

## Higher education capitalism in Indonesia as a social problem: A case study in the digital age

### *Kapitalisme pendidikan tinggi di Indonesia sebagai masalah sosial: Studi kasus di era digital*

Doddy Sumbodo Singgih✉, Bagong Suyanto, & Septi Ariadi

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Airlangga  
Surabaya, 60286, East Java Province, Indonesia

E-mail of corresponding author: [doddy.singgih@fisip.unair.ac.id](mailto:doddy.singgih@fisip.unair.ac.id)

#### Abstract

Since the Indonesian state entered the reform era in 1998, several state universities that were centers of scientific development had their legal status changed by the government to become State-Owned Legal Entity University. From a sociological perspective, changes in legal status are commonly understood as institutional changes, which include changes in the norms that refer to governance, changes in governance procedures, and changes in organizational structure and governance. Some of the State Universities that have changed their legal status (institutions) are the Universitas Indonesia (UI), Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB), Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU), Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI), and Universitas Airlangga (UNAIR). This article will describe whether, in today's digital era, these changes cause social problems of their own, especially social problems related to inter-structural relationships in academic activities on campus. This study employed Mixed Methods Research and 100 students as a sample of this study. The results found the fact that most of the student respondents (55.42%) considered that social problems that arise in State-Owned Legal Entity University were related to the capitalism of higher education. This research also found the impact of institutional changes being State-Owned Legal Entity University is a change in the inter-structural relationship among the academic community in carrying out academic activities to become exploitative, hegemonic, and repressive. Therefore these changes in an inter-structural relationship were also considered as a social problem.

**Keywords:** capitalism; digital age; higher education; Indonesia; social issues

#### Abstrak

Sejak negara Indonesia memasuki era reformasi pada tahun 1998, beberapa perguruan tinggi negeri yang menjadi pusat pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan telah diubah status hukumnya oleh pemerintah menjadi Perguruan Tinggi Badan Hukum Milik Negara. Dalam perspektif sosiologis, perubahan status hukum umumnya dipahami sebagai perubahan kelembagaan, yang meliputi perubahan norma yang mengacu pada tata kelola, perubahan prosedur tata kelola, dan perubahan struktur organisasi dan tata kelola. Beberapa Perguruan Tinggi Negeri yang mengalami perubahan status hukum (lembaga) adalah Universitas Indonesia (UI), Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB), Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU), Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI), dan Universitas Airlangga (UNAIR). Artikel ini memaparkan apakah di era digital sekarang ini, perubahan-perubahan tersebut menimbulkan masalah sosial tersendiri, terutama masalah sosial yang berkaitan dengan hubungan antar struktur dalam kegiatan akademik di kampus. Studi ini menggunakan Mixed Methods Research dan 100 mahasiswa sebagai sampel dalam studi ini. Studi ini menemukan fakta bahwa sebagian besar responden mahasiswa (55,42%) menganggap bahwa masalah sosial yang muncul di Perguruan Tinggi Badan Hukum BUMN terkait dengan kapitalisme pendidikan tinggi. Penelitian ini juga menemukan dampak perubahan kelembagaan menjadi PTN adalah perubahan hubungan antar struktur di kalangan civitas akademika dalam menjalankan kegiatan akademik menjadi eksploitatif, hegemonik dan represif. Oleh karena itu perubahan-perubahan dalam hubungan antarstruktur ini juga dianggap sebagai masalah sosial.

**Kata kunci:** kapitalisme; era digital; pendidikan yang lebih tinggi; Indonesia; isu sosial

## Introduction

Since globalization swept the world, literature has shown various studies on global capitalism conducted by academics and practitioners, including studies focused on global capitalism in the higher education

field. In the past five years, there are many studies published by international journals with various interesting themes, for example, the theme of academic capitalism (Jessop 2017, Somers et al. 2018, Appe 2020), higher education commodification (Chaplin et al. 2015, Bunce et al. 2016, Shukry 2017), higher education commercialism (Gupta 2015, Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra 2016), higher education neoliberalism (Kauppinen 2015, Boossabong 2017, Klees 2020), and higher education entrepreneurship (Sommers et al. 2018).

In the context of the development of globalization in Indonesia, especially after Indonesia entered the reform era in 1998, the Indonesian government has also followed the flow of globalization in the administration of higher education, among others by changing the seven legal statuses of State University into State-Owned Legal Entity University. The change in the legal status of the seven State Universities occurred in Universitas Indonesia (UI), Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB), Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU), Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI), and Universitas Airlangga (UNAIR). The change in legal status refers to Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning The National Education System, especially article 53 paragraph (1), which mentions that: "Educational Legal Entities are intended as a legal basis for the organization and/or education units, among others, in the form of State-Owned Legal Entity".

Meanwhile, the essence of changing the legal status to State-Owned Legal Entity University is the granting of higher education autonomy rights, commonly referred to as campus autonomy rights, as mentioned in Law Number 20 of 2003, especially article 24 paragraph (1), article 50 paragraph (6), and article 51 paragraph (2). Article 24 paragraph (1) stated: "In the implementation of education and the development of science, in higher education, academic freedom and academic pulpit and scientific autonomy apply". Meanwhile, article 50 paragraph (6) stated: "Universities determine policies and have autonomy in managing education and its institutions", and article 51 paragraph (2) stated: "The management of higher education units is carried out based on the principles of autonomy, accountability, quality assurance, and transparent evaluation".

Sociologically, the change in the legal status of State-Owned Legal Entity University is an institutional change, in the sense of changing something that is considered to have been established and patterned that regulates social relations in a community (Horton & Hunt 2007). As stated by Horton and Hunt, the conceptualization of institutional change contains at least three keywords, namely: first, common values that refer to shared goals and objectives. Second, general procedures, namely behavioral patterns that are standardized and followed. And third, is the social relations system, namely the network of roles and statuses that become the vehicle for carrying out this behavior. In other words, it can be said that the institution is a social relations system that occurs in a community that is formed because of the values, procedures, and structures that are mutually agreed upon.

From the preliminary study, it is known that the institutional changes of State-Owned Legal Entity University involve changes to several regulations that are the legal basis for managing education in order to produce the expected goals. By borrowing Marx's theoretical thinking, a change in the way education is managed is by changing the mode of production. The term capital in the context of regulations in Indonesia is related to Law Number 25 of 2007 on Concerning Investment. Article 1 paragraph (7) stated, that capital in the form of money or other forms other than money owned by the mod investors has economic value.

Marx explained the mode of production using the production circulation formula  $M - C - M$  (Money - Commodity - Money). That is, money is used as capital to produce commodities that can be sold to the market. Profits from the sale of these commodities are used to produce more commodities, and so on so that circulation of production is formed. This way of managing capital is explained by the theory of capitalism and until now theoretically, it is commonly referred to as the popular term never-ending circuit of capital accumulation. After all, capitalism only exists as an ideology or perspective of thought, but it has the potential to influence the behavior of individuals and/or groups.

Mallarangeng (2002), for example, in his research on Economic Liberalization Policy in the era of President Soeharto's Administration, explained how strong an idea's influence was on the country's economic policymaking. The change in Indonesia's economic policy from centralized to liberal which began in 1980-1983, cannot be separated from the influence of ideas put forward by scholars, writers, opinion-makers, activists, and economists who create conditions or create pressure for changing the country's economic policy. By policymakers, these ideas are then used as the basis for formulating various actions they take, for example in making state policies.

In several cases, the process of institutional change at State-Owned Legal Entity University has created its own tension, for example, seen from the spread of the phenomenon of student demonstrations held in various forms, both by intra-campus and extra-campus student organizations. The peak of tension occurred when a judicial review application was submitted to the Constitutional Court against article 53 paragraph (1) Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning National Education System, and Law Number 9 of 2009 concerning Educational Legal Entities which is the basis for institutional change in State-Owned Legal Entity University.

The institutional change phenomenon at State-Owned Legal Entity University becomes interesting and important to study because changes in the way of managing education (mode of production) which are packaged in terms of campus autonomy rights will have a separate impact on academic activities. Furthermore, the principles of capitalism, which have been accused of exploiting workers, are very likely to be treated differently in State-Owned Legal Entity University. In that context, interesting questions to answer are: first, is an institutional change in State-Owned Legal Entity University a social problem in itself? In a sociological view, a social problem is a shared problem that interferes with the social values of a community (Horsfall 2018). This question is becoming increasingly interesting to explore the answer in the field because now we have entered the digital era or an era where information can be easily and quickly obtained using technology so that it has changed social relationships in social life (Lupton 2015, Marres 2017). In the field of education, for example, this era was marked by among other things, the increasingly common use of online learning models, either by using e-learning facilities, zoom cloud meetings, or other online media.

In addition, this research also wants to see what kind of social impacts arise as a result of institutional changes, especially the impact of inter-structure relationships in academic activities? To answer these questions, this research uses the case study method, with the hope that in-depth, distinctive, and unique answers will be found and other nuances in the management of higher education in Indonesia, especially in the era of State-Owned Legal Entity University.

Until now, there have been many studies on capitalism in Indonesia, both capitalism that spread during the pre-colonial, colonial, Old Order, and New Order eras. When Indonesia entered the reform era in 1998, there were not many studies on capitalism. Onghokham (2008) stated that the capitalism phenomenon in Indonesia has been spreading since before the Dutch colonial government took place. At that time, capitalism grew along with the emergence of trade partnerships between ethnic Chinese and the Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC), where at first ethnic Chinese became intermediary traders. In subsequent developments, large and capitalistic Chinese trading companies emerged, for example, the company owned by Oei Tiong Ham concern.

In the next development, namely during the Old Order government, there were also not many studies on capitalism. According to Sjahrir (1986), because at that time there was no capitalistic economic activity. Although Sjahrir did not specifically study capitalism in Indonesia, his dissertation explained the realities related to capitalism. According to Sjahrir, at that time the economic policy of the Old Order government was contained in the Banteng Program, whose main objective was to develop indigenous Indonesian entrepreneurs. Furthermore, at that time the Old Order government was also busy implementing the nationalization program for foreign companies in Indonesia, so there was no capitalistic economic policy.

In contrast to the two previous periods, during the New Order period, there were more studies on capitalism. The study conducted by Muhaemin (1991), for example, also examines the nuances of capitalism in the Indonesian government's economic policymaking. According to Muhaemin, during the three periods of the political system that prevailed in the postproclamation of Indonesian independence, namely the parliamentary system, guided democracy system, and the New Order; it turned out that in all these periods it had spawned client entrepreneurs, namely individuals or companies who depended on the authorities in carrying out their economic and business activities.

The study of capitalism in Indonesia by focusing on state policy is complete with the publication of a book *Soeharto & Kebangkitan Kapitalisme Indonesia* written by Robison (2012). The book explains in detail how state policies in the era of President Soeharto's administration collaborated with businessmen to give birth to political families of bureaucrats and giant conglomerates, whose positions were not determined by abstract market mechanisms, but through links to corrupt and centralized patronage systems under the Suharto's government. In the current context, this explanation becomes relevant when faced with the reality of the coalition relationship between the state and universities in the management of education. Whatever the reason, the position of capital has become a tool of power, both in the context of the emergence of capitalism in the New Order era (for example, the emergence of state policies that provided certain facilities to conglomerates), as well as in this reform era (for example, the emergence of state policies that legalized the implementation of campus autonomy). The development of capitalism studies in the reform era, among others, was carried out by Mallarangeng (2002). In his dissertation, Mallarangeng explained the liberalistic economic policy of the Indonesian state. Although he did not explain the economic policy of the Indonesian state by using structural variables, such as the logic of capitalism, capital mobility, and global capitalism; he acknowledged how big the role of scholars, writers, opinion-makers, activists, and economists in creating conditions of pressure for changes in the country's economic policies. It was through their ideas that the Indonesian state's economic liberalization policy was formed.

By using comparisons in several countries in Southeast Asia, Kunio (1991) also uses the perspective of capitalism to understand the economic behavior of big entrepreneurs in Southeast Asia, including entrepreneurs in Indonesia. In his research, Kunio found the fact that the success of big entrepreneurs in controlling the market in countries in Southeast Asia, was due to the excessive provision of facilities by the local government. The creation of competition in the free market, in fact, is not based on the pure principle of capitalism but is actually controlled by the local government in excess. This reality is called pseudo capitalism (*ersatz capitalism*).

Compared to previous studies on capitalism – which generally explain capitalism in a negative perspective, the study conducted by Wasino (2008) looks different. In his dissertation, Wasino raised the issue of what and how the impact of capitalism on people's lives during the colonial period. By examining the history of two sugar factories in the past, namely the Colo Madu sugar factory (in 1861) and the Tasik Madu sugar factory (1871) belonging to a relative of Mangkunegaran Surakarta, empirical evidence was found that the practice of capitalism in the two sugar industries had a positive impact. That is, at that time capitalism was used by relatives of the Mangkunegaran palace as a reaction to the increasing expansion of private capital coming from the west, which had already entered the form of coffee, tobacco, and sugarcane cultivation plantations by renting land from Mangkunegaran nobles and officials. By Mangkunegara IV, capitalism was used as a tool to improve the welfare of the people in the Mangkunegaran region by building their own sugar factory. The capitalism that developed at that time was called *priyayi* capitalism because the owners and business actors of plantations came from the aristocratic circles.

In Indonesia, although studies of capitalism have spread in the past, nowadays there are not so many studies on capitalism, especially those that question capitalism as a social problem. In a sociological view, social problems are shared problems that interfere with the social values of a community (Horsfall

2018), so that problems have their own format for studying them. In that context, this research wants to show whether capitalism in higher education is a social problem or not.

## Research Method

This research uses mixed research methods which are used simultaneously between quantitative research methods (surveys) and qualitative research methods (case studies) (Yin 2018), as explained by Creswell (2014) and Creswell & Clark (2018). The use of mixed research methods is based on the following considerations: first, so that researchers are free to collect data, both quantitative and qualitative data. And second, researchers can draw conclusions on a macro and micro basis.

The location of this research is in one of the state universities in Indonesia which in 2002 changed its legal status to State-Owned Legal Entity University. The considerations are: first, since the legal status of the university has changed, the university has gradually made institutional changes on an ongoing basis. And secondly, the phenomenon shows that the institutional change process involves many parties, so it is very likely to cause various social problems, especially those concerning inter-structure relations in carrying out academic activities.

This research data was collected from a sample of 102 student respondents who were interviewed in a structured manner, especially students from faculties who were the most responsive in responding to the issue of institutional change in State-Owned Legal Entity University. The sample was taken purposively with the requirements that: first, they are active students when there are institutional changes. And second, they know conceptually about the institutional changes in State-Owned Legal Entity University.

In accordance with the type of research used, the researcher is the key informant in the process of collecting data in the field. In this study, the researcher used the following data collection methods: first, the participant observation method (observer as a participant). This method is used with the consideration that researchers can see, hear and interact directly with informants. Second, the researcher uses a structured interview method with respondents. This structured interview was conducted using a questionnaire. And third, the researcher used in-depth interviews using selected informants. This in-depth interview was conducted using an interview guide.

After the data is collected, the data is analyzed quantitatively in the form of data displayed in frequency tables and cross tables, and qualitatively in the form of narrative texts. Both types of data are used simultaneously to fulfill two data analysis strategies, namely: first, general data analysis, where data analysis is carried out depending on the skills of the researcher himself. And second, data analysis specifically, where data analysis is carried out using a focused data analysis model.

## Results and Discussion

As stated from the beginning that one of the instruments related to higher education capitalism in Indonesia is the granting of campus autonomy rights to State-Owned Legal Entity University. Therefore, data on students' knowledge of the concept of campus autonomy at State-Owned Legal Entity University is one of the entrances in this research. The data, for example, are data concerning students' knowledge of campus autonomy rights, data on the phenomenon of the commodification of education, data on the phenomenon of educational hegemony, and data on the phenomenon of repressive education. In this study, the data on student knowledge becomes an early indicator of whether students perceive educational capitalism as a social problem or not that grows and/or develops on campus.

Data obtained from one hundred purposively selected student respondents indicate that their knowledge of these concepts is very shallow. Even though viewed theoretically, the four concepts are an inseparable part of the implementation of autonomy in State-Owned Legal Entity University. By using the entrance through these four concepts, it is hoped that this research can explore the data more deeply. The data about respondent knowledge can be seen in Table 1.



**Table 1.**  
Student knowledge of concepts relating to campus autonomy concepts

Student knowledge of concepts relating to campus autonomy	Concepts that develop along with the implementation of campus autonomy							
	Campus autonomy		Capitalism		Hegemony		Repression	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Knowing correctly	40	39,22	53	51,96	22	21,57	38	37,25
Not knowing correctly	62	60,78	49	48,04	80	78,43	64	62,75
Total	102	100	102	100	102	100	102	100

Source: Primary data

From the data display, it can be seen how shallow students' knowledge about campus autonomy is. The description of the data is at the same time an obstacle to how difficult it is to dig deeper into the data in this study because there is no adequate entrance that can be used to dig further data. The data in Table 1 shows that a very important concept in institutional change at State-Owned Legal Entity University, namely the concept of campus autonomy, only 39.22% of student respondents knew about it. This means that these institutional changes do not get enough attention from students, and therefore it becomes very natural for these institutional changes to go on like that.

In this study, it is also known that the knowledge of a number of students about the phenomenon of institutional change at State-Owned Legal Entity University is not only very shallow but also wrong. The number of those who misunderstood campus autonomy was 60.78%. Misunderstanding, for example, when a number of students were asked to answer the question, what do they know about the change in legal status at State-Owned Legal Entity University, they replied that the change was the government's attempt to privatize State University, privatize higher education or commercialize higher education. As stated by several student informants as follows: "The State-Owned Legal Entity Campus did not get funding from the government and the campus then looked for its own source of funds, so the cost of education became expensive" (Informant number 23).

"... By the State-Owned Legal Entity Campus, everything is used as a commodity and the campus implements all financial and curriculum issues independency ..." (Informant number 4)

"State-Owned Legal Entity is an effort to commercialize education and emphasize quantity over quality of education" (Informant number 12)

From the three student informants' answers, it appears that their knowledge of university autonomy or campus autonomy is not only very shallow but also wrong. The first student informant (Number 23), for example, identified campus autonomy with the high cost of education, the second student informant (Number 4) identified campus autonomy as an activity to commodify education, and the third student informant (Number 12) identified campus autonomy with the commercialization of education. When further data exploration was carried out, the three student informants did not provide other answers that were more complete and in-depth.

### Social problems

By definition, autonomy is a concept whose essence is to regulate one's own household, not privatization, not commodification, and also not commercialization. It is the regulation of the household itself that is often a problem in itself, because it is often done excessively, causing the concept of authority to turn into arbitrariness. For example, arbitrariness in making changes to the organizational structure of work, in determining the number of tuition fees, in determining the various entrances for new students, and in making other strategic decisions at the university level related to institutional changes.

Meanwhile, for the understanding of the concept of capitalism which is also the entry point in this research, more than half (51.96%) of students actually understood it correctly. This means that the majority of students know that on-campus there has been some kind of higher education trading activity, especially the trading of chairs for new students. It seems that the concept of capitalism is easier for most students to understand than the concept of campus autonomy because theoretically capitalism is commonly associated with trading activities, buying and selling activities, or more simply as an activity to seek financial gain.

From a theoretical point of view, it is common to say that every change will cause its own problems, including in this context the institutional changes in State-Owned Legal Entity University. To describe whether students perceive institutional change as a social problem or not, the data is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.**  
Student knowledge capitalism as a social problem in relation to student knowledge of campus autonomy

Student knowledge of social problems	Student knowledge of campus autonomy					
	Capitalism		Hegemony		Repression	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
As a social problem	52	55,42	30	31,91	34	36,17
Not as a social problem	13	13,83	30	31,91	24	25,53
Others (no clear answer)	29	30,85	34	36,17	36	38,30
Total	94	100	94	100	94	100

Source: Primary data

Conceptually, the answers from a number of students clearly indicate that they do not know what social problems have actually been and are happening on campus, no matter how much they are part of the academic community. From the data in the table, it also appears that capitalism is more considered a social problem by most students (55.42%) than hegemony (31.91%) and repressive education (36.17%). In other words, the number of students who consider capitalism, not as a social problem is not enough (44.58%). Even though it is only in the form of an understanding or perspective, capitalism is very powerful in influencing the behavior of individuals and/or groups. Therefore, to examine capitalism whose existence does not appear real is very difficult, what can be done is to examine the behavior that arises as to the result of understanding capitalism. To date, there were no publications about any other changes in State-Owned Legal Entity University, so we cannot compare our findings with previous ones. Our study will explain how those changes are viewed as social problems.

### Social impact on inter-structure relations

The data showed that 55.42% of students think that capitalism is a social problem, furthermore, this study wants to see what social impacts it has, especially those related to changes in the pattern of social relations between structures on campus. To see changes in the inter-structure relationship in academic activities at State-Owned Legal Entity University, this study uses structural analysis. That is an analysis that emphasizes the relationship between parties who have a productive role in academic activities. In sociological analysis, there are quite a number of theories that explain the relationship between structures, such as Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, and Paulo Freire. The three theoretical thoughts of these figures will be used in the analysis of this research because they are considered compatible with the focus of the problem being studied, namely the relationship between structures. According to Karl Marx, the inter-structure relationship is the relationship between those who have (control) capital and those who do not have (control) capital. Meanwhile, according to Antonio Gramsci, the inter-structure relationship is the relationship between the hegemonic party and the hegemonic party. And according to Freire, the inter-structure relationship is the relationship between the educator and the educated in the educational process.

Theoretically, the three perspectives will produce at least three typologies of inter-group or inter-structure relationship models. First, the exploitative relationship model; second, the hegemonic relationship model; and third, the repressive relationship model. The exploitative relationship model is a model of inter-group or inter-structural relations used by Karl Marx to explain the exploitation by the control group of the means of production (the skipper) to the group of workers (the workers). The term exploitation is used by Karl Marx, to explain the process of extortion of labor, which then causes injustice in the acquisition of exchange values between the ruling class of the means of production (the skipper) and the labor force (labor).

While the hegemonic relationship model is a model of inter-group or inter-structure relations used by Antonio Gramsci to explain the occurrence of domination between the dominant group and the dominated group through ideological internalization. In other words, hegemonic relations are inter-group relations or inter-structures that are built not on the basis of and/or using violence, but on the basis of reaching consensus. According to Antonio Gramsci in Ritzer (2011), hegemony occurs when the way of life, way of thinking, and perspective of the lower group or structure imitates and accepts the way of thinking and lifestyle and perspective of the upper group or structure.

In addition to the exploitative and hegemonic relationship model, there is also a repressive relationship model. This relationship model is a model of inter-group or inter structure relationships used by Freire to explain the relationship that occurs between teachers and students in a learning process at school. According to Paulo Freire, this relationship occurs repressively, because the teacher sees himself as the subject and the student as the object, so there is absolutely no dialogue between the two. In that context, Paulo Freire then referred to teachers as oppressors and students as oppressed people.

What if the three typologies of the inter-structural relationship model will be used to describe changes in the pattern of inter-structural social relations, especially after the State University changes its legal status to State-Owned Legal Entity University. As previously stated, the concept of structure in this study is understood as social relations between groups that play a certain role in a community. For example, there are groups that play the role of policymakers, there are groups that play the role of teachers (lecturers), and there are groups that play the role of students. Typologically, and for the purposes of this research, the three models of inter-structure or inter-group relationships can be described simply by using the following six indicators. *First*, is the basis for the formation of social structure. *Second*, the role holder in the structure. *Third*, is the nature of the relationship between structures. *Fourth*, is the function of the relationship in the structure. *Fifth* is the impact of inter-structure relations. And *sixth*, the future of inter-structure relations. In more detail, the six indicators will be explained further with the following description. The first indicator explains how the history of the formation of groups in a community, the second indicator explains who the actors who actually play a role in a community are, the third indicator describes the nature of the inter-group relations formed in a community, the fourth indicator explains what is the function of inter-group relations formed in a community, the fifth indicator explains what the impact of inter-group relations in a community is, and the sixth indicator explains how the future formation of social groups formed in a community will be.

In simple terms, the typology of the inter-structure relationship model described from the perspective of Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, and Paulo Freire can be seen in Table 3. By using the three perspectives of the inter-structure relationship model, it is hoped that the reality of the relationship between the structures studied will be easier to understand. However, because it is only a model, the typology must be understood only as an effort to make it easier to understand the reality under study.

Therefore, by using the six indicators, it is hoped that the complexity of the reality of inter-structure relations that grows, develops, and/or even sneaks into the management of education at State-Owned Legal Entity University, which is the location of this research, can be described in more detail, simply and of course sociologically. In more detail, the cross relationships between internal indicators can be seen in Table 3.



**Table 3.**

Typology of inter-structure relationship model in its theoretical perspective Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci and Paulo Freire

Indicator	Typology of interstructure relationship model		
	Marx model	Gramsci model	Freire model
The basis for the formation of the social structure	On control of the means production and capital	Persuasion and internalization of values and ideologies	Oppression in learning
Role holders in social structure	Skipper structure and labor structure	Dominant structure and dominated structure	Oppressive structure and oppressed structure
The nature of the relationship between social structure	There is an exploitative relationship	There is a hegemonic relationship	There is a repressive relationship
The function of relations between social structure	To perpetuate power	To perpetuate power	To perpetuate the gang of power
Impact of relations between social structures	To form awareness	To form ideological compliance	To form silent culture
The future of relations to conduct inter-social structures	To social revolution	To war positions	To carry out liberation education

Source: Analyzed from theoretical frameworks

After the State University changed its institution to become a State-Owned Legal Entity University, the work organization structure followed the government regulations governing institutional changes. As has been stated in the previous description, State-Owned Legal Entity University, which is the location of this research, made changes to the work organization structure three times, namely in 2006, 2008, and 2011. The change in the structure must have had its own impact, for example, the impact on inter-structure relationships in academic activities. After a State University becomes a State-Owned Legal Entity University, the corporate feel becomes even stronger, because this new structure requires the institution to have a strategic plan whose achievements must be clearly measurable.

That is why the inter-structure working relationship in the era of institutional change to State-Owned Legal Entity University feels more exploitative, in the sense that the management is trying its best by using all means so that its institutional performance can reach the best condition. Sociologically, in this context, it is quite difficult to describe the reality of the exploitation that occurs, because the benchmarks of inter-structure inequality that should be measured from the comparison between the length of work time, workload, and work results cannot be traced using only methods that commonly used in scientific research. Inequality in obtaining work results or salaries or incentives between officials and staff, for example, is very difficult to track, because salaries or incentives are directly transferred through bank accounts. Now, the achievement of institutional performance is a problem in itself, because it overlaps with the performance measurement used by the government, namely government agency performance reports. In fact, to achieve maximum performance, State-Owned Legal Entity University introduced a new breakthrough known as the academic milestone. A strategy to accelerate the achievement of institutional performance based on certain targets that must be achieved every year. For example, there are targets for how many doctors must graduate each year, how many professors are inducted each year, what is the ideal ratio of lecturers to students, and various other achievement targets. All of these institutional performance achievements are directed to produce RAISE, which stands for Relevance, Academic atmosphere, Internal Management and Organization, Sustainability, Efficiency, and Productivity. The previous description has explained the institutional performance indicators that

must be achieved by State-Owned Legal Entity University, based on the calculation of the situation at the beginning of the planning year as the basic data, which is then made an achievement target for each year. All institutional performance achievements, both at the departmental, faculty, and university levels, are evaluated annually and the evaluation results are officially documented in the Self Evaluation document.

Furthermore, in order to achieve the targets that have been set, the institution then carries out socialization efforts so that what is targeted for achieving its best performance gets support from all leaders in all lines, lecturer staff, and of course students. Referring to Antonio Gramsci's theoretical analysis, the socialization process in which the rulers socialize by not imposing their will, but by taking a subtle or soft approach is what is called the hegemonization process. According to Antonio Gramsci, hegemony is actually also an attempt to control other parties. Because of the very subtle or soft way of mastery, the party who is controlled does not feel that he has actually been controlled by another party. Data on how the process of hegemony occurs is actually available in the internal campus media coverage (news).

Meanwhile, the inter-structural relationship that occurs between lecturers and students also changes. Now, the relationship between the two structures is framed by the term efficiency in the educational process. For example, it is possible for students to graduate as soon as possible, which is for 3.5 years of college. For this reason, all curricula must be designed efficiently, by carrying out an efficient learning process, for example by using the outline of the learning program, lecture even unit, and lecture contracts. Administratively, the outline of the learning program, lecture even unit, and lecture contracts is an instrument for efficiency in the learning process, because students are given a structured, definite, and achievable menu within the specified time (one semester). From an academic point of view, especially sociologically, which relies more on independence in thinking, such a structured lecture menu will clearly not provide sufficient provisions for students.

However, in the name of achieving efficiency in the learning process, the repressive learning model as theorized by Paulo Freire is an unavoidable choice. Even now the achievement of efficiency is legally recognized by the National Accreditation Body of Universities and Directorate General of Higher Education as evidence of success in the learning process through counting values of educational efficiency figures, or a number that shows how big the ratio between incoming students and graduating students is. Education Efficiency Number is considered good if it is close to 100% presentation, meaning that the number of incoming students compared to the number of students leaving is the same. For example, the number of students who enter 100 people and the number of students who graduate on time must also be 100, then the Education Efficiency Number is 100%.

The problem will be different if the measure of success in the learning process uses Freire's concept where Paulo Freire describes the success of the learning process through the measure of achieving critical awareness. Critical awareness is the awareness that students (students) are expected to have of the reality that grows, develops, and slips around them. In the context of this research is awareness about institutional changes carried out by using the modus operandi of campus autonomy. In fact, as the data obtained in this study which has been analyzed in the previous description, students' understanding of the reality that occurs around them is very shallow.

## **Conclusion**

This study found several important things related to higher education capitalism, namely: first, as many as 39.22% of student respondents knew about the phenomenon of campus autonomy which became the spirit in the management of education in State-Owned Legal Entity University. Second, as many as 51.96% of student respondents knew about the phenomenon of higher education capitalism that occurred in a State-Owned Legal Entity University. Third, as many as 21.57% of student respondents knew about the phenomenon of truth hegemony that occurred in State-Owned Legal Entity University. And fourth, as many as 37.25% of student respondents knew about the phenomenon of repression in learning that occurs at State-Owned Legal Entity University.

Meanwhile, this study also found the fact that most of the student respondents (55.42%) considered that social problems that arise in State-Owned Legal Entity University are related to the capitalism of higher education. In addition, this problem is also related to the occurrence of truth hegemony (31.9%) and also related to repressive education (36.17%). Finally, the conclusions that can be drawn from this research are, first, the capitalism of higher education that developed in the era of the State-Owned Legal Entity University is a social problem, and second, the impact of institutional changes being State-Owned Legal Entity University is a change in the inter-structural relationship among the academic community in carrying out academic activities to become exploitative, hegemonic and repressive.

## References

- Appel S (2020) Internationalization in the context of academic capitalism. *Research in Comparative and International Education* 15 (1):62-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499920901949>.
- Boossabong P (2017) Neoliberalizing higher education in the global south: Lessons learned from policy impacts on educational commercialization in Thailand. *Journal of Critical Policy Studies* 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2017.1403341>.
- Bunce L, Baird A, & Jones SE (2016) The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. *Journal of Studies in Higher Education* 1-21. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1127908>.
- Chaplin D & Forset N (2015) The commodification of higher education myth. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2298883>.
- Creswell JW (2014) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell JW & Clark VLP (2018) *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Gupta T (2015) The perils of commercialization of higher education. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, IT and Social Sciences* 5 (10):1-9.
- Horsfall ST (2018) *Social Problems: An Advocate Group Approach*. USA: Routledge.
- Horton PB & Hunt CL (2007) *Sosiologi*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Jessop B (2017) Varieties of academic capitalism and entrepreneurial universities. *Higher Education* 73 (6):853-870.
- Kauppinen I (2015) Towards a theory of transnational academic capitalism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 36 (2):336-353.
- Kezar A & Bernstein-Sierra S (2016) Commercialization of higher education. In: Bretag T (ed). *Handbook of Academic Integrity*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8>.
- Klees SJ (2020) Beyond neoliberalism: Reflections on capitalism and education. *Policy Futures in Education* 18 (1):9-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210317715814>.
- Kunio Y (1991) *Kapitalisme Semu Asia Tenggara*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Lupton D (2015) *Digital Sociology*. New York: Routledge.
- Mallarangeng R (2002) *Mendobrak Sentralisme Ekonomi: Indonesia 1986-1992*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Marres N (2017) *Digital Sociology: The Reinvention of Social Research*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Muhaimin YA (1991) *Bisnis dan Politik: Kebijaksanaan Ekonomi Indonesia 1950-1980*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Onghokham (2008) *Anti-China, Kapitalisme, dan Gerakan Cina: Sejarah Etnis Cina di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu.
- Robison R (2012) *Soeharto & Bangkitnya Kapitalisme Indonesia*. Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu.
- Ritzer G (2011) *Sociological Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Shukry M (2017) Commodification of education in United Kingdom. *Journal of Law and Society Management* 4 (1):64-72.
- Sjahrir (1986) *Ekonomi Politik Kebutuhan Pokok: Sebuah Tinjauan Prospektif*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Sommers P, Davis C, Fry J, Jasinski L, & Lee E (2018) Academic capitalism and the entrepreneurial university: Some perspectives from the Americas. *Roterio Joacaba* 43 (1):21-42.

**Singgih et al.: "Higher education capitalism in Indonesia as a social problem"**

Wasino (2008) Kapitalisme Bumi Putera: Perubahan Masyarakat Mangkunegaran. Yogyakarta: LKiS.  
Yin RK (2018) Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods. Thousand Oaks, California:  
Sage Publications, Inc.