

Academics as interpellated: A study about academic identity

Hakkı Toy

The Ministry of National Education, Türkiye

Abstract

It can be said that there is a large literature on the metamorphosis in the direction of marketization brought about by capitalist globalization in the academic field. In the aforementioned literature, it is stated that the academy operates more and more with the rules of the capitalist market and therefore academic study, education and training become more instrumental to market purposes. Just as it is insufficient to describe the market and market-centered transformation with the "invisible hand" metaphor in order to hide the market actors in the economic field, it is just as inadequate to describe the metamorphosis in the academic field without considering the academic identity. In this sense, it is necessary to evaluate the market-oriented transformation in the academic field together with the metamorphosis and erosion of academic identity. Academics, like other social identities, become subjects through the Althusserian "interpellations of dominant ideologies" or their identities are constructed in the context of Foucauldian power relations. While academics are subject to this procedure, they also become subject to this process. In order to survive in this ambiguous operation, academics try to resist the interpellations of the dominant ideology in the academic field and the dominant capitalist market ideologies and conditions in the social field, on the other hand, they try to transform these conditions that make them subordinated.

Problematizing the collective identities of academics/scientists who identify with social transformation, autonomy and emancipation is critical to understanding and trying to overcome this dilemma. This study is based on and begins with the analysis of the dominant ideology and its interpellations theorized by Althusser.

Keywords: *Ideology, interpellation, academic identity, subjective experience*

Introduction

Universities, defined as academic fields, are historical and social institutions that operate to fulfill important facts and purposes including scientific research, knowledge production, publication, education and training. Today, since universities have historically undergone a radical transformation in terms of purpose, structure and functioning; they are called by new names such as multiverse, university of technology, entrepreneurial university, etc. (Deem, 2001; Guerrero-Cano, Kirby, & Urbano, 2006; Audretsch & Belitski, 2021). Considering the market-oriented metamorphosis in today's universities and the functions performed by universities in this direction, it can easily be said that they are no longer the universities of the last century, even starting from these new names.

At first glance, this transformation in higher education seems to ensure that scientific knowledge production and reproduction of labor power are carried out under the control of capital, in line with the global transformation in social/economic structures. This situation has led to the weakening of the public quality of the information produced in universities, and the fact that information is considered more as a commodity with regulations such as patents and intellectual property rights. The commodification process of knowledge has taken on a situation where those who produce knowledge/academics in universities are alienated from their products (Ildır, 2011). According to Fiske

(2003), ruling classes control not only the production and distribution of goods, but also the production and distribution of ideas and meanings. This means that the ruling classes produce, distribute and control not only the reproduction of knowledge and labor power in universities for their own economic and political interests, but also the thoughts and meanings of academics as the subject of education and scientific practice.

It can be said that these developments, which changed academic life, destroyed scientific autonomy, academic freedom, and eroded academic identity, placed the scientific research agenda much more in the determination of profit-oriented companies, capital, in short, the capitalist market. So, what are the dominant ideologies that evoke academics from Althusser's point of view in the network of capitalist social relations, and what are the sources of these dominant ideologies/ideologies? For example, it can be said that the dominant ideology/ideologies in the field of science; can be scientific societies, institutions and organizations, science academies that determine who is a scientist and who is not, what is science and what is not (Nalbantoğlu, Özel, Narin & Günsoy Kaya, 2008, p. 8) as well as associations outside the scientific field, non-scientific social institutions, media, state, market and capital.

Across of commodification and its marketization, how likely is it for universities to function autonomously (as a phenomenon, not as an epiphenomenon) in a way that includes academia, in short, an end in itself and a purpose for itself? Today, academics, the main actors of education and science, what was once seen in ivory towers, in the context of the commodification process of information (Ildır, 2011), are being squeezed into laboratories and technoparks with more and more flexible working regimes. The imagination of academics in the minds, the change of value and meaning in academic activity, in historical process, has faced the risk of turning academy into a factory, alienated academics into foremen, students into customers and processed

objects. The revolutionary character and transformative power, prestige and virtues of the rational, and therefore the science and scientist, which were described as the "transition from mythos to logos" in ancient Greece, have become very sought after these days. Nowadays, it seems as if the logos have been replaced by capitalist market mythologies and ideologies in the field of education/science at universities.

It is important to understand the metamorphosis in the academic field both the subjectivity of the academician and his/her subordination as an interpellated, in terms of finding a political liberation. For this purpose, in this study, it is aimed to re-discuss the system of social relations, power relations, meta-discourse or dominant thought(s)/ideology(ies) and the sources that produce it, which condition the academician to work as we witness. This study will be considered successful to the extent that it contributes to other studies that politically problematize the social position and function of the academic, who is one of the professional identities.

Academic identity

In The Communist Manifesto written a century ago, "The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage laborers." As evidenced by his statement (Marx & Engels, 2018, p. 55), the academic, who is seen as an intellectual in society, is in danger of turning into an ordinary knowledge worker. Expressed as the proletarianization of academics, it actually stands before us as a reality that works in order to leave no "privileged" or "glorified" social status to academics within the globalized capitalist system. In order to understand the problems experienced by academicians, who are one of the main actors of scientific knowledge production and education, and to produce valid solutions,

it requires a holistic discussion of the ontological and epistemological dimensions of the identity, which refers to the title of academician. Otherwise the discussion will be too reductionist.

According to Özsoy (2007), it is not to problematize academic identity, to criticize the ideological contents related to the ontological status of the academician, or to place our academic image on a consistent ideological basis; is to know whether it is possible to create a new “truth politics” regarding academics. Thus, we shift the axis to "the truth of the academician".

Because, just like science, the academician does not have an eternal truth waiting to be discovered or invented. Like every historical and social reality, the reality of the academic is constantly reconstructed. It bears the imprint of power relations and acquires content and form by them. Identity construction always takes place within a network of power relations; what is important is by whom and for what purpose this fiction was made (Özsoy, 2007).

According to Althusser, professionals who specialize in any branch, whether they have an academic education or not, are people "overdetermined" (surdetermined) by a culture of domination that has made them divided beings. Althusser reveals this determination that the production of truth about academics does not take place in a historical and social vacuum. This means that no matter which axis we discuss the ontological and epistemological status of the academician; we are essentially trapped within the cognitive framework drawn by the dominant ideology, a culture of domination that cripples us as divided entities. So, is it possible for an academic to escape from this prison or to transcend the boundaries of this identity within this framework?

So, who is an academic? Is it a person who only engages in scientific activity based on his expertise? Althusser (2000, p. 37) defines the ideas of academicians about the work they do and the relationship they have with this work as the ideology of science per se, and he argues that every academic has

such an ideology, whether he is aware of it or not. Similarly, it can be said that the discussions conducted for universities are made by adopting a market-oriented/utilitarian perspective regarding the functions that universities fulfill rather than their existential problems, as mentioned above. The ontological problem of universities can only be resolved by solving the epistemological problem of what, how and for whom academics do as the subject of scientific research. For whom and under what conditions do academics produce education, knowledge and science today? I wonder, academics work as knowledge workers with the principles of economic rationality in universities that turn into factories for profit maximization in line with the demands of capital and the capitalist class to meet the requirements of capitalist production relations? Are they aware that they are objectified and subaltern at the same time as they become subject as part of this process? In such a case, is it possible to talk about the struggle for autonomy and liberation in the scientific and social field? I leave the answers to these and similar questions to the reader. In this sense, thinking of the academician together with the academic identity, Althusser's dominant ideology and interpellation theory can provide an opportunity to politically understand and discuss the transformation in today's university.

Academics and the ambivalent nature of ideology

It refers to the ontological dimension of academic identity why the academic exists. What, how and for whom the academic tries to discover and also knows constitutes the epistemological dimension of this identity. In this study, in which academic identity is aimed to be problematized, firstly, a discussion will be made on Althusser's approach to science and ideology, and then with Althusser's ideology-interpellation theory and criticisms of this theory, academic identity will be discussed in an organic integrity with its ontological and epistemological dimensions.

In an article published in 1971, Althusser expresses this reflexive construction as follows: “In order to grasp what follows, it is essential to realize that both he who is writing these lines and the reader who reads them are subjects themselves, and therefore ideological subjects (a tautological proposition), i.e. that the author and the reader of these lines both live “spontaneously” or “naturally” in ideology in the sense in which I have said that “man is an ideological animal by nature” (Althusser, 1971). In that case, it can be said that the scientist as the producer of any scientific work and the readers, critics or beneficiaries of this work spontaneously live in ideology based on Althusser's suggestion.

Well, what is ideology as one of the concepts on which the debates will never end? What is the source of ideology? What is the dominant ideology? Let's look at the answers to your questions. Aristotle, who says " man as being a rational animal" in a society where there is a distinction between slave and human, shows man as the source of thought/idea, and distinguishes human existence from other beings because of this ability. At the same time, with this feature, human is the one who thinks about himself existentially and knows that he is different from other living things as a species. Thus, at first glance, ideology, as a concept that directly evokes thought, is directly associated with human existence and considered together. Based on this connection, human as specie has been defined as a natural ideologue/thinker with his existence. Now, at this very point, the first determination about ideology can be made: Ideology is not an external phenomenon to human beings, but the source of ideology itself at the same time.

When the concept of ideology is analyzed etymologically; this concept, which is formed by the combination of the Greek terms “eidos” and “logos” (Williams, 2007, p.185), it was first used by the French thinker Destutt de Tracy in the 18th century and in the sense of the science of ideas/ thoughts. The concept is to

explain how thoughts are formed; anthropology, biology, archeology etc. It has been used as close to the meaning we use as a science nomenclature or refer to sciences today (Sucu, 2012). However, soon after Napoleon was in power, names such as Cabanis, Condoret and Tracy, who defined themselves as "ideologists", described ideology as not science, but as ideas devoid of concrete foundations, and therefore as metaphysical rather than as science, due to their criticism of social events in the country. Moreover, he said that ideologues also do "metaphysics" (Mardin, 1976). Thus, for the first time historically, ideology was given a pejorative or negative meaning. Manfred and Alfred, (1999, 198) ideology; conditioned by the production relations of society, expressing certain class interests and influencing people's thoughts, feelings and actions, to create opinions, values and judgments in their own direction and to set behavioral norms; they defined it as a system of political, philosophical, religious, artistic, etc. social ideas.

To make a second point about ideology: ideologies try to establish themselves through action, so it can be said that ideology has a controversial nature and ideology lacks fixed foundations like the political one. The determination of power relations about what is political and what will be the subject of political discussion is in question, as well as what is ideology, what ideology is, the structure of ideology is again determined by power and power relations and is the subject of political struggle. It is like comparing, for example, the thoughts of Adam Smith and Karl Polanyi on the capitalist free market system. As opposed to the views of Adam Smith, who ascribes very limited duties to the state and argues that social interests will be realized through an invisible hand, on the market, similar to the views of Karl Polanyi, who argues that market society and market economy did not arise spontaneously, and that a very serious state intervention is necessary for the construction of a market economy

(Polanyi, 1986). What do you think is considered an ideology today? I leave the answer to this question to the reader.

Ideology is a concept that does not have a founding principle (an-arkhe) due to its similarity with the political one. In that case, ideology in the academic field, the existence of the academic can be directly associated with both science and educational practice and his/her imaginary existence. The problem isn't putting someone in the place of the scientist role model or the academician image in people's minds; for example, the more organic instead of the "traditional", the "engaged" instead of the indifferent to the oppressed and "specific" instead of the "universal". etc.), but also to question the political, economic and institutional regime that produces a certain truth about the academic, that one way or another necessarily creates it, that tests and approves this existence, and that it legitimizes it, and if possible, it is also to replace the academic-non-academic dichotomy with one that does not produce (Özsoy & Ünal, 2010).

For Althusser, ideology is more a matter of the affective relations we establish with the world, the practical processes and the reproduction of social formation. Making a categorical distinction between the state as an element of coercion, which is a concentrated form of political power, and the state, which includes the wider conditions of existence of people, Althusser developed the theory of The Repressive State Apparatus (RSAs) and Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) to define the state as “The Repressive State Apparatus and Ideological State Apparatuses are gathered under the power of the state” (Althusser, 2000, p. 58). While ISAs operate mainly based on consent, RSAs operate based on coercion. The dominant ideology that Althusser means by ISAs; as Marx put it in *The German Ideology*:

“The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same

time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance. (Marx & Engels, 2013, s. 52).

More specifically, the social formation must be able to reproduce its own conditions of existence in order to persevere in the existence of the capitalist formation at a particular moment in history. Otherwise, as Marx said, every child knows that a social formation which did not reproduce the conditions of production at the same time as it produced would not last a year“ (Althusser, 2000, p. 153). The ability of ISAs operating on a consent-based basis by using the dominant ideology to reproduce the production possibilities depends on their ability to produce subjects who will willingly obey the dominant ideology emerging from the heart of the capitalist formation.

According to Althusser, the existence of ideology manifests itself by interpellating people as subjects. The individual interpellated by the ideology always clearly understands that this interpellation is directed towards him and turns towards this voice, and with this turn, the individual becomes the subject. To imagine this event in a theatrical way; “for example, when a police officer shouts (or hails) "Hey, you there!" and an individual turns around and so-to-speak “answers” the interpellation, he becomes a subject. (Althusser, 2000, p. 200). Ideology works symbolically. Subjects who have internalized meaning and truth through ideology ensure that they respond to these interpellates every time. The subject is constituted through the interrelationships of the symbolic and the real. Like a network, ideology reproduces itself through the identification of subjects. Human subjects ensure the continuity of social reproduction only through identifications established through invocations (Althusser, 2000). The symbolic operation of ideology, the imagination of the

academician regarding the field of academia, an identity suitable for the produced reality of the identity called academician, image-image, can also be described as an acceptable academic. The work of the aforementioned academician should be content in accordance with the dominant ideology, from the scientific paradigm he will adopt to the understanding he attributes to science, what and how he will problematize it as a science, and the set of concepts he will use. In other words, it will mean answering "here you are mine" only if the boundaries of science and doing science remain within a field determined by the dominant ideology. It ensures the continuity of the system by identifying with the image of the academician in accordance with the invocations of the dominant ideology.

This process is mind-blowing, "How can the subject know that this voice is directed towards him and can he communicate with this voice?" brings up the question. According to Althusser, the individual called by the ideology always clearly understands that this call is directed towards him and turns towards this voice, and with this turn, the individual becomes the subject. "How can a person recognize and, moreover, respond to that 'call' that makes him/herself a subject as identity, if he/she is not already a subject as an identity? Isn't reciprocation, recognition, understanding, and analogy, that is, one has to be a subject before one can be a subject? In this case, the subject has to exist before its own existence (Eagleton, 2005, p. 203). Being aware of this problem, Althusser puts forward the idea that individuals are always subjects, even before birth, on the basis of the thesis that ideologies are eternal in order to solve the problem in question.

Criticisms of interpellation theory and identities that interpellations cannot consume

Evaluating Althusser and Foucault together, Butler mentions that power both subjectivizes and subordinates it while talking about the founding feature of the subject like ideology (Butler, 2005). Therefore, to be a subject is also to accept the conditions of subordination. The subject that the dominant ideology interpellates and subjectivizes is also the subaltern. Identity here: “The concept of [subject], which means both being subject and being a subject, refers to the ambiguous structure of subjection and/or subjectivity, and considering that subjecting and being subject are not mutually exclusive, but are deeply related to each other, the ambiguity of subjection is thesis. Evaluating them together is important in terms of making sense of the reasons that condition the construction of the subject or any social identity and the consenting obedience to the order. Here, it is a good support point in terms of explaining the reasons for the academician's consent and obedience to the rules operating in the field of science, and to the order in general.

Judith Butler is critical of Foucault, while maintaining Foucault's point of view that emphasizes the positive functions of power. According to Butler, Foucault identified the ambivalence of subordination by considering power in a framework that both subordinates and establishes the subject, but because of his insistence on not including it in his psychoanalysis theory, he could not fully explain the psychic functioning of power and the mechanisms of this ambivalence. Butler, saying that subjection does not only mean being oppressed by the power, subordinated, but also means being a subject; she states that subordination establishes the conditions of existence of the subjects in this sense, and that it contains an aspect that cannot be separated from the conditions of existence of the subject. Touching on the philosophies of Hegel and Nietzsche to clarify this situation, Butler sees the phenomenon that Hegel calls

“unhappy consciousness” in the slave-master dialectic, the emergence of the figure of the master, which initially seems external to the slave, as the conscience of the slave, as an example of the power gaining a psychic form. In Nietzsche's philosophy, on the other hand, the phenomenon of conscience is the introjection phase of nihilism, as Deleuze puts it; at this stage, he develops the understanding of "it's my fault" by taking human blame on himself. This understanding mediates the subject's relationship to himself and to other subjects. Saying that what the philosophies of Hegel and Nietzsche show us is that power acquires a psychic form that establishes the identity of the subject, Butler explains this situation with a “turns back” figure, the subject is formed by a will that turn back upon itself, assuming a reflexive form, then the subject is the modality of power that turns on itself; the subject is the effect of power in recoil (Butler, 2005, p. 14). In that case, it can be said that the academician as a subject is dependent on his own subaltern conditions and desires subaltern conditions.

If we consider Althusser's metaphor of being interpellated in this context, it can be said that the academic is in touch with a desire that precedes this turn return. As a subject, the academician needs and desires the founding power of the law in order to make himself exist. However, this does not simply mean that the subject internalizes the law and power. Because such an explanation ignores the deep relationship between these two, the identity constitutive power of power, by considering “subject” and “power” as already given categories. Without any objections in Althusser's account, "why me, who are you, why should I return?", an analysis of the factors that condition this behavior of the subject who obeys the law without asking such questions will reveal the relation of conscience to the psychic functioning of power. The return of the individual towards the sound of the law, besides making a reference to the subordination of the subject, is a kind of return of the subject to himself, since it also establishes the

possibility of the subject's conditions of existence. The individual has to pay this subordination price in order to exist as a subject. It is through conscience that the subject can return to himself, to make himself an object for himself. Conscience prevents the person from forming a critical relationship with this voice, preventing possible rejection. Althusser is aware of the importance of reproducing conscience in order to re-create the capitalist social formation itself. Other ideological apparatuses play a much more important role in capitalist social formations; so that all of these devices tend towards a single "target"; this goal is the uninterrupted reproduction of the relations of production every day in the material behavior, that is, in the "conscience" of people who perform the various functions of capitalist social production (Althusser, 2000, p. 113). This reproduction in subject's conscience make the subject vulnerable against the call of law, the subject desires to integrate with the law to prove his/her innocence and being a "good" subject. Since this announcement is not a singular act but the product of a continuous reproduction, being a "subject" is a process of freeing oneself from constant accusation and acquitting (Butler, 2005, p. 113).

According to Butler, who developed the concept of "passionate attachment" to explain the subject's dependence on his own subordinate conditions; since power relations are a structure that establishes the basic conditions of existence of the subject, the academician also shows a passionate commitment to subaltern conditions in order to reproduce his own living conditions and to survive. Acts of recognition inevitably become acts of gratitude or obedience when subordinates apply schemas that are the product of domination to those who hold them under their yoke, in other words, when their thoughts and perceptions are structured in harmony with the structures of domination relations imposed on them (Bourdieu, 2015, p. 26).

When we consider the concept of "passionate attachment" together with the basic problematic that Althusser tries to explain in his work titled *Ideology and the Ideological Apparatus of the State*, it can be said that the long-term existence of capitalism depends on the creation of academic identities that are passionately committed to it. Drawing attention to the exploitable aspect of the desire for perseverance in existence, Butler says that this desire will emerge as love; if the passionate attachment one feels is essential for one's survival, one cannot survive without love. This love of the person for the subordinate is not a love independent of interest, and it is not a love that can only be reduced to interest. Butler points out that Althusser's handling of ideology in the context of material processes and rituals causes him to overlook the regimes of desire in the context of self-reproduction of the capitalist formation. Whoever heeds the interpellation of the dominant ideology does so with passionate devotion. Desiring conditions that leave him subordinate is, in a way, the turning of desire against him/her. In order to become a subject/academic, a person attributes his/her desire to the desire of the great subject (State, market, media, sources of the dominant ideology in the academic field, etc.). These views of Butler point beyond Althusser's metaphor of being interpellated and raise the issue of a regime of desire that will pave the way for us to rethink the relationship between the desire to persevere in the existence of capitalism and the desire of academics to exist.

If it is remembered that what the subject really desires are the conditions of existence, it becomes clear that power is not directly desired, but that what is desired is the power that establishes these conditions. A form of explanation that overlooks this situation goes to "holding the subject himself responsible for the subordination of the subject" (Butler, 2005, p. 14). In order for the capitalist social formation to be reproduced, it is necessary to reproduce the social relations, thus reproducing the subjects who will realize the social roles. In this

direction, in order for individuals to listen to the call and become subjects, the call must also contain a content in which the subject can realize his own conditions of existence. Thus, in accordance with Butler's thesis of the ambivalence of subordination, the individual not only becomes an academic by making himself into existence, but also contributes to the reproduction of the system by being subject to the capitalist formation. In that case, it can be mentioned that there are two desires that are in a tense relationship with each other in the call: the system's desire for perseverance in existence and the desire of individuals to exist. For the interpellations of the dominant ideology to be accepted, it must not simply be a direct reflection of the will to power of the ruling class. In addition, it takes serious interest in people's existing desires and desires, captures and reveals real expectations and needs, voices them again in their own special language, and presents the ideology in question to the relevant identities in a way that makes it reasonable and attractive in their eyes (Eagleton, 2005, p. 36). In his work in question, Althusser's saying that subjectification of subjects, apart from a few exceptional "bad subjects", operates by their own consent, and adopting a functionalist approach, reduces institutions and individuals to ISAs that equip them with ideas and skills suitable for material production processes gives the impression. This conflicting character of the dominant ideology gives clues to the possibility of an emancipatory politics. These clues can be traced by following the theoretical path that Butler opened through his criticisms of Althusser. The concept of "hegemonic practices", which can be interpreted as an expression that power structures and forms of subjectivity are not static structures, but contain a contingent and contingent structure, emphasizes the possibility of social change by showing that "what is" carries the potential of being different. Things could have always been different and every order is based on the exclusion of other possibilities. Every order is always an expression of a particular arrangement of power relations (Mouffe, 2015, p. 22). Butler's ideas are essentially similar to

the concept of hegemonic practices developed by Laclau and Mouffe. The meaning of identity as the interaction of certain powers points to a form of subject/subjectivity beyond being interpellated, which the dominant ideology cannot fully consume and remains from the interpellation. Such a perspective opens the door to an emancipatory politics by enabling the agency of the subject.

Butler states that subaltern conditions and passionate attachment are factors that enable the subject's agency, let alone prevent it. It can realize the agency of the subject within the framework of the conditions of power and subordination that establish the conditions of existence. The fact that the conditions of subordination enable the agency of the subject does not mean that the agency of the subject is conditioned by reproducing the conditions of subordination, that agency will necessarily reproduce power relations. The concept of "repetition" has an important place in Butler's understanding of agency, which makes resistance to power possible. In the beginning, the power that prioritizes subjectivity, establishes its conditions of existence, and makes agency possible; together with the agency of the subject, it becomes related to the act of the subject. In Butler's dual formulation of power-subject, subject/power, there is a creative reversal in the transition from the first conception of power-subject to the second. According to Butler, who states that subjectivation is a non-mechanical field of repetition, although the agency of the subject includes the conditions of its formation, this does not mean that agency will always remain the same and completely dependent on these conditions. When he uses and repeats power through the agency of the subject, he temporalizes the elements that make his agency possible, revealing that these elements are not static structures. This reveals that the agency of the subject is not an act that is completely conditioned by reproducing the subaltern conditions and it is not

possible to go out of these conditions, but that it is a creative and productive act; creates a sense of agency in academics.

Conclusion

Reading the reproduction of the capitalist formation, which is the main problematic that Althusser tries to explain in his work titled *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, together with Butler's thoughts, gives clues about how a resistance against capitalism is possible for academics. The dominant ideology that interpellates individuals academics, processing them through ISAs and prepares them for the roles they will play in the capitalist formation, is related to the subject-power formulation in Butler's theory, which prioritizes academic identity, establishes its conditions of existence, and which the individual needs in order to become an academic. As the power that makes agency possible becomes associated with agency with a “repetition”, the second meaning of the subject-power formulation is passed. Thus, the possibility of resistance to power arises. The fact that an individual needs the interpellations of the dominant ideology in order to become an academic, for example, does not mean that every action of the individual is predetermined to reproduce subaltern conditions and/or power relations. Every behavior of an individual who has become an academic as a wage laborer in the capitalist social formation in order to persevere in his existence is not necessarily in a position to reproduce power relations or wage labor relations. The academic can transform these forces by revealing the contingency of the forces that determine him/herself as a wage-labour academic with a “repeat”.

The events that took place around the world a year before 1969, when Althusser wrote “*Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*”, are the most concrete example of this situation. Subjects/(college students) within the educational ISAs, which Althusser says were established as a result of the ideological

struggle of the bourgeoisie against the church, which he defined as the dominant ideological apparatus of the old state, and which he defined as the dominant ISAs of today, were almost making a revolution in 1968. In order to exist as subjects in the beginning, the students, who heed the interpellations of the educational ISAs, the dominant ISAs of the capitalist formation, later embarked on the task of transforming the forces that structured them with the emergence of agency opportunities. As this historical example shows, Butler's critiques of Althusser through the ambiguity of subordination thesis point to an academic identity beyond invocation and establish the possibility of resistance and a liberating politics.

To what extent can we talk about the social image of the academy, which has become almost universally entrenched today, and its emancipatory and critical character? The institutional identity of the academy lies in the imagination of this identity in the minds of who the academician is, his/her job, his/her role. Right here, it would not be wrong to say that the existing image of the academy, the features listed above about how our future academy dream will be, and the approaches to what kind of an institution the academy should be are built within an ideology. Moreover, politicizing the collective identity of the academician so that academics can reach their truth, not as a class in itself but as a class for itself; it is necessary to analyze the rhetoric/discourse of the dominant ideology. Maybe academics will have the opportunity to overcome their alienation from their own truth with a possibility.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. *Lenin and philosophy and Other Essays*. Londra: New Left Books.
- Althusser, L. (2000). *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları [Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses]*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Audretsch, D., & Belitski, M. (2021). Three-ring Entrepreneurial University: In Search of a New Business Model. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(5), 977-987.
- Bourdieu, P. (2015). *Eril tahakküm[Masculine Domination]*. (B. Yılmaz, Çev.) Ankara: Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Butler, J. (2005). *İktidarın Psikik Yaşamı [The Psychic Life of Power]*. (F. Tütüncü, Çev.) İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the Local Dimension Still Important? *Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7-20.
- Eagleton, T. (2005). *İdeoloji [Ideology]*. (M. Özcan, Çev.) İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Fiske, J. (2003). *İletişim Çalışmalarına Giriş [Introduction to Communication Studies]*. (S. İrvan, Çev.) Ankara: Ark Yayınları.
- Guerrero-Cano, M., Kirby, D., & Urbano, D. (2006, June). A Literature Review on Entrepreneurial Universities: An Institutional Approach. Barcelona: Departament d'Economia de l'Empresa, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Ildır, I. (2011). Üniversitede Bilginin Metalaşma Süreci [The Process of Commodification of Knowledge at the University]. *Bilim ve Gelecek*(84), 56-58.
- Manfred, B., & Alfred, K. (1999). *Bilimsel Felsefe Sözlüğü [Dictionary of Scientific Philosophy]*. (V. Bildik, Çev.) İstanbul: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları.
- Mardin, Ş. (1976). *İdeoloji [Ideology]*. Ankara: Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayını.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2013). *Alman İdeolojisi [The German Ideology](Feuerbach)*. (O. G. Tonguç Ok, Çev.) Ankara: Sol Yayınları.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2018). *Komünist Manifesto [The Communist Manifesto]*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mouffe, C. (2015). *Dünyayı Politik Düşünmek [Agonistics: Thinking The World Politically]*. (M. Bozluolcay, Çev.) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Nalbantoğlu, H., Özel, H., Narin, Ö., & Günsoy Kaya, F. (2008). *Bilim ve İktidar [Science and Power]*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Özsoy, S. (2007). Eğitim Bilimcinin Politik İşlevi ve Sorumluluğu: "Yaratıcı Özyıkım" [The Political Function and Responsibility of the Educational Scientist: "Creative Self-Destruction"]. *Karaburun Bilim Kongresi*, (p. 1). İzmir.

- Özsoy, S. & Ünal, L. I. (2010). *Eğitim bilimleri felsefesine doğru [Towards the philosophy of educational sciences]*. Ankara: Tan Kitabevi Publications.
- Polanyi, K. (1986). *Büyük Dönüşüm [The Great Transformation]*. (A. Buğra, Çev.) İstanbul: Alan Yayınları.
- Sucu, İ. (2012). Althusser'in Gözünden İdeoloji ve İdeolojinin Bir Taşıyıcısı Olarak Yeni Medya [Althusser's Ideology Through the eyes of and new media as a Carrier of an Ideology] . *Selçuk Üniversitesi Dergileri*, 7(3), 30-41.
- Williams, R. (2007). *Anahtar Sözcükler [Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society]*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Author details

Hakkı Toy is a PhD in Science of Education Management and Policy. He works as an electronics teacher at the Balgat Vocational and Technical High School in Ankara, Turkey. His research interests are in the fields of education management and policy, economy of education, critical theory, philosophy of education and philosophy of politics.

Address: Electric and Electronic Dept., Balgat Vocational and Technical High School. 06450 Çankaya, Ankara / Türkiye.

Phone: +90 5052990922

Email: hakkitoy@gmail.com