



Foundation University Students' Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity Levels and Their Correlations with Academic Performance*

Betul ISCAN¹, Aydin BALYER²

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 30 June 2018

Received in revised form: 14 Nov. 2018

Accepted: 22 Sep. 2019

DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2019.84.4

Keywords

Academic performance, consumer identity, foundation university, learner identity, neoliberalism

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this research was to determine the level of foundation university students' consumer orientation and learner identity; and their correlations with students' academic performance.

Research Methods: The study was conducted with a correlational survey model. The sample was 376 students from two foundation universities in Istanbul in 2017-2018 academic year. In order to collect the data, "The Extent of Students' Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity Scale" was used. The data were analyzed with SPSS 21 packet program.

Findings: Results showed that the level of consumer orientation was at 'Disagree' level, and the learner identity was at "Agree" level. A negative correlation was found between academic performance and students' consumer orientation levels. There was also a low and positive correlation between academic performance and the level of learner identity.

Implications for Research and Practice: It might be said that decision-makers in higher education field should take measures to maintain and increase quality towards changing social demands, behaviors and opinions of students in marketising and marketised universities.

© 2019 Ani Publishing Ltd. All rights reserved

*This study was presented at the 5th International Eurasian Educational Research Congress in Antalya, 02 May – 05 May, 2018

¹ Yildiz Technical University, TURKEY ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8844-5906>

² Yildiz Technical University, TURKEY, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1784-2522>

Introduction

Nowadays, as a result of neo-liberal movements, there is a tendency to marketize higher education field all over the world as well as in Turkey. In this regard, students are considered as consumers of marketised universities, which is considered to cause consumer orientation in students (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2005; Nixon, Scullion & Hearn, 2016; Tomlinson, 2016). Consumer-oriented students see higher education as a process to acquire vocational qualification (Wellen, 2005). Thus, students aim to gain only required knowledge and skills which are demanded by the business sector (Molesworth, Nixon & Scullion, 2009; Nordensvärd, 2010; Williams, 2010). In this direction, for students the target is not being a real learner, but getting only diploma (Brown, 2011; Brown & Carasso, 2013; Molesworth et al., 2009; Nixon et al, 2016; Nordensvärd, 2010; Pathan, Mahesar & Shah, 2017; Saunders, 2015; Tomlinson, 2014; 2016).

Playing active role in learning and intellectual development contradicts with consumer-oriented learners' tendency for passive learning (Nixon et al, 2016; Tomlinson, 2016). Consumer-oriented learners aim to have well-paid jobs and increase employability, which reveals beneficiary perspectives towards higher education (Bunce, Baird & Jones, 2017; Nixon et al, 2016; Saunders, 2015; Tomlinson, 2014; 2016; Williams, 2013). Namely, these kinds of students are career focused students (Pathan et al., 2017). They even separate courses as necessary or unnecessary for their future career. In this context, they do not want to take unnecessary courses, and they enjoy doing practical work (Haywood, Jenkins & Molesworth, 2011; Nixon et al., 2016). Also, they tend to decrease theoretical parts of lessons to the lowest level (Nixon et al., 2016; Nixon, Scullion & Molesworth, 2010).

These consumer-oriented students consider learning as process of getting brief, pre-packaged knowledge, which impairs acquisition of upper-level skills and development of autonomous and lifelong learning habits (Naidoo et al., 2005; Naidoo, Shankar & Veer, 2011). In addition, the higher the tuition fee is, the higher the level of consumer orientation increases (Tomlinson, 2016; Wellen, 2005; Williams, 2013). With increasing importance of employment, students consider higher education as an investment for their future career (Williams, 2013). Research reveal that at market-driven universities students consider learning as commercial process and they consider themselves as passive learners (Naidoo et al., 2011).

Learner identity is also of great importance. Students with high level of learner identity identify themselves as learners first, while those with low ones identify themselves with different roles (Lawson,2014). It means that a student with high learner identity participates in lectures regularly, reads about the field, strives for learning, defines themselves as learner, enjoys learning, and minds university process (Bunce et al., 2017; Lawson, 2014).

The other element is students' academic performance. Academic performance is regarded as the most important factor presenting quality of education (Johansen, 2014). It is used to evaluate achievement and generally evaluated by grade point average (GPA) (Strenze, 2007). In addition, while it is thought that consumer

orientation negatively affects academic achievement, there are not few studies conducted on it (Mark, 2013). Therefore, it is important to understand the correlation between academic performance and the level of consumer orientation and learner identity.

The number of foundation universities has increased in Turkey recently. It is claimed that they are sometimes established without having enough academic and physical infrastructure, and the student acceptance scores are believed to be below average. Therefore, it is a question of matter whether these universities function well or not. To this end, the results of this research may help understand the situation better. Thus, this study aimed to determine whether there was a correlation between the level of consumer orientation and learner identity behaviors of students with their academic performance. For this general aim, the answers of the following questions were researched:

1. What is the level of consumer orientation and learner identity behaviors of foundation university students?
2. Is there a significant difference in the level of consumer orientation and learner identity behaviors of foundation university students regarding the participants' age, gender, grade level, scholarship ratio, department and goal GPA for graduation?
3. Is there a significant correlation between the level of foundation university students' consumer orientation and academic performance?
4. Is there a significant correlation between the level of foundation university students' learner identity and academic performance?

Method

Research Design

The study was conducted with a correlational survey model which searched correlation between two or more different variables (Creswell, 2014). The variables were the levels of consumer orientation and learner identity behaviors of foundation university students and their academic performance.

Research Sample

The population comprised of 376 students in two foundation universities in Istanbul in 2017-2018 academic year. These two universities were chosen as population, because they were rich in departmental diversity. There are 35 bachelor's degree and 27 associate degree programs in Fatih Sultan Mehmet Foundation University. There are 111 bachelor's degree and 188 associate degree programs in Istanbul Medipol University. The sample size required for the population was 24.670 (Higher Education Council (YOK), 2018) at 95% confidence level was calculated as 376 (Cochran, 1962. as cited in Balci, 2015). The students were selected with random sampling method (Buyukozturk, Kilic Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2012).

Of these participants, 299 were females, and 77 were males. As far as department variable is considered, the students were from 55 departments and 196 of them were from STEM departments while 180 of them were from non-STEM departments. When age is considered, the mean-age was 21.

Research Instruments and Procedures

The data were collected using “The Extent of Students’ Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity Scale” developed by Bunce et al. (2017) and adapted into Turkish by İscan and Balyer (2018). It was scaled as five-point Likert type and rated as “totally disagree” (1) to “totally agree (5)”. The scale was composed of 18 items under two factors; 8 items for “consumer orientation” and 10 for “learner identity”. The factor loading of the items for Factor 1 was found as between 0,523-0,759 and for Factor 2 as 0,523-0,759. The explanatory variances were stated as “the level of consumer orientation” and “the level of learner identity” of the foundation university students to explain their relations with academic performance. Cronbach’s Alpha value for each dimension of the adapted scale was measured for consumer orientation as 0.855 and 0.848 for learner identity. It is suggested that Cronbach’s Alpha value above 0.80 is highly reliable (Cokluk, Sekercioglu & Buyukozturk, 2010). Thus, it was found that Factor 1 (0,855) and Factor 2 (0,848) have high internal consistency.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed with SPSS 21 packet program. Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality analysis was done to determine whether the distribution of the data came from normality. Pearson correlation analysis was used to analyze the relationship and the degree of relationship, t-test was used to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of two sample groups. Variance analysis (ANOVA) was implemented to examine whether there is a significant difference between the averages of more than two groups (Kalayci, 2009). Also, levene test was used to check the homogeneity of variances and post-hoc Scheffe test was used to find out which means are significantly different from each other (Buyukozturk, 2007) to determine the differences between the groups and if the variances are distributed homogeneously and the averages of the groups (Buyukozturk, 2007). Cronbach Alpha value test was used to evaluate the reliability of the scale (Kalayci, 2009).

Table 1

Normal Distribution Test Results

Scale	Statistic	df	p	Kurtosis	Skewness	Mean	Median
Consumer Orientation	0,115	376	0,00	0,671	-0,278	2,17	2,00
Learner Identity	0,078	376	0,00	-0,236	-0,474	3,84	3,90

According to the results of the normality analysis, although the data did not come from the normal distribution ($p < 0.05$), it was decided that the distribution of the data did not deteriorate from the normality due to the fact that the kurtosis and skewness were between ± 2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010), the mean and the media were close to each other, and the number of participants was above 30 due to the central limit theorem. As a result, it was decided to use parametric analyses (normal distribution analyses).

It is stated that if p-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), it is interpreted that results are statistically significant. If p-value is greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), results are statistically insignificant. As for correlation coefficient (r-value), if it is between 0.70 and 1.00, it represents high level of relationship. If r-value is between 0.70 and 0.30, it shows moderate relationship. If it is between 0.30 and 0.00, it presents low relationship (Buyukozturk, Kilic Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2012).

Results

In this part, the data were presented. Firstly, descriptive statistics related to the level of consumer orientation were shown at Table 2.

Table 2

The Level of Consumer Orientation

Items	n	Totally Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Totally Agree	\bar{x}	s.s
2. If I cannot get a good job after I graduate, I should have some of my tuition fees refunded	n	140	72	64	31	69	2,51	1,51
	%	37,23	19,15	17,02	8,24	18,35		
	%	38,56	25,00	17,02	8,51	10,90		
7. It is part of my lecturers' job to make sure I pass my courses	n	204	76	57	22	17	1,86	1,15
	%	54,26	20,21	15,16	5,85	4,52		
	Mean = 2,25							

In Table 2, the level of consumer orientation was at Disagree' level ' ($\bar{x}=2,25$). The item with the highest arithmetic mean was " If I cannot get a good job after I graduate, I should have some of my tuition fees refunded ($\bar{x} = 2,51$) ". The item with the lowest mean was 'It is a part of my lecturer's job to make sure I pass my courses ($\bar{x}=1,86$).'. These findings might be interpreted that there is a relationship between the tuition fee paid and the level of consumer orientation and the increase in tuition fee over time might increase consumer orientation of the students. The highest arithmetic mean might be interpreted as the students' opinion on getting return for the tuition fee paid for higher education. The lowest mean might be due to the fact that the students do not take the responsibility for learning in paid process in which students are considered as customers, therefore the responsibility of students'

learning is put on lecturers' shoulders.

Table 3

The Level of Learner Identity

Items		Totally Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Totally Agree	\bar{x}	s.s
		n						
10.I prepare for class	n	39	68	133	83	53	3,11	1,17
	%	10,37	18,09	35,37	22,07	14,10		
	%	6,65	14,36	42,82	22,87	13,30		
15.I want to learn as much as possible while at university	n	4	2	48	74	248	4,49	0,82
	%	1,06	0,53	12,77	19,68	65,96		
	%	2,93	7,45	15,16	26,06	48,40		
Mean= 3,79								

In Table 3, the level of learner identity was at "Agree" level ($\bar{x} = 3,79$). Also, while the highest item was "I want to learn as much as possible while at university ($\bar{x} = 4.49$)"; the lowest ($\bar{x}=3,11$) was "I prepare for class". The high level of learner identity may be due to the students' desire to succeed because higher education provides employment and higher salary. When the highest and the lowest mean are considered, the students' tendency to complete the learning process effortlessly might be interpreted as a sign of consumer orientation, which might negatively influence learner's identity.

Table 4

Difference of the Level of Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity in Terms of Gender

	Gender	n	\bar{x}	s.s.	Levene Test		t	p
					f	P		
Consumer Orientation	Female	299	2,08	0,81	1,377	0,241	-	4,040
	Male	77	2,51	0,90				
Learner Identity	Female	299	3,86	0,60	4,427	0,036	1,222	0,224
	Male	77	3,75	0,69				

*p<0,05

In Table 4, difference in consumer orientation level regarding gender was statistically significant (t=-4,040; p<0,05 p=0.000). In this regard, the female students'

level of consumer orientation was lower (\bar{x} = 2.08) than males' (\bar{x} = 2.51). The difference of the level of learner identity was not statistically significant ($p>005$). It can be commented that males exhibit more consumer orientations in higher education than females. It might be concluded that males gain more positive results than females in all aspects from the investment they make to labor market and education.

Table 5

Difference of the Level of Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity in Terms of Age

	Age	N	\bar{x}	s.s	T	sd	p
Consumer Orientation	18-20	218	2,36	0,76	-1,02	374,00	0,31
	21 - +	158	2,44	0,81			
Learner Identity	18-20	218	3,78	0,60	-0,37	374,00	0,71
	21 - +	158	3,80	0,64			

In Table 5, regarding age variable, difference in consumer orientation and learner identity levels were not statistically significant ($p>005$). Insignificant difference between the level of consumer orientation and age might be because of universities' failure to change views and behaviors of students. Insignificant difference between the level of learner identity and age may be because of the awareness of students about life.

Table 6

Difference of the Level of Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity in Terms of Grade Level

	Grade Level	N	\bar{x}	s.s	f	p
Consumer Orientation	1	128	2,12	0,70	1,255	0,286
	2	182	2,15	0,90		
	3 - +	66	2,32	0,95		
Learner Identity	1	128	3,90	0,60	1,726	0,179
	2	182	3,83	0,63		
	3 - +	66	3,73	0,64		

In Table 6, difference in consumer orientation and learner identity levels was not statistically significant regarding grade level ($p>0.05$). Insignificant difference in consumer orientation in terms of grade level might be because of the students' low level of consumer orientation in Turkey. For the learner identity level, it may be because of that the foundation university students consider diploma guarantee in return for tuition fee paid.

Table 7

Difference of the Level of Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity in Terms of Scholarship Ratio

	Scholarship Ratio	n	\bar{x}	s.s.	F	P	Scheffe
Consumer Orientation	Full	70	1,78	0,68	9,654	0,000*	1-3
	%50	212	2,24	0,88			1-2
	%25	94	2,31	0,82			
Learner Identity	Full	70	3,87	0,66	0,911	0,403	
	%50	212	3,86	0,65			
	%25	94	3,76	0,53			

*p<0.05

**p>0.05

In Table 7, difference in consumer orientation level regarding scholarship ratio was statistically significant ($f=9,654$, $p=0.000$ $p<0.05$). As a result of Scheffe tests, there were significant differences between the student groups with full and 25% scholarship, and also between the ones with full and %50. The students with 25% ($\bar{x}=2.31$) and 50% ($\bar{x}=2.24$) scholarships have higher level of consumer orientation than those with full ($\bar{x}=1.78$). There was not statistically significant difference between these groups regarding learner identity. Based on this consumer orientation data, it might be concluded that the foundation university students paying tuition fee are willing to provide more services, satisfaction and benefit for the fee they paid and therefore have more consumer orientated views and behaviors.

Table 8

Difference of the Level of Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity in Terms of Department

	Department	n	\bar{x}	s.s.	Levene Test			p
					f	P	T	
Consumer orientation	STEM	196	2,21	0,87	1,026	0,312	0,968	0,334*
	Non-STEM	180	2,13	0,83				
Learner identity	STEM	299	3,74	0,60	0,975	0,324	3,228	0,001**
	Non-STEM	77	3,94	0,63				

*p>0.05

**p<0.05

In Table 8, difference in the level of consumer orientation was not statistically significant. However, there was a statistically significant difference regarding learner

identity ($t=-3,228$; $p<0,05$ $p=0.000$). The level of learner identity was lower for those studying at STEM departments ($\bar{x}=3,74$) than those at non-STEM departments ($\bar{x}=3,94$). This may be because that foundation university students choose one of the STEM departments to get a job with higher salary instead of the departments they are interested in. Furthermore, the student, seeing diploma as a right in return for tuition fee, might only aim to pass courses with minimum effort.

Table 9

Difference of the Level of Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity in terms of Goal GPA for Graduation

	Goal GPA for graduation	N	\bar{x}	s.s.	F	P	Scheffe
Consumer Orientation	(-) - 3.00	102	2,60	0,96	21,654	0,000*	1-3
	3.00 – 3.50	165	2,07	0,76			
	3.50 – 4.00	109	1,91	0,70			
Learner Identity	(-) - 3.00	102	3,55	0,65	32,084	0,000*	1-2
	3.00 – 3.50	165	3,78	0,57			
	3.50 – 4.00	109	4,18	0,51			

* $p<0.05$

In Table 9, difference of consumer orientation level regarding goal GPA for graduation was statistically significant ($f =21,654$, $p = 0.000$, $p <0.05$). According to Scheffe test results, there was a significant difference between students with (-)-3,00 and 3,50-4,00 goal GPA. The level of consumer orientation was higher for those with (-)-3,00 goal GPA ($\bar{x}= 2,60$) than those with 3,50-4,00 ($\bar{x}= 1,91$). The low level of goal GPA for graduation of the students with high level of consumer orientation might be due to the tendency of students to focus on diploma as their right and thus to complete the higher education process with minimum effort.

Difference of the level of learner identity was statistically significant ($f=32,084$, $p=0.000$ $p<0.05$). According to Scheffe test result, the significant differences were between the students with (-)-3,00 goal GPA and those with 3,00-3,50 goal GPA, and between the ones with (-)-3,00 and 3,50-4,00. The level of learner identity for those with (-)-3,00 GPA goal ($\bar{x}=3,55$) was lower than those with 3,00-3,50 goal GPA ($\bar{x}=3,78$), and than those with 3,50-4,00 goal GPA ($\bar{x}=4,18$). The low level of learner identity of the students with low goal GPA might be due to their low motivation towards higher education and therefore their adoption of superficial learning approach.

Table 10*Correlation Between Academic Performance (GPA) and the Level of Consumer Orientation*

	Consumer Orientation	GPA
Consumer Orientation	r	1
	p	-0,284
GPA	r	1
	p	0,000*

*p<0.05

In Table 10, there was a low and negative correlation between academic performance and the level of consumer orientation ($r = -0,284$ $p = 0,001$, $p = 0,000$). This may be due to the fact that university students with consumer-oriented views and behaviors want to complete higher education process with minimum effort by regarding diploma as guarantee. Thus, the tendency to ignore the responsibilities required by higher education might be interpreted as the reason of low AGNO, which is the indicator of the academic performance of the students.

Table 11*Correlation between Academic Performance (GPA) and the Level of Learner Identity*

	Learner Identity	GPA
Learner Identity	r	1
	p	0,322
GPA	r	1
	p	0,000*

*p<0.05

In Table 11, there was a low and positive correlation between academic performance and the level of learner identity ($r = 0,322$ $p = 0,000$, $p = 0,000$). Intellectual engagement, deep learning approach, students' introducing themselves as learners, regular attendance to lessons increase both academic performance and the level of learner identity so they might be interpreted as the causes of this positive correlation.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

In this study, the students' consumer orientation level was found at 'Disagree' level. In this regard, while Bunce et al. (2017) found similar results; Delucchi and Korgen (2002), Nixon, Scullion and Hearn (2016), Obermiller, Fleenor and Raven (2005), Universities UK (2017), and Ikeda, Campomar and Veludo-de-Oliveira (2009)

observed contrasting findings. They found that students consider themselves as consumers in higher education. The consumer orientation level of students in Turkey is close to Bunce et al.'s result (2017). Financial support of higher education in the UK is almost totally students' responsibility (Geven, 2015) as in Turkey where 90% of tuition fee is provided by students (Buyukuslu, 2010) Thus, in these two countries, similar ratio of tuition fee and proximity of students' consumer orientation might indicate that there may be positive relationship between ratio of tuition fee and students' consumer orientation level.

In this research, the item with the highest mean was "If I cannot get a good job after I graduate, I should have some of my tuition fees refunded." which might mean that students want to get their tuition fee's worth. This result was supported by Barnett (2011), Brown (2011), Clark (2009), Jones-Devitt and Smith (2007), Naidoo and Williams (2015), Paricio (2017) and Tomlinson' research results (2016). The item with the lowest mean is that "It is part of my lecturers' job to make sure I pass my courses."; which contradicts with Koris and Nokelainen's findings (2015) that students in marketised universities think that learning, graduating and getting a diploma are their responsibilities, rather than lecturers' and universities'. Another result showed that the level of learner identity is at 'Agree' level; which might mean that students want to be successful, because success provides employment and a well-paid job, therefore; their learner identity level is high. Similar results were found out by Abouserie (1995) and Ekinci (2008).

It was also found that females' consumer orientation level is lower than males'. Increase in females' education level is important for employment (Yildiz, 2013). Therefore, it is necessary for women to keep education level high and to improve at the highest level (Mulligan & Rubinstein, 2008). Yildiz (2013) observed that there is gender discrimination and low female employment in Turkey. Therefore, women have to be highly skilled; which might be reason for women's low consumer orientation. However, Bunce et al. (2017) found that consumer orientation does not differ regarding gender; and Douglas, Douglas and Barnes (2006) discovered that both male and female students describe themselves as consumers.

Regarding age variable, there was no statistically significant difference. However, Bunce et al. (2017) found that there is a negative relationship between age and consumer orientation level. This result is not consistent with study results of Douglas et al. (2005) that students between 25-29 and 30-34 ages consider themselves more as consumers than the other age groups. This may stem from conditions in Turkey. In Turkey, it is alleged that foundation universities do not provide necessary academic, intellectual, personal and social development for students, which is similar with the results of Balaban and Cakmak's (2016) study.

In this study, difference of the level of learner identity regarding age is not statistically significant. However, lifelong learning skills (Adams, 2007; Koc, 2007) and factors determining the level of learner identity are similar. Yildiz (2014) observed that participants' perception of lifelong learning increases as age increases,

which might lead to an increase in learner identity. But the result of this study does not support Yildiz's (2014) findings.

The consumer orientation level differs concerning scholarship rates. Students with 25% and 50% scholarships have higher consumer orientation than those with 100% scholarship; which are similar with the results of Bunce et al. (2017), Koris et al. (2015), Tomlinson (2016), Wellen (2005) and Williams (2013). They reveal that consumer orientation level increases as tuition fee increases. Kaynas (2012) states that consumers choose products or services to get more benefits; which might be interpreted that as students want to receive tuition fee back as high quality service, benefit and satisfaction so they show consumer orientation, which is similar with Barnett's (2011) and Jones-Devitt et al.' results (2007).

Moreover, results of this research showed that the learner identity level was found lower at STEM departments than those at non-STEM departments. Similarly, Entwistle and Tait (1995) state that at STEM departments, students have more superficial learning approaches, because STEM departments lead learners to adopt superficial learning approach, and superficial learning approach is related to low level of learner identity (Platow, Mavor & Grace, 2013).

As for students' goal GPA for graduation, there is a significant difference in students' consumer orientation level. In this context, as goal GPA decreases, the level of consumer orientation increases; which might be because students see diploma as a right in return for tuition fee (Naidoo et al., 2005). Students may also have a tendency to complete higher education with minimum effort (Brown, 2011; Calyson & Haley, 2005), to focus only on diploma rather than learning (Brown, 2011; Brown et al., 2013; Clark, 2009; Molesworth et al., 2009; Naidoo et al., 2005; Newson, 2004; Nixon et al., 2016; Nordensvärd, 2010; Pathan et al., 2017; Saunders, 2015; Tomlinson, 2014; 2016; Wellen, 2005; Williams, 2010). This finding is not consistent with the findings of Bunce et al. (2017), Tomlinson (2014) and Saunders (2015). It was seen in the study that as goal GPA for graduation decreases, the level of learner identity decreases which might be because of low motivation towards higher education and therefore; students have superficial learning approach. Gorard, Smith, May, Thomas, Adnett and Slack (2006) support this finding.

The results also showed that there is a negative and weak correlation between academic performance (GPA) and the level of consumer orientation, which is similar with the result of Bunce et al. (2017). In Alkis (2015) and O'Connor and Paunonen's (2007) studies; there is a positive correlation between students' responsibility and success. Consumer-oriented students view higher education as service they get in exchange of tuition fee so students tend to avoid responsibilities (Barnett, 2011; Jones-Devitt et al., 2007; Naidoo et al., 2005; Naidoo et al., 2011; Nixon et al., 2016; Williams, 2010); which might cause decrease in academic performance. Alkis (2015) observed that students are more interested in lectures which they consider beneficiary. Brackney and Karabenick (1995) also state that there is positive correlation between students' exam grades and importance they give to lectures. Thus, while it is expected that consumer oriented students give importance to

lectures because of employment and high salary opportunity, it is found that there is a negative correlation between the level of consumer orientation and academic performance. Therefore, the research result contradicts with the findings of Alkis (2015) and Brackney et al. (1995).

There is also a positive and low correlation between academic performance (GPA) and the level of learner identity. Alkis (2015), Brewer and Burgess (2005), Bunce et al. (2017) and Lawson (2014) assert that regular attendance to lectures provides higher grades. Lawson (2014) also observes that students with high learner identity regularly participate in all lectures, seminars and presentations. Thus, the fact that participation in lecture increases both the level of student's learner identity and academic performance might be interpreted as the reason for positive correlation between the level of learner identity and academic performance. Krause (2005) and Bunce et al. (2017) states that intellectual engagement is positively related to academic performance so to the level of learner identity. Thus, intellectual engagement may be interpreted as the reason. Boyle, Duffy and Dunleavy (2003), Chan (2003), Ramsden (2000) and Smyth, Mavor, Platow, Grace and Reynolds (2015) found that students with deep learning approach have internal motivation to learn and to use learning strategies such as critical thinking and higher-level cognitive activities. Chan (2003) also states that students with superficial learning approach do not have motivation towards learning. Bunce et al. (2017) and Platow et al. (2013) state that people with higher learner identity show deep learning approach. Thus, it is observed that having deep learning approach affects both the level of learner identity and academic performance of the students positively. As result, this finding might be resulted from students' deep learning approach.

A number of conclusions were drawn in this study. First, it was observed that the level of students' consumer orientation is at "Disagree" level, and the level of learner identity was at 'Agree' level. Another result showed that the females' consumer orientation level was lower than males'. As for variables, there was no significant difference between age, and consumer orientation and learner identity levels. Students with 25% and 50% scholarships had higher level of consumer orientation than those with 100%. While there was no significant difference in the level of consumer orientation, the level of learner identity studying at STEM departments was lower than those studying at non-STEM departments. The level of consumer orientation of students whose goal GPA for graduation was between (-) -3,00 was higher than those between 3,50-4,00. The learner identity level of students whose goal GPA for graduation was between (-) -3,00 was lower than those between 3,00-3,50, and than those between 3,50-4,00. Negative and low correlation was found between consumer orientation level and academic performance. A positive and low correlation was found between learner identity level and academic performance.

Decision-makers for higher education might make arrangements to increase academic performance by considering the negative correlation between the level of consumer orientation and academic performance, and positive correlation between the level of learner identity and academic performance. The decrease in academic performance might be investigated. There found positive correlation between the

learner identity level and academic performance. A research might be conducted to determine ways to increase the learner identity level and to decrease consumer orientation. A mixed study might be carried out to compare findings. A similar research can be conducted at public and foundation universities in different regions and provinces, with graduate and post-graduate students with various samples. The level of males' consumer orientation was found to be higher than females'. The reasons behind it might be examined with another mixed research.

References

- Abouserie, R. (1995). Self esteem and achievement motivation as determinants of students approaches to studying. *Studies in Higher Education*, 20(1), 19-27.
- Adams, D. (2007). Lifelong learning skills and attributes: The perceptions of Australian secondary school teachers. *Issues in Educational Research*, 17(2), 149.
- Alkis, N. (2015). *The influence of personality traits, motivation and persuasion principles on academic performance* (master's thesis). The Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Balaban, O., & Cakmak, D. (2016). Examination of university students' perception of personal development training. *The Sakarya Journal of Economics*, 5 (1), 1-17.
- Balci, A. (2015). *Research in social sciences (11st edition)*. Ankara: Pegem A Publication.
- Barnett, R. (2011). *The marketised university: Defending the indefensible*. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion, & E. Nixon (Eds), *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 39-51). London: Routledge.
- Boyle, E. A., Duffy, T., & Dunleavy, K. (2003). Learning styles and academic outcome: The validity and utility of Vermunt's inventory of learning styles in a British higher education setting. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 267-290.
doi:10.1348/00070990360626976
- Brackney, B. E., & Karabenick, S. A. (1995). Psychopathology and academic performance: the role of motivation and learning strategies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42(4), 456-465.
- Brewer, E. W., & Burgess, D. N. (2005). Professor's role in motivating students to attend class. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 42(3), 23-47.
- Brown, R. (2011). *Higher education and the market*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Brown, R., & Carasso, H. (2013). *Everything for sale? The marketisation of UK higher education*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Bunce, L., Baird, A., & Jones, S.E. (2017). The student-as-consumer approach in higher

- education and its effects on academic performance, *Studies in Higher Education*, 42,11. doi:10.1080/03075079.2015.1127908
- Buyukozturk, S. (2007). *Data analysis handbook for social sciences* (8th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Buyukozturk, S., Kilic Cakmak, E., Akgun, E.A., Karadeniz S., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Scientific Research Methods (11th edition)*. Ankara: Pegem Publication.
- Buyukuslu, A.R. (2010). *The rise of academic capitalism and global universities*. İstanbul: Derin Publication.
- Chan, K. (2003). Hong Kong teacher education students' epistemological beliefs and approaches to learning. *Research in Education*, 69, 36-50.
- Clark, L. (2009). Average students debts will hit more than £10,000 by the end of the decade, *The Daily Mail* (21 April).
- Clayson, D.E., & Haley, D.A. (2005). Marketing models in education: Students as customers, products, or partners, *Marketing Education Review*, 15,1, 1-10.
doi:10.1080/10528008.2005.11488884
- Douglas, A., Douglas, J., & Barnes, B. (2006). *The student as customer?* Proceedings of the 9th Toulon-Verona Conference University of Paisley, 7th-8th September 2006.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Cokluk, O., Sekercioglu, G., & Buyukozturk, S. (2010). *Multivariate statistics for social sciences: spss and lisrel applications*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Delucchi, M., & Korgen, K. (2002). We're the customer – we way the tuition': student consumerism among undergraduate sociology majors. *Teaching Sociology*, 30(1), 100–107.
- Ekinci, N. (2008). *Undergraduate students' approaches to learning and their relationships with the variables of teaching-learning process (Ph.D. dissertation)*, Hacettepe University Social Sciences Institute, Department of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Entwistle, N., & Tait, H. (1995). Approaches to studying and perceptions of the learning environment across disciplines. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 64, 93–103.
- Fatih Sultan Mehmet Foundation University. (2018). *Departments*. Retrieved November 5, 2018, from <http://www.fatihsultan.edu.tr/>
- George, D., Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: a simple guide and reference*

17.0 update, 10. Boston: Pearson.

- Geven, K. (2015). "How did the latest increase in fees in England affect student enrolment and inequality?", *The European Higher Education Area*, 479–500.
- Haywood, H., Jenkins, E., & Molesworth, M. (2011). *A degree will make all your dreams come true: Higher education as the management of consumer desires*. In N. Molesworth, R. Scullion, & E. Nixon (Eds.), *The marketization of higher education and the student as consumer*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Higher Education Council (YOK). (2018). The number of students in 2017-2018 education year. Retrieved from <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/>
- Ikeda, A. A., Veludo-de-Oliveira, T.M., & Campomar, M.C. (2009). "Business students' perspective on customer in education", paper presented at the BALAS Annual Conference, ITESM, 1 April 2009, Guadalajara, Mexico, available at http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/9/6/1/4/pages296144/p296144-1.php (accessed April 2013).
- İscan, B., & Balyer, A. (2018). Adaptation of the scale of the extent of students' consumer orientation and learner identity into Turkish. *YILDIZ Journal of Educational Research*, 3(1), 1-26.
- Istanbul Medipol University. (2018). *Departments*. Retrieved November 5, 2018, from <http://www.medipol.edu.tr/Default.aspx>
- Johansen, V. (2014). Entrepreneurship education and academic performance, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 58,3, 300-314. doi:10.1080/00313831.2012.726642
- Jones-Devitt, S., & Smith, L. (2007). *Critical thinking in health and social care*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore: Sage Publishers.
- Kalaycı, S. (2009). *SPSS applied multivariate statistical techniques*. Ankara: Dinamik Akademi.
- Kaynas, M. (2012). Consumers irrational behaviours and their economic outcomes (master's thesis). T.C. Istanbul Kültür University Social Sciences Institute, Department of Economics, Economics of Management Program. Istanbul
- Koc, G. (2007). *Lifelong learning*. O. Demirel (Ed.), *New Directions in Education* (209-222) Ankara: Pegem A Publication.
- Koris, R., & Nokelainen, P. (2015). The student-customer orientation questionnaire (SCOQ). application of customer metaphor to higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29(10), 115–138.
- Krause, K.-L. (2005). *Understanding and promoting student engagement in university*

- Learning communities*. Paper presented at the Sharing Scholarship in Learning and Teaching: Engaging Students, James Cook University, Townsville
- Lawson, A. (2014). Learner identities in the context of undergraduates: a case study, *Educational Research*, 56, 3, 343-356. doi: 10.1080/00131881.2014.934557
- Mark, E. (2013). Students are not products. They are customers. *College Student Journal*, 47(3), 489-493.
- Molesworth, M., Nixon, E., & Scullion, R. (2009). Having, being and higher education: the marketisation of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (3), 277-87.
- Mulligan, C. B., & Rubinstein, Y. (2008). Selection, investment, and women's relative wages over time, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122 (3), 1061-1110.
- Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Empowering participants or corroding learning: towards a research agenda on the impact of student consumerism in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20 (3): 267-281.
- Naidoo, R., Shankar, A., & Veer, E. (2011). The consumerist turn in higher education: Policy aspirations and outcomes, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27, 11-12, 1142-1162. doi:10.1080/0267257X.2011.609135
- Naidoo, R., & Williams, J. (2015). The neoliberal regime in English higher education: charters, consumers and the erosion of the public good. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56 (2): 208-223.
- Newson, J. (2004). Disrupting the 'student as consumer' model: the new emancipatory project. *International Relations*. 18(2), 227-239.
- Nixon, E., Scullion, R., & Hearn, R. (2016). Her majesty the student: marketised higher education and the narcissistic (dis)satisfactions of the student consumer, *Studies in Higher Education*. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2016.1196353
- Nixon, E., Scullion, R., & Molesworth, M. (2010). *How choice in higher education can create conservative learners*. In M. Molesworth, Scullion, R., & Nixon, E. Nixon (Eds.), *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 196-208). London: Routledge.
- Nixon, E., Scullion, R., & Hearn, R. (2016). Her majesty the student: marketised higher education and the narcissistic (dis)satisfactions of the student consumer, *Studies in Higher Education*.
- Nordensvärd, J. (2010). *The consumer metaphor versus the citizen*. In M. Molesworth, E. Nixon and R. Scullions (editors). *The Marketisation of Higher Education: The Student as Consumer*, Routledge.

- Obermiller, C., Fleenor, P., & Raven, P. (2005). Students as customers or products: perceptions and preferences of faculty and students, *Marketing Education Review*, 15(2), 27-36.
- O'Connor, M. C., & Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(5), 971- 990.
- Paricio, J. (2017). Students as customers: a paradigm shift in higher education. *Debats. Journal on Culture, Power and Society*, 131(3), 137-149.
- Pathan, S. K., Mahesar, H. A., & Shah, S. (2017). The impact of student consumerism metaphor on higher education students: a critical review of literature. *Grassroots*, 50(3).
- Platow, M. J., Mavor, K. I., & Grace, D. M. (2013). On the role of discipline-related self- concept in deep and surface approaches to learning among university students. *Instructional Science*, 41 (2), 271–85.
- Ramsden, P. (2000). *Learning to teaching in higher education*. London: Newyork Routhlodge Falmer.
- Saunders, D. B. (2015). They do not buy it: exploring the extent to which entering first-year students view themselves as customers, *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 25,1, 5-28. doi: 10.1080/08841241.2014.969798
- Smyth, L., Mavor, K. I., Platow, M. J., Grace, D.M & Reynolds, K.J. (2015). Discipline social identification, study norms and learning approach in university students, *Educational Psychology*, 35, 1, 53-72. doi: 10.1080/01443410.2013.82
- Strenze, T. (2007). Intelligence and socioeconomic success: A meta analytic review of longitudinal research. *Intelligence*, 35, Stock, J., & Cervone, D. (1999). *Proximal Goal Setting Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14 (5).
- Tomlinson, M. (2014). Exploring the impacts of policy changes on student approaches and attitudes to learning in contemporary higher education: implications for student learning engagement. *Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/Research/policy_change_student_attitudes.
- Tomlinson, M. (2016). Student perceptions of themselves as 'consumers' of higher education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38,4, 450-467. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2015.1113856
- Universities UK. (2017). *Education, consumer rights and maintaining trust: what students want from their university*. Retrieved from <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2017/education-consumer-rights-maintaining-trust-web.pdf>

- Wellen, R. (2005). The university student in a reflexive society: consequences of consumerism and competition, *Higher Education Perspectives*, 1(2).
- Williams, J. (2010). *Constructing consumption: what media representations reveal about today's students*. In the marketisation of higher education, edited by M. Molesworth, R. Scullion, and E. Nixon, 170–82. Oxon: Routledge.
- Williams, J. (2013). *Consuming HE why learning can't be bought*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Yildiz, O. (2013). Women employment in Turkey from the view of employer: A field survey. *Dokuz Eylul University Literature Faculty Journal*, 2(3), 95-110.
- Yildiz, S. (2014). What do universities promise? A content analysis of print ads of the universities in Turkey. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 14(2), 157-160.

Vakıf Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Tüketici Yönelim ve Öğrenen Kimlik Düzeyi ile Akademik Performansı Arasındaki İlişki

Atıf:

- Iscan, B., & Balyer, A. (2019). Foundation university students' consumer orientation and learner identity levels and their correlations with academic performance. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Sciences*, 84, 71-92, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2019.84.4

Özet

Problem Durumu: Son yıllarda yükseköğretimin piyasaya açılması ile üniversitelerde tüketici yönelimli öğrencilerden daha fazla söz edilmektedir. Piyasalaşan üniversitelerde öğrencilerin tüketici yönelimli öğrenci davranış ve tutumları üzerine araştırmaların artmasına rağmen, öğrencilerin kendini tüketici olarak görme düzeyi üzerine hala yeterli sayıda araştırma bulunmamaktadır. Dolayısıyla öğrencilerin tüketici yönelimi araştırma yapılması gereken bir konu olarak gündeme gelmiştir.

Yükseköğretimde piyasalaşmanın aynı zamanda öğrencilerin öğrenen kimliği üzerinde ve dolayısıyla öğrenci kavramı üzerinde farklılıklara yol açtığı düşünülmektedir. Dolayısıyla yapılan bu araştırma ile Türkiye’de piyasaya katılan vakıf üniversitesi öğrencilerinin öğrenen kimlik düzeylerinin ortaya çıkarılması hedeflenmektedir. Bu konuda farklı ülkelerde araştırmalar bulunmasına rağmen Türkiye’de alanyazında yeterince araştırma bulunmamaktadır. Aynı zamanda piyasalaşmanın akademik performans ile öğrencilerin tüketici yönelim ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ile ilişkisini incelemek yükseköğretimin kalitesini artırmak için önemli görülmektedir. Dolayısıyla hem alan yazındaki eksiklikleri tamamlamak hem de konuyu Türkiye bağlamında çalışmak için bu araştırmanın yapılması hedeflenmiştir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu çalışma, farklı değişkenlere göre vakıf üniversitesi öğrencilerinin tüketici yönelim ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyini ve bunların akademik performans ile arasında bir ilişkinin bulunup bulunmadığını belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Çalışma nicel ilişki modeline dayalı yürütülmüştür. Araştırmada incelenen değişkenler, vakıf üniversite öğrencilerinin tüketici yönelim ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ve akademik performanstır. Araştırmanın evrenini, 2017-2018 eğitim-öğretim yılında İstanbul'daki iki vakıf üniversitesinde öğrenim gören 376 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Öğrenciler basit seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemiyle seçilmiştir. Araştırmada veriler, Bunce, Baird ve Jones (2017) tarafından geliştirilen ve İşcan ve Balyer (2018) tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan "Öğrenci Tüketici Yönelim ve Öğrenen Kimlik Düzeyini Belirleme Ölçeği" kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Ölçek beşli likert tipi bir ölçektir. Veriler, SPSS 21 istatistik programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlara göre katılımcıların tüketici yönelimi 'katılmıyorum' düzeyinde bulunmuştur ($\bar{x}=2,25$). Öğrencilerin tüketici yönelim düzeyini gösteren en yüksek madde ($\bar{x}=2,51$) ortalamayla "Mezun olduktan sonra iyi bir işe giremezsem, okul yapmış olduğum ödemelerin bir kısmını geri ödemelidir." olarak bulunurken, en düşük madde ise ($\bar{x}=1,86$) ortalamayla "Hocalarımın işinin bir parçası da beni derslerimden geçirmektir." olarak bulunmuştur. Yine diğer bir sonuca göre öğrencilerin öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ($\bar{x}=3,79$), 'katılıyorum' düzeyindedir. Öğrenen kimlik düzeyine ait en yüksek madde ($\bar{x}=4,49$) ortalamayla "Üniversitede mümkün olduğu kadar çok şey öğrenmek isterim." maddesi iken, en düşük madde, ($\bar{x}=3,11$) ortalamayla "Derslere hazırlık yaparım." maddesidir. Kadınların tüketici yönelim düzeyi ($\bar{x}=2,08$), erkeklere göre ($\bar{x}=2,51$) daha düşük bulunmuştur. Öğrenen kimlik düzeyinin cinsiyete göre farklılığı istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir ($p>0,05$). Öğrencilerin tüketici yönelim ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyi yaşa göre istatistiksel anlamda bir farklılık göstermemiştir ($p>0,05$). Katılımcıların tüketici yönelim düzeyinin ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyinin sınıf düzeyine göre farklılığı istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir ($p>0,05$). Bursluluk durumu değerlendirildiğinde, %25 burslu ($\bar{x}=2,31$) ve 50% burslu ($\bar{x}=2,24$) olanların tüketici yönelim düzeyi, tam burslu olanların düzeyine ($\bar{x}=1,78$) göre daha yüksek bulunmuştur. Öğrencilerin öğrenen kimlik düzeyinin bursluluk oranlarına göre farklılığı istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir ($p>0,05$). Katılımcıların tüketici yönelim düzeyinin bölümlerine göre farklılığı istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir ($p > 0,05$). STEM bölümündeki öğrencilerin öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ($\bar{x}=3,74$), STEM bölümünde olmayan öğrencilere ($\bar{x}=3,94$) göre daha düşük bulunmuştur. Hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su (-)3,00 katılımcıların tüketici yönelim düzeyi ($\bar{x}=2,60$), hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su 3,50-4,00 olanlara ($\bar{x}=1,91$) göre daha yüksek bulunmuştur. Hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su (-)3,00 ($\bar{x}=3,55$) olan katılımcıların öğrenen kimlik düzeyi, hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su 3,00-3,50 ($\bar{x}=3,78$) ve 3,50-4,00 ($\bar{x}=4,18$) olanlara göre daha düşüktür. Akademik performans ile tüketici yönelim düzeyi arasında negatif yönde düşük kuvvetli bir ilişki bulunmuştur ($r=-0,284$ $p=0,001$, $p=0,000$). Akademik performans ile öğrenen kimlik düzeyi arasında pozitif yönde düşük kuvvetli bir ilişki tespit edilmiştir ($r= 0,322$ $p=0,000$, $p=0,000$).

Araştırma Sonuçları ve Öneriler: Araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlara göre, öğrencilerin tüketici yönelimleri 'katılmıyorum'; öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ise 'katılıyorum' düzeyindedir. Kadınların tüketici yönelim düzeyi, erkeklerin tüketici yönelim düzeyine göre daha düşük iken; öğrenen kimlik düzeyi cinsiyete göre anlamlı farklılık göstermemektedir. Tüketici yönelim ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyi, yaşa göre anlamlı bir farklılık sergilememektedir. Tüketici yönelim düzeyi ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyi öğrencilerin bulunduğu sınıf düzeyine göre anlamlı farklılık göstermemektedir. %25 ve 50% burslu olanların tüketici yönelim düzeyi, tam burslu olanların tüketici yönelim düzeyine göre daha yüksek iken; öğrenen kimlik düzeyi bursluluk oranına göre anlamlı farklılık göstermemektedir. Tüketici yönelim düzeyi bölüme göre anlamlı farklılık göstermezken, STEM bölümündeki öğrencilerin öğrenen kimlik düzeyi, STEM bölümünde olmayan öğrencilerin öğrenen kimlik düzeyine göre daha düşüktür. Hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su (-)3,00 olan öğrencilerin tüketici yönelim düzeyi, hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su 3,50-4,00 olan öğrencilerin tüketici yönelim düzeyine göre daha yüksektir. Hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su (-)3,00 olan öğrencilerin öğrenen kimlik düzeyi, hedeflenen mezuniyet AGNO'su 3,00-3,50 ve 3,50-4,00 olan öğrencilerin öğrenen kimlik düzeyine göre daha düşüktür. Tüketici yönelim düzeyi ile akademik performans arasında negatif yönde düşük bir ilişki var iken, öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ile akademik performansı arasında pozitif yönde düşük bir ilişki vardır.

Yükseköğretim alanında politika geliştirenler, vakıf üniversitelerinin tüketici yönelim düzeyi ile akademik performans arasındaki negatif ilişki ve öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ile akademik performans arasındaki pozitif ilişkiyi dikkate alarak akademik performansını artırmaya yönelik düzenlemeler yapabilirler. Böylece tüketici yönelim düzeyi arttıkça, akademik performanstaki düşüşün nedenleri araştırılabilir. Ayrıca, öğrenen kimlik düzeyi ile akademik performans arasındaki pozitif ilişkiye dayanarak, öğrenen kimlik düzeyini artırmak için ne yapılması gerektiği konusu yürütülecek olan karma bir araştırma yöntemiyle karşılaştırılabilir. Yine benzer bir araştırma devlet üniversitelerinde, farklı bölgelerdeki ve illerdeki vakıf üniversitelerinde de yapılabilir. Benzer bir araştırma lisans, lisansüstü ve doktora düzeylerine yürütülebilir ve lisans öğrencileriyle karşılaştırılabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Akademik performans, neoliberalizm, öğrenen kimlik, tüketici kimliği, vakıf üniversitesi.

This study was produced from Betul ISCAN's thesis "Investigation of The Correlation Between The Extent of Consumer Orientation and Learner Identity, and Academic Performance of University Students: Foundation University Case" and supported by the Scientific Research Projects Unit of Yıldız Technical University. Project Number: 3342.

