



RESEARCH ARTICLE

2024, vol. 11, issue 1, 41 - 51

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15258133>

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF FOUCAULT'S POWER AND KNOWLEDGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH

Victor J. PITSOE¹, Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU²

¹ Dept Education Leadership and Management, University of South Africa, South Africa,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3127-8198>

² CCCSEM, University of Craiova, Romania
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6929-1614>

Abstract

This article explores the lasting impact of Michel Foucault's views on power and knowledge in several academic fields, specifically in the context of modern research in higher education. By drawing on many sources from different time periods, the article argues that Foucault's conceptual framework offers scholars a deep perspective to analyse the complex interactions between power, knowledge, and their interconnection. This highlights the crucial significance of Foucault's theories as a theoretical framework for understanding the intricacies of higher education, where academic institutions are acknowledged as centres of power dynamics and the creation of knowledge. The article examines the use of Foucault's power and knowledge framework in higher education research while also recognising its influence. The text explores the difficulties, inconsistencies, and possible restrictions while also discussing worries regarding the freedom of academia, opposition from established authorities, and the risk of knowledge becoming too uniform within specific fields. The critique encompasses the marginalised voices in academia, raising doubts about the efficacy of the framework in enhancing the visibility of these perspectives. This article seeks to enhance our understanding of power relations in academia by conducting a thorough investigation. It promotes research methodologies that prioritise inclusivity, equity, and a diverse knowledge landscape, aiming to bring about transformative changes.

Keywords: Michel Foucault, Power/Knowledge Framework, Higher Education Research, Academic Disciplines, Inclusivity in Research Practices

1 Introduction and background

Various academic fields find common ground in Michel Foucault's theories of power and knowledge, which offer a valuable perspective for analysing the complex interplay between power, knowledge, and their interconnectedness (Bowman, 2023; Lifková, 2019; Meynell, 1989). In the complex web of the 21st century and modern academic institutions, Foucault's theories continue to have an outsized influence on the way scholars think about and participate in knowledge production (Comber, 2018; *Enabling Knowledge Sharing Practices for Academic and Research in Higher Education Institutions*, 2019). It is possible to critically examine Foucault's theories, despite the fact that they provide a strong foundation for comprehending the intricacies of knowledge formation. Investigating Foucault's power/knowledge paradigm within the framework of research on higher education, this article sets out on an extensive examination. This analysis goes beyond a simple theoretical dissection to probe the difficulties, paradoxes, and possible constraints that may occur when academics apply Foucault's perspective to the complex terrain of academic research.

It is fundamental to highlight that research into higher education in the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) era is complex, but Foucault's theories on knowledge and power provide a theoretical compass (Glueck & Jauch, 1975). At a time when universities are being seen as hubs of power dynamics and information production, Foucault's theory is useful for analysis. In light of Foucault's (1980, 1991, 1994a, 1994b) conception of the power-knowledge dynamic, academics are encouraged to investigate not just the nature of knowledge but also its production, dissemination, and legitimization processes. In modern higher education, Foucault's impact is seen in

the examination of disciplinary formations, institutional structures, and the complex relationship between power and academic knowledge (Clarence & McKenna, 2017). In order to understand the regulatory mechanisms that control knowledge creation in the ivory towers, the intricacies of academic discourse and curriculum design are all subject to scrutiny when scholars apply Foucault's concepts.

A critical discourse, however, emerges as Foucault's ideas spread throughout the field of research on higher education (Madan, 2011). The power/knowledge concept presents difficulties for scholars, who investigate its possible limits and wonder whether it is applicable. The nuanced, contradictory, and complicated issues that arise when Foucault's theories are applied to academic research are the subject of this article's critical examination. Academic freedom within the context of the power/knowledge nexus is the primary focus of the critique's initial arguments. Academic freedom could be curbed if all knowledge is seen as an expression of power relations, a worry voiced by researchers in response to Foucault's critique of the objectivity of knowledge production. By navigating this contradiction, the article investigates how redefining concepts of autonomy and intellectual pursuit may result from acknowledging power dynamics inside academia.

Analysis of academic resistance and agency is another component of critique. Resistance becomes less effective when power systems are well-entrenched. The lack of a normative foundation for resistance and Charles Taylor's doubts about the subject's ability to escape ubiquitous control become significant themes (Anabtawi, 2005; McAdams & Nadler, 2011). In light of these issues, the article takes a critical look at academic power dynamics and the revolutionary force of resistance. The investigation delves into institutional practices and disciplinary regimes, wherein Foucault's (1991) focus on the control of information within fields prompts inquiries on the possible standardisation of scholarly understanding. The criticism explores the ways in which the power/knowledge paradigm affects the legitimacy of academic research by either weakening or strengthening disciplinary boundaries. Concerns regarding the erasure of particular perspectives in scholarly discussions are also addressed in the article. Although Foucault's paradigm encourages researchers to examine power dynamics, some critics (Nnamuchi, 2022; Ghadiri et al., 2023) contend that it fails to offer specific instructions on how to give a voice to underrepresented groups or combat structural inequality in research.

In this light, delving deeply into Foucault's power and knowledge paradigm as it pertains to the research praxis of modern higher education is an exciting adventure into the maze of academic life. This article takes a critical look at Foucault's theories in an effort to decipher the complexities, difficulties, and possible limits that arise when scholars apply his theoretical framework to the study of power dynamics and knowledge construction. Through successful navigation of these challenges, researchers can enhance our understanding of academic power dynamics and strive for transformative research practices that promote inclusivity, equity, and a more diverse and rich body of knowledge.

2 Foucault's Power and Knowledge in Higher Education: An Overview

Foucault's enigmatic theories are relevant to the 4IR context, particularly his power and knowledge framework, serve as a revolutionary compass for scholars navigating the labyrinth of contemporary higher education. At its core, Foucault's (1994a) paradigm challenges the very bedrock of traditional perspectives on knowledge production. It boldly asserts that power and knowledge are not mere bedfellows; they are inextricably woven into the fabric of academic inquiry. Within the hallowed halls of higher education, this revolutionary perspective reshapes the understanding of academic knowledge, stripping away the illusion of neutrality and revealing the intricate dance between knowledge and the pervasive influence of power relations. (James, 2020; Ahmadi, 2021).

In the context of modern higher education, Foucault's ideas herald a seismic shift, prompting a re-evaluation of foundational assumptions. No longer can knowledge be perceived as an impartial pursuit divorced from the power dynamics inherent in institutional structures (Dosi & Marengo, 2014). Foucault's (1994a) lens forces scholars to confront the uncomfortable reality that the academic realm is not a neutral space but a terrain sculpted by the contours of power relations, where the very act of knowledge production is entangled with the forces that govern and shape it.

Within this complex web of academia, scholars become agents, navigating the terrain of knowledge production within the intricate dynamics of power. The power/knowledge framework illuminates the multifaceted nature of scholarly endeavours, acknowledging that the production of knowledge is not a sterile and objective process but a journey fraught with the influences of institutional structures, disciplinary regimes, and the pervasive forces that dictate the contours of academic life (Phan Le Ha, 2023; Clarence & McKenna, 2017). Foucault's (1994a) ideas resonate profoundly in the analysis of institutional practices, peeling back the layers that conceal the power relations embedded within the very foundations of higher education. In examining these practices, scholars are prompted to scrutinise the subtle, and often not-so-subtle, ways in which power permeates decision-making processes, shapes academic policies, and influences the direction of scholarly pursuits. The power/knowledge

framework becomes a potent tool for unveiling the intricate tapestry of institutional power, offering scholars a nuanced perspective on the complex power dynamics inherent in academic institutions (P. T. R. G. P. R. A. S. C. 2020; Zamani, 2022).

Disciplinary formations, another focal point of Foucault's exploration, emerge as critical arenas where power and knowledge converge. The power/knowledge framework invites scholars to question the boundaries of academic disciplines, challenging the traditional silos that compartmentalise knowledge (Foucault, 1991). In this context, disciplinary formations are not seen as neutral containers for knowledge but as active agents in shaping and regulating what is deemed legitimate within the academic domain. This perspective sparks a re-evaluation of the very nature of academic disciplines, pushing scholars to interrogate the power dynamics that influence the creation and perpetuation of disciplinary boundaries.

Furthermore, the examination of knowledge construction, dissemination, and legitimisation within higher education reveals the far-reaching implications of Foucault's theories. The academic discourse, often considered a bastion of objective inquiry, is laid bare as a terrain where power relations manifest. Foucault's (1994a) lens invites scholars to dissect the power dynamics embedded in curricula, challenging the presumed neutrality of educational content. The very act of deciding what knowledge is disseminated and legitimised becomes an exercise in power, with implications for the shaping of collective understanding and the perpetuation of certain perspectives over others.

Institutional mechanisms governing knowledge production, such as peer review processes and funding allocations, emerge as crucial sites of power in the academic landscape (Grenier & Hagmann, 2016). Foucault's framework prompts scholars to critically examine these mechanisms, recognising the potential for power dynamics to influence which research is deemed worthy of publication, funding, or institutional support. This critical lens sheds light on the gatekeeping role of academic journals and funding agencies, unveiling the power structures that may inadvertently perpetuate certain paradigms while marginalising others.

In conclusion, Foucault's power/knowledge framework, when applied to higher education, emerges as a transformative paradigm that disrupts traditional views of knowledge production. Scholars operating within this framework navigate a complex web of power dynamics, institutional structures, and disciplinary regimes. The implications of Foucault's (1991) ideas are profound, urging scholars to critically examine the intricate dance between power and knowledge within the academic realm. This exploration serves as an invitation to unravel the complexities, question assumptions, and engage in a transformative dialogue that redefines the landscape of contemporary higher education research praxis.

3 Knowledge as Power and Its Implications for Academic Freedom

In Foucault's (1994a) power/knowledge framework, a ground-breaking paradigm arises that questions the fundamental principles of conventional perspectives on knowledge creation and, consequently, the esteemed notion of academic freedom. The core of this critique rests on the deep claim that knowledge and power are inherently interconnected. This perspective provides a new way to analyse the dynamics of academia, but it also presents a complicated set of consequences for the important ideal of academic freedom. Academic freedom, as traditionally defined, grants scholars the independence to pursue knowledge without being unduly influenced by external factors. Autonomy is seen as a protection for the quest for truth, creating an atmosphere where a variety of perspectives may be examined and controversial ideas can be highlighted. Nevertheless, in Foucault's framework, where knowledge is shaped by power dynamics, the notion of academic independence encounters a significant obstacle.

The consequences arise in a contradictory manner—a subtle interaction between the independence of researchers and the widespread impact of power relations. Foucault exposes the fallacy of perceiving knowledge as an impartial and unbiased endeavour while also revealing the intricate systems of authority that control the generation and distribution of knowledge within academic establishments. This discovery presents a new perspective on academic freedom, highlighting it as a complex process where scholars balance their pursuit of truth with the influential factors that affect academic research. Foucault's (1994a) claim that power and knowledge are inherently connected necessitates a thorough analysis of the independence given to researchers in their quest for knowledge. Knowledge is inherently influenced by power dynamics; hence, the process of inquiry is inevitably entangled with the power dynamics present in institutional systems. The scholar, previously perceived as an independent truth-seeker, is today embedded in an intricate network of power dynamics that impact the formulation of inquiries, the choice of study subjects, and the understanding of results.

The critique encompasses the conventional concept of academic fields as impartial vessels for knowledge. Foucault's (1991, 1994a) perspective encourages scholars to critically examine the limits that supposedly define objective areas of study. This raises doubts about the independence of scholars within these disciplinary

frameworks. The structure of academic disciplines itself serves as a clear demonstration of power, exerting influence over what is considered valid knowledge and determining the direction of scholarly endeavours. This presents a significant obstacle to the independence that researchers have traditionally enjoyed in their respective professions. Furthermore, the criticism is evident in the institutional systems that regulate the creation of knowledge. The peer review mechanisms, which are generally praised for safeguarding the academic standard, are being closely examined. In a context where information is utilised as a means of exerting power, the function of peer review procedures as gatekeepers might be susceptible to possible manipulation. The ability of researchers to share their research findings and contribute to academic discussions is influenced by power dynamics that are ingrained in the procedures of evaluation and validation.

The ramifications of academic freedom also encompass the wider academic discussion, where the hierarchical dynamics inherent in curriculum are highlighted (Lehman & Anderson, 2023). Foucault's (1994a) paradigm redefines the ability of researchers to influence educational curricula. The process of selecting course materials, structuring lectures, and designing educational programmes is exposed as a manifestation of authority, exerting influence over which knowledge is given priority and recognised within the academic sphere. This questions the conventional interpretation of academic freedom as an unrestricted pursuit of knowledge within the domain of education. The conflict between knowledge and power is also evident in the distribution of research money, which is a crucial element of academic independence (Hooi & Wang, 2019; Arboledas-Lérida, 2023; Langfred & Rockmann, 2016). According to Foucault's paradigm, the power dynamics among funding bodies determine which research projects are considered deserving of financial support. The freedom of scholars to investigate unorthodox or opposing viewpoints is influenced by the underlying, subtle prejudices present in these power dynamics. This phenomenon fundamentally alters the academic landscape, questioning the fundamental ideals of independence and liberty that form the basis of knowledge exploration.

This critique urges a reassessment of the conventional understanding of academic freedom, acknowledging the intricate interplay between scholars' independence and the significant impact of power dynamics in higher education. Scholars are faced with the task of carefully navigating the complex relationship between academic freedom and the influences of institutional structures, disciplinary formations, and funding systems (Curnalia & Mermer, 2018). Ultimately, the analysis of knowledge as a form of power within Foucault's (1994a) framework leads to a deep reassessment of the concept of academic freedom. The revered principle, previously regarded as an impregnable stronghold protecting the quest for knowledge, is today embedded within the complex interplay of power dynamics. This critique urges researchers to actively explore a sophisticated comprehension of academic freedom that acknowledges the intricate balance between independence and the widespread impact of power dynamics. This is an invitation for researchers to explore and examine the assumptions in this complicated field. It encourages a revolutionary debate that will change the way academic research is conducted, considering the relationship between knowledge and power.

4 Resistance and Agency in the Academic Milieu

Foucault (1994a) asserts that "resistance exists wherever power is present" serves as a guiding principle for scholars navigating the complex landscape of academia. The argument implies that scholars have the capacity to resist, challenge, and transform within the power systems that control academia. Nevertheless, when this statement is applied to the field of higher education research practice, a group of critics arises, questioning the transformational capacity of Foucault's framework. This critique examines the fundamental aspects of resistance and agency in academia, investigating whether Foucault's ideas offer a fertile foundation for significant transformation or restrict researchers to an ongoing interaction with the power structures they aim to contest. In the academic realm, resistance manifests in several ways—a complex interplay where researchers question established paradigms, amplify marginalised viewpoints, and critique institutional procedures. However, while Foucault recognises the presence of resistance, a careful examination exposes certain limitations in his framework when it is employed in the context of higher education. Several scholars contend that the theoretical basis for comprehending and promoting significant opposition is insufficiently established within the framework of Foucault's paradigm.

Charles Taylor's astute critique penetrates the prevailing optimism about resistance and agency. The references cited are Millard & Forsey (2006), Houston (1998), and Quéré (2021). The scholar's incisive inquiries compel individuals in academia to directly confront the degree to which they can genuinely disentangle themselves from the all-encompassing impact of power systems deeply rooted inside educational establishments. According to Taylor's suggestion, resistance is inevitably influenced by the power dynamics it aims to oppose, resulting in a contradiction where the potential for transformation through academic research is trapped. The

desired liberation from dominant power structures is hindered, resulting in scholars being bound to a system that can unintentionally assimilate their attempts to rebel.

An evident shortcoming in Foucault's theories is the absence of a normative framework. In the academic sphere, where ethical considerations define the limits of scholarly conduct, the lack of a distinct ethical framework impedes scholars' capacity to express the moral necessity of resistance. In the absence of a normative framework, the rationale behind resistance becomes an ambiguous domain, posing a challenge for researchers to articulate why they should challenge established power structures and advocate for particular reforms within higher education. Critics contend that the ability of resistance to bring about significant change is closely tied to the establishment of a standard basis—a collection of moral principles that direct scholars in navigating the intricate realm of power within academia (*Ethical Considerations in Sentiment Analysis: Navigating the Complex Landscape*, 2023; Cummings, 2016). The lack of such a basis within Foucault's paradigm prompts inquiries regarding the logical consistency and long-term viability of resistance endeavours. Resistance, without a clear standard of behaviour, runs the risk of becoming a reactionary power that lacks the essential moral foundations required for long-lasting and intentional involvement.

Furthermore, the critique explores the complex interplay between resistance and the perpetuation of power institutions. Foucault's paradigm acknowledges the presence of resistance, but it unintentionally restricts it to predetermined avenues, thus constraining its capacity to facilitate profound and revolutionary alterations. When resistance is assimilated by the power structures it aims to oppose, the effectiveness of academic investigation as a catalyst for change relies on the unpredictable actions of the existing authority (Choudhary et al., 2020). This critique compels scholars to confront the underlying ambiguity in Foucault's argument. Resistance in the academic sphere can be co-opted and assimilated into the existing power structures, causing the boundaries between subversion and assimilation to become unclear. Scholars have the challenge of striking a delicate equilibrium as they contemplate whether their actions of resistance genuinely foster revolutionary change or simply uphold the current system under the guise of dissent (Landa, 2022; Jimenez-Luque, 2020).

Ultimately, the analysis of resistance and agency in the academic sphere, as conceptualised by Foucault's power/knowledge framework, provides a critical examination of the capacity for scholarly pursuits to bring about meaningful change. Foucault's argument provides a foundation for conceptualising resistance within academia. However, opponents raise significant inquiries regarding the constraints of this framework. The scholarly investigations conducted by intellectuals such as Charles Taylor emphasise the intricate interaction between opposition and the all-encompassing impact of power systems within educational establishments (Birdsall, 1995; Charles Raphael et al., 2018). The lack of a clear set of standards adds complexity to the situation, forcing researchers to explain the ethical obligations behind their acts of resistance. As academics analyse these important aspects, the discussion about resistance and agency in academia becomes a lively space where the possibility of bringing about significant change is considered in relation to the complex interaction with existing power systems.

5 Disciplinary Regimes and Institutional Practices in Foucault's Power/Knowledge Framework

Foucault's (1980, 1991, 1994a) examination of disciplinary regimes and institutional practices is a fundamental aspect of his power/knowledge paradigm. It provides a transformational perspective for researchers to analyse the systems that control academic disciplines and validate knowledge. Nevertheless, while considering the current state of academic research, it is important to acknowledge that Foucault's ideas are not exempt from criticism. This scrutiny reveals both the possible advantages and inherent constraints of utilising his theories in the intricate realm of higher education. Scholars are critically examining Foucault's assertion that disciplines are not passive receptacles for knowledge but rather active forces that influence what is considered acceptable. This critique is discussed by Duma (2010) and Apple (1999). This viewpoint promotes a thorough evaluation of the limits imposed by different fields of study, but it also brings up worries about the possibility of knowledge becoming too uniform within these bounds. Foucault's (1991, 1994a) paradigm suggests that disciplines acting as active actors might unintentionally lead to a reduction in views, restricting the acknowledgment and adoption of varied ideas and interdisciplinary methods.

The notion that disciplines have an active role in producing valid knowledge prompts a reassessment of the academic environment. Researchers in higher education are compelled to examine whether the frameworks governing academic fields foster a vibrant exchange of ideas or unintentionally establish closed circles that perpetuate prevailing paradigms. The challenge comes from finding a balance between maintaining disciplinary coherence and promoting intellectual diversity and creativity in academic research. Furthermore, the consequences of disciplinary regimes (Foucault, 1991) go beyond intellectual limitations and cover matters of inclusiveness and representation in research conducted in higher education. The possibility of knowledge becoming uniform across fields prompts inquiries into which voices are amplified and which viewpoints may be

marginalised. Disciplines have the authority to determine what is considered valid knowledge, but this can lead to the continuation of systemic inequalities if some voices are excluded or not adequately represented within disciplinary frameworks (Behari-Leak et al., 2021; Hassan, 2023; Kirchner & Krott, 2022).

Within the wider scope of institutional practices, Foucault's (1994a) paradigm encourages scholars to closely examine the complex systems that regulate the creation of knowledge. An important criticism is how peer review, publication norms, and funding systems contribute to maintaining certain power relations in academia. The gatekeeping role of academic journals and funding agencies, which is influenced by established conventions and preferences, might unintentionally create obstacles that restrict the adoption of research that challenges existing paradigms. Peer review, a fundamental aspect of scholarly assessment, is a crucial subject of analysis within Foucault's theoretical framework. Although peer review functions as a means of assuring rigour and intellectual integrity, it is susceptible to the impact of power dynamics (Resnik & Elmore, 2015). The criticism stems from the possibility that peer review methods may strengthen established paradigms, show preference for specific methodologies, and suppress dissenting or alternative viewpoints. Scholars may encounter a situation where they must conform to established conventions in order to be accepted, which could impede the development of innovative ideas.

The norms governing publication, which are closely connected to the process of peer review, form an integral part of the institutional framework that influences the boundaries of academic communication (Raitskaya, 2018). Foucault's viewpoint urges scholars to scrutinise the underlying biases ingrained in these standards, such as inclinations towards specific research procedures, theoretical frameworks, or themes considered more 'publishable.' The power/knowledge framework stimulates a critical examination of whether these norms unintentionally foster the marginalisation of alternative epistemologies or voices that are marginalised inside the academic canon. The impact of funding systems exacerbates the intricate connection between power and knowledge in institutional practices (Sengupta & Rossi, 2023). Funding agencies, which control financial resources for research projects, may reinforce power imbalances by showing preference for research that aligns with established paradigms or addresses specific societal issues (Lagner & Knyphausen-Aufseß, 2012). The financial allocation criteria are crucial for comprehending how institutional practices influence the direction of academic investigation, perhaps guiding it towards paths that are in line with established power structures.

To summarise, Foucault's (1991, 1994a) examination of disciplinary regimes and institutional practices within his power/knowledge framework provides a significant viewpoint for critically analysing the structures that control academic disciplines and validate knowledge. However, it is not immune to scrutiny. The possibility of knowledge becoming uniform within specific fields raises issues regarding the presence of intellectual diversity and inclusivity. An examination of institutional processes, such as peer review, publication criteria, and financing systems, reveals the complex power dynamics involved in the acceptance and diffusion of research inside academia. When scholars interact with Foucault's framework, they must carefully manage the tension between preserving disciplinary consistency and promoting intellectual variety. They also aim to question institutional practices that unintentionally strengthen power structures in research within higher education.

6 Marginalisation and Power Dynamics in Research

Foucault's (1991, 1994a) innovative perspective on power and knowledge introduces a crucial demand into academic research, asking scholars to examine the exclusion of voices and perspectives within the complex process of knowledge creation. Nevertheless, within the significant capacity for change, a critical examination arises—a thought-provoking inquiry into whether Foucault's theory unintentionally sustains prevailing power structures and continues to marginalise specific perspectives within the scholarly conversation. Within Foucault's power/knowledge paradigm, the explicit call is to analyse the power systems that marginalise certain voices in academic research. The lens is intended to reveal the mechanisms through which power functions, uncovering both the subtle and obvious ways in which the production of knowledge becomes a place of conflict. Within the context of underrepresented voices, this framework offers the possibility of profound change by challenging long-established models that have historically suppressed different viewpoints.

Nevertheless, the critique raises a resounding question: *Does Foucault's framework, despite its capacity to disrupt, offer sufficient instruments and direction to destroy the deeply rooted power systems that sustain marginalisation?* The demand for examination is evident yet achieving fair research techniques is still difficult given the complex relationship between power and knowledge. Critics contend that although Foucault (1980) identifies the issue, he does not provide a specific plan for scholars to proactively enhance the voices of marginalised individuals and confront the deeply rooted systematic inequities present in research methodologies. The power/knowledge framework, despite its intellectual robustness, faces difficulty converting criticism into tangible implementation (Held, 2020; 유희복, 2017). The lack of explicit instructions generates inquiries regarding

the degree to which academics can traverse the intricacies of power dynamics and actively strive to dismantle the very systems that marginalise specific perspectives. In the absence of a defined plan for change, the framework could unintentionally support the continuation of current power dynamics, as scholars may struggle with the challenging responsibility of tackling structural inequities without specific instructions.

An aspect of this critique centres on the concept of inclusion in research methodologies. Although Foucault's perspective effectively reveals the power dynamics in action, it lacks specific methods for scholars to incorporate marginalised perspectives into the dominant academic conversation. The challenge comes from both acknowledging the presence of power disparities and providing concrete solutions that enable researchers to effectively address and modify these disparities in their research pursuits. In addition, the power/knowledge concept faces scepticism over its ability to effectively combat deeply rooted systemic inequities (Kromydas, 2017). Critics contend that although Foucault encourages scholars to challenge power structures, a clear vision for implementing inclusive and fair research techniques is still not evident. The absence of a well-defined normative framework in Foucault's theories may unintentionally deprive researchers of the fundamental principles necessary to initiate significant transformation. In the absence of a transformational vision, researchers may find it difficult to explain why the amplification of marginalised voices is not only a theoretical necessity but also a moral and ethical necessity that fundamentally influences the development of fair knowledge.

The intricacy intensifies when contemplating the phenomenon of intersectionality – the interconnection of diverse social categories such as race, gender, and socioeconomic status. Foucault's (1994a) perspective encourages scholars to examine power dynamics, but detractors contend that this framework has difficulty acknowledging the complex intersections of many forms of marginalisation. The outcome is a possible oversimplification of power relations, as scholars may struggle with addressing the intricate and complex injustices encountered by individuals who hold many marginalised identities. In addition, the critique examines how institutions contribute to the perpetuation of power disparities in research. Foucault's theory prompts examination of institutional structures, although opponents raise doubts about whether this examination leads to practical approaches for effecting institutional reform. Institutions, as the guardians of knowledge generation, possess significant influence in determining the course of research. In the absence of explicit guidelines for scholars to question and modify these institutional systems, the power and knowledge framework can unintentionally result in researchers struggling with the continuation of systemic inequities deeply ingrained in academic institutions.

Ultimately, Foucault's (1980, 1994a) power/knowledge paradigm is a powerful tool for understanding the power dynamics involved in knowledge production. However, there is a critical discussion over its ability to bring about meaningful change for marginalised voices in research methods. The framework's power to highlight the issue of marginalisation is unquestionable, but its ability to offer specific tactics and a normative basis for transformational action is a subject of debate. The critique poses crucial inquiries regarding the interconnectedness of power, the necessity for a revolutionary perspective, and the effectiveness of the framework in tackling deeply entrenched structural disparities. As researchers grapple with Foucault's theories, the difficulty lies in effectively implementing revolutionary change that goes beyond criticism and actively reshapes the landscape of inclusive and fair research procedures in academia.

7 Navigating the Complexities of Power and Knowledge in Higher Education Research

Applying Foucault's power and knowledge framework to current research practices in higher education is a complex exploration of the academic landscape, characterised by difficulties, inconsistencies, and possible constraints (Baxter Magolda, 2010; Morley, 2014; Reid et al., 1995). Foucault's (1994a) theories provide a unique perspective on power dynamics in knowledge production. However, there are several key concerns within this context. These include worries about academic freedom, the effectiveness of resistance, the influence of disciplinary regimes and institutional practices, and the potential exclusion of certain voices in research. One of the main criticisms is the intricate equilibrium between the power/knowledge framework and the concept of academic freedom. Foucault's (1994a) paradigm questions the idea that knowledge production is a neutral and objective process and highlights the potential limitations on academic freedom. Scholars are prompted to examine the independence of their intellectual endeavours due to the acknowledgment that knowledge is intertwined with power dynamics (Contu, 2019).

Engaging in a critical analysis of power dynamics in academia can result in a paradox. Scholars who are conscious of the influence of power structures on their work may find themselves operating within a landscape where the pursuit of knowledge is intrinsically constrained by the very forces they aim to investigate. The effectiveness of resistance within the academic sphere arises as another important topic of criticism. Foucault (1994a) argues that resistance emerges in the presence of power, but sceptics doubt the ability of resistance to

bring about significant change in deeply rooted power systems. The lack of a well-defined framework for effective opposition, as emphasised by Charles Taylor and other academics, casts doubt on the ability of scholars to challenge existing norms and power structures. Without effective methods for resisting, the ability of academic research to bring about significant change may be impeded, leaving researchers struggling with the boundaries imposed by institutions. (Dolamo, 2018; Clegg, 2010).

The examination of disciplinary regimes and institutional practices' impact on knowledge production becomes a crucial area for investigation. Foucault's (1980, 1991, 1994a) focus on the control of knowledge within academic fields pushes scholars to examine the possibility of academic knowledge becoming uniform. The critique explores how disciplinary boundaries can unintentionally hinder the inclusion of diverse views in research. The power/knowledge framework compels researchers to address the restrictions imposed by disciplinary norms, urging them to question and surpass established boundaries that may restrict the depth and scope of academic investigation (Rabbi, 2020; Roberts, 2022; Lie, 1997). Foucault's (1994a) paradigm critically examines the institutional procedures that regulate the production of knowledge, such as peer review processes and funding mechanisms. The gatekeeping function of academic journals and funding agencies is acknowledged as a domain where power is exerted, impacting the determination of whether research is considered deserving of dissemination and financial backing (Handrigan & Slutsky, 2007; Funding Agencies Must Support Clinical Research, 1998). The possibility of institutional procedures upholding specific paradigms while excluding others is a matter of concern, prompting inquiries regarding equal access to information within the academic field.

A significant critique of the power/knowledge framework (Syse, 2010) is the possibility of marginalising specific voices in the research scene. Foucault's (1980) ideas inspire scholars to examine power dynamics, but detractors contend that the framework lacks explicit instructions on how to amplify marginalised viewpoints or confront systematic inequalities in research procedures. The explicit focus on power dynamics may unintentionally reinforce the continuation of established social structures, resulting in the marginalisation of specific perspectives within scholarly discussions (Lehman & Anderson, 2023; Perera, 2020; Basthomi, 2012). Notwithstanding these criticisms, Foucault's views remain pertinent and provide a valuable viewpoint for scholars involved in higher education research. The power/knowledge framework functions as a catalyst for a thorough analysis of the complex power dynamics that influence the creation of knowledge (Wu, 2022; Flood et al., 2022; P. T. R. G. P. R. A. S. C., 2020). The focus on reflexivity among researchers is of utmost importance, urging scholars to consistently examine their own positions within power systems and the inherent biases present in their research procedures.

Moreover, Foucault's (1980, 1994a) paradigm promotes the critical examination of existing standards within the academic sphere. Through the act of questioning and pushing the limits of academic fields, academics can participate in interdisciplinary conversations that go beyond conventional divisions, promoting a comprehensive comprehension of intricate phenomena (Smith et al., 2023). This focus on questioning established standards extends to the moral aspects of research methodologies. Scholars working under the power/knowledge paradigm are encouraged to examine the ethical consequences of their research, acknowledging the capacity for power to shape not only the subject matter but also the methods and communication of their studies.

To summarise, the exploration of the intricacies of power and knowledge in research conducted in higher education is a constantly evolving process characterised by both conflicts and opportunities. Although the critique acknowledges obstacles such as limitations on academic freedom, opposition, the impact of disciplinary boundaries, and the risk of being marginalised, Foucault's theories remain an effective instrument for conducting critical analysis. Continuing to explore Foucault's theories encourages scholars to accept the intricacies, challenge assumptions, and actively participate in a transformative conversation that alters the field of higher education research.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, R. (2021). Students' perceptions of student voice in assessment within the context of Iran: the dynamics of culture, power relations, and student knowledge. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(2), 211-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1882401>
- Anabtawi, I. (2006). There is some Skepticism about increasing Shareholder power. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.783044>
- Apple, M. W. (1999). What Counts as Legitimate Knowledge? The Social Production and Use of Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(4), 343. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170768>
- Arboledas-Lérida, L. (2023). The Role of Competitive Project-Based Funding in the Commodification of Academic Research: A Marxist Analysis. *Critical Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08969205231209679>
- Basthomi, Y. (2012). Ambivalences: Voices of Indonesian Academic Discourse Gatekeepers. *English Language Teaching*, 5(7). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n7p17>

- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2010). A tandem journey through the labyrinth. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.v0i2.61>
- Behari-Leak, K., Nkoala, S., Mokou, G., & Binkowski, H. (2021). Exploring disruptions of the coloniality of knowledge, power, and being to enable agency as disciplinary activists for curriculum change. *Journal of Decolonizing Disciplines*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.35293/jdd.v2i2.25>
- Birdsall, D. G. (1995). Power and influence: Enhancing information services within the organization *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 21(4), 320. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0099-1333\(95\)90024-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0099-1333(95)90024-1)
- Bowman, T. D. (2023). Viewing research assessment, the academic reward system, and academic publishing through the power and knowledge lens of Foucault. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2023.1179376>
- Choudhary, M. N., Friedman, R. Z., Wang, J. T., Jang, H. S., Zhuo, X., & Wang, T. (2020). Co-opted transposons help perpetuate conserved higher-order chromosomal structures. *Genome Biology*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-019-1916-8>
- Clarence, S., & McKenna, S. (2017). Developing academic literacies requires understanding the nature of disciplinary knowledge. *London Review of Education*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.18546/lre.15.1.04>
- Clegg, S. (2010). The State, Power, and Agency: Missing in Action in Institutional Theory? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19(1), 4–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492609347562>
- Contu, A. (2019). Answering the crisis with intellectual activism: Making a difference as business schools scholars. *Human Relations*, 73(5), 737–757. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719827366>
- Coomber, R. (2018). How do professional service staff perceive and engage with professional development programmes within higher education institutions? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 23(2), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2018.1543216>
- Cummings, C. (2016). Navigating Academia: A Mixed Methods Analysis of Sense of Community, Student-Faculty Relationships, and Student Success. *McNair Scholars Online Journal*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.15760/mcnair.2016.3>
- Curnalia, R. M. L., & Mermer, D. (2018). Renewing our commitment to tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance to navigate challenges in higher education. *Review of Communication*, 18(2), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2018.1438645>
- Dolamo, R. T. (2018). The continued debate on law and gospel among selected Lutheran scholars within the change agency paradigm. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 74(3). <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v74i3.5219>
- Dosi, G., & Marengo, L. (2014). The dynamics of organisational structures and performances under diverging distributions of knowledge and different power structures. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 11(3), 535–559. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744137414000204>
- Duma, S. (2010). Legitimate agents of knowledge: who are they? *Curationis*, 33(3). <https://doi.org/10.4102/curationis.v33i3.1>
- Enabling Knowledge Sharing Practices for Academics and Research in Higher Education Institutions. (2019). *Knowledge, Information and Knowledge management* <https://doi.org/10.7176/ikm/9-3-09>
- Ethical Considerations in Sentiment Analysis: Navigating the Complex Landscape. (2023). *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering, Technology, and Science*. <https://doi.org/10.56726/irjmets46811>
- Flood, K., Mahon, M., & McDonagh, J. (2022). Language and Power Dynamics: Shaping Knowledge and Action in the Application Of Ecosystem Services Approaches. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4125804>
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In: Gordon C. (ed) *Power and Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977* New York, USA: Random House.
- Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline and Punishment. the birth of the prison*. New York, USA: Random House.
- Foucault, M. (1994a). The subject and power. In: Faubion JD (ed), *Power. Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984*. London, UK: Penguin Books, Vol. 3
- Foucault, M. (1994b). The ethics of concern for the self as a practice of freedom. In: Rabinow P. (ed.) *Ethics*. London, UK: Penguin, Vol. 1
- Florea, M. (2023). Technological and vocational education–A basic component in modern education. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*.

- Funding agencies must support clinical research. (1998, July). *Pharmaco Economics & Outcomes News*, 169(1), 4–4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03277606>
- Ghadiri, N., Nair, J., & Moots, R. J. (2023). The challenge of ocular inflammation in systemic vasculitis: How to address inequalities of care? *Rheumatology and Immunology Research*, 4(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.2478/rir-2023-0001>
- Glueck, W. F., & Jauch, L. R. (1975). Research ideas among Productive scholars *The Journal of Higher Education*, 46(1), 103–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1975.11780631>
- Grenier, F., & Hagmann, J. (2016). Sites of Knowledge (Re-)Production: Towards an Institutional Sociology of International Relations Scholarship. *International Studies Review*, 18(2), 333–365. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viw006>
- Handrigan, M., & Slutsky, J. (2007). Funding Opportunities in Knowledge Translation: A Review of the AHRQ's "Translating Research into Practice" Initiatives, Competing Funding Agencies, and Strategies for Success. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 14(11), 965–967. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1553-2712.2007.tb02374.x>
- Hassan, A. (2023). Who has the capital for knowledge production? Reflections on the sharp white background of academia and anti-racist scholarship. *Stolen Tools*, 1(1), 25–31. <https://doi.org/10.59745/st.v1i1.18>
- Held, M. B. E. (2020). Research Ethics in Decolonizing Research With Inuit Communities in Nunavut: The Challenge of Translating Knowledge Into Action. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 160940692094980. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920949803>
- Hooi, R., & Wang, J. (2019). Research funding and academic engagement: a Singapore case. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 18(2), 162–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14778238.2019.1638739>
- Houston, C. (1998). Alternative Modernities. *Critique of Anthropology*, 18(2), 234–240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275x9801800206>
- James, S. (2020). Knowledge, Power, and Academic Freedom by Joan Wallach Scott. *The Review of Higher Education*, 43(4), E-36. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2020.0021>
- Jimenez-Luque, A. (2020). Decolonial leadership for cultural resistance and social change: challenging the social order through the struggle of identity. *Leadership*, 17(2), 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715020952235>
- Kirchner, M., & Krott, M. (2022). Making science-based natural hazard risk management work within power networks—from co-production models of knowledge transfer to the Research-Integration-Utilisation (RIU) model. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 82, 103362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2022.103362>
- Kromydas, T. (2017). Rethinking higher education and its relationship with social inequalities: past knowledge, present state, and future potential. *Palgrave Communications*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-017-0001-8>
- Lagner, T., & Knyphausen-Aufseß, D. (2012). Rating Agencies as Gatekeepers to the Capital Market: Practical Implications of 40 Years of Research. *Financial Markets, Institutions, and Instruments*, 21(3), 157–202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0416.2012.00173.x>
- Landa, N. (2022). Navigating the Delicate Balance between Academia and Administration through Transformational Leadership in a South African University. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 18(2), 131–145. <https://doi.org/10.57054/jhea.v18i2.1881>
- Langfred, C. W., & Rockmann, K. W. (2016). The Push and Pull of Autonomy. *Group & Organisation Management*, 41(5), 629–657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601116668971>
- Ledford, H. (2008). Investigation into lost bacteria collection raises concerns about biobanks. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/news.2008.1096>
- Lehman, I. M., & Anderson, R. (2023). Second language academic writer identity, relations of power, and discourse practices. *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny*. <https://doi.org/10.24425/kn.2018.125000>
- Lie, J. (1997). Moral ambiguity, disciplinary power, and academic freedom. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 29(1), 30–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.1997.10409697>
- Lifková, A. (2019). Digiselfpower: Self-tracking technologies through Michel Foucault lens *Politické Vedy*, 22(4), 81–101. <https://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2019.22.4.81-101>

- Madan, A. (2011). Higher education and the need for Critical knowledge *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 8(2), 161-182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097318491100800203>
- McAdams, R. H., & Nadler, J. (2011). The Power of Focal Points is Pervasive: An Experimental Study of Strategy Labels in Coordination Games. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1884601>
- Meynell, H. (1989). ON KNOWLEDGE, POWER AND MICHEL FOUCAULT. *The Heythrop Journal*, 30(4), 419-432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2265.1989.tb01118.x>
- Millard, G., & Forsey, J. (2006). Moral Agency in the Modern Age: Reading Charles Taylor through George Grant. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 40(1), 182-209. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.40.1.182>
- Morley, L. (2014). Inside African Private Higher Education: Contradictions and Challenges. *International Higher Education*, 76, 14-15. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2014.76.5525>
- Nnamuchi, O. (2022). Justiciability of Socioeconomic Rights in Nigeria and Its Critics: Does International Law Provide Any Guidance? *The Age of Human Rights Journal*, 19, 137-164. <https://doi.org/10.17561/tahrj.v19.7561>
- Perera, K. (2020). Interviewing academic elites: a discourse analysis of shifting power relations. *Qualitative Research*, 21(2), 215-233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794120924208>
- Phan Le Ha. (2023). Re-opening an Asia-Scar: engaging (troubled) emotions in knowing, knowledge production and scholarly endeavors. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 24(2), 265-280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09870-0>
- Quéré, L. (2021). La hermenéutica crítica de Charles Taylor. *Sociologie et Sociétés*, 53(1-2), 87. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1097744ar>
- Rabbi, S. (2020). Mapping Rhetorical Knowledge in Advanced Academic Writers: The Affordances of a Transactional Framework for Disciplinary Communication. *Across the Disciplines*, 17(3), 69-91. <https://doi.org/10.37514/atd-j.2020.17.3.03>
- Raitskaya, L. (2018). Book review: Brian Paltridge, The Discourse of Peer Review: Reviewing Submissions to Academic Journals. *Discourse & Communication*, 12(6), 668-671. DOI 10.1177/1750481318798070b
- Raphael, C., Tundui, C.S. and Kato, M.P. (2018). Influence of Individual and Organisational Factors on the Performance of Academic Staff in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.25215/0602.084>
- Reid, J., Barker, J., & Murphy, K. (1995). Quality and Equity in Australian Universities: Contradictions and Challenges. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 14(2), 233-243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436950140206>
- Resnik, D. B., & Elmore, S. A. (2015). Ensuring the Quality, Fairness, and Integrity of Journal Peer Review: A Possible Role of Editors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 22(1), 169-188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-015-9625-5>
- Roberts, P. (2022). Pushing the Boundaries of Knowledge: Educative Possibilities in (Trans)Disciplinary Inquiry. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 4(3), 665-670. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00299-z>
- Sengupta, A., & Rossi, F. (2023). The relationship between universities' funding portfolios and their knowledge exchange profiles: A dynamic capabilities view. *Technovation*, 121, 102686. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102686>
- Smith, P., Callagher, L. J., Hibbert, P., & Krull, E. (2023, August). Developing Interdisciplinary Understanding to Span Disciplinary and Organizational Boundaries. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2023(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/amproc.2023.11394abstract>
- Syse, K. V. L. (2010). Expert Systems, Local Knowledge, and Power in Argyll, Scotland. *Landscape Research*, 35(4), 469-484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2010.486855>
- T. R. G. P. R. A. S. C. (2020). Challenges to knowledge-making: the intricate interrelation of knowledge and resistance. *Journal of Political Power*, 13(2), 169-178. DOI 10.1080/2158379x.2020.1764795
- Wu, J. (2022). Shaping the future of power: Knowledge production and network-building in China-Africa relations. *African Affairs*, 122(486), 179-181. <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adac041>
- Zamani, R. (2022). The Power of Offering Space Rather Than Solutions. *Academic Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-022-01618-z>
- 유희복. (2017). China's Intellectual Challenge to the Mainstream IR Theory in its Rise to Great Power Status: With Focus on "Peaceful Rise" and "China Dream." *China Knowledge Network*, 10(10), 5-44. <https://doi.org/10.35389/ckn.10.10.201711.5>