The same defence may be enunciated by parents. By getting courage from their parents, students can use same language. I think, parents are the real source of such attitudes. (*Teacher G.*)

Although managers' attitudes are varied in terms of the scale of the organization where they are recruited, they rather act to conciliate the conflicts emerge between parents and teachers:

The institution rather takes side with parents. There was no such a problem in the institutions where I was previously employed since the number of students attended in those was too much. Therefore, the management thought that 'if one student leaves the institution, another somehow registers' and they accordingly stood rather for teachers. Yet, the situation is completely otherwise in my current institution since the number of registered students is few. Then, managers stand for parents by expressing that 'you shall ignore whatever parents say' or 'you shall go easy on parent's demands. (*Teacher A.*)

When it is, at least, considered in terms of private courses and the scale of work place is taken into account, the employers which teachers confront are students-parents. This situation obscures the real employer. On the other hand, students-parents simultaneously are in touch with the real employer, namely the owner of course, and managers who run the business in the name of owner. On this issue, another teacher asserts that:

Especially in the registration period, parents are told that it is a private course and parents can call to account in whatever way they like. The institution is presented as a business to parents in those periods... As a result, parents make us, sometimes indirectly but sometimes to obviously, feel that we are recruited here by their money". (*Teacher S.*)

As we stated in the previous sub-section, Burawoy analyzes the isolation of employees in the work place and the competition between them as a factor which obscures the relation of exploitation in the capitalist labor process. In parallel with this, teachers work as isolated as the nature of their profession. That means, a teacher does not engage in a relationship with another teacher in the technical progress of labor process. This situation, as a matter of fact, inhibits teacher's estrangement to the labor process since it provides teachers with an independent work space by easing the control over teachers (Ozga and Lawn, 1988; Sinclair et al., 1996). Moreover, a teacher who is employed at a public school has the chance get in relation with his/her fellow teachers; such as, to exchange ideas with other teachers, talk with various issues when he/she finishes his/her class or in his/her free time. Therefore, a teacher, in comparing with a factory worker, has a greater opportunity to get in social relations in the work place.

We are making conversations in the teacher's room. Our topics are not very sophisticated ones in general but we have the chance to talk between each other about the situation of our school, the education or any other subject... though not in outside of school, we involve in very good relations within the school. (*Teacher Ö.*)

This situation is valid for the private course's teachers to a certain extend. Although it is hard to get in relationships for those teachers thanks to the intense course schedule and long work hours, it is not totally impossible:

People, here, talk about the attitudes of managers and the work conditions in general. The fellow teachers may mention about successful students who will likely get a good place in the competition. Except this, those who are more sincere with each other may speak about their private lives. (*Teacher E.*)

Nevertheless, the opportunity to get in social relations does not always inhibit the atomization in the work place. Sometimes due to their concerns about the work place and sometimes their fear of losing their jobs, teachers can't talk about any issue in every time. The real important thing is that those who eager to talk faces with the danger of being isolated:

Unfortunately, the teachers are not very courageous to talk with managers or owners about their rights out of being an employee. Very few people here encourage talking to management about the issues which they speak about within the friend circles. If you do it, you will become Don Quixote fighting against the windmills. (*Teacher S.*)

It is necessary talk about a very intense competition between teachers in the private courses. There are so many candidates who are newly graduated that the competition begins already before being teacher. After beginning to work in the

private course, however, a teacher remains all alone. The trade unions of workers are not organized enough among teachers who have no right to be organized in the public service unions. The high percentage of unionization among the teachers who are employed in the public institutions is the result of the peculiar relationship between union and politics rather than the expression of a strong solidarity between teachers.

Although the wage dependency of workers to capitalists which Burawoy stresses on is valid for each and every worker, teachers have serious advantages to lose that dependency. Having a chance to give private courses weakens the dependency of teachers to capitalist or state as employer to a certain extent. Similarly, the teachers recruited in the public institutions have the chance to deal with their personnel affairs in the summer times and create resources for supplementary income. Nevertheless, this is not valid for teachers in the private courses. Those teachers are not paid wages in the summer times in general and their insurance premiums are not given when they do not work.

### **The Resistance at the Site of Production**

Almost all the issues that we analyzed so far are about mechanism that functions to control teachers in the work place. On the other hand, work place is not just the sphere of repression and isolation, the specific kind of struggle and resistances occurs at this place (Burawoy, 1985:108). It is necessary to give some examples of resistances and struggles that teachers experienced. It is a known fact that the budgets of primary schools are composed by the 'voluntary donations' paid by parents and the wages of personnel those are hired to take care of buildings are paid out of those donations. As well as creating tension between school management and parents, this fact resulted in the confrontation between managers and teachers. In other words, being controlled in the labor process does not mean that teachers do not resist the current of affairs. A teacher expresses his experience in this issue as following:

Our director brought the issue of collecting money from students in table. The meeting was about how much money would be asked from students. I told that it was not pleasant to talk about such issues in the meeting as a kind of resistance. Anyway, when I expressed my negative feelings about the issue, the director reacted and ordered the vice-director to write a minute about me. He immediately acted to finish me... (*Teacher G2*)

It is hard to claim that teachers who are employed at a public school as permanent staff are interested in getting title of master or head teachers through the carrier exams. While some protests and does not attend the exams, the teachers who attend in the exams claimed that getting those titles does not mean anything but increase in wages:

This differentiation is not so beneficial, since we all do the same job, our job remains the same! After being a master I was provided with neither different job nor room etc... I am exactly doing the same job what I was doing before being a master. In certain professions, the quality of job is differed after being a master. We are doing the same job. (*Teacher Y.*)

The scale of resistance may vary for the teachers in the private course since course's teachers may probably pay the price of resisting with their jobs. Accordingly, some practices of resistance which became common in the working

life are related with the basic human needs; such as, resting or eating. Sometimes, the teachers have to evade even to eat:

There are 20 or 30 minutes of resting time for our branch teachers but there is no such a time for the guidance counselors since they have to accompany students in their entrance and leaving times. They shall be accessible to students by all the time. As a result, we either hidden go out for lunch in the shortest time possible or we eat some snacks in the canteens in order to meet our needs when students are in the classes. *(Teacher S.)*

### **How Teacher Experiences the Production Regime?**

We mentioned that Burawoy's concept of the production regime is composed of four elements: the labor process, the reproduction process, the inter-firm competition and state policies. Now, it is time to discuss what those elements mean for teachers in the hegemonic production and hegemonic despotic regime.

### **The Teacher and Labor Process in Terms of the Production Regime**

The most important difference which differs the hegemonic despotism from the hegemonic production regime in terms of the labor process is the increase in the despotic practices in the work place with the emergence of different recruitment types. As a result of the emergence of different teacher's status which refers to atypical recruitment models and unsecured work types, the dependencies of teachers to the school management are solidified. Teachers who lack their rights may have a future to be decided by the school director. A teacher who long standing are hired with a temporary contract expresses:

Our situation is rather different from teachers who are permanently employed...They can act more independently but we cannot. Since it matters to us about how the management would act in case of any problem...For example, you take a decision about an issue. It is important to us to consult management about that decision. After being confirmed by the management, we can apply that decision. *(Teacher Y2.)*

Another difference is related with the decrease of teacher's autonomy. Various technological utilizations and the guide books which standardize the education confine the autonomy of teachers. Teachers who previously used to be recognized as the person of having the knowledge about how to teach, be respected and did not allow anyone to intervene in his/her area of jurisdiction has been evolving a technician in the process of modernizing the profession (Ünal, 2005:47). Especially in the private sector, the technology is utilized so widespread in the name of improving the speed of teaching that teachers remain mostly as the transmitters of knowledge:

The writings at the board are directly copied to booklets through the computers owned by nearly all students. That means, students do not take notes, they just fill in the blanks in the booklets. The whole content of any subject stands in front of students in the boards...A mathematician who uses a smart board does not invest his/her time in writing a new question, he/she strives to answer the question which readily comes across in the board. *(Teacher G.)*

### **The Teacher and Reproduction Processes in Terms of the Production Regimes**

The most significant threshold of the production regime is the processes of reproduction for teachers. According to Hill (2003:3), who defines teacher as the guardians of quality of labor force, teachers function a significant role in the social reproduction of labor force as providing future labor process with skill, quality and proficiency. In case of Turkey, by actively involving in the establishment of nation-state as the agents of idea of Republic and enlightenment, teachers have been one of the significant and indispensable parts of the regime. This resulted in the emergence of teachers as a highly respected social group. And teachers gave their consent to the regime. This situation is appropriate with the practices of hegemonic production regime. In the hegemonic despotism, on the other hand, teachers are expected to both to train labor force and present their own labor force to market at the same time (Ercan, 2013). Although being held responsible to defend the state ideology in the hegemonic production regime, teachers are assumed to argue for the market ideology in the hegemonic despotism. Even if teachers are hired in a public institution, the situation does not matter since state itself stands for the market ideology.

But, it is misleading to analyze the transformation as an inevitable result caused by necessities of capitalism. Especially in the hegemonic production regime, the scale of teacher's autonomy is larger and in this sense, they, as teachers or educators, may support the social struggles in the name of economic and social justice and have a significant impact on creating a counter-hegemony (Hill, 2003:18). Indeed, in Turkey, teachers constituted one of the leading groups in the social opposition movements during the 1960s and 1970s.

### **The Teacher and Inter-Firm Competition in Terms of the Production Regimes**

There is no important share of private schools and courses in the education as a sector in the hegemonic production regime. Teachers are largely employed in the state institutions and they accordingly remain as immune from the intra-sector economic competition. The only possible competition at that point is the competition between state schools in terms of credibility rather than a competition as occurs between private schools that run after economic gains. Therefore, there is no competition which might influence the work conditions and teacher's professional rights. In hegemonic despotism, however, the share of public sector diminishes gradually. More private institutions involve in the sector and therefore, more teachers are begun to be recruited in the private sector. The teachers who are hired in the private institutions are more vulnerable to be influenced by the competition between those firms in terms of their working conditions and rights. This adds up for the emergence of despotic practices:

The managers in the private courses perpetually keep us pins and needles. Since there are a lot of unemployed teachers, there are a lot of people seeking for job. The management thinks that it can easily hire another people if someone leaves the job. It always keeps teachers on standby. Sometimes those teachers are invited by the management. It tries to say to the working teachers that that there are alternatives to them; so, they have to work straight. (*Teacher C*).

The competition between state schools extends beyond the competition of credibility in the hegemonic despotism. Since the schools are in need of donations asked to parents, the issue which school children of wealthy parents do prefer becomes the matter of economic competition rather than a mere prestige. The management of the public schools engages in a severe competition on this matter:

There is not a certain budget put forth by the Ministry for the primary and elementary schools. The managers run the school by merely depending upon the donations given by parents. Let me give an example. We have four employees working as cleaner, etc. In addition to their wages, the expenditures of paper work and computer are all paid by parents. We are bound with parents! (*Teacher A.*)

### **The Teachers and State Policies in Terms of the Production Regimes**

The state policies identify economic and political developments in the macro-level which cover the all three elements. All the emergence of unsecured and atypical recruitment types, restriction of teacher's autonomy in the labor process, the transformation of teacher's function in the reproduction processes and extension of private institutions in the education as a sector are all related with the state policies. As a matter of fact, the state policies are nothing but the combination of neo-liberal economic policies and the growing influence of conservatism that is imposed by neo-liberalism.

### **Conclusion**

In this study, the transformation of teaching process which have been experienced by the teachers from the 1980s to today is analyzed by the help of Burawoy's concepts. In the first section, we discussed his contributions to the debates on capitalist labor process, the process of the obscuring and securing of the surplus value and the concepts, such as relations in production, relations of production and production regimes. Then, we examined the transformations in teaching profession through Burawoy's set of concepts. After debating the difference between productive and non-productive labor, we studied the teacher's position in relations in production in the light of evidences derived from the field study. Afterwards, we presented the examples of resistance at the site of production and discussed eventually the position of teacher in two different production regimes.

As we earlier discussed within the text, we attempted to adopt Burawoy's theoretical approach, which Burawoy himself developed for the work places those produced tangible goods, in the sphere of education where the services are produced and accordingly in the labor process where teachers are involved. What Burawoy's model made appealing for our subject is that it approaches to the labor process not just in terms of commodity production but also in terms of production of social relations. This differentiates Burawoy from the other scholars who reflect on the labor process. Conceiving the site of production as a place which has its own distinctive ideological and political dynamics is the important contribution that Burawoy has made in the theory.

There are two main weaknesses of this study. First of all, we approached to the labor process through the arguments of Burawoy and did not mention the contributions of the other scholars, preeminently Braverman, at all. Although this is an important problem for a study reflecting on the labor process, we did not include the other contributions in order not to get away from the main points that we wanted to stress. Second weakness is related with Burawoy's approach that he equally stresses on the mechanism of struggle and resistance as well as control and isolation at the site of production. We gave much more space, on the other hand, to the dynamics of control and isolation than the struggle and resistance. Accordingly, our Burowian approach is flawed with one important aspect of the theory. Here, we had to make a choice and were aware of such problem. We hope to ameliorate this absence with the future studies accompanying with our new debates on the literature.

### References

- Aksoy, H. H. et al. (2013). "Eğitimde Teknoloji Kullanımına İlişkin Eleştirel Bir Değerlendirme" [A Critical Evaluation about the Use of Technology in Education]. In, N. Kurul. et al (Ed.). *Kamusal Eğitim, Eleştirel Yazılar [Public Education, Critical Articles]*, pp.107-129, Ankara: Siyasal Publishing.
- Apple, M. W. (2005). "Education, Markets and an Audit Culture", *Critical Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No: 1-2, pp. 11-29.
- Balkız, Ö. I. (2013). "Yeni Üretim/Yönetim Modelleri ve Denetim: TKY Modelinde Hegemonik Despotizmin Yükselişi" [New Models of Production/Management and Supervision: the Rise of Hegemonic Despotism in the Model of TQM]. *Çalışma ve Toplum*, No: 36, pp. 187-210.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent, Changes in the Labour Process Under Monopoly Capitalism*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1985). *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*, London: Verso.
- Ercan, F. & G. Şimşek (2013). "Öğretmenlik Mesleğinin Dönüşümü/Dönüştürülme Çabaları: Ulus-devletin Muhafızlarını Yetiştirmeden Sermaye İçin Emek Gücü Yetiştirmeye" [The Transformation /The Efforts for Transformation of the Teaching Profession]. Web: <http://www.sendika.org/2013/01/turkiyede-ogretmenlik-mesleginin-donusumudonusturulme-cabalari-ulus-devletin-muhafizlarini-yetistirmekten-sermaye-icin-emek-gucu-yetistirmeye-gizem-simsek-fuat-ercan> Retrieved: 03.01.2013.
- Hill, D. (2003). "Global Neo-Liberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance", *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, Vol. 1, No: 1, Web: <http://www.jceps.com/PDFs/01-1-01.pdf> Retrieved: 05.11.2012.

- Keskin-Demirer, Derya (2012). *Bitmeyen Sınavlar, Yaşanmayan Hayatlar* [Unending Exams, Dead Lives]. Ankara: Dipnot Publishing.
- Kurul, N. (2012) "Turkey under AKP Rule: Neoliberal Interventions into the Public Budget and Educational Finance", In, K. İnal and G. Akkaymak (Ed.). *Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey: Political and Ideological Analysis of Educational Reforms in the Age of the AKP*, pp. 82-94, New York: Palgrave and McMillan Press.
- Marx, K. (1975). *Kapital, Birinci Cilt [Capital, V. 1]* Translated from English by Alaaddin Bilgi, Ankara: Sol Publishing.
- Ozga, J. & M. Lawn (1988). "Schoolwork: Interpreting the Labour Process of Teaching", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, V. 9, No: 3, pp. 323-336.
- Öngen, T. (1996). *Prometheus'un Sönmeyen Ateşi, Günümüzde İşçi Sınıfı* [Prometheus's Inextinguishable Light, Current Working Class] İstanbul: Alan Publishing.
- Özüğurlu, M. (2008). *Anadolu'da Küresel Fabrikanın Doğuşu, Yeni İşçilik Örüntülerinin Sosyolojisi* [The Emergency of the Global Factory in Anatolia, the Sociology of New Labor Patterns] İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- Reid, A. (2003). "Understanding the Teachers' Work: Is There Still a Place for Labour Process Theory", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, V. 24, No: 5, pp.559-573
- Rikowski, G. (2003). "Schools and The GATS Enigma", *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, V. 1, No: 1, pp.52-65.
- Robertson, S. L. et al. (2002). "GATS and the Education Service Industry: The Politics of Scale and Global Reterritorialization", *Comparative Education Review*, V. 46, No: 4, pp.472-496.
- Sinclair, J. et al. (1996). "Classroom Struggle? Market Oriented Education Reforms and Their Impact on Teacher Labour Process", *Work, Employment and Society*, V. 10, No: 4, pp.641-666.
- Ulutaş, B. (November-December 2012). "Eğitim Fabrikasının Ağır İşçileri: Dersane Öğretmenleri" [The Sloggers of the Education Factory: Teachers in Private Courses] *Eleştirel Pedagoji*, No: 24, pp.43-53.
- Ünal, I. (2005). "'İktisat İdeolojisi'nin Yeniden Üretim Süreci Olarak Eğitim" [Education as the Reproduction Process of the Ideology of Economics] *Ekonomik Yaklaşım*, V. 16, No: 57. Web: [https://www.academia.edu/3306166/iktisat\\_ideolojisinin\\_yeniden\\_uretim\\_sureci\\_olarak\\_egitim](https://www.academia.edu/3306166/iktisat_ideolojisinin_yeniden_uretim_sureci_olarak_egitim) Retrieved: 15.12.2012.
- Thoma, D. (2005). "Restructring The Teachers' Labour Process: The Case of Greece", *Mediterranean Journal of Education Studies*, V. 10, No: 2, pp.1-17.

Yılmaz, G. (2005). "Hizmet Emeđi ve Marksist Deđer Teorisi" [The Labor in Service Sector and Marxist Theory of Value] Web: [http://emekdoga.org/hizmet\\_emegi\\_ve\\_maxist\\_deger\\_teorisi.htm](http://emekdoga.org/hizmet_emegi_ve_maxist_deger_teorisi.htm) Retrieved 05.01.2013.

Yücesan-Özdemir, G. (2010). "Despotik Emek Rejimi Olarak Taşeron Çalışma" [Sub-contracted Labor as the Despotic Working Regime], *Çalışma ve Toplum*, No: 27, pp.35-50.

### **About the Author**

Orkun Saip Durmaz is currently carried out his PhD study in the Department of Labor Economics and Industrial Relationships at the Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences. His studies are mainly about the theories of labor process, sociological aspects of the process of (re) proletarianization and Marxist methodology and epistemology.

*International Journal of Educational Policies*

ISSN: 1307-3842

<http://ijep.icpres.org>

<http://ojs.ijep.info>

©

IJEP