Education Development and Institutional Change at the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg Campus in the 1980s and 1990s

Disciplinary	Power a	and the	Making of	Academic	Subjects

T.	Maria	Fre	drika	\bigcap da	ndaal
-IV	чагне	rre	агіка	Cae	กดลลเ

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in the Faculty of Education

As the candidate's supervisor I have/have not approved this thesis/dissertation for submission.

Signed:

Name:

Date:

Abstract

The thesis utilises Michel Foucault's work on disciplinary power to study the changes which played themselves out in the area of educational activities and governance at the Pietermaritzburg centre of the University of Natal during the 1980s and 1990s. It examines the effects of these changes in relation to students, staff, and the institution, the 'academic subjects' of the title, raising questions about the implications of these for the future of the institution. The overall context of the changes was one of national transition from an apartheid to a democratic, nonracial dispensation; decreasing state funding for higher education; and international 'globalisation'. The primary vehicles for the changes were Education Development initiatives around access, teaching and learning, curriculum, and related issues, which brought 'disadvantaged' black students into the fold of an 'historically white' institution and facilitated their academic success; and a Vice Chancellor's Review and rationalisation and restructuring processes which brought about structural and governance changes. The study examines how these processes interacted with each other and with other forces (e.g. technological change); the discourses and resistances they generated; and how Education Development gave way to a new dominant discourse of 'Quality'. Its point of departure is genealogy, an analytic which reveals the mutually-generative, normative, subject-producing nexus between knowledge and modern disciplinary power, as illustrated by Foucault's historical studies of the prison and human discourse on sexuality. It demonstrates that Education Development, operating against resistance and established norms of autonomy, developed and employed sophisticated techniques and tactics of power-knowledge to supervise tighter norms in student and staff academic practices. Education Development's linkage with the Vice Chancellor's Review and other processes and the uneven incorporation of its truths into the everyday practices of the university's established 'regime of truth' produced a more general mechanism of institutional control which 'transformed' the university, partly in line with political demands but also, through an increased degree of government of its staff and students, as a more panoptical institution for efficiency, productivity and 'international competitiveness'. The study posits the need for further inquiry into whether the university's current 'regime of truth' is that of an 'ethical' institution producing 'ethical' subjects, that is, subjects capable, in Foucault's terms, of inventing themselves through exercising 'the care for the self' as a practice of freedom.

CONTENTS

Dedication		i
Acknowledgements		i
Declaration		ü
Abbreviations		ш̈
Introduction		1
Chapter One:	The method of the study	17
Chapter Two:	The university and disciplinary power	46
Chapter Three:	The 1980s	79
Chapter Four:	1990 - 1993	112
Chapter Five:	1994 - 1999	159
Conclusion		193
Bibliography		

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my sons, Delani, Mayibuye, and Ntsike; and to my colleagues and all the students I have worked with, past and present, at the University of Natal; for the richness all of them have added to my life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The financial assistance of the Human Sciences Research Council towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this thesis and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the Human Sciences Research Council or any other party.

My deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Roger Deacon. for his insights, lightness of touch, unfailing encouragement, and superb turn-around times; all of which have assisted me greatly in completing this thesis.

For their moral and practical support, my thanks also to Tracey Harper, John Inglis, and my friends.

DECLARATION

I declare that this entire thesis, except where specifically indicated to the contrary in the text, is my own original work.

Marie Fredrika Odendaal

December, 2001

ABBREVIATIONS

References to the following texts by Foucault, referred to repeatedly throughout the thesis, have been abbreviated as listed below. Normal ordering (eg. 1980a; 1980b; etc.) has been retained below and in the Bibliography.

HS The History of Sexuality: An Introduction (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1981)

DP Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (Harmondsworth, Peregrine, 1986a)

DPS 'Disciplinary Power and Subjection' in S. Lukes (ed) Power (Oxford, Blackwell, 1986b) 229 - 242

ECS 'the ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom' an interview with michel foucault on January 20, 1984 conducted by raul fornet-betancourt, helmut becker, alfredo gomez-muller transl. by j.d. gauthier, s.j. in *Philosophy and Social Criticism* Vol. 12, 1987

References to the following institutions, organizations, and programmes in the text and the bibliography have where appropriate or necessary been abbreviated as follows:

AD Academic Development

ED Education Development

HE Higher Education

NU Natal University

PFU 'Preparing for University'

SAAAD South African Association of Academic Development

SFP Science Foundation Programme

TTT Teach Test Teach

UDUSA Union of Democratic University Staff Associations

UN University of Natal

UND University of Natal, Durban campus

UNP University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg campus

NOTE ON LANGUAGE USAGE

Oxford English has been used throughout this thesis. Hence '-s-' has been used instead of '-z-'. (When quoting directly, original spelling has been used.)

In quotations, all emphases are in the original, except where indicated otherwise.

Introduction

1. A story of institutional change

This thesis is a study of change in one South African university, the University of Natal. during the two decades of the 1980s and 1990s. The main areas of change pertained to the institution's educational (teaching and learning, and related) activities, its governance and management, its structures, and the racial demographics of its student population. The study utilises Michel Foucault's work on disciplinary power to demonstrate how these changes came about, and to examine the effects of these changes in relation to students, staff, and the institution as a whole; these are the 'academic subjects' of the title. It also poses some questions about the implications of these effects for the future of the institution.

The changes in the university took place in the context of national political changes and decreasing state funding for higher education. In the 1950s, soon after the minority white Afrikaner Nationalist party had come into government, the university was legislated as a 'whites only' institution', in line with the government's apartheid policy, and remained thus for more than thirty years. The 1980s brought an intensification of both violent political repression by the government, and resistance and underground armed opposition from amongst the majority black population. This scenario led into the demise, in the early 1990s, of the apartheid government and its replacement by a democratic, non-racial dispensation in which all South Africans had full political rights.

Political transition was preceded and accompanied by demands that previously-segregated education institutions be 'transformed': not just changed, but radically changed. The concept of 'transformation' had many, sometimes contradictory, associations. Central ones included: non-racialism; Africanisation; non-discrimination; equal opportunity and affirmative action; democratisation of governance; and relevance to 'reconstruction and development' needs in the wider community, with implications for both curricula and research agendas (see for instance Kell

¹ Except for its medical school, which was for blacks only - also in line with apartheid legislation.

1991: 147). The University of Natal made some effort to address these issues. In the period covered by the study, its student profile changed to approximately 80% black. This shift was accompanied by intensive attention to questions of access, teaching and learning, curriculum, and related issues, under the rubric of 'Education Development', to address black students' prior 'disadvantage' and facilitate their academic success. State legislation also induced some limited changes in the university's highest governing body and certain of its policies; student demands also played a role.

But the end of apartheid also meant the end of international isolation, and incitements for the university to become more internationally competitive, especially as increasing forces of 'globalisation' impacted on higher education². Orientation for 'international competitiveness' did not square easily with the political demands of 'transformation'; in addition, both these complex, multifaceted and contradictory sets of pressures had to be faced under increasingly severe financial constraints that apparently necessitated the university 'doing more with less' on most fronts. International trends and financial constraints became key factors informing decisions about structural changes in the university's administrative, service, and academic sectors, including the replacement of existing faculties, each made up of several discipline-based departments, with a small number of super-faculties composed of multi-disciplinary schools.

Financial management and aspects of governance went from a centralised to a campus-based, and then back to a largely centralised model. The institution's overall modus operandi changed from one which permitted considerable internal autonomy, to an attempt at a more tightly-controlled, business-oriented mode of management that was applied not only to administrative operations, but also to the core functions of teaching and learning, and (to a lesser degree) research.

The thesis tells the story of how these changes took place on the Pietermaritzburg campus, one of (then) three campuses of the university. The story has two main, closely intertwined, strands: the

²Cf. Maughan-Brown, 1995.

one pertains to Education Development (ED), intended to bring changes in teaching and learning and related matters; and the other to the structural and governance changes brought about initially through a Vice Chancellor's Review, and subsequently through rationalisation and restructuring processes. The thesis explores the nature of the relationship between Education Development and the broader institutional change process. Other factors which interacted with these two main processes (for instance, financial aid crises, government requirements, the increasing use of technology for administrative management purposes) are woven into the account.

Education Development change efforts were implemented through a series of differentlydesignated structures and programmes, which produced a number of discourses, or particular knowledges and practices. Initially these were about 'student development' and 'staff development'; before long, 'curriculum development' became a central focus, subsuming staff development. However, after about ten years of intensive effort and considerable resource commitment, Education Development as an institutional initiative was, in a very short space of time, largely phased out, ostensibly through 'mainstreaming' or integrating it into the everyday teaching and learning of the disciplines. This was in keeping with perceptions of its role as a change agent. Only those components which had been structured as self-contained programmes, such as the Science Foundation Programme, remained visible. Simultaneously, however, the discourse of 'quality' assumed dominance, with 'quality promotion' and 'quality assurance' taking centre stage. 'Student development' was relocated from academia into Student Services and produced a sub-discourse of 'student leadership development'. All in all, within the space of a decade Education Development had emerged as a distinct discourse and a separately-designated, separately-managed set of practices aimed at transforming the pedagogy of the institution, and then, with one or two exceptions, disappeared again.

The thesis problematises aspects of this story which might seem self-evident. What occasioned the emergence of Education Development, and what its sudden apparent demise? Had it succeeded in changing what it intended to change, even institutionalising the changes, so that there was no longer any need for it? That is, were its goals achieved, had it served its purposes of increasing

access and transforming teaching and learning, and was it therefore terminated? Alternatively, was it inadequate or ineffective in bringing about change, and therefore had to be abandoned or replaced by other strategies? Did it in fact disappear, or does it still operate in different guises in certain institutional practices? And what was the relationship between Education Development and the wider change process? Was ED supported, or 'dumped'. by the latter? On its side, did it serve to support the institutional change process, or did it exploit it to its own advantage, or perhaps both? And, whichever of these explanations is most valid, how did these things come about? This latter question requires a material rather than an ideological answer: how, not why.

Of crucial interest is another, prior, material question: What did ED actually achieve? Put differently, what were the *effects* of Education Development and its various discourses? And what are some of the implications of these effects? In particular, what are the implications for the university's business of teaching and learning so as to produce educated 'graduates'?

A further question arises: is there anything to be learned about institutional change from this story? Does what happened to Education Development contain any predictive value for future attempts at change, or for the surviving discourses such as student development, student leadership development, and 'quality'?

The above are some of the questions that the story offered here examines. It does so, not from the still-dominant (but now waning) modernistic perspective of much social scientific and historical analysis, but through the analytical lens provided by the French philosopher Michel Foucault in his analyses of the interrelations between knowledge, power, and the subject. Mainly, it analyses how, and to what effect, power operated in the change process. To do this, it does not ask 'How did people exercise their power in order to bring about change?' - the subjective view of power - but regards power as operating at a more impersonal level, and problematises 'change' in terms of power's material effects. One of these effects is the production of knowledge; another, the production of subjects.

What this perspective entails, how it differs from a 'common sense' or conventional view of power and change, and how it informs the questions which the study seeks to answer and the way it seeks to answer them, will be briefly outlined here, and further elaborated in the next two chapters.

The common sense view of power is generally based on certain key assumptions. These include, briefly, that some people 'have' power whereas others do not; that those with power can wield it over those without it, hence power is associated with domination and the suppression of freedom; and that knowledge of 'the truth' can empower people to free themselves from such domination. This is a subjective view of power: a view of power as (individual or collective) agency, fired by emancipatory knowledge to struggle against power as domination. Its influence in South Africa's history of struggle for political liberation is reflected in the mid-eighties slogan of 'People's Education for People's Power' (Levin 1991: 118; see also Khotseng, Matlou and Mahlomaholo 1986: 161).

Where change is concerned, people holding this view usually adopt certain assumptions: either change can be achieved through the intentional actions of people in positions of authority (such as 'the executive' or 'the government') exercising their authority, their *power*, to bring about change by telling others what to do and how to do it; or change can be achieved through the resistance and struggles of the dominated to overthrow those in power. These two positions are in fact two sides of the same coin, the coin of sovereign or subjective power. In this view, subjects 'have' power. Change is achieved through purposive exercise by subjects of their power.

By contrast, Foucault's analysis of modern social institutions reveals how power operates non-subjectively, not through the will, intentions, choices, or decisions of individual or collective subjects, but as a force circulating in the social body through individuals as its vehicles, as "the elements of its articulation" (DPS: 234). Individuals do not control this power. Yet it is not non-intentional power: it is "both intentional and nonsubjective there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives" (HS: 94-95). It has emerged, historically, as a product of

the disciplines of the social sciences, hence its designation as 'disciplinary power'. It operates in the multidirectional interplay between social structures and institutions and the choices, decisions, and actions of many individual and collective subjects shaped by the structures and institutions; and it has effects upon those same subjects and institutions. In these effects lie its aims and objectives.

It is this understanding of disciplinary power which the study adopts in analysing the change process. Its meaning, and philosophical usefulness in the context of the challenges facing higher education in South Africa today, are explained in the section on the method of the study (Chapter One).

This understanding of power does not deny the agency of the people who were involved in the change process; but it does not foreground it. Both Education Development and the transformation, such as it was, and rationalising and restructuring of the University of Natal were, at one level, deliberate responses to a changing context and changing imperatives for Hügher Education. They in turn contributed to changing the context and the imperatives. They were thus amongst the elements and forces interacting in an overall series of what Foucault would term 'strategic engagements' involving many players on various levels, including the systemic level, inter- and intra-institutional levels, and even the level of the individual. The 'players' aimed to influence institutional developments through attempting to exercise subjective power, but were themselves subjected to power exercised on and through them. They included government servants and structures; organised labour bodies; the institution itself, and other institutions; the university executive; the staff in Education Development and other sectors, especially academia and the Student Services Division; and, not least, the students.

The concerted, or even conflicting, intentional efforts by these players to bring about change by no means constituted the sum of the actual operations of power in the change process, nor did their intentions and activities necessarily determine outcomes. In the series of strategic engagements mentioned above, numerous techniques of power were at work, and the currents of

power continually shifted in intensity and direction between the various elements and levels, inducing effects both on and through the players themselves, their personal intentions notwithstanding. For instance, student protests influenced the actions of administrators, and vice versa, although not necessarily to the extent or effect either grouping intended; and Education Development's interventions into teaching and learning in the institution, in turn brought it under intense scrutiny and pressure to change itself.

This view of power does not see power as oppressive, curtailing human freedom, and knowledge as a means of attaining freedom from power, vanquishing power. It does not see knowledge as something the function of which is necessarily to bring 'progress' in the modernist sense of improvement and betterment of the human condition. It does not necessarily see change as 'progress' (or 'regress', for that matter). Instead it sees power operating everywhere, all the time (HS: 93), producing knowledge which in turn produces more power. There is, therefore, no such condition as freedom from power; change or 'progress' constitutes only shifts in the dynamics of the struggle of forces; and knowledge does not diminish power but increases it.

In this view the function of Education Development and the knowledge produced by it cannot be assumed to have been an un-problematic 'good', nor can the 'progress' attained by the university in its transformation and change processes.

From this point of departure, the questions addressed in the thesis become of the order of: How, by what means, was power exercised in this particular institution over the past two decades? What specific techniques and tactics of power can be detected in the existing records of the university's operations? What were the effects, and the patterns of the effects, of this exercise of power - especially the effects pertaining to both staff and students, and to the institution as a whole?

One key effect of the workings of power is revealed to have been an extension of the domains of knowledge pertinent to higher education itself. Education Development, through its exercise of disciplinary power, created new discourses or 'truths' about the business of university teaching and learning, for instance. In terms of these new truths, students and staff were required to act in certain ways. In this manner, the extension of knowledge further impelled the workings of power over, and through, the people in the institution. This achieved another key effect - the production of 'subjects' who differed in certain ways from the subjects produced in and by higher education two decades previously. The subjects in question were not only the students and graduates of the institution, but also its staff; and, indeed, the institution itself.

The study raises - but cannot fully answer - certain questions about these effects. Does the kind of 'institutional subject' which the university has been constructed, and constructed itself, as, produce the kinds of human subjects needed for the 'reconstruction and development' of South African society? Does it, in line with its stated intention, produce ethical graduates who are "... more equipped to reason about the ethical issues they will undoubtedly face in their personal and professional lives" (Gourley 1994)? Is it producing "educated person(s)" capable of ensuring "man's very survival" (ibid.)? In Foucault's terms, such graduates would be subjects capable of exercising "the ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom" (ECS: 112), an ethic which, through minimising domination in relations of power, makes possible this same practice of freedom on the part of other subjects. This concept of ethics and these challenges are elaborated in greater detail in Chapter One. I turn now to outline briefly the process I have followed in writing this dissertation, before concluding with an overview of the chapters to come.

2. Writing the dissertation: subjecting the self

The study as it stands constitutes a major shift from my earliest ideas for it, reflection on which is in itself part of the study insofar as it is reflection on my own process of subjection through the workings of power-knowledge in the institution; through the 'regime of truth' which governs university-produced knowledge. The practical steps whereby I have proceeded have been roughly as follows (roughly, because there is a messy recursiveness which must be acknowledged but cannot readily be captured in delineating the process):

In the earliest phase, I knew that I wanted to write a dissertation in the area of my own work, that is student development, so as to establish a more rigorous theoretical and empirical basis for it. My work had until then been informed by critical pedagogy perspectives which inclined me to a qualitative study on the relationship between student development and institutional change that would foreground the voices of students, since their voices were seldom heard in the institution or in existing literature, and their role in contributing to changing the institution was, in my view, either deliberately circumscribed, or not recognised for its possibilities, or both. I wished to develop a deeper theoretical understanding to properly inform both my belief that students could and should be important actors in institutional change processes, and my practices as a 'student development educator' of critical pedagogy persuasion attempting to 'empower' students to play more of a role as change agents.

Besides developing a theoretical understanding I also wanted to implement the critical theory notion of praxis in the study itself. The study was to be carried out in a way that would contribute directly to the very aims of my work in student development, both in terms of its methods, planned to entail focus group participation by students, and by its findings, by the insights it would generate from the dialogue between us. I wanted consonance between my beliefs and my practices in the research process; I wished to integrate theory and a reflexive practice in doing a study which would be part of contributing to the process of institutional change.

But this idea was radically to be transformed during the process of seeking a supervisor and defining the research project more closely. The limitations were many. At this early stage the conceptualisation of the study was unclear, even clumsy. I was also aware of the difficulties I would encounter attempting to gather data through repeated focus group discussions involving students who were themselves subjected to their own tight timetables and study demands. Finding

³This became particularly evident when in 1998 I conducted a review of research reflecting people's perceptions of the university over the past few years and could find very little material which contained student voices or revealed students' views (Odendaal-Magwaza 1998).

⁴ Such as education development/academic development literature

a supervisor was difficult, despite the interest colleagues showed in the topic area, and their willingness to engage with me. Neither Education Development nor its 'sub-field' of Student Development (in the broader terms in which I construed it, which differed from other constructions that either focused more narrowly on students' academic development, or stemmed primarily from a psychological paradigm) fitted neatly within any specific discipline. They were not established fields of study nor were they of 'mainstream' interest in the Education Faculty, which was concerned with developing its own coherent research programme focused directly on various aspects of teacher education and the school system. Nor did I find anyone from Education or elsewhere with quite the interdisciplinary orientation I sought, or who was willing to cosupervise on an interdisciplinary basis, despite the lip service being paid to the interdisciplinarity which I believed my topic required.

Every interview with a prospective supervisor resulted in a new draft version of my abstract, as I shifted and turned with new perspectives introduced from the others' specific academic bias or area of expertise. But none quite satisfied me. Previous experience of institutional rigidities, which had set back my attempts to pursue postgraduate study, also disinclined me to register in any department whose discipline I had not majored in: knowledge gained 'on the job' was given short shrift as a qualification for admission at postgraduate level.

Ultimately, it was as much from the pressure of needing to find a supervisor and get started on the dissertation as it was out of interest in the theoretical framework proposed to me by a colleague in Education, that the biggest shift occurred: the shift from a 'grounded theory' qualitative approach located in critical social theory, to accepting Foucault's 'interpretive analytics' framework as my point of departure. This was an entirely new perspective for me. While the topic of investigation remained the same, i.e. the relationship between student development and institutional change, the methodological approach changed altogether. What was intended to be an exercise directly involving students and myself in dialogue, came to be largely a solitary and individualistic literature-based effort, involving only my own subjection: which I have come to see clearly is what research for a higher degree is actually about. There has indeed been transformation in the

research process - transformation of myself. (And, when I have completed writing the dissertation, should judgement of the fruits of my labours be that I have been sufficiently 'normalised' in terms of the criteria applied in the 'game of truth', the institution will formally constitute me a different kind of subject than I was before, qualifying me as a 'Master of..'. What I will have mastered is ostensibly content knowledge and research skills in the field of Education; in Foucault's terms, it will be the self that has been mastered through subjection to disciplinary power.)

But reaching the work of Foucault as a point of departure was only the preliminary stage of this process of my subjection. The next step was reworking the proposal in terms that met Faculty requirements for constructing knowledge at Masters level, and employing more 'Foucaultian' discourse. Familiarising myself with Foucault's key texts came next, reading and taking copious notes to which I have returned frequently to deepen my knowledge and understanding of the ideas. I then gathered empirical data from a range of different kinds of documents, some internal to the institution and some external, including a review of the literature on student development. These provided me with additional access to the discourses of the institution during the period under study (additional, that is, to my own direct experience of them), and the discourses pertaining to education development and student development. From the institutional data I constructed a time line of 'events' reflecting the institutional change process, and 'events' in the history of Education Development.

Having constructed these time lines, the task of analysing the change process and telling the story of that process - the task of actually writing the dissertation - was undertaken. This included of necessity revisiting my research questions, struggling to clarify my focus using new analytical concepts and tools, and revisiting the theoretical literature and the data, time and again. The biggest challenges were understanding how to use Foucault's analytical tools in making sense of the data; how to interweave the analysis with the narrative of actual historical events in a manner which was readable and made sense; and how to structure the enormous mass of material that all constituted elements of the story. Interpretively, the treatment of discourse not as that which

reveals the 'truths' or even the 'perceived truths' of what happened, but as an effect (the 'truth' or 'falsehood' of which is entirely irrelevant) which in turn produces further effects, required me to relinquish previously-held modes of thinking and ideological 'truth' footholds, especially those of political agency. Cast into the swamp of interpretive analytics, I had to re-examine my dearly-held critical theory beliefs and methods, in the process discovering that the swamp is actually solid ground obscured by the ideologies.

The process of writing this dissertation has brought me to the point of being able to say: this study must be read for what it is, nothing more nor less than an effect of the very same practices it is analysing. It has come to constitute my own attempt - as someone who has been working in Education Development for ten years and has been subjected by the workings of powerknowledge described in this study - at self-reflexivity; recognising the constructed nature of myself as the subject-object producing the study: seeing myself as an effect, a discourse of the self-same discourses I am examining, seeing my actions in producing more discourse as an effect of the power operations of the institution, and seeing my discourse in turn as producing further effects. Those effects may not be my intended effects, or they may be those as well as other effects; or they may work quite counter to my intended effects; for power is not mine, power circulates in and through me, creates possibilities for me as well as placing limits on me. But my sense of agency is not lost, for this is my particular bit of discourse, and no-one else's; it is generated through my subjection, no-one else's; hence I need to create exactly what it is that I want to say - the 'truth' I want to construct. What I have attempted, in doing this study, then, is to adopt a creative, experimental approach based on critical reflection: to construct in myself an "attitude, an ethos, a philosophical life in which the critique" of what I am, is "at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits" that are imposed on me, and "an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them" and making myself other than I am (Foucault 1984b: 50). I have attempted to practice freedom.

The account I have produced of the movements or phases of change in the institution - of its engagement in and subjection to the "eternal play of dominations, the domain of violence,

subjugations and struggle" (Foucault 1980: 97), and of the reciprocal power-knowledge productions of this engagement - is largely a chronological one, albeit with some references backwards and forwards in time at various points, as will be explained. Chapter One explains the methods I used to analyse what was happening in the two processes of Education Development and institutional change, viz. methods of genealogy, archaeology, and ethics, as well as concepts central to these methods: disciplinary power, knowledge, and the human subject. It identifies challenges which this theoretical framework raises in relation to current social and political contexts, particularly challenges pertaining to producing 'practices of freedom' and subjects who practice freedom, in the institution and the society at large.

Chapter Two begins with a discussion of the application of the analytical framework Foucault developed in his text on the history of the prison, *Discipline and Punish*, to the study of the university. It elaborates further on the central concepts of power and knowledge, and the 'rules' Foucault adopted in his study of the prison. The 'soul' of the subject as one of the primary effects elicited by the exercise of disciplinary power on the body is explicated, and the purpose of the subjugation of the body-soul, viz. productivity. These concepts frame the dissertation as an account of the 'political anatomy' of university education. In the second part of the chapter, various aspects of the history of the university in South Africa up until the 1980s are analysed, revealing thematic continuities in the institution's exercise of disciplinary power: the penal mechanisms at its heart; the use of apparatuses such as the examination; the production of delinquency, and others. The history of government control, particularly in terms of racial segregation, and resistance to such control is outlined in both the school and higher education systems. The chapter concludes with an overview of the Education Development and institutional change processes of the two decades.

Chapter Three covers the 1980s in some detail. The account includes the entry into the university of small numbers of black students accompanied by the emergence of the discourse on the 'disadvantaged student' and the establishment of Student Support Services as the initial form of Education Development; alternative selection procedures, particularly the Teach Test Teach

programme; the insertion of Student Support into the faculties; an analysis of the exercise of disciplinary power in interfaculty programmes; and the critiques and challenges of Student Support which led to the construction of Education Development as a new field of enquiry. Interwoven with this narrative are national developments in higher education and politics, financial concerns, and institutional management initiatives leading up to the production of the university's first Mission Statement in 1989.

Chapters Four and Five have a common structure which differs slightly from that of Chapter Three in that both begin with an outline of national political and education developments for the entire period covered in the chapter, including both school and higher education level, so as to provide the context of such events for the subsequent narrative of the internal institutional developments, which are also for the most part handled in the two distinct strands previously identified. This departure from a strictly chronological account in which all events and developments are presented scrambled together in order of occurrence, is done for the sake of foregrounding the main narrative both to create a more manageable reading experience and to draw out certain themes in the analysis. It is an admittedly artificial technique which carries the risk of creating a false sense of coherence of the events and processes being described.

Chapter Four covers the period 1990 - 1993, beginning with the thawing-out of the country's congealed political power relations that heralded the change of government in 1994. The period was one of disruptions in both the schooling and higher education sectors. The Union of Democratic University Staff Associations positioned itself to become a key policy player in higher education. At the University of Natal there was a shift from Student Support to Education Development, and the Vice Chancellor's Review initiated an intensification of institutional governance. These two processes were not, however, unaided and unabetted as vehicles of disciplinary power: other institutional mechanisms, such as adjustments to the timetable and the work of the Senate Readmission Appeals Committee, both supported and were supported by them. There were also moves to transform the university's highest governing body, the Council. A substantial section of the chapter provides an in-depth analysis of Education Development's

tactics and techniques of power-knowledge, and lecturers' resistances to them.

Chapter Five addresses the remainder of the decade in two periods, viz. 1994 - 1996, and 1997 -1999. Political liberation brought popular elation followed by a degree of disillusionment at the lack of social and economic change; the student protests about financial aid shortages which began in the 1990 - 1993 period became an annual feature for most of the decade, and a compound of annual state subsidy cuts and pressures for international competitiveness deepened the financial crisis from within which the university had to respond to the demands of government policies for the transformation of the higher education sector. Retrenchments started in the institution's support sector. Escalating student unrest and crime were implicated in increased security and technological measures. During the 1994-1996 period the central Education Development unit was transposed into a Tertiary Education Studies Unit; ED shifted its focus increasingly to curriculum development, began offering professional training for tertiary educators, and came under the direction of a new, full time Vice Principal's post. The Vice Chancellor's Review, for its part, produced a set of Planning Guidelines 1994 - 1998 which required the establishment of multidisciplinary schools. While the reciprocal exploitation of ED and the Review process intensified, drawn-out efforts to establish a Broad Transformation Forum in line with student demands and government requirements achieved little by way of substantive institutional change.

The second

A funding crisis in 1997 resulted in violent protests and the revisiting of the VCR Phase I outcomes, with a consequent return to centralised budgeting and control and plans for 'downsizing' in the academic sector. The intensive resistance from staff produced some amelioration of the proposed cuts. Faculties became amalgamated and new schools were created by combining departments. Education Development was, theoretically, fully 'mainstreamed' into the disciplines, except where self-contained structures like the Science Foundation Programme had been created; and posts from the central unit were taken up in a new Quality Promotion Unit. Other ED staff, particularly those from the Durban campus, resisted the disestablishment of their posts and were mostly absorbed into a new Centre for Higher Education Development with a

brief of staff development, in the School of Education. Student development, however, spiralled sideways into the Student Services sector, and upwards with the creation of a Dean of Student Development post. A splintering of the discourse produced what has come to be called student leadership development.

The concluding chapter summarises the findings of this study. It concludes that Education Development, from having been on the margins of credibility in the academy, faced with resistance and denied validity in the university's existing 'regime of truth,' adopted tactics and techniques of disciplinary power which created 'new subjects' amongst staff and students, produced extensive discourse and penetrated established social and discursive practices. albeit unevenly; and that despite its disappearance many of the discourses which splintered from it, are establishing themselves in the institution and extending the spiral of power-knowledge which ED brought into play. The conclusion also poses some questions for possible future research into the exercise of disciplinary power in the institution, in areas crucial to the future of the institution and its staff and students; all pertain to the broad challenge facing the institution, of fulfilling its role in society through constructing itself as an 'ethical subject' engaging in the 'practices of freedom'.

Chapter One

The method of the study

"... a critical thinking that takes the form of an ontology of ourselves or ... of the present" (Foucault, quoted in Hoy 1986: 22).

"One has to dispense with the constituent subject, to get rid of the subject itself ... to arrive at an analysis which can account for the constitution of the subject within a historical framework" (Foucault 1980: 117).

"It is necessary to think of the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of 'science' and 'ideology', but in terms of 'truth' and 'power'" (Foucault 1980: 132).

To attain critical distance from a past that was so very recently the present, is not necessarily rendered any the easier by the rapid pace of change that currently characterises western society. The method I have used to try to attain a critical perspective on the university's contemporary history of change, including deconstructing my own work in it, derives from genealogy, Foucault's approach to analysing the changing modalities of power in society; and my introduction has touched briefly on disciplinary power, the concept at the heart of this analytic approach. But my method is also informed by two other complementary' aspects of Foucault's work: his earlier interest in what he termed archaeology, the historical analysis of knowledge systems within which are produced various discourses; and his later interest in ethics, the analysis of the self's relationship to itself. In this development his critical historiography came to encompass those three levels which he regarded as making up concrete human experience (Hoy 1986: 3), viz. discursive (knowledge-making) and social (power) practices, and practices of the self.

These three interrelated domains of analysis - archaeology, genealogy, and ethics - each with a wider scope than the former, hence also differing methodological implications (Davidson1986:

¹ See Davidson 1986: 221.

230), are relevant analytical modes for a study of change in the university because the university is the institution which embodies and propagates the knowledge systems of the era. These knowledge systems generate discourses which serve as the vehicles of disciplinary power; and this disciplinary power shapes people as certain kinds of subjects or 'selves'. Of the three modes, genealogy has been the most important for my analysis of institutional change, and ethics for the development of a critical perspective pointing into the future. While the methods of archaeology have not been significantly used, analysing the discourses of the institution has required an archaeological framework and concepts.

These three methodological approaches, their central concepts and their application in the study, are outlined in more detail below. Archaeology and genealogy are dealt with first, in a more-orless integrated manner because of the interrelatedness of their central concepts, knowledge and power; thereafter ethics is explained. This is followed by a more detailed explanation of how the analysis of data in the study has been tackled. Further elaborations of concepts and methodology are integrated at various points in subsequent chapters, especially Chapter Two which deals in some detail with Foucault's study of the relationship between power and knowledge as demonstrated in the history of the prison. The present chapter concludes with a consideration of philosophical issues which these methods raise for any institution engaged in higher education in South Africa's current context.

1. Archaeology and genealogy: knowledge, power, and the construction of subjects

Archaeology, as has been said, is the analysis of the rules of the knowledge systems of a given era: the rules whereby what counts as valid knowledge or 'truth' in a particular society is established. These rules govern the production of discourses through which institutions and other objects are wrought, given form, validated, and in turn produce discourse. Discourses are thus the means whereby knowledge and power are interconnected: through discourse, knowledge has the power to bring 'things' into existence; it produces social constructs and confers 'reality' on them.

The rules which govern the production of truth in a society are generated in the institutional

apparatuses of society (of which universities are one), and are themselves subject to historical transformation; knowledge is therefore not absolute and fixed, but a social construct. In modern society knowledge exists and carries truth only through a symbiotic nexus with power, each producing the other. Knowledge is both an instrument and an effect of power, as well as producing effects of power in society; power in turn is both instrument and effect of knowledge and produces effects of truth (Foucault1980: 52).

Unlike the conventional notion that power constrains freedom, genealogical analysis shows that power is not in an oppositional relationship to freedom, nor to knowledge of 'truth' as the path to freedom. 'Truth', so far from being outside of and opposed to power, a means to obtaining freedom from power, is a central component of modern power. To reiterate: truth is produced by power, and truth in turn produces power (Foucault 1980: 52,131). This articulation of knowledge and power relations, which may be termed power-knowledge (DP: 305), operates to take control of and administer life at the levels of both the subject body and the species body (HS: 139-145). This occurs primarily through the discourses of the human sciences, discourses which are founded in disciplinary power with its manifold techniques of observation and control. The primary effect of knowledge is the creation of the individualized human subject, who is both an object of knowledge (in fields of psychology, sociology, criminology, and so on) and is subjected - constituted as a subject - by that knowledge (DP: 224-228; 295 - 296).

Archaeology links directly with genealogy through this link between knowledge and power. Genealogy is used to interpret or diagnose and grasp the significance and power of social practices from within those same practices, recognising them as constructed practices and not absolutes. Foucault's interest was the practices in Western culture that have been instrumental in forming the modern individual: the practices of the human sciences, which through their linking of knowledge and power to construct 'truth', have fabricated current Western understandings of the individual and the society. Such social and discursive practices change over time: the discipline of psychology in the early 21st Century, for instance, has through its knowledge-producing practices constructed concepts about human beings not available to the psychology of a century ago, as a

result of which it now does not operate altogether according to the same rules of knowledge-making which then pertained in the discipline. As social and discursive practices change, so the self, or subject, and self-understanding change: our ancestors of a century ago did not have the concepts of the ego and the id. These material practices are therefore the "observable manifestations of historically variable experiences of the self" (Hoy 1986: 17); their particular manifestation in a given era reflects the self-understanding of people of that era and society. Genealogy is thus a tool which serves to reveal the particular self-understanding of an era. Such self-understanding is not the same as self-consciousness, which is achieved through introspection: rather, it is the taken-for-granted assumptions, at a particular time in history, about what it is to be human (ibid.).

How humans understand themselves and their institutions in a particular era is revealed, not through their ideologies, by which they ascribe meaning and purpose to their actions, but through their very actions and patterns of action. These actions and patterns may seem rational, coherent. purposeful and intelligible, yet a 'critical history' examining power at work in them shows that this is not really the case (Hoy1986: 17-18). Archaeology and genealogy both recognise that, since institutions are social constructs, their existence in a given form at a given time in history has no inevitability or universality about it but is the product of a combination of unfolding ideas and knowledge, action, accident, and circumstance (Nietzsche's "iron hand of necessity shaking the dice-box of chance" [Foucault 1984: 88]).

This means that *all* taken-for-granted, self-evident 'truths' of history, whether those of religion, culture, social mores, the human body, or the transcendence of the self - 'Man' - as a subject, are called into question. The two methods converge in this denial of absolutes or fundamental truths: together, they place "everything considered immortal in man' within a process of (historical) development" (Davidson 1986: 225), so that even the present era can never be considered the culmination of such development, but only a new phase in it.

The scope of genealogy, however, is wider than that of archaeology. Archaeology attempts to

isolate the level of discursive practices by means of which 'truths' are produced, and formulate the rules of production and transformation for these practices. Genealogy concentrates on the forces and relations of power connected to discursive practices, but does not separate the rules for production of discourse from relations of power. On the contrary, it shows the integral interconnectedness between these two social processes. This does not mean that a genealogical approach displaces archaeological analysis; rather, it builds on it and brings a vital additional dimension to the analysis.

More needs to be said about power and its relationship to domination and freedom, so as to lead to an understanding of Foucault's view of the subject, which is a central concept in his analysis of ethics. Power, in Foucault's terms, is not domination. Domination occurs when power 'congeals'. when strategic engagements freeze into stasis. Power by contrast is a fluid network of relations, a flow of forces potentially reversible at any moment. This flow of forces only operates in and through individuals and bodies that are free. Their freedom is the very condition of the existence of power: "These relations of power are ... changeable, reversible and unstable ... there cannot be relations of power unless the subjects are free" (ECS: 123).

Power in this sense therefore does not exist in a relationship of total domination, such as the master-slave relationship. Such a state of domination occurs when the flow of power has been blocked, when power relations coalesce into a hardened, fixed state. Yet even in the unfree, dominated condition of the slave there can be an element of freedom of choice. Resistance is possible for example through attempting to run away, or committing suicide as against continuing to accept domination.

Freedom as a condition for the operation of power is, however, greater than this form of desperate resistance to domination. It is the freedom to govern yourself in the context of a network of power relations in which others (individuals, collectives, institutions, etc.) seek to influence and govern you. This is where Foucault's understanding of ethics in terms of "care for the self as a practice of freedom" (ECS) comes into play. Self-governance necessarily entails some

resistances to the workings of power in the network of social relations. In order to choose your own forms of subjection, to construct yourself as a subject, you must needs reject some of the subjections imposed on you. In turn you seek to influence, to enact governance over others in your social relations. You are at once an object, acted upon by others; a subject-participant, acting on others; and a vehicle in the transmission of relations of power, through your freedom. Just as this applies to the individual as subject, so it applies to the institution as subject.

In distinguishing between domination and power Foucault does not deny the reality of, nor reject the cause of struggle against, political domination; and indeed education used as a tool for political domination, and the struggle against such domination, are vivid strands in the weave of South African twentieth century history. What Foucault warns against, though, is conceiving of power in modern times - even in the context of struggle against domination - purely in terms of domination: the repressive view of power. Power as domination, or 'sovereign power' as Foucault termed it, is not productive: it is repressive. Modern, or 'disciplinary' power, is productive, especially of knowledge and subjects, although it may be experienced by the individual as oppressive in its subjection of him/her, and resisted. This resistance is the medium in relation to which power operates.

How then can power be analysed if not in terms of domination? This question takes us back to discourse: according to Foucault, the key issue for analysis of power is "how men govern (themselves and others) by the production of the truth (... the establishment of the domains in which the practice of true and false can be made at once ordered and pertinent)" (Foucault, quoted in Smart 1985: 59). Governance of people in modern society occurs by means of creating procedures for producing truth, or knowledge, in accordance with which people are required to live their daily lives: the doctor's truth, the lawyer's truth, the legislator's and teacher's truth, etc.

This means that government (in the broad sense) by people of others is about structuring the possible field of action of those others (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982) through these truth-producing procedures or discourses of knowledge. Action is permitted or disallowed

according to the criteria of 'truth'. These criteria determine what is 'normal' and what is not; the normal is tolerated and encouraged, the 'abnormal' not. Disciplinary power is thus a normalising power (DP: 177-184).

If government of others is about structuring their possible fields of action, government of yourself, in turn, is about constructing or subjecting yourself and structuring your own possible field of action through constructing your own truth about your self. This entails firstly recognising yourself as a historically contingent subject and then choosing which aspects of your subjection to accept and which to reject, in a effort to remake yourself. This is care for the self, which, for Foucault, is a "practice of freedom".

The political act of liberation from domination (such as that which occurred in the South African revolution) is an important and a necessary process, but it is not in itself sufficient to ensure freedom, to "decide all the practical forms of liberty" of daily life (ECS: 114). For these purposes an ethic of care for the self is necessary: an ongoing, daily process of self-construction.

2. Ethics: the relationship of the self to the self

Insofar as this study raises questions about the subject-producing effects of the power-knowledge operations of the university - questions about what kinds of subjects (students, graduates, staff members, even the university) are being produced, and how; whether these are desirable kinds of subjects, whether other kinds of subjects are desirable and possible to produce, and if so, how - it draws on this concept of ethics: the analysis of the self's relationship to the self, of how the self acts towards itself.

Ethics in this sense is not about a moral code; rather, it might be termed a 'critical ontology' (Foucault 1984: 47, 50) of the self at both the individual and the collective level. This mode of ethical analysis is not a theory or a doctrine, nor even a "permanent body of knowledge that is accumulating" (Foucault 1984: 50) about the self. Rather, it is a creative, experimental approach based on critical reflection: an "attitude, an ethos, a philosophical life in which the critique of what

we are is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits that are imposed on us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them" (Foucault 1984: 50).

Critical ontology thus has "two separate but related components: work on oneself and responding to one's time" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1986: 112). This makes it at once a more personal and 'engaged' or directly political analytics than either archaeology or genealogy, from which it emerges; for it means understanding how we come to be what we are, but also seeking to change what we are. Seeking to change ourselves is what, for Foucault, constitutes a key practice of freedom. Freedom is not a social or even political condition as such; it is in itself, by its very nature, political, for freedom resides in the relationship of the self to the self. Care for the self as a practice of freedom is what constitutes life lived ethically. Not to consciously choose to exercise freedom in constructing yourself, is not caring for your self; to choose to live ethically, is to choose freedom, and vice versa: "(l)iberty is the ontological condition of ethics. But ethics is the deliberate form assumed by liberty" (ECS: 115).

How does Foucault arrive at this understanding, which appears to contradict the prevailing 'common sense' idea that ethics has more to do with one's relationship to others than one's relationship to self? Drawing on the ancient Greek definition of freedom, he proposes that "(l)iberty ... has a political model, in the measure where being free means not being a slave to one's self and to one's appetites, which supposes that one establishes over one's self a certain relation of domination, of mastery, which was called *arche* - power, authority" (ECS: 117). The ethical subject must exercise self-discipline to exercise freedom; in exercising freedom, s/he is the architect and the author of the self.

It is necessary to understand what this task of self-construction entails, and its limits and possibilities. Since subjects do not exist unfettered in a social vacuum, the ongoing exercise of freedom in constructing the self does not occur in isolation, without limitations. It is not an exercise founded on nothing, or reliant only on the whims of the individual. Firstly, it explicitly involves assimilating certain truths. In this respect it draws on knowledge, especially knowledge

of the self, but also what might be termed cultural-moral knowledge: knowledge of those behaviourial practices and values which hold sway within one's particular society in one's own time. Foucault terms it "the knowledge of a certain number of rules of conduct or principles which are at the same time truths and regulations. To care for the self is to fit one's self out with these truths. That is where ethics is linked to the game of truth" (ECS: 116).

'Truths' here are, as has previously been discussed, socially-generated rules, not absolutes emanating from the realms of the divine and divinely transmitted to humans. Foucault elaborates the notion of 'game of truth' as "an ensemble of rules for the production of the truth. It is not a game in the sense of imitating or entertaining ... it is an ensemble of procedures which lead to a certain result, which can be considered in function of its principles and its rules of procedures, as valid or not, as winner or loser" (ECS: 127). The 'game' which constructs 'truth' is thus itself a socially-constructed set of mechanisms; and the 'truth' or result produced through the game, that which is validated by the game as being true, is not something fundamental, essential, eternal and unchanging, or universal, as is so often ascribed to the meaning of the concept 'truth'.

To speak of a 'game of truth' and to state that 'truth' is not something absolute is not, however, to reduce the validity or significance of truth, or render it flippant, for the notion of truth is pivotal in Western society: people, civilisations, live and die by it. Why, asks Foucault, do we

care for ourselves, only through the care for truth? This question is very fundamental, it is the question of the Western world. What caused all Western culture to begin to turn around this obligation of truth, which has taken on a variety of different forms? Things being what they are, nothing has, up to the present, proved that we could define a strategy exterior to it (ECS: 126).

Fundamental as this last claim is, let us suspend examination of it (since its justification is beyond the scope of this thesis), to look at the idea that 'truth games' (and hence their 'truth outcomes') take on diverse forms, and relate this to education.

Different societies at different times in history have different 'games of truth': different means or mechanisms by which knowledge is constructed and validated as 'true' and taken as the basis for living according to truth. The scientific revolutions of past millennia reveal such shifts (and even now such a scientific shift is discernible particularly in the field of physics); so do various religions and religious revolutions. The significance of education in contemporary times is how it has been vested with the power of mass socialisation or subjectification. It is one of the primary instruments by which a particular society's 'games of truth' are perpetuated and by which individuals from their early childhood assimilate the truths, are 'fitted out' with the rules of conduct, of that society in the process of being constructed/constructing themselves as subjects.

Assimilating given 'truths', often through education, then, creates certain parameters for the practices of freedom. But besides the individual's practices being informed by those truths s/he has assimilated, they are also enacted specifically and dynamically in relation to other subjects. In addition to being shaped by the culture or 'rules of conduct' of the society, one's exercise of freedom" ... implies complex relations with others, in the measure where this ethos of freedom is also a way of caring for others" (ECS: 118). As important for the free subject, who behaves 'correctly' in exercising power over his or her self to construct himself or herself as an ethical freedom-practising person, is to exercise power correctly towards others. That 'correctness' respects other peoples' practices of freedom in self-construction as innately interdependent with your own practices of freedom. In other words, caring for the self, or governing your self ethically, facilitates others caring for themselves - it makes more possible the ethical selfgovernment of other people. And, by implication, to fail to govern yourself ethically, to fail to exercise the practices of freedom in self-construction, is to create a hindrance to the practices of freedom by others. Conversely, the way in which you govern yourself inherently informs and implicates your exercise of power in relation to others: "There, too", says Foucault, "is the art of governing" (ECS: 118).

For Foucault, then, the key issue for analysis of power is not domination - from which power is absent - but the domain of government, including that of self-government. Proper care for the self

through the practices of freedom is fundamental to good government and good leadership. Foucault cites Xenophon in the Memorabilia who "calls out to young people, 'Hey, you, you want to become a political person, you want to govern the city, you therefore want to take care of others but you did not even take care of yourself, and if you do not take care of yourself, you will be a bad leader" (ECS: 124). Thus, "the care for self appears like a pedagogical, moral and also ontological condition, for the constitution of a good leader. To constitute one's self as a subject who governs implies that one has constituted himself as a subject having care for self' (ECS: 124). Higher Education as the socialising agency expected to produce the future leaders of the society, thus faces the challenge of equipping graduates with the capacity to care for the self as a practice of freedom in order to be good leaders, i.e. effectively to govern others.

From the aforegoing discussion it is clear that relations of power in Foucault's terms are 'not something bad in themselves, from which one must free one's self' (ECS: 129). If relations of power are the means by which individuals try to influence and even determine the behaviour of others, and include the relationship of power of the self to the self, there is no society in which such relations are absent, and one cannot escape them. The ethical practice in relations of power is 'to give one's self the rules of law, the techniques of management, and also the ethics, the ethos, the practice of self, which would allow these games of power to be played with a minimum of domination' (ECS: 129, latter emphasis mine). Effective government is thus government which entails minimum domination; and minimal domination in relations of power creates social stability: "A city in which everyone would be correctly concerned for self would be a city that would be doing well, and it would find therein the ethical principles of its stability" (ECS: 118). This view, too, runs contrary to conventional notions.

To avoid misunderstanding it is necessary to emphasise that the correct concern for the self is not about a narcissistic self-centredness, greed, or a desire for self-aggrandisement and unfettered personal power. The concept of freedom as self-construction should also not be confused with the notion of 'the self-made man' as an apologia for capitalism, nor with an elevation of personal success to the highest possible status in the raison d'etre of human existence. Neither paternalism

nor exploitation of others for the attainment of personal desires are in keeping with Foucault's ethic of 'care for the self', because such behaviours fail to respect others' freedom, or go beyond 'minimum domination' of others.

Foucault did not address the issue of how material conditions impact on the possibility of constructing oneself as an ethical subject, but implicitly, in his view, even the poorest person without immediate power to alter the structural conditions of his or her life, has the capacity to establish power over him or her self, to construct an ethical subjectivity. So does the person living under the rule of a dictatorship. This does not mean that a struggle to change material conditions or overthrow a dictator is irrelevant or unnecessary; on the contrary, engaging in such actions may be integral to pushing the limits of who one is, and making oneself the kind of person one wishes to be.

The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom contradicts corrupt behaviour as much as it stands in contrast to the self-interest and paternalism that underpinned the Nationalists' grand plan of apartheid which pursued maximum, not minimum, domination in the games of power through legislating control over almost every aspect of citizens' lives. The intermeshing plethora of apartheid laws was aimed at producing wholly docile subjects, not subjects engaged in self-authorship. In effect it produced both docile subjects and subjects who, though not necessarily 'freedom-practising' subjects, struggled for freedom from 'domination'; and it produced degrees of both social stability and social upheaval. The challenges now, in the context of political liberation and the ongoing effects of apartheid, is the transformation of subjects with habits of docility and/or habits of struggle into freedom-practising subjects for a stable society. These are challenges of self-transformation, of self-inventiveness.

For Foucault modern man, the modern subject, is "the man who tries to invent himself" (Foucault 1984: 42). He is not man seeking to discover his fundamental 'essence', which genealogy has shown does not exist, for "(t)his modernity" (this particular philosophical ethos) "does not 'liberate man in his own being'; it compels him to face the task of producing himself' (ibid.). This

is what it means to practice freedom: to face the task of producing yourself. Of necessity self-production entails recognising yourself as a contingent being, an outcome of the whole history of humankind and of your own social, cultural, and personal history; but at the same time as you recognises these historical limits imposed on yourself, self-production requires a critical stance towards them, and an effort to resist them, to push them outwards, to create new possibilities: to experiment with transforming yourself, making yourself other than what you are. The practice of freedom thus inevitably entails some measure of resistance to the imposed norms of society, including the mechanisms whereby they are imposed, such as education. Yet education itself, and the norms it imposes, appear to be precisely the means whereby people can attain 'freedom' in the sense of both personal self-fulfilment and improved material conditions of life; to resist them, therefore, apparently mitigates against success in these terms. This is one of the self-evident 'truths' promoted in present-day society. The challenges generated by this contradiction are considered further in the second section of this chapter on the challenges of transformation in South Africa (p. 36).

Before explaining how I have applied these methods and concepts and giving a more detailed account of the analytical process, some justification of the choice of methodology is in order. I have already argued that Foucault's concepts are legitimate and relevant tools for analysing the change process in the university because education - one of the most central of power-knowledge practices in our time - is a primary vehicle for constituting the individualized human subject, and higher education is the apparatus which continually constructs the disciplines by means of which this process of subject construction is mediated, as well as the apparatus whereby knowledge is produced and disseminated. The methodology is also, however, integral to my rationale for doing the study; it informs my subjective 'will to knowledge', and has come to inform my political rationale not just in doing the study, but also in my work as a whole.

The political task Foucault identified for the intellectual who occupies a specific position in relation to the apparatuses of truth in society (say, an educator in a university), is to uncover and problematise the 'regime of truth' governing the society, seeking to establish a new politics of

truth (Foucault 1980: 133). This is the intellectual's responsibility in a society's process of self-invention.

The political task I have set myself in this thesis is far more limited than 'establishing a new politics of truth'. I am, however, trying to uncover and problematise the regime of truth that governed the university during the period of the study, which is a necessary first step toward establishing any such new politics of truth. What this has meant in practice is attempting to explain what happened at Natal University through examining the data pertaining to the social practices of the two decades, so as to analyse and record the "recent history" of the effects of power in and on the institution and the subjects associated with it. In broad terms, I am writing a history of the interpretations that gained currency during the 1980s and 1990s; that is, a history of how certain practices (particularly those of Education Development) came to constitute certain aspects of reality, or certain 'truths' of this particular era in the life of the university. (Obviously, those practices did not suddenly at a given time spring fully-fledged into existence without antecedents: their prior history also requires recognition; the central question, though, is how power operated to convert their status, giving them the effect of 'truth'.) My thesis is thus deconstructing or uncovering power operations (which I myself was an element in the transmission of) and their truth-producing effects, and posing questions about these in order to contribute insights into the ongoing creation of a transformed and transforming institution, transformed and transforming lecturers, students, and graduates. Although it includes a record of the actions of people as subjects, its main concern is to account for their (our) shaping as subjects, or objects of knowledge. The emphasis is not primarily on human agency. The history I am writing is, needless to say, quite a different history than I would have produced had I pursued my earlier 'grounded theory' approach located within a 'critical pedagogy' perspective.

3. The application of methods, concepts, and rules

The application of an archaeological framework and genealogical methods entails recognising the university itself as a product or an effect of discourse (i.e. brought into existence through discourse operating according to a particular system of rules); and as an institution which

incorporates a set of cultural practices revolving around knowledge which, by the very knowledge they produce, inform our understandings of society and the individual.

What I attempt to do in this study is use the key archaeological concepts of knowledge/truth and discourse - the joining of knowledge and power - to analyse the changing 'truths' of the institution during the period under consideration. The questions are, what discourses were constituting, and being constituted by, the university, in the change process? Were they governed by the same rules of 'the game of truth' as occurred previously, or was there a displacement, a discontinuity, of old rules giving way to new ones? What were the effects of the discourses; did they produce change? If so, of what kind, and how? And how were they in turn affected? Indeed, were there really changes, and if so, what were these; or was there rather continuity where there appeared to be change?

Integral to this analysis of discourses is the analysis of power relations and this is where I draw on genealogy as a tool to analyse social practices in the institution. I examine change in the university through analysing the power operations and truth-producing effects of its changing sets of knowledge-making practices; in particular, those which produced the individual subject-objects that constitute the university, and are constituted by it: staff members and students. I focus primarily on the discursive and social practices of Education Development, but also examine other practices employed in the broader institutional change process, attempting to reveal the changed self-understanding, if any, reflected in the changing practices. The actions and patterns of action of the changing practices during the chosen period appear in many respects rational, coherent, etc, because of the ideological content ascribed to them; I attempt to examine the legitimacy of such claims to coherence.

My analysis of ED in particular reveals a cyclical, productive process: an extension of power in the institution commensurate with the increased production of 'truth' or knowledge about the business of teaching and learning. I also show that the wider change process employed various of the mechanisms of disciplinary power; that these also operated in the minutiae of daily social

practices such as the structuring of people's time, which had effects on students and staff alike; and that there were definite links between all of these.

The third component of my analysis pertains to ethics. The university's function of producing graduates can be viewed as the task of producing the collective self, man-in-society, through a process of training the individual to produce him or her self. The questions which ethics poses from my study, then, are: to what extent do the current workings of power and knowledge in the institution construct people as subjects-constructing-themselves? Do the institution's practices promote the necessary tension between recognising and analysing imposed limits, and resisting these, i.e. do they produce subjects who practice freedom in a daily active process of self-construction; or do they produce subjects who are primarily inert, compliant, malleable beings, accepting of the workings of power on them? If the latter rather than the former is happening, how can these practices be changed so as to produce people constructed to practice freedom?

In the analytical process I have been guided by the general rules Foucault formulated for the study of power, or the 'regime of truth' of the modern era, and for the analysis of discourse.

In the first instance, I have had to identify the discourses generated in, by, and around the institution, in order to analyse them. Two major areas of discourse emerged, as has been said: the one pertaining to Education Development, the other to a broader institutional change process, with a minor discourse on 'transformation'. I have traced what has happened with these discourses over time in terms of their proliferation, their splintering into sub-discourses, their transformations and their disappearance or relocation in the structures and strategies of the institution.

This discursive analysis has required consideration of the 'rules' Foucault posited in analysing sex apropos of power relations (HS: 98-102). These are: one, the necessity of starting from local centres of power-knowledge and analysing specific relations, since power is never external to knowledge: "Between techniques of knowledge and strategies of power, there is no exteriority,

even if they have specific roles and are linked together on the basis of their difference" (HS: 98); two, recognising that relations of power-knowledge are not static forms of distribution but "matrices of transformation" (HS: 99); three, recognizing the interdependent conditioning between broader strategies and specific tactics (HS: 100); and four, recognizing the "tactical polyvalence" of discourses; that they have different tactical values, or function at different times in relation to different strategies (ibid.).

The local centre in which I have analysed power relations has been the university itself, and more specifically its Pietermaritzburg campus; within which smaller local centres have presented themselves: academic departments; the sites of Education Development practices; student residences; the Broad Transformation Forum, the Senate Readmission Appeals Committee, and numerous others. The power relations at work in these centres have demonstrably been fluid and shifting, with an ongoing process of redistribution of power. I have looked for the ways in which specific tactics, such as those of ED, have been affected by broader strategies of institutional change, and vice versa: a reciprocity of 'conditioning' between micro and macro levels. And I have looked for evidence of the same discourses surfacing at different times, in different centres, through different channels, and being used to different, sometimes opposite, effect depending on their strategic context: the 'tactical polyvalence' of discourses.

Foucault's analysis in the History of Sexuality (41-47) also revealed four key operations of power through discourse, for which I have sought evidence in relation to the specific objects of my study. Thus, I have attempted to see whether there was increasing prohibition or control of staff and students through ever-deeper lines of penetration (HS: 42) into the social body of the university, by means of devices of surveillance, correction, prescription, and so forth; and, if so, whether the effect of this was the multiplying and extending of teaching-learning, power, and discourse. Secondly, was there an incorporation of 'exceptions and perversities' and were individuals specified as cases - were certain 'species' of student and staff created? Was there an inclusion and specification of, and a focus on, 'aberrant' types of behaviour and subjects, and were these thereby given "an analytical, visible, and permanent reality" (HS: 44) in the institution?

Thirdly, how were the Education Development and transformation discourses encouraged to multiply? Were these discourses being elicited by means of confessional mechanisms operating through the disciplines? What other techniques of power served to elicit these discourses? And fourthly, were the discourses incited through being forbidden; were "places of maximum saturation," (HS: 46, 47) privileged spaces and rituals, created in and around the institution to incite the discourses? Were there denials and refusals that called them forth? These are the forms of evidence of power at work through discourse that I have looked for in analysing the changes in the institution.

The guidelines which Foucault derived for the study of power in his history of the prison have also informed my analysis (Foucault1980: 96-99; Davidson 1986: 226). These can be summarised as follows: firstly, power should not be studied just as repression or prohibition, but its positive effects must be studied, that is, what it produces; secondly, power and its techniques are to be analysed in terms of their own specificity; power must not be reduced to a consequence of legislation and social structure; thirdly, power should be analysed from the bottom up, from the smallest mechanisms, their techniques and tactics, and "how these mechanisms of power have been - and continue to be - invested, colonised, utilised, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended, etc., by ever more general mechanisms" (Foucault 1980: 99). In this respect, what I have attempted to do, in Foucaultian terms, is to detect a "micro-physics of power" as a "net-like circulating organisation" in the institution (DP: 226). Fourthly, power is not to be analysed at the level of conscious intention or decision but at the level of those processes that constitute people as subjects. This injunction has obliged me to try continuously to steer away from my wellconditioned reflex of vesting power in the conscious intentions of the players in the narrative, and look instead for the ways in which the players have been constituted as subject-objects. The last of these principles is that power should not be analysed through ideological constructs; the apparatuses of knowledge it produces are not ideological but material in nature.

In Chapter 2, I outline my application in this study of the four general 'rules' Foucault adopted for his study of the prison (DP: 23-24) in order to analyse penal leniency as a technique of power; viz.

regarding punishment as a complex social function, as a political tactic, as historically convergent with the emergence of the human sciences, and as changing through the changing investment of power relations in the body. This analysis clearly reveals techniques of disciplinary power at work in the 'progressive' (in both the political and historical sense of the word) 'humanization' of the university.

In applying these rules to analyse the workings of power in the institutional change process, I have attempted to identify the positive effects, the 'products' of power, which have emerged from the transformation and Education Development discourses and practices. While I have recognised that legislation and social structures have been elements in the process, I have not taken them as determining factors, the sources of power; I have taken them, too, as effects of the workings of power, and have looked for ways in which they themselves have produced effects in the entire network of power relations. I have analysed power 'from the bottom up', scrutinising closely the smallest mechanisms in the institution and their techniques and tactics: mechanisms, techniques and tactics in the teaching- learning process, the administration of 'student affairs', the distribution of information, committee decision-making, and so forth. And I have looked for the ways in which these mechanisms of power have linked with more general mechanisms of institutional management, state bureaucracy, and economic interests.

This explanation of method has included discussion of the relevance of the methods of archaeology, genealogy, and ethics to the task of understanding change in the university. Their value, though, goes beyond methodological relevance: they offer philosophical, indeed ethical challenges to the business of producing graduates, which is one of the university's core functions and of central concern to this study. Identifying these challenges requires some discussion of the current contexts in which South African higher education operates and the challenges of 'transformation' posed by them, and to this I now turn, examining the general political and social context in the aftermath of apartheid, and that of higher education itself.

4. The challenges of transformation in South Africa: challenges for higher education

1994 saw an end to the long struggles of the majority of South Africans against racist colonialism and apartheid rule, with the attainment of their political freedom: a freedom now entrenched in a democratic constitution hailed as the most liberal in the world. On April 27 the country held its first ever national democratic elections, in which the African National Congress came to victory with promises of 'reconstruction and development'. In this attainment of democracy South Africans achieved what Michel Foucault, in distinguishing between domination and relations of power, called "truly an act of liberation, in the strict sense of the word" (ECS: 114).

This was political liberation from a state of near-domination in which relations of power had at times seemed immoveable; for when the Nationalist Party became the government in 1948 it began to deploy every possible means: political, economic. social, religious, legal, military - and, principally, the instrument of education (Nkomo1984: 92) - to institutionalise its system of social segregation and racial capitalism and to entrench itself in government. In effect, it sought to immobilise the field of relations of power, to make these relations "impassive, invariable, non-reversible" (ECS: 114). It attempted to achieve the perfect system of control of the people of South Africa: to direct them in accordance with a grand plan based on an ideology of white Afrikaner supremacy, in line with the belief that the Afrikaner was God's chosen nation in Africa. In this ideology, blacks and whites were not only culturally and racially different, whites were superior and blacks inferior. For the plan to work, then, blacks and whites had to be segregated and socialised differently, their subjectivities shaped in keeping with the respective roles designated them by the economic rationality underpinning the Afrikaner's racialist world view (Nkomo 1984: 92).

This ideal of racialised, rationalised control is summed up in the infamous 1953 speech of the then Minister of Education, Dr H.F. Verwoerd, identifying the function of Bantu Education as training Africans to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water" (Horrell 1968: 5), for, in terms of the Government's plan of separate 'homelands' for Africans, "there was no place for the Bantu in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour" (ibid). And, if in this scheme the

African majority were to be constructed docile, inferior, labouring subjects, their minority white counterparts were correspondingly, through Christian National Education, to be constructed superior subjects, but equally docile in their willingness to fulfil the god-ordained role of 'baas' over the native.

Apartheid policies like the above rested on explicit assumptions that people could be governed in more efficient and cost-effective ways through relations of power aimed at structuring their actions (the imposition of pass control laws is but one example) rather than simply through the brute force which characterises states of domination (ECS: 114); this notwithstanding the brutality that often characterised the actions of the various arms of the state, such as the police and military. The policies exemplified how disciplinary power may be implicated in fascistic projects of social control. The state's eventual aim for black people might have been self-governance; but this aim, the policies and strategies for achieving it were all forcibly imposed, and severe punishments meted out to those who transgressed the law. Under this system people's capacities and opportunities to engage in 'the ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom' were severely circumscribed.

Unsurprisingly, the grand scheme of apartheid failed. Its success would have required impossible conditions: the annihilation of all relationships of power, total domination. And, as we have seen, modern power's modus operandi is not in terms of domination, or sovereignty, or even as a property - of the state or a particular class or group such as white Afrikaners. Nor are the relations of power static or rigid, but fluid and variable: different 'partners' in the network of relations always have the possibility of adopting strategies which alter the direction of flow of power. Put differently, the freedom of subjects is intrinsic to relations of power, not external to them, and the resistance of subjects is just as permanent a feature of human co-existence as is power. Thus, in every sphere in which the Nationalist Party sought to extend its domination - including education, which became the terrain of vigorous struggles - black South Africans in particular resisted the policies imposed on them. The combined and cumulative effects of their

resistances was to break down the attempted systemic blockage of the flow of power. The form of this political revolution, this act of liberation, was, uniquely, a negotiated, peaceful settlement.

This positive outcome notwithstanding, people internalised numerous subjections under the apartheid regime, not least through education. Segregation and other strategies also effectively insulated many people (especially whites) from knowledge of the full extent of the actions of both the government and its opponents; others (both black and white), though aware in some degree of what was happening, responded with either denial or acquiescence. The oppositional and often militant nature of the struggle, whether conducted in classrooms, campuses, factory floors or township streets, by means of strikes and consumer boycotts or 'necklaces' and armed incursions from neighbouring countries; the increasingly brutal and repressive measures employed by the government; and, also, the negotiated nature of the final political settlement - all these had powerful shaping effects on the subjectivities of South Africans, whether they imposed or opposed apartheid, engaged in the struggle or saw themselves as its direct or even indirect targets. These effects on human subjectivities had profound implications for the attempt, after liberation, to create a 'new South Africa'. They required, and still require, a significant unmaking and reshaping amongst black and white South Africans alike of certain habits of the soul, particularly habits of inferiority and superiority.

These issues are related to material conditions in the society. And in material terms, despite a degree of improvement in some areas, 'liberation' has yet, in the lived experiences of 'ordinary people', to translate into positive effects in the social and economic aspects of society. The first democratically- elected government rapidly shed both the rhetoric and the structures of the Reconstruction and Development Programme, replacing it with an economic policy dubbed 'GEAR': Growth through Employment and Redistribution. Almost six years into GEAR the society is characterised by inflation and instability, with high levels of crime, corruption in both civil society and all levels of government, domestic, social, and political violence and intimidation,

² 'Necklacing' was execution through placing a burning tyre over the head of a suspected 'informer' or spy.

and conditions of widespread unemployment, poverty, hardship, and disease - all of which existed previously, but appear to be escalating.

Some social conditions, like poverty, are self-evidently structural and require structural interventions and time to change them, if indeed they can be changed. But it is also true that individual subjective behaviours like apparently senseless acts of violence are related to structural conditions, although the nature of the relationship may be unclear. Similarly, all structural conditions also have dimensions of subjectivity, and all have powerful effects on the subjectivities of people, effects which intertwine and interact in particular ways with the effects of people's experiences under apartheid. One who perceived his poverty during the apartheid era as a factor of state oppression and who continues, contrary to all expectations, to experience poverty under the new regime for which he fought and voted, may, in disillusionment and to alleviate his circumstances, resort to criminal behaviour. Another's sense of entitlement arising from expectations of the redress of past injustices may reduce her willingness to earn rewards through hard work. Acts of exceptional brutality that are now part of the everyday behaviour of ordinary people reveal a devaluing of human life, a devaluing by the self of the self and of others which leads to abandonment of ethical self-governance and exercise of extreme domination over others. What is perceived to be happening is a destructive ongoing dehumanization of people and a breaking down of moral order in society, rather than a productive process of 'radical social transformation'.

The subjective response of the majority of people to these difficult and painful social conditions is a desire for 'freedom'. They seek both 'freedom from' oppressive and debilitating circumstances, and 'freedom to' build better lives for themselves and their children. They desire, under improved material and human conditions, to be able to realise their own full potential as human beings in every dimension of their lives. For some, whose ethic embraces the interdependence or even inseparability of the individual and the collective, these values are held highly for other people just as for themselves. Others seek only their own good. But overall, popular perception endows 'the government' - not 'the people' - with the power, and the responsibility, to create the freedoms

people desire. Radical transformation of society is largely abdicated to the government. This is a perpetuation of the sovereign view of power.

The provision of quality education, and access to it, is commonly seen as an important vehicle for achieving this desired 'bright future': the means of both personal development and material progress through profitable employment. To be an educated person is to have a strong chance of success in life, so the belief. This demand for education as one of the goods of society was articulated decades prior to 1994 in the Freedom Charter: "The doors of learning and culture shall be opened to all". Wolpe, too, identifies as one of three recurrent themes in the struggles against bantu education the claim that "education is deeply political and should be an agent of social transformation" (Unterhalter et al 1991a: 6). Education is seen as changing people, and as changing social circumstances. It is seen as a sine qua non for human, social, and economic development.

Just how can education as a primary and mass socialising institution facilitate development to play its role in meeting the challenges of social transformation? This question has come under close scrutiny by the new government, and the nature of both non-formal and formal education provision is being changed as a consequence. A single National Education Department and provincial departments have been established, and there has been a move to Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) within a National Qualifications Framework so as to gear educational outcomes more closely to economic needs. The proliferation of programmes along 'Education for Democracy' lines, and the introduction of 'Life Skills' in the curriculum, are two strategies aimed at addressing issues of social and political transformation.

The question of who gains access to education, and especially higher education, is also a burning one in light of apartheid's history of unequal education provision. Education Development, as has been noted, addressed this issue of access, both to higher education and within higher education, attempting to facilitate black students' access to the disciplines through addressing teaching-

learning issues. For a brief period, access specifically of poor, rural, and working class students was also a focus; all too soon, subsidy and funding cuts removed this priority from the agenda.

In summary, then: freedom is conceived by most people as deriving from the presence or absence of various political, social, and economic circumstances external to the self, conditions for which government is largely seen as responsible; and education or 'knowledge' (also to be provided by the government) is seen as an essential vehicle for the attainment of freedom. This viewpoint is understandable given the country's history of social engineering and political oppression; it is not, however, equal to the task of radical social transformation. Even within this flawed perspective, it is clear that education alone cannot bring about development, but has to work together with other institutions in a set of coherent policies and practices (Unterhalter and Wolpe1991a: 3).

Nevertheless, education does have a key role to play; a role perhaps not yet adequately analysed in terms of its function of subjectification - the production of subjects. This is a primary concern of this dissertation: an analysis of this function in a particular institution in a brief historical moment, prior to, during, and immediately after the event of political liberation.

The stakes in South Africans 'getting it right' in the post-liberation period are extremely high. Failure to realise the desired 'freedoms' of social transformation will, many fear, undermine the society's hard-won political freedom, rendering it vulnerable to right-wing forces and a new reign of oppressive government. Yet others see the seeds of both oppressive government and failure of the social transformation project already evident in many of the actions of the new dispensation, which appear to imitate features of the corrupt and authoritarian rule exercised by preceding governments. South Africa also has the eyes of the world on it: having succeeded in a peaceful resolution of its political conflict, it is now expected to show how to overcome the problems of social and economic underdevelopment. As has been demonstrated above, however, the 'present conjuncture', to use a popular phrase, is producing particular kinds of subjects, and they are not evidently the kinds of subjects who have the capacity to transform themselves and society and its institutions and conditions to more desirable states, in ethically desirable ways. Political liberation, hard fought for as it was, has produced neither social freedom, nor free subjects.

It is clear, as Foucault pointed out, that the act or process of liberation alone is insufficient to establish the practices or "practical forms" of liberty (ECS: 114): those practices necessary for people, society and individuals to "decide upon receivable and acceptable forms of their existence or political society" (ibid.). These practical forms or practices of liberty are not the abstract structures, the liberal constitutions, policies or institutions of society per se, which have by now largely been put in place in South Africa; they are the multitudinous daily enactments by, on, and through people that, taken together, constitute people as subjects, as citizens, as wives and husbands, children and parents, teachers, students, workers, professionals, and so forth; that constitute their lived relationships and daily practices of productivity and creativity, their ways of being; and that occur within (and sometimes without) those structures and institutions.

Radical social transformation is to be understood in terms of the transformation of the society through the transformation of its subjects and its institutions, through the practices of freedom. Defining the practices of freedom constitutes, for Foucault, the crucial ethical task facing us as humans. This indeed appears to be the task embedded in South Africa's transition to a democratic society: the continuous, daily, painstaking labour of defining the practices of freedom; a process which entails people, individually and collectively, reshaping their subjectivities and relations of power with themselves and each other, constructing new selves and a new society.

But besides generating this task, it is also the case that liberation, which may have produced more favourable conditions for creating these practices of freedom (cf. ECS:1 14), "opens up new relationships of power, which have to be controlled by practices of liberty" (ECS: 115). These new relationships of power may appear to be exactly what was struggled for; yet they may be even more dangerous to 'acceptable forms of existence' than was the previous state of domination. The ethical challenge is thus for all South Africans to develop the practices of freedom from a history of limited, almost non-existent, experience of such practices - to construct themselves as freedom-practising, self-caring people; and to use those practices to control the new relationships of power opened up by political liberation such that ethical governing of self and of others may be maximised, and domination minimised.

It is necessary to examine more closely education's function of subjectification in meeting this challenge, starting with the apartheid state's use of education for purposes of control, as already mentioned. Educational supporters of apartheid generated Fundamental Pedagogics (FP) as the 'truth' about education, and they and the government justified both Christian National Education and Bantu Education through Fundamental Pedagogics. The government attempted to control school-level education through an inequitably-resourced racially segregated system which led to a bizarre proliferation of bureaucracy in the form of nincteen separate education departments. By this means it sought to make of black and white South Africans, of different ethnic groupings even, particular kinds of subjects with particular subjectivities. This had implications for society as a whole, but also particularly for Higher Education institutions when school-leavers enrolled as their students. There were at least two groups of distinctly differently-equipped academic subjects requiring to be taught and transformed into 'graduates'. In addition to cultural differences, they also came with very differing subjectivities, as already described. All had to be 'normalised' according to the same standards, according to the 'rules of the game' of academia.

The Nationalists, however, attempted to control not only school level education, but also tertiary education. In 1960 they prohibited, under the ironically-named Extension of University Education Act, any new registration of Africans at the so-called 'open' universities in virtually any courses; for access to a higher education founded on liberal principles would have equipped people with the critical intellectual tools to contest the political ideology of apartheid and the knowledge used to legitimate this ideology - such as the theories of eugenics and certain perspectives in psychology³. It would also have given them aspirations above the status designated for them. Instead, Africans could only enrol at UNISA, the University of South Africa, a correspondence university (and the institutional origin of the educational 'science' of Fundamental Pedagogics in South Africa, which was used to give theoretical credibility to Bantu Education), or at a Bantu university college.

³ Dr HF Verwoerd, Minister of Education in 1953 and subsequently Prime Minister, was a psychologist by training.

The effects of this and subsequent government interventions in Higher Education under apartheid rule, and the actions of authorities and students in the universities, contributed in various ways to constituting each of the institutions as a unique context in many different respects - in terms of history, the demographics of staff and of students, educational and political ideologies, curriculum characteristics, physical design, resourcing, institutional ethos, and so forth. The subjectivities of staff and students of these institutions were thus further shaped by the particularities of institutional context, and by the deeply fragmented nature of the HE sector. These issues all have a bearing on the question of how educational institutions which are required to produce ethical, freedom-practising subjects for the transforming of society can themselves be transformed so as to fulfil this task, and what the challenge of producing those ethical subjects - 'graduates for reconstruction and development,' the future citizens, governors, and leaders of the society - entails.

One of the key challenges each institution, Natal University not least, faces is that of defining and creating internal 'practices of freedom', or at least the conditions within which such practices on the part of students and staff can flourish, while simultaneously creating itself as an institutional 'subject' which engages in the 'ethic of care for the (institutional) self as a practice of freedom' in the context of the contradictory pressures, the volatile network of power relations in which it is caught up.

In addition, the context of South African society, which surrounds but also translates into its institutions, is one of interaction and collision between many different cultures with different histories, values (including the value ascribed to freedom), and 'rules of conduct', different understandings of the self and even of the relative importance or value of self and a notion of self. The established 'truths' and 'games of truth' of these cultures differ; what is 'truth' for one, or the means of attaining it, may be falsehood, distortion, or irrelevancy for another. Constructing the governmentality of the society (and of an institution) can thus only occur through ongoing processes of negotiation between different 'games of truth' in the network of power relations, on

all levels, from the level of individual interaction through to institutionalised social structures to which all individuals are subjected, from the local and particular to the national and general.

Some 'games of truth', however, have established near-hegemonic domination over others - for instance, the western scientific mode of knowledge over indigenous African knowledges - as have the 'truths' of those games over the truths of other games - thus, for example, in the academy as in the workplace, the capitalist notion of efficiency epitomised in the adage that 'time is money' holds sway over a very different African cultural perspective on time and the investment of human energy. Consequently, the processes of negotiation do not in the first instance take place from a basis of equality or even minimal domination. This in itself constitutes a major challenge to the development of ethical modes of governance, and subjects capable of exercising such ethical governance.

At the same time our society is located within a rapidly-changing world where globalising forces are increasingly prevailing in the spheres of particularly the economy and technology - especially information technology - drawing other dimensions of the social order into a global dynamic as well. In this situation there are universalising elements at work in and on the context within which more or less localised resolutions to local problems are being sought, with consequent tensions between local and globalising demands. There may also be synergies between global and local issues, but tensions pertain to the validity of particular strategies for particular contexts.

It is in this web of immensely complex, dynamic, colliding internal and external matrices of power relations that the university has the task of producing ethical 'academic subjects' whose task in turn is the ongoing transformation of the institution itself, and the wider society. The next chapter examines the nature of this institution called a 'university' and some of the tools it has at its disposal for this task, from a Foucaultian perspective, as well as identifying some of the historical continuities of the university in South Africa.

Chapter Two

The university and disciplinary power

"At the heart of all disciplinary systems functions a small penal mechanism" (DP: 177).

"... in its function, the power to punish is not essentially different from that of curing or educating" (DP: 303).

"Is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons?" (DP: 228 - 229).

The first part of this chapter looks more closely at the university as an institution against the historical background to normalizing power that Foucault provided in his history of the prison (DP: 308), showing in greater detail the application of his theoretical framework to the university. The second part examines certain continuities in the exercise of power in the history of the university in South Africa, as backdrop to the period under study. The chapter concludes with an overview of the structure of events in the 1980s and 1990s.

1. An analytical framework: the university viewed from the history of prison bars

Conventional historians might be forgiven for asking what relevance a study of the history of the prison, a punitive institution which locks society's reprobates behind bars, has for a study of the history of the university, where dedicated, academically meritorious souls are rewarded with knowledge and its concomitant possibilities of access to social and economic success. Yet a genealogical history reveals a fundamental commonality between the two institutions as embodiments and instruments of western 'civilisation'. The prison (unlike savage torture and execution, the punishment enacted by sovereign or pre-modern power) is "the penalty of civilized societies" (Rossi 1829, cited in DP: 232); the university, the epitome of the characteristic and reward of civilised societies: accumulated knowledge. The same element defines their 'civilisedness': both rely fundamentally on the workings of disciplinary power - at the heart of which functions "a small penal mechanism" (DP: 177) - for their operations.

And what better description for the university's role of producing graduates than that which Michel Foucault gives to the role of the prison: viz. as an "exhaustive disciplinary apparatus" for transforming individuals (DP: 235). The mode of action by which the prison fulfils this role, says Foucault, is "the constraint of a total education: ... 'this education, which, in short, takes

possession of a man as a whole, of all the physical and moral faculties that are in him and of the time in which he is himself [Lucas II 123-124]" (DP: 236. my emphasis). And this education, this art of punishment "that is still more or less our own," (DP: 296) that we enact undiscriminatingly through the prison and the university, is the art of exercising the "power of normalization" (DP: 308); a power which makes possible "the fabrication of the disciplinary individual" (ibid.). The disciplinary individual is the 'normal subject' produced in and by civilised, modern, western societies.

In Discipline and Punish, Foucault's text on the prison, he provided an historical background for studies of "the power of normalization and the formation of knowledge in modern society" (DP: 308). This examination of the university is one such study. Foucault's text demonstrates, through an analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge which emerged in the creation of the prison, the productive effects of this relationship. Primary among these is the modern subject.

The techniques of power and knowledge born with the prison have been distributed widely throughout the institutions of modern society, primarily through the workings of the human sciences. This network of institutions Foucault terms the "carceral network" (DP: 298, 305). Education is an integral part of the 'carceral network': one of society's chief instruments for wielding the power of normalizing individuals, that is, it is one of the primary modes whereby individuals are socialised, or, 'the modern subject' is produced. Education is also a vehicle for the normalization, or legitimisation, of knowledge and the ways of making knowledge public and widespread. The university is a specific component of the educational system. Its primary functions are to produce particular modern subjects - 'graduates' who will play a leadership role in society - and to produce and distribute the knowledge valued by society. Discipline and Punish would thus provide an analytical perspective (or a 'lens,' to use a more Foucaultian term) through which to understand the institution(s) of education in our society today. Like the prison, the history of the university proves to be one in which "the exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power" (Foucault 1980: 52).

Foucault's aim in writing the history of the prison in *Discipline and Punish* was, simply put, to examine how changing approaches to punishment over time, from the infliction of extreme physical cruelty to more 'humane' methods, were implicated in the emergence of a scientific approach to studying people. In his own words, he wanted 'to study the metamorphosis of punitive methods on the basis of a political technology of the body in which might be read a

common history of power relations and object relations" (DP: 24) so that, through an analysis of penal leniency as a technique of power, he could provide an understanding of both "how man, the soul, the normal or abnormal individual have come to duplicate crime as objects of penal intervention; and in what way a specific mode of subjection was able to give birth to man as an object of knowledge for a discourse with 'scientific' status" (DP: 24). What Foucault means here is that, where previously interventions in the form of punishment were defined in relation to acts of crime, the interventions have now come to be aimed at the people who commit, or are expected to commit, crimes; and the interventions now define the people, rather than being defined by the crime.

The historical change Foucault observed in society's approach to penality was from severe forms of punishment involving spectacular public torture and execution processes in the era of kings - sovereigns, to a more lenient system of imprisonment that still prevails today, in which punishment is aimed not at inflicting extremes of bodily pain but at transforming the 'soul' through depriving a person of his/her liberty and exercising various forms of discipline over him/her. At the heart of this change in the penal system, which took place over two centuries from the mid-eighteenth century onwards, was surveillance of the individual so as to structure his/her actions.

Foucault juxtaposes a horrific public execution with a prison timetable (only eighty years apart) to embody the changes (DP: 3, 6). The timetable as a surveillance device for structuring the actions of people is, of course, as much at the heart of university education as it is of prison management and the 'rehabilitation' of prisoners - prisoners who would previously have been mutilated or drawn and quartered.

Other historians have construed these changes in the penal system in ideological terms, seeing them essentially as a progressive, quantitative rationalisation and 'humanization' of the system; a reduction of the enactment of arbitrary, oppressive power over people. Foucault, by contrast, analyses penal leniency in terms of an increase in what he terms "a new modality of power" (DP: 305): not the power of the sovereign, but modern, disciplinary power. He demonstrates how, through the employment of specific 'techniques of power' the prison, and an increasingly 'carceral' society construct individuals as 'disciplinary individuals.' The disciplinary individual is the individual constructed by, and subjecting him/herself to construction by, 'the disciplines,' primarily the disciplines of the human sciences. This disciplinary individual is the modern subject.

The discourses of the recent history of the university also reflect the ideological theme of 'humanization' in subtle as well as overt ways. The efforts to redress racial and gender imbalances through 'affirmative action' so as to offer 'equal opportunity'; calls for the 'democratisation' of university decision-making structures and procedures, and for 'transparency' in governance; the discourses of Education Development, about 'empowering' 'disadvantaged' students; the provision of professional psychological counseling services incorporating both western and traditional African approaches - these could readily be construed as indications of the university's politically and educationally progressive stance, of an organization 'humanizing' itself. What needs to be traced, however, is how these discourses mask the increasing and intensified deployment of ever-more specific techniques of power to construct both staff and students as 'disciplinary individuals' more efficiently than ever before.

This power of the disciplines is an increasingly wide-ranging "normalizing power" (DP: 308), that is, it defines what is 'normal' and 'abnormal' in society, and tolerates only the normal. It is "a certain policy of the body, a certain way of rendering the group of men docile and useful" (DP: 305) - what in social science discourse might be termed 'socialization'. It is the same modality of power which has produced and been produced by the human sciences: psychology, psychiatry, educational psychology, sociology, anthropology, criminology; and it is the same modality of power that operates in the education system.

This 'policy of the body', the emergence of which Foucault traced in the history of the prison, entailed new procedures of individualization through 'the involvement of definite relations of knowledge in relations of power...(and) a technique of overlapping subjection and objectification' (DP: 305). The individual subject, or 'knowable man', whom Foucault also calls "soul, individuality, consciousness, conduct," (ibid.) is the "object-effect" of these procedures of surveillance, of domination-observation. In the university, especially during the past twenty years in the institution studied here, an intensification of just such procedures has increasingly rendered both students and staff 'knowable man' - 'learning man' and 'teaching man' respectively. This has occurred primarily through the work of Education Development.

Foucault delineated four rules for his study of the prison (DP: 23-24), which have relevance for the study of education and of a university. Firstly, he regarded punishment as a "complex social function" (DP: 23), and, instead of concentrating only on the repressive effects of penality, he chose to see its possible positive effects. Education, too, is a 'complex social function'. The

conventional perception of education is that it is a highly desirable social good which enables people to succeed in life. Yet there is a mechanism of penality at the heart of education. Close examination of its complexity as a social function, and both its repressive and positive effects (and what is meant by positive effects), subverts much conventional wisdom about education.

Secondly, Foucault regarded punishment as a "political tactic" (DP: 23), seeing punitive methods as specific techniques in the general field of ways of exercising power. In this study, education is regarded as a political tactic and education, educative methods, and acts of governance in the institution are analysed as specific techniques for exercising power. Education is profoundly political, the university a political institution. Power is at the heart of the education process and of institutional processes. This study examines how power operates: the 'educational politics' or tactics of power in the institution.

Thirdly, Foucault looked for what is common in the histories of penality and the human sciences, examining whether they stem from a single process. The process he identified is one in which "... the technology of power [is] the very principle both of the humanization of the penal system and of the knowledge of man" (DP: 23). The commonality in the histories of education and the human sciences is revealed at a micro-level and on a small scale, in the institution under scrutiny, through observing the intertwinement of practices of the human sciences in the institution's education processes. Changes in the institution, in 'humanizing' it, are seen to employ 'the technology of power' of the human science disciplines. This is revealed in a number of aspects, perhaps most clearly in the process of Education Development which is examined in some detail in Chapter Four.

Fourthly, Foucault enquires whether this process of 'humanization', which he describes as "the entry of the soul onto the scene of penal justice" (DP: 24) and which is concomitant with the infusion of scientific knowledge into legal practice, is "the effect of a transformation of the way in which the body is itself invested by power relations" (ibid.). In examining the changes in the university, especially in Education Development processes but also in other spheres, and observing how these go hand in hand with infusing increasing scientific knowledge into educational practices, the way in which power relations are invested in the body - whether of the lecturer, administrator, or student - is seen to be shifting.

Adopting these four 'rules' for his study - regarding punishment as a complex social function, as a political tactic, as historically convergent with the emergence of the human sciences, and as changing through the changing investment of power relations in the body - can be summarised as analysing penal leniency as a technique of power. By doing so, Foucault claimed, "one might understand both how man, the soul, the normal or abnormal individual have come to duplicate crime as objects of penal intervention; and in what way a specific mode of subjection was able to give birth to man as an object of knowledge for a discourse with 'scientific' status' (DP: 24).

What Foucault means by 'man coming to duplicate crime as an object of intervention' is that. where penal intervention in the pre-modern era targeted acts of crime for intervention to try to prevent further acts of crime from being committed, in the modern prison it is the individual who committed the crime and has been labelled the criminal, who becomes the target of intervention. Even individuals who may potentially commit some unspecified crime at some unknown future date, become targets for intervention. Power must be exercised in relation to the individual, who must thereby be transformed to a more 'disciplined' person. The exercise of that power entails constructing scientifically credible knowledge about the individual and then applying it in acts of intervention aimed at transforming him. This, too, is observable in the university where staff and students alike have become objects of more intensive educational intervention than has been the case in the past. Students, specifically, have become objects of knowledge for a discourse which has been striving to gain the credibility of 'scientific' status, the discourse of Education (or Academic) Development. This discourse has spiralled upwards in the institutional hierarchy to embrace staff as well, through processes of 'professional development'.

The university may thus be seen as a social institution embodying the operation of power-knowledge, and as such provides a fruitful site for the analysis of the techniques of power. However, Foucault observes that

..the university hierarchy is only the most visible, the most sclerotic and least dangerous form of this (power-knowledge) phenomenon. One has to be really naive to imagine that the effects of power linked to knowledge have their culmination in university hierarchies. Diffused, entrenched and dangerous, they operate in other places than in the person of the old professor" (Foucault 1980: 52).

This view of the relative harmlessness of the university's hierarchies notwithstanding, the university may well be the social institution in which the operations and effects of power-knowledge are most taken for granted, perhaps because of their very visibility; and hence become the more dangerous as they are ignored. For, if they are dangerous, they are surely dangerous in the university, where future leaders are being prepared, just as elsewhere. Foucault himself, in a radio debate with Noam Chomsky, said: "It seems to me that the real political task in a society such as ours is to criticize the working of institutions which appear to be both neutral and independent; to criticize them in such a manner that the political violence which has always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight them" (Foucault 1974: 171).

'The old professor' of the hierarchy is today not only a 'place' in and through which power-knowledge operates, he or she is also more intensely subjected to these workings than in any previous era; as are his/her students, who are the prospective political, civic, business, and professional leaders of the society. Furthermore, the complex and problematic relationship between education and social inequality renders all the more important the need to scrutinise people's subjection (the most extensively at university level) to an education system geared increasingly to the 'norm' of global capitalism. For these reasons, and because of the tensions between the values placed by the society on university education as a means both to individual social mobility and to finding solutions to social inequality, particularly in the context of a newly-established democracy, the workings of disciplinary power in the university require close analysis.

Foucault's first chapter in *Discipline and Punish*, 'The Body of the Condemned.' effectively poses the question, what is penality? It is *not*, according to Foucault, a means of reducing crime; hence leniency and severity of penality need a basis of explanation other than redress, prevention, or elimination. Nor can it be accounted for by the juridical structure of society alone, or by its fundamental ethical choices: an ideological explanation for the nature of penal justice is inadequate. Penality is a social phenomenon, with concrete systems of punishment to be studied, which is interlinked with other elements in a wider field of operation. Punitive measures are linked with "a whole series of positive and useful effects which it is their task to support" (DP: 24); punishment doesn't operate to punish offences, rather offences are defined and prosecuted in order to maintain punitive mechanisms and their functions and effects.

Similarly, education, though most frequently accounted for in ideological terms, is a social phenomenon with concrete systems which can be studied, and which interconnect with other systems in society. Educative measures support a largely unperceived range of 'positive and useful effects'; contrary to popular belief, they do not operate primarily to promote individual learning and knowledge (although this may be one of their effects), but rather, learning and education are defined and promoted in order to maintain educative mechanisms and their functions and effects which are something other than 'learning' as the accumulation of personal knowledge.

The material element in the concrete systems of punishment is always the body. Foucault cites Rusche and Kirchheimer who relate the different systems of punishment with the systems of production within which they operate. In this 'political economy of the body', whatever the nature and severity or otherwise of punishment, it is "always the body that is at issue - the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission" (DP: 25). Transposing this to education, we see that here it is also 'the body and its forces' - understood in terms which include 'mind,' 'intellect' - 'their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission,' which is at issue. Education is an attempt to transform a person and her behaviours, primarily through 'cultivating the intellect' but also through various forms of social training. What we term 'mind,' 'intellect,' 'personality,' and 'habits' or 'ways of being and thinking' would form part of what Foucault terms 'soul'. Understanding man, the modern subject, includes understanding soul, for soul, so far from being a mysterious metaphysical dimension of being, is one of the primary effects elicited by the exercise of power on the body. Hence Foucault variously describes soul as not "the reactivated remnants of an ideology" (DP: 29) nor "an illusion or an ideological effect" (ibid.), but rather "the present correlative of a certain technology of power over the body" (ibid.). Soul is not in itself physical, it is "non-corporal," but it nevertheless

exists, it has a reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished - and, in a more general way, on those one supervises. rains and corrects, over madmen, children at home and at school, the colonized, over those who are stuck at a machine and supervised for the rest of their lives (DP: 29 my emphasis).

This is what Foucault sees as the historical reality of the soul. The soul is "born...out of methods of punishment, supervision and constraint" (DP: 29). This soul, to reiterate, is not a substance, but the medium through which the productive interplay of power-knowledge is possible: "the element in which are articulated the effects of a certain type of knowledge, the machinery by

which the power relations give rise to a possible corpus of knowledge, and knowledge extends and reinforces the effects of this power" (DP: 29). The soul is often seen as that part of the being of a person which is capable of really recognising and knowing truth, distinguishing truth and 'things eternal' from falsehood and ephemeral matters. Foucault refers to the soul of modern man as a "reality-reference" on which "various concepts have been constructed and domains of analysis carved out: psyche, subjectivity, personality, consciousness, etc; on it have been built scientific techniques and discourses, and the moral claims of humanism" (DP: 29-30).

Before the historical emergence of the discipline of psychology, the self-understanding and culture of western people was quite different: concepts such as psyche and consciousness, for instance, were neither part of the corpus of knowledge people held of themselves, nor were people able to act on themselves or on each other in ways which were based on and employed such concepts. Now psychology and its concepts are widely used in education, by principals, teachers, researchers, curriculum designers, cognitive psychologists, counsellors, and so on, to manipulate "the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission" (DP: 25).

But this understanding of 'soul' in the modern era is not merely a shift from a metaphysical view of existence to a materialist one: it is a new understanding of how the human being comes to be a human being; of how even the soul is a construction. For it is not that "a real man, the object of knowledge, philosophical reflection or technical intervention, has been substituted for the soul, the illusion of the theologians" (DP: 30); rather,

The man described for us, whom we are invited to free, is already in himself the effect of a subjection much more profound than himself. A 'soul' inhabits him and brings him to existence, which is itself a factor in the mastery that power exercises over the body. The soul is the effect and instrument of a political anatomy; the soul is the prison of the body (ibid.).

What this means is that the exercise of power on the body creates man's 'soul', and the very action of this soul, this thinking, acting being, becomes part of the process of the ongoing construction of the body-soul: an endless cycle of creating, defining, determining, the human subject based on prior definitions and determinations. In writing the history of penality as a history of the 'micro-physics' of the punitive power, Foucault is thus doing no less than writing a history,

or genealogy, of the modern 'soul' (DP: 29); analysing how the treatment of the human body in the interaction between power and knowledge has come to construct the modern soul.

This body-soul is "directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs" (DP: 25) - as accurate a description of what education does to people as one could wish. Power relations are integral to numerous relations in the university, nowhere so much as in the lecturer-student interaction, the teaching-learning situation. The lecturer 'has' knowledge in her field which she imparts to the student who 'lacks' that knowledge; the lecturer assesses whether the student has 'acquired' the knowledge, and decides whether the student may be accredited and progress to a next level of knowledge acquisition, or whether validation should be withheld. The student is required to perform certain tasks - participate in lectures, tutorials, and practicals, seek information, read it, make notes, repeat various exercises, etc, in order to acquire knowledge and gain proficiency in certain skills; and must then emit the signs (written assignments, essays, examination answers) that prove acquisition and proficiency. Similarly the lecturer has to perform tasks, preparing and delivering lectures, supervising and reading students' work, writing comments on it, attaching numerical value to it, filling in examination lists, and so forth. Students make demands on lecturers; withhold co-operation, responses and validation: the power flow is two-way. Both are caught up in certain ritual ceremonies ranging from the lecture itself to the graduation ceremony. Both, as 'educated people', are ultimately marked in their speech, gestures, habits of thought and argument, modes of control - of self, of information, of others; valuing of knowledge; and so forth, in ways which differ from the markings of people who have not been subjected to the political economy of tertiary education.

The purpose of this subjugation of the body-soul is productivity: "This political investment of the body is bound up, in accordance with complex reciprocal relations, with its economic use; it is largely as a force of production that the body is invested with relations of power and domination" (DP: 25-26); and, in the case of university education, the body is treated as a force of production of 'knowledge' in the first instance. However,

its constitution as labour power is possible only if it is caught up in a system of subjection (in which need is also a political instrument meticulously prepared, calculated and used); the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body" (DP: 26).

This means that the body, to achieve anything useful to itself, to society, cannot simply be permitted to produce uncontrolled, randomly directed energy, or knowledge at its own behest and of its own choosing: its energies need to be constrained and channeled. The *needs* of that body are a primary instrument for channeling its forces. In tracing the history of education, we can see the emergence of a universal 'need' that has been created for education, which is seen as the primary means to meet the material, social, and intellectual needs of individuals and societies. So compelling is this universal need that in most countries education is now rendered compulsory by state legislation, while the popular notion in South Africa is that the individual can only have a 'bright future' through education: the more education, potentially the brighter that future will be, so the belief.

Various means can be used to achieve the subjection of the body-soul: it is "not only obtained by the instruments of violence or ideology" (DP: 26), although the instruments of ideology are also used in education; it can also be

direct, physical pitting force against force, bearing on material elements, and yet without involving violence; it may be calculated, organized, technically thought out; it may be subtle, make use of neither weapons nor of terror and yet remain of a physical order. That is to say, there may be a 'knowledge' of the body that is not exactly the science of its functioning, and a mastery of its forces that is more than the ability to conquer them: this knowledge and this mastery constitute what might be called the political technology of the body (DP: 26).

This is power-knowledge, or disciplinary power: effectively the knowledge of how people are malleable and manipulable as human beings; be the disciplinary techniques psychological, affective, or involving direct contact with the body, they 'remain of a physical order'. Implicitly, the 'subjection' is achieved, whether over a short or a long span of human history, whether individually or collectively, through the interactions of people as they seek to influence and thereby attain some degree of control over others; or even through the self exercising power on the self, to attain knowledge and mastery of the self.

'Discipline,' then, may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus: "it is a type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets; it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology" (DP: 215). As such it may be taken over by specialized institutions (eg penitentiaries) and institutions using it as an essential instrument for a particular end, like schools or universities.

They are able to make use of various of the techniques which constitute this 'political technology of the body', for, its origin in the penal system notwithstanding, discipline is not a unitary coherent technology confined to any single domain in society but one which spreads everywhere, haphazardly: "It cannot be localized in a particular type of institution or state apparatus. For they have recourse to it; they use, select or impose certain of its methods" (DP: 26). It is "diffuse, rarely formulated in continuous, systematic discourse; it is often made up of bits and pieces; it implements a disparate set of tools or methods" (ibid.). Despite the fragmentary nature of the technology and its functioning at the level of the individual, its results or effects are uniform, coherent and on a different level and scale altogether: through knowledge and mastery of the body, the construction of the human subject. Foucault puts it thus: "What the apparatuses and institutions operate is, in a sense, a micro-physics of power, whose field of validity is situated in a sense between these great functionings and the bodies themselves with their materiality and their forces" (ibid.).

Power, in the terms Foucault understood it, is not a property (which can be owned) but a strategy (DP: 26); its effects of domination arise from "dispositions, manoeuvres, tactics, techniques, functionings" (ibid.). In it we should "decipher... a network of relations, constantly in tension, in activity, rather than a privilege that one might possess" (ibid.). The model Foucault employed is that of a continual battle, not a contract. Power is exercised not possessed; it is not a privilege of the dominant class "but the overall effect of its strategic positions - an effect that is manifested and sometimes extended by the position of those who are dominated" (DP: 26-27, my emphasis). The way power is exercised is not as an obligation or a prohibition on the 'powerless', for since individuals or groups cannot possess power, neither can they be deprived of it - they cannot be power-less. Instead, the exercise of power "invests them, is transmitted by them and through them; it exerts pressure upon them, just as they themselves, in their struggle against it, resist the grip it has on them" (DP: 27). Thus power relations are not confined to relations between particular groupings/bodies, eg. State-citizens, upper classes-working classes, lecturers-students, administrators-students, but permeate all social relations in reciprocal and multi-directional fashion; nor do they "merely reproduce ... the general form of the law or government...", but "go right down into the depths of society," and operate according to "a specificity of mechanism and modality" (DP: 27).

Foucault's notion of the workings of power is infinitely more fluid and hence more exciting for both lovers of freedom and historians than is the repressive model of power as domination. Power relations, in his view, "define innumerable points of confrontation, focuses of instability, each of which has its own risks of conflict, of struggles, and of an at least temporary inversion of the power relations" (DP: 27). This has implications for one's understanding of freedom: freedom is not merely a political or personal state of being or set of circumstances attained through victory over a dominant power, and then permanently inhabited or retained until forcibly removed by a new dominant power. The overthrow of the 'micro-powers' does not obey the law of 'all or nothing', is not "acquired once and for all by a new functioning or a destruction of the institutions" (DP: 27); furthermore, none of its 'localized episodes' (such as the episodes described in this study) "may be inscribed in history except by the effects that it induces on the entire network in which it is caught up" (ibid..); that is, its systemic effects. The challenge, thus, is not just to discern confrontations and temporary inversions but also the systemic effects of the workings of power in the university's history.

The other central concept in Foucault's analytic, integral to power, is knowledge. Foucault rejects the idea that power is inimical to knowledge, an oppositional force which suppresses individuals' acquisition of knowledge and truth, and the growth of knowledge in general; that "knowledge can exist only where the power relations are suspended and that knowledge can develop only outside its injunctions, its demands and its interests" (DP: 27) His proposition is the opposite, viz.

that power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful): that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations (DP: 27).

This view of knowledge extricates it from the subjective truth-seeking and knowledge-producing activities of the individual, instead seeing both the individual and knowledge as outcomes of a larger process:

These 'power-knowledge relations' are to be analysed, therefore, not on the basis of a subject of knowledge who is or is not free in relation to the power system, but, on the contrary, the subject who knows, the objects to be known and the modalities of knowledge must be regarded as so many effects of these fundamental implications of power-knowledge and their historical transformations. In short, it is not the activity of the subject of knowledge that produces a corpus of knowledge, useful or resistant to power, but power-knowledge, the processes and struggles that traverse it and of which it is made up, that determines the forms and possible domains of knowledge (DP: 27-28).

Adopting this view of power and knowledge in examining the history of the university will produce a story of different events being determined at a different level (and, sometimes, the same events but construed on a different level) than those written about by historians and/or political activists from a critical theory perspective; who, seeing power as the possession of successive apartheid governments and conservative university administrations, were, in their resistance and challenges to the oppression and domination imposed through the implementation of apartheid education,

(h)eartened by the knowledge

that history can be willed

where there is focused purpose and dogged pursuit;

who often "dearly...paid" for their pursuit of political victory over the apartheid dispensation; and whose hope was that their struggles, whether on the academic or activist front, would

...elevate the future

beyond tyranny and apartheid's scourge. (Nkomo 1990: iii)

The accounts of such critical theorists focused directly on the struggle for political liberation, at a level exemplified in the following extract:

The long odyssey of black subjugation to white domination continues albeit with greater resistance against a fracturing but no less determined repressive state apparatus. In the 1980s these two antagonistic forces have reached a sharp point of confrontation represented by a resolute force of white dominance on the one hand, and the indefatigable force of black resistance on the other. One is over-equipped with deadly armory, the other with a fierce determination to quench its thirst for the perquisites of fundamental human rights in the land of their birth (Nkomo 1990: 4)

This account is not at the level of the willed political battle that occurred over education, i.e. at the level of the 'subjects who know', the people conventionally taken to be players struggling over the power to control the nature, purpose, direction, governance and so forth of education and its institutions - people such as the students, university lecturers and administrators, government ministers, etc. of successive eras, although it will include that story. Rather it is an account of how power penetrated events and people, within, beyond, and despite the overall state of domination that pertained in society. Instead of viewing the players primarily as agents in an ideologically- or even academically- or financially-based struggle, whose purposes, actions, and strategies determined the outcome of the struggle, they are viewed instead as effects or products of an impersonal process of struggle on an altogether different level: a level which rendered them

not just agents but also 'objects to be known': the level of the anatomy of power. At that level, history is not 'willed' through 'focused purpose and dogged pursuit': agency does not control destiny, whatever its contribution may be to loosening the congealment of power relations in a state of domination. So too, the system, its institutions and the modalities of knowledge implemented by, in, and around the institutions are regarded, not as the fruits of purposeful human endeavour, but as "so many effects of these fundamental implications of power-knowledge and their historical transformations" (DP: 28).

This, then, is an account of the "political 'anatomy" (DP: 28) of university education. It is concerned with "the 'body politic,'" (ibid.) which is not a group of people but "a set of material elements and techniques that serve as weapons, relays, communication routes and supports for the power and knowledge relations that invest human bodies and subjugate them by turning them into objects of knowledge" (ibid.). First it examines these material elements and techniques generally, in the period up to the '80s; then it considers how these things are manifested at Natal University, specifically the Pietermaritzburg campus as a local site of the 'body politic'. In investigating the subjugation of the human body, it takes into account the injunction that "We should analyse what might be called ... 'the least body of the condemned man'" (DP: 29): the students who are not selected to study, or who fail, or are academically excluded from the institution; the AD staff who lack the academic qualifications which confer credibility in the institution; the lecturers who despite high-level academic qualifications. are condemned to obtain training in tertiary education practice; the whole elaborate set of rituals and the discourse aimed at coding "the 'lack of power' with which those subjected to punishment are marked" (ibid.).

This 'micro-physics' of (educative) power includes the workings of disciplinary power in the genealogy, not just of the subject's soul (whether student or staff) but also of the *university's* 'soul', for subjection has occurred not only in terms of people but also of the institution itself.

The aforegoing discussion has highlighted the centrality of power in education as an institution, touching on the university as a particular educational institution. Moving from this level of generality to consider the history of the university in South Africa, it can be shown, also in very general terms, that there are parallels between the history of the penal system in terms of the 18thC reforms which led to the emergence of the prison as "the penalty of civilised societies" (DP: 232), and various developments in the university's history, particularly the reforms which have taken place over the last two decades.

What follows is a necessarily cursory and selective review and analysis of pertinent developments in the university and broader education system up until the 1980's, to provide the background for a more in-depth study of events in and surrounding the University of Natal, during the most recent period. This is in keeping with Foucault's insistence on the necessity of studying the operations of power and knowledge in particular, localised sites rather than in generalities.

2. University education up to the 1980's

Subjection has to do with limits and possibilities; with issues of control and autonomy. Control and autonomy, along with the standards and quality of education and finance are dominant themes in the recent period of change under scrutiny, the 1980's and 1990's, but they reach back to the university's earliest beginnings in South Africa. They can be found, in relation to both people and institutions, even in the foundational raison d'etre of university education in the country, which could be said to be, not teaching or research, but the small, apparently insignificant apparatus of the examination; a key technique of disciplinary power. In 1873, one year after the Cape was granted 'Responsible Government', the University Incorporation Act established the first university in the country, the University of the Cape of Good Hope. It was purely an examining university (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 230).

The material significance of this beginning to the history of South African universities lies in the nature and the centrality of the examination in the power-knowledge relationship; for, "in this slender technique are to be found a whole domain of knowledge, a whole type of power" (DP: 185). Indeed, it is a technique whose history, "a history more general, more indefinite, but more determinate as well" (ibid.), begs to be written. Foucault says of the examination that it "combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to *qualify*, to *classify* and to *punish*" (DP: 184): and that its highly ritualized mechanisms, which combine coercion and scientificity - "the ceremony of power and the form of the experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth", - establish over individuals "a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them" (ibid). The examination "manifests the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectification of those who are subjected. The superimposition of the power relations and knowledge relations assumes in the examination all its visible brilliance" (DP: 185).

The first university of the country thus had vested in it the power, not to teach, but to wield the technique lying at the heart of procedures of discipline in order to differentiate and judge, to

qualify, classify and punish the subjects who were being taught at colleges. In so doing, it was also, but only indirectly, differentiating and judging the institutions themselves, placing the starop of approval or otherwise on the quality of teaching of 'the old professors' of those institutions.

More than 120 years later, in what can be seen as a continuity from this beginning, the 'superimposition of ...power relations and knowledge relations' is being brought to bear directly, not only on students, but on teachers and on institutions themselves. Universities as institutional 'subjects' have begun to be subjected to close examination - indeed, to the most intense process of objectification in their history so far, that of having their quality judged directly. And yet, not quite directly. Rather, they are being judged on their demonstrated capacity to judge their own quality themselves.

This is done by means of two mechanisms. Firstly, universities are required to submit to an observing hierarchy and render themselves and the teaching they do visible for scrutiny and control by registering the qualifications they offer with the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA). Secondly, they are required to subject themselves, their administration, teaching, research, and services to the normalizing judgement of the examination through a process of Quality Audit. A Quality Audit requires of them to demonstrate the effectiveness and efficacy of their *own* system of self-examination: their own mechanisms of scrutiny whereby they assure themselves (and hence interested others) of the quality of what they are doing. These mechanisms of self-scrutiny are termed 'Quality Assurance' systems. A Quality Audit is externally imposed, an exercise of "the ceremony of power and the form of the experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth" (DP: 184) vis a vis the internally-imposed exercise of the same in a particular institution. Institutional self-scrutiny of this nature of necessity means the scrutiny, not just of the students studying in the institution, but also of the staff teaching and administering in them.

To return to the beginnings of this continuity, in 1918, by the end of its 45 years of existence, the University of the Cape of Good Hope had 'qualified' 17,416 candidates out of 30,506 in its matriculation examination, and 2,273 out of 3,417 students in its degree examinations (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 233); the balance of these numbers, some 43% and 33% respectively, it had 'punished' through failing them. While this was assessed some fifty-odd years later, in 1971, as a "fine achievement" (on the part of the university, not the colleges) (ibid.), results of this order in other institutions would in subsequent years be seen as cause for concern, especially when they

emerged in relation to black students enrolled in previously all-white institutions - even if the results of white students in the past had been no better.

This reflects another theme in the history of disciplinary power, namely the production of 'delinquency' - in the case of the university the delinquents are those who fail or 'drop out', or even those who do not meet standard entrance requirements - i.e. all those who are insufficiently subjected. Foucault's history of the prison reveals how, as soon as penality took the form of surveillance, the prison "began to secrete its own raw material, namely delinquence" (Foucault 1980: 39). From the beginning, the intention of the prison was "to be an instrument, comparable with - and no less perfect than - the school, the barracks, or the hospital, acting with precision upon its individual subjects" (Foucault 1980: 40). Failure to achieve this aim, however, was immediate, and realised immediately: by 1820 it was already understood that "the prisons, far from transforming criminals into honest citizens, serve only to manufacture new criminals and to drive existing criminals even deeper into criminality" (ibid.). And it was then that "there took place, as always in the mechanics of power, a strategic utilisation of what had been experienced as a drawback. Prisons manufactured delinquents, but delinquents turned out to be useful, in the economic domain as much as the political. Criminals come in handy" (ibid.).

Just as the prison mechanism stripped people of civil status, so that when they came out they could do nothing but become criminals again - pimps, policemen, and informers - so the university milieu, whose "political and economic value (is) far from negligible" (Foucault 1980: 42), is structured to produce academic delinquents or failures. This it does directly, both in the conventional sense of students who do not meet its criteria for success or drop out en route before achieving that success, and far more subtly and indirectly, in the sense that no amount of formal study, however successfully accomplished, can ever be sufficient: the pressure is always there to study further, to obtain higher qualifications, and, in current parlance, to engage in 'lifelong learning' (which generally implies lifelong seeking of additional accreditation, whether academic or professional). Such lifelong learning is now deemed indispensable to the economic success of both individuals and societies. Where 'the old professor' is concerned, having long ago gained her doctorate and earned her professorial status in her discipline, no matter how zealously she has subsequently kept up with current developments in her particular field of specialisation, she is now required to learn about and gain qualifications in the terrain of tertiary education.

Direct failures are part of the system, a risk built into the business. For this reason a certain margin of 'illegality' or 'delinquence' is not seen as a serious problem, but rather as perfectly tolerable. The cost of a completely effective educational system (or institution) - one without any failures - would be too high, and thus uneconomical. Provided levels of failure remain on the right side of the divide between the tolerable and the serious, the system can relax, and, "aware of its own solidity, ... afford to accept at its margins something which after all poses absolutely no threat to it" (Foucault 1980: 43). This explains why failure levels acceptable at a particular stage in the university's history became a threat and unacceptable under different historical-political conditions.

The ways in which the mechanics of power in the university in the period under consideration produced "a strategic utilisation of what had been experienced as a drawback" (Foucault 1980: 40) (that is, the high failure rates of black students in particular), are examined more closely in Chapter Four in the analysis of Education Development. The institution not only manufactured 'delinquents' - failing students, or students deemed not fit to enter directly into degree studies - but delinquents "turned out to be useful, in the economic domain as much as the political" (ibid.). Failing, 'underprepared,' and 'disadvantaged' students 'came in handy', to borrow Foucault's colloquialism. Their manufacture meant that a great extension of knowledge in the domain of Education Development, with concomitant effects of power, became possible.

We have seen that the University of the Cape of Good Hope was founded in 1873 as an examining institution. The University of Natal's origins date ten years earlier, in 1863, and were very different in form: the Pietermaritzburg High School, a teaching institution. From the Pietermaritzburg High School it was decided in 1897 to establish the Natal University College, also a teaching institution which was not empowered to conduct examinations. Then, in 1909, with effect from 1910, the Natal University College was incorporated for examining purposes under the University of the Cape of Good Hope by the Act of the Natal Parliament. The University College's 'standards' were thus ensured through an external, independent examination system, the only one in the country. 1910 is generally taken, by the University itself, to be its founding year (Brookes, 1966: 13).

At that time, with several university colleges of this kind established in the country and providing teaching at secondary, post-secondary and pre-university levels, and with only a small amount of university-level work being done - most students obtained their degrees in Europe - "(h)ow

university education should be organized became the subject of much controversy" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 231). This related to the rationality of the system: should there be one national teaching university, or a federal or affiliated system, or several independent institutions? Questions of governance - of setting standards, controlling examinations and the awarding of degrees, institutional autonomy; and questions of resources or finance, i.e. how many institutions the country needed and could support - were all at issue in this debate. These themes continue to permeate the 'transformation' debates at the end of the century.

In 1910 control of higher education was moved from the provinces and placed under the central government, with university education becoming the responsibility of the Minister of Education "who had, in particular, to handle the thorny question of financial responsibility for university education" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 232). Ninety-odd years later, finances and financial responsibility still present themselves as thorny questions for the Minister, the system as a whole, and its institutions. Thus state subsidies to institutions have been cut; there are universities on the verge of bankruptcy with enormous debts and unpaid student fees; universities undertaking severe 'rationalisation' procedures; and moves by government to merge some institutions and close others. Material more than ideological factors are placing the 'soul' of the university at issue.

The solution to the financial and governance issues in 1916, after various proposals, was through the University Acts of 1916 which made provision for a federal examining university called the University of South Africa (UNISA - later to become the country's main 'correspondence' university), into which the Natal University College and several other colleges were incorporated, with representation on its Senate but having their own principals and governing and academic structures. The Universities of Cape Town and Stellenbosch were also established, and the first 'mother body' of the colleges, the University of the Cape of Good Hope, ceased to exist.

The purely examining function of the country's first university had had 'profound effects' upon education in South Africa. These were productive effects, both in terms of producing graduates - people who were rated 'qualified'- and in terms of producing a particular mode of teaching/learning in the university colleges, a mode which also generated resistance. The resistance took the form of criticism of the effects of the first University's function being limited to examination. The criticism was that this resulted in the placing of "undue emphasis on examinations and their results" in the education process, so that although "academic standards were kept at a reasonable level", the approach and the methods used in the university colleges

emphasized "getting through" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 230). As much as the later ideologies of apartheid, this examining function of the country's first university laid the foundations of rote teaching and learning methods which were to become the characteristic mode of operation of disciplinary power and the focus of so much criticism in Bantu Education; and which were identified in Education Development as a central factor contributing to black students' high failure rates at university.

Despite criticisms of its operations the University had, in Behr and MacMillan's retrospective view, "done much good work in laying the foundations upon which it was possible to build sound university college and university structures" (ībid: 233).

The 1916 Act also established the joint Matriculation Board as the gatekeeper to control the entrance examination admitting students to South African universities. The examination was thus important for control of both entrance and exit 'standards' from the early days of higher education in the country. It was a central technique in the various mechanisms used to control - whether to limit, or to increase, or to improve the selective capacity of - 'access' to higher education, and thence, at the exit end, access to the professions and other high-level forms of employment.

Contrary to short-term perspectives which conflate the histories of apartheid and racism, the history of South African universities was, from its early years three decades before the Nationalist party came to power in 1948 and entrenched racial separatism as government policy, a racialised history. Thus 1916 also saw the establishment of the first of the Bantu (black African) university colleges, the South African Native College (later to become Fort Hare University) so as to provide for "the higher education of the non-White people" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 234). Under apartheid policy, racialisation also became geographically-based ethnic separatism: Fort Hare became the institution catering for the Xhosa people who lived predominantly in the eastern Cape region where the university was situated. Also under this policy the University Colleges of the North (for Sothos) and Zululand (for Zulus) were established in 1960, in their respective 'homelands', followed shortly by the University Colleges of the Western Cape and Durban-Westville for 'Coloured' and Indian students respectively. These institutions were under the academic control of the University of South Africa and the financial and administrative control of the central State - initially the Minister of Native Affairs, and then from 1960 the Minister of Bantu Education - , unlike the State-aided and semi-autonomous universities for whites. The 'homeland' university colleges subsequently gained full university status in 1970-71.

The University College of Natal became a fully-fledged University in 1949 (Brookes, 1966: 68-71). Its Durban campus had been admitting 'non-Whites' (mainly Africans and Indians) into part-time evening and weekend classes from 1936 onwards (Brookes, 1966: 44). These students did not attend the same classes as white students, although they were taught by the same staff, wrote the same examinations, and were awarded the same degrees. The arrangement was considered a temporary one; but permanence was not proposed in the direction of total integration, in fact the opposite: the idea was mooted of "the ultimate establishment of a federal university of Natal comprising three colleges, one White, one Indian, and one Bantu" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 447). In 1951 a 'non-White' medical school was established in Durban as part of the University of Natal (Brookes, 1966: 84). In practising academic and social segregation, then, the University appeared to have acquiesced to an extent in serving the implementation of apartheid ideology.

Bulman (1996: 51) identifies two reasons for the government establishing what came to be referred to as the HBUs or 'Historically Black Universities': to legitimise the idea of separate development for different racial and ethnic groups, and, citing Gwala (1988: 165). "(t)o ensure that the extension of a 'racist pedagogy' into the tertiary sector secured the domination of Afrikaner nationalism" (Bulman 1996: 51). The Minister of Bantu Education wanted government control of these universities to prevent "undesirable ideological developments", i.e. resistance to apartheid. Behr and MacMillan note that the Select Committee reporting in 1958 on the Separate University Education Bill of 1957 saw Africans in a paternalistic light as "under-developed people who did not yet have the sense of responsibility, the initiative, or the necessary knowledge to found and control their own universities" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 238); in other terms, insufficiently subjected. Furthermore, "If the Government ... was in earnest about the full development of the Bantu, then the establishment of their own university colleges was imperative. Leaders in many fields were required, and the whole development plan would collapse if they were not forthcoming in increasing numbers" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 238-239). The university colleges should be established on an ethnic basis so that each group could serve its own community, and it was the State's duty to see that they undergo "a sound process of development and not remain at an inferior standard" (ibid: 239). One of the functions of the black universities was thus to facilitate the government's establishment of 'Homelands' for various ethnic groups, by producing graduates to staff the civil service of the homelands: Transkei, Ciskei, KwaZulu, etc.

Lecturers and administrators at these 'bush colleges' as they were derogatorily referred to by their critics, were mainly (white) graduates of Afrikaans universities, institutions which supported and

promoted apartheid ideology. The Councils and Senates of the black universities were all-white bodies, with Africans serving on separate bodies that had merely advisory status (Horrell 1968: 161). Only when the councils, etc of these colleges were mature enough to manage their own affairs would they be granted full university status.

The graduates of the Afrikaans universities who played such a dominant role in the development of the black universities had been shaped in their own thinking not only by apartheid ideology but by the positivist, technicist approach taken in the Afrikaans institutions to teaching and learning. Many of these institutions established academic bureaux which researched teaching and learning within a positivist paradigm; the findings informed the teaching philosophy and methods of staff, particularly but not only in the field of education. This produced "an extension of Fundamental Pedagogics into the tertiary sector" (Bulman 1996: 48). This view "was then transmitted to the new black universities through the graduates of the Afrikaans universities who went to administer and teach in them [Gwala 1988, v.d. Berg 1991]" (Bulman 1996: 48). Dominance of Afrikaner ideology was reinforced in the black universities through the curriculum, over which UNISA had control, and through rote teaching/learning methods.

The apparent ideological and methodological differences notwithstanding, there is some resonance between the Afrikaans universities' adoption of the disciplinary technique of creating 'scientific knowledge' about teaching and learning and the techniques of power adopted some decades later in English universities when Academic or Education Development Programmes came on track and began to generate knowledge about the teaching-learning processes at higher education level. That these programmes initially targeted black or 'educationally disadvantaged' students also led to accusations, among other criticisms, of a racist pedagogy at work under the guise of 'affirmative action' principles.

Whereas the liberal tradition informing academia in the white English-language universities extended to a liberal ethos for student life and politics, there were strict regulations for the control of students in the black colleges, as outlined in Horrell (1968:121). Students could not leave the college precincts, form organizations or engage in organizational work, hold meetings in the grounds of the college, circulate magazines, publications or pamphlets for the production of which they were wholly or partly responsible, or give statements to the Press on behalf of students, without prior permission from the Rector or a senior staff member authorised by him (the Rector

was invariably 'him'). These denials and refusals of students' rights can in fact be seen as incitements for them to pursue those very rights; and they did, with great energy.

Control over staff was also strict. The 1957 Separate University Education Bill had provided for the Minister of Native Affairs to control the appointment and dismissal of professors and lecturers, who were State employees, through a disciplinary code which prohibited staff to comment "adversely" on the administration of any government department or to propagate "any idea" or take part in or identify with any "propaganda or activity" or act in a manner: calculated -

- (i) to cause or promote antagonism amongst any section of the population of the Union against any other section of the population of the Union; or
- (ii) to impede, obstruct or undermine the activities of any Government department (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 238)

This Bill generated controversy because of its potential threat to the autonomy of universities and the academic independence of university staff (ibid.) and was subsequently partly modified to give the University College Councils more (though still limited) power in respect of staffing matters.

Indeed, this was not the only aspect of the Bill to which there was resistance: the very concept of ethnically-based university education was challenged. A minority report of the Select Committee had supported the view of the University of the Witwatersrand that "there is only one basic type or kind of genuine university education and that all those who attend a university...should, broadly speaking and in spite of their respective racial, religious or cultural differences, receive the same kind of education and training" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 239).

This theme of the nature of university education, to what extent it is or should be universalistic and to what extent particularistic, and hence also of the role of the university in society and how it relates to the nation or volk, culture, and the state, including issues of university autonomy and academic freedom, has been an integral one in the country's history of ideological debate around universities, not only in relation to the provision of separate and ethnic universities for blacks and whites, but also in the Afrikaans-English divide. Some of this debate is reflected in the 1975 conference paper collection *The future of the university in Southern Africa*. It is, effectively, a debate about normalisation through the workings of power-knowledge.

By 1968 the total enrolment of the three black colleges consisted of only 1,430 students - of an African population of almost fifteen million people. While a minuscule number of black students was still admitted, via special permits granted by the Minister, to what came to be referred to as HWUs - 'historically white universities' (generally the 'open' English language institutions, since Afrikaans universities hardly admitted black students at all) - after 1960 there was effectively total racial and ethnic segregation in higher education institutions, and black colleges were entirely isolated from other institutions. Only later, in the 1980s, did the government loosen its tight restriction by according historically white universities 'quotas' for the admission of black students. The (English-language) universities at that time resisted the application of quotas on the grounds of academic autonomy and academic freedom, as indeed they had also protested in 1959, with the passing of the Extension of University Education Act, against the exclusion of black students from their ranks.

The number of Indian students enrolled at the University College Durban (which became the University of Durban-Westville in 1971) in 1968 almost equaled the number of Africans at the three black university colleges: there were 1,407 students. In that same year it awarded a total of 109 bachelors' degrees and 24 Honours degrees (Behr and Macmillan 1971: 450-451).

The total number of students (including the tiny minority of 'non-white' students) enrolled at the University of Natal in 1968 was 5,867 - more than double the total number of African and Indian students enrolled at the one Indian and three African university colleges altogether (Fort Hare, for instance, had only 451 students enrolled in 1968; the University of Zululand, 368). In the space of just over 50 years the university's student numbers had increased almost 120-fold, from its enrolment of 49 students in 1916 (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 244). Nationally, the ratio of white university students to total white population had improved from 1:1,133 in 1911 to 1:97 in 1960; one of the highest proportions of university attendance in the world (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 243). By contrast, the level of literacy, let alone the level of university attendance, amongst the black population was abysmally low.

High ratios of university attendance for whites were, however, paralleled by high failure rates, particularly in first year: averaging 35%, this was higher "than at any other period in the whole educational system" and constituted a "serious and a national" problem (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 254). Various explanations for this phenomenon and ideas to address the problem had been explored by different institutions, from as early as 1948 when the University of the Witwatersrand

considered a 'basic year' with an integrated curriculum (which would have required a total revision of existing first year courses), but abandoned the scheme because of "financial and other difficulties" (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 257). Aptitude and other tests; advisory services; orientation programmes on study methods, smaller tutorial groups, "moral tutor" schemes, and better supervision in residences were some of the strategies institutions employed (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 255) - clear precursors to Education Development. Success was limited: approximately 55% of students obtained their first degree in the minimum period plus two years, the remaining 45% not completing (Behr and MacMillan 1971: 258).

Such results may have been indicative of white students' apathy or complacency at their privileged position. Where politics was concerned, apathy, complacency, and compliance apparently prevailed: few students participated in student political activities or in protests against the segregation of universities or other apartheid policies. The National Union of South African Students was virtually the only 'white' organisation which did. Amongst black students, however, the government's policy of separate universities had some unintended effects, fostering strong political resistance and black nationalist subjectivities in students of the African university colleges; a good illustration of Foucault's proposition regarding the changeability, reversibility and instability of power relations. Horrell, in attempting to assess the role of these institutions says "...one comes back to their isolation in a multi-racial country, an isolation which may well foster African nationalism. It is tragic that, in South Africa, prejudice among many white students as well as Government policy prevents the contact between students of different racial groups which would promote understanding and tolerance among those who are likely to become leaders in their respective communities" (Horrell 1968: 161).

While Horrell lamented the loss, through isolation, of the opportunity to foster liberal values and liberal consciousness, Welsh and Savage pointed out the implications of black universities becoming focal points of opposition to white rule rather more sharply:

The ideology of black consciousness, through its vehicle the South African Students' Organisation, had taken root in greater or lesser degree on each of the campuses, including those of the universities for Coloured and Indian students. While it may be a matter for debate whether black consciousness is inherently 'anti-white' it is surely beyond dispute that its emergence indicates a dangerous degree of polarisation in South African society (Welsh and Savage 1977: 141)

- a polarisation the inevitability of which they acknowledged given the circumstances of structural social inequalities and segregated institutions.

Nkomo, in his seminal study of student culture and activism in black South African universities, which he subtitled 'The Roots of Resistance', characterises the three African universities as having been "in constant turbulence" since their inception, marked by "regular closures, suspensions and expulsions of sizeable numbers of students and the stipulation of increasingly rigid conditions of admission or re-admission" (Nkomo 1984: xix). He sees a common thread in the findings of no less than four government commission reports being that "all the grievances are related to the general socio-economic conditions to which Africans are subjected", and makes the point that "[t]he intrusion of external factors into the university's social environment tends to transform university-oriented student consciousness into an outwardly focused political consciousness", citing Ashby's (1966: xii) example of universities in colonial settings serving as "nurseries of nationalism" (Nkomo 1984: 8). Significantly, in Nkomo's view, this period beginning in 1970, that became marked with incessant turbulence at these institutions, coincided with the first bona fide products of the Bantu Education system - from elementary level through university - graduating from the African universities.

Nkomo interprets the political culture characteristic of student subcultures as being "anti-authoritarian" (Nkomo 1984: 13) - a characteristic oppositional by its very nature to the authoritarianism of both the black university administrations and the government, the former of whom frequently called on the latter's forces of 'security' and 'law and order' to quell student revolts. That the students were opposed to being subjected to authoritarian control is undoubtedly correct: however, circumspection is called for both in ascribing their resistance to an ideological motive and in characterising it as inherently (i.e. 'by nature') anti-authoritarian, a characterisation which ignores the use of various degrees of coercion by students to mobilise support for their acts of resistance against the domination of the authorities. The students were, after all, fully engaged in a politics of education which was simultaneously part of a broader political struggle, and Foucault's characterisation that politics is war pursued by other means (Foucault 1980: 90, HS: 93) is fully relevant to their engagement.

Where ideology as an analytical tool is concerned, Foucault points to three difficulties. Firstly, ideology stands in virtual opposition to something else which is supposed to count as truth. The problem, for Foucault, however, is not that a line needs to be drawn between what is scientifically true and what isn't, but "in seeing historically how effects of truth are produced within discourses which are themselves neither true nor false" (Foucault 1980: 118). Providing an ideological account of the nature of and motivation for the students' resistance is thus of less relevance than

the effects of the discourse generated by their resistance - effects on themselves and on others. Secondly, the concept of ideology refers to something of the order of a subject, and Foucault calls into question the notion of a transcendent subject. Basing the analysis of political struggles purely on the aims, intentions, and will of individual and collective subjects is to miss perceiving crucial non-subjective dimensions of the struggle. Thirdly, "Ideology stands in a secondary position relative to something which functions as its infrastructure, as its material, economic determinant, etc." (ibid). The material conditions of the students were more fundamental in informing their struggles than ideological positions. For these reasons Foucault cautions against using the concept of ideology in analysis.

In drawing on socio-psychological theories of student culture (i.e. an ideological analysis) to interpret the events in the colleges, Nkomo risks construing the interplay of forces between authorities and students solely or at least primarily in terms of the concept of repression. Undoubtedly the conditions in the colleges were extremely oppressive, and undoubtedly the students were engaged more in a war aimed at political liberation than in resistance to modern, disciplinary power. Nkomo's interpretation, however, may be reflective more of his own "longing for a form of power innocent of all coercion, discipline and normalisation" (Nkomo 1980: 117) than of the realities of the interplay of forces.

This is not to say that students' resistance was not informed by ideology. Welsh and Savage claim that two judicial commissions of inquiry into campus 'episodes', at the Universities of the North and the Western Cape respectively, both revealed that "white control, reflected in the universities from the pattern of the wider society, was the critical source of grievance among blacks. The universities, in other words, became surrogate targets for the unequal social order whose termination was sought" (Welsh and Savage 1977: 141). Advocates of black consciousness wanted a 'black university' controlled by blacks in the interest of what they themselves regarded as true black development, entirely freed from white control.

Resistance was not confined to the universities. The pressures for change in the system at school level had begun to be felt quite acutely in the 1970s, particularly with the 1976 revolt which began in the schools of Soweto in opposition to 'gutter education' and the imposition of teaching through the medium of Afrikaans. State reaction to the pupils' protest resulted in the death of school pupils by police shooting on June 16, 1976, an event initially shown country-wide on newly-introduced television broadcasts (over which the government soon imposed tight

censorship) and captured for posterity in a famous photographic image of the first victim, Hector Petersen, dying in the arms of an agonised friend.

The effect of the brutality and the publicity was to intensify the revolt of students, who mobilised under the slogan 'Liberation before education', and of the broader community. As people's resistance mounted and spread into country-wide school boycotts and other forms of protest, so did state action to suppress the resistance intensify. The struggles of schoolchildren fed into the broader political struggle, which escalated so that not just schools but townships around the country became increasingly 'ungovernable'. The African National Congress' armed underground movement, Umkhonto we Sizwe ('Spear of the Nation') gained many recruits as schoolchildren and university students fled into exile in neighbouring countries, underwent military training, and returned with fellow cadres to mount armed attacks and carry out bombings on government targets and, increasingly, on civilian targets. A generation or more of youth came to be seen as a 'lost generation' not only where their formal education was concerned, but also in terms of the overall effects on them - demoralising and brutalising - of the political violence that was shaking the country. Some of these youth, as well as their counterparts who had fallen foul of the system in the historically black universities, were among the black students to enter historically white institutions such as Natal University.

In a period of some fifteen years or more the struggles and resistance of the youth and communities led, in some instances, to educational and institutional change. However, such changes often preceded struggles, and generated resistance on more than one occasion. Examples of changes preceding struggles were the 1967/68 legislation which radically expanded the numbers of school-going pupils; the increased government investment in Bantu education, despite their own protestations, partly due to the demand for skilled labour from business; the ideological Afrikaans-medium issue which fed the burning student discontent that erupted in Soweto's 1976 riots; and the immediate knee-jerk changes the government introduced after the 1976 protests.

In 1980, in response to the continuing pressures of protest against apartheid education in the schools, the Government appointed the Human Sciences Research Council De Lange Commission to investigate the state of education in South Africa. In its 1981 reports the Commission recommended a single Education Department for the country. The Government ignored this, only implementing technical aspects of the report. It was to require more than a decade and the installation of a democratic government before a single department was instituted, although in the

interim, the government introduced 'Model C' schools into the white system which admitted middle-class students of all races. White schools thus began, slowly, to desegregate, but not so black schools. Poorer students could not afford the fees at Model C schools, and remained in their impoverished township schools, where many of their teachers were under- or unqualified.

In the early eighties the pressures in the school system, combined with the pressures for political change in the country and movements in Higher Education systems elsewhere in the world, such as the shift from an elite system to a universal/mass base of Post Secondary Education (Bulman 1996: 18), began to translate into pressures on the South African higher education system and its institutions, some of which were beginning to align themselves with the need for changes, and to prepare for anticipated changes. Education Development (ED - also known as Academic Development or AD in other institutions) at the University of Natal was, from its inception as Student Support Services through later developments, both a response to this need for change and an agent of change: a set of discourses supporting the relations of power at work in the change process. In turn, it was itself subjected from the outset to ongoing change processes. This occurred as the knowledge generated by ED discourses gave rise to new understandings as to how to address the problems facing the institution, and hence new strategies for dealing with them, as well as new discourse; but also as other factors impacted on ED.

I conclude this chapter with an overview of the narrative which will follow in the next 3 chapters. It weaves together the two strands of Education Development and institutional change, the latter in itself a multistranded process. External factors which impacted on the university, such as national (and some international) developments in the political and higher education arenas, are brought into the account where relevant. The narrative is interpreted at various stages through an analysis of disciplinary power at work in the institution.

Both the institutional change processes and the Education Development story are presented as falling into several overlapping stages. The institutional change narrative has, roughly, three broad periods. The first, which I will term the 'Mission Statement' period, covered approximately the first decade of this study, including the development of a Management Policy statement in 1982 and a Mission Statement in 1989. This led into the second period, that dominated by the Vice Chancellor's Review, initiated in 1991 by the new Vice Chancellor, Prof James Leatt. Despite Leatt's departure within two years, the process he initiated continued for most of the decade. The

third period, from 1997, entailed a further review producing intensive rationalisation and restructuring.

The first stage of the ED story corresponded more or less with the 'Mission Statement' period outlined above. It related to the enrolment of the first small numbers of black students on the campus and was fed by, and itself fed, the emerging discourse on black students as 'disadvantaged', i.e., deficient subjects. It began, roughly, with the establishment in 1981 of an English Language Development Scheme geared to the academic communication skills needs of English second language students, and moved into the second stage with the additional establishment of the more broadly-oriented Student Support Services in 1987. Internal shifts towards ED were already occurring by the time the Vice Chancellor's Review got underway.

The Review process itself occurred in two phases: Phase I reviewed the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the university's governance system and Phase II entailed a strategic planning process. The Phase I report was produced by December 1991; implementation of its recommendations coincided with Phase II's process which began in March 1992, producing a working paper by September 1992. A year later the negotiated outcome, the 'VCR Strategic Planning Guidelines 1994 - 8' was approved by Senate and Council and in May 1994 disseminated in the university, followed by further negotiations and implementation of the modified proposals.

The second stage of ED, beginning with the establishment of the Student Support Services in 1987, was characterised by the emergence of both an 'academic support' model and an increasing assertion of the importance of addressing students' 'environmental support' needs. The target for support (for subjection, in a Foucaultian analytic) was 'disadvantaged students'. But by 1990, as both numbers and failure rates of these students increased, recognition that the 'support' model, its structures, and the allocated resources were inadequate led to the adoption of a developmental model and a shift in the discourse, from 'disadvantaged' to 'underprepared', and 'support' to 'development'. Neither of the two earlier terms disappeared altogether, however, indeed the term 'disadvantaged' has prevailed most strongly into the present, suggesting the usefulness of the subject 'disadvantaged student', a theme which will be pursued later in the narrative.

The two-phase Review change period with its production of Strategic Planning Guidelines overlapped with the third period, which entailed more extensive restructuring and rationalisation - a process ostensibly precipitated by an ever-deepening financial crisis. The third period began in

early 1997 with a review of the outcomes of Phase I of the Review so as to propose alternative structures, specifically more centralised ones, to reduce the budget; and its scope included academic, administrative, and management structures, unlike Phase I which had concentrated on the governance system. This was the period which most modified the institutional subject into one of governmental instrumentality, but its changes could not have occurred without the groundwork of the preceding periods, and specifically the micro level interventions of ED which had rendered staff more pliable, had generated the specific power tactics required for governmentality, and had produced a finer intermeshing of power relations in the institution.

The majority of these micro level interventions occurred in the third stage of ED, that of the 'University Education Development Programme'. It began in late 1991, soon after the initiation of the Review, with the establishment of structures which, it was thought, would be more understandable to, and hence carry more credibility with, the academic community than did the Student Support Services: an ED Board, mimicking the idea of Faculty Boards, followed by a Centre for University Education Development with Director and other staff, and additional faculty ED programmes. The governance structure of ED, the Board, thus preceded the implementation structure. The ED programmes were faculty-based to encourage 'ownership' and hence commitment to their aims, by Deans and lecturers.

Even as the ED Programme was being born, however, institutional decision-making structures began to exert pressure for it to be curtailed: financial stringencies were cited as a reason for not prioritising ED activities and posts, and only retaining the most important. This reduction of ED activities was resisted, and an external review report two years later recommended strengthening the central unit and its links with and influence over faculty programmes. Instead of this happening, however, internal discussions, the resignation of the ED Centre's Director, the impact of the Review and the creation of a part-time campus Vice Principal's post during the first part of 1994 all contributed to two decisions. These were, one, to 'mainstream' ED programmes fully into the faculties, making them the Deans' responsibility; and two, to do away with a Director, combining the vacant Director's post with the Vice Principal's post to make the latter a full time one incorporating a specific ED brief. The Vice Principal would have responsibility for the work of a reconceptualised central unit, and the Deans would report to him on ED matters.

In this scant and chequered four-year ED Programme stage the focus of subjection by disciplinary measures shifted increasingly from students to staff. It ended by the beginning of 1996, when the

ED Centre was reconstructed as the Tertiary Education Studies Unit under the Vice Principal's office. This change in nomenclature from Education Development to Tertiary Education Studies signaled the coming into existence, in the fourth stage of ED, of a view of higher education as an endeavour worthy of study in its own right; and, indeed, the Unit began to offer post-graduate qualifications for staff, thus joining power and knowledge in a new and newly-validated field of discourse. In this fourth stage there was an increasing convergence between the focus of the Review and ED - now Tertiary Education Studies - in the terrain of curriculum reform, which embraced the whole teaching-learning process.

Less than two-and-a-half years later, by June 1998, the fourth stage had ended: Unit staff were redeployed, one of them to Student Leadership Development within the Student Services Division, two to the Quality Promotion Unit, which was to ensure the quality of the institution's offerings, in both the academic and 'non-academic' or 'service' sectors, through instituting and monitoring systems of evaluation or self-regulation. These systems were primarily of a quantitative, technicist nature. This was the phase in which elements of ED became fully co-opted in the service of governmentality. 'Education Development' discourse *per se* at UNP then became a thing of the past. Many of the discourses generated by ED had, however, become a part of everyday institutional discourse.

Both the institutional and the ED change processes were responses to external pressures which in various ways at various times also translated into internal pressures. They were thus part of a bigger movement of change, which included both the higher and the school education systems, and political developments. The next chapter now examines in more detail the 80s, and Chapters Four and Five the 90s, at UNP.

Chapter Three

The 1980s

1. The emergence of Education Development initiatives

Education Development at the Pietermaritzburg campus was, from its earliest stages through later developments, not only a response to the pressure for change but also an agent of change: a set of discourses supporting the relations of power at work in the change process. In turn, it was itself subjected from the outset to ongoing pressures to modify, indeed to reinvent, itself. This occurred as the knowledge generated by ED gave rise to new understandings as to how to address adequately the problems facing the institution, and hence new strategies for dealing with them; but also as other factors (like the Review process and financial constraints) impacted on ED.

Why Education Development and not Academic Development as was the case at many other institutions, and what, if any, was the difference? The argument for preferring the former term put forward by Student Support Services staff when the shift to a new structure was debated, was that not only students' academic development, but their development as whole persons needed to be addressed, as well as the development of the whole educational process and environment provided by the university, not just its academic aspects. This 'holistic approach' recognised that not only academic factors, such as curriculum and course design, teaching/learning and assessment methods, but also a whole range of 'non-academic' factors such as extra- or co-curricular activities, institutional structures and relations, accommodation, finance, institutional ethos, social and cultural elements, etc., all affected students' experience and impacted on their development, either hindering or enhancing their capacity and chances for success at university. Addressing academic issues alone would not solve the problem of academic failure. The 'holistic approach' was in line with liberal discourse which perceived the aim of education as being to "encourage the growth of the whole child" (Transvaal Teachers' Association, cited in Ashley 1989: 32).

Taken altogether, these concerns amounted to a notion akin to Foucault's characterisation, noted

earlier, of the prison's mode of action as "the constraint of a total education" (DP: 236, my emphasis). The role of the prison was to be an "exhaustive disciplinary apparatus" (DP: 235) for transforming individuals; it had to "assume responsibility for all aspects of the individual, his physical training, his aptitude to work, his everyday conduct, his moral attitude, his state of mind ..." (ibid.). In similar vein, the term 'Education Development' signalled a notion of the coherence and totality of the educational process thought to be required to enable students to develop as 'whole people' and succeed at university. ED staff saw themselves as advocates and change agents working to bring about the institutional changes needed to achieve such a coherent educational process. Both the university and the students needed transforming.

Elsewhere, the chosen terms were 'Academic Support' (used in most other 'historically white' universities) or 'Academic Development' (used in 'historically black' universities - also referred to as historically disadvantaged institutions). These terms defined the focus of the endeavour as addressing academic matters only; 'environmental' issues fell outside the ambit of Academic Support/Academic Development. Although these terms were used more widely than ED, I will use them only when context, general allusion or literary reference requires. Since the study focuses mainly on the University of Natal, I will for the most part use the term ED. At a later stage (p. 110) I will discuss further the way the definitions and terminology of Education/ Academic Development discourse, besides reflecting differences between institutions, also shifted continuously as Education/Academic Development was obliged by various external and internal pressures to reflect on and invent and reinvent itself.

The visible beginnings of ED at the Pietermaritzburg campus occurred when in 1981, in anticipation of changes in the racial/cultural profile of the student population and hence in students' academic and linguistic needs, the English Language Development Scheme was set up to run extra-curricular (non-credit bearing, voluntary) courses in academic communication skills such as essay writing and study skills for English second-language, that is, black students. This

¹Few local Afrikaans-speaking students enrolled at the University of Natal: they generally chose one of the Afrikaans universities such as Stellenbosch, Pretoria or University of the Orange Free State.

unit's predecessor was the Language and Reading Centre, which used a language and reading laboratory to assist students (at that time only English first-language speakers) to improve the efficiency of their reading and writing. It researched practices of first-year entrants through a reading proficiency test in its laboratories, to provide a basis for remedial intervention based on individualised information. The Language and Reading Centre was thus already into the business of exercising techniques of disciplinary power through the use of technology which facilitated diagnosis, surveillance, supervision, correction, and prescription. When its Director, who championed this cause, retired, it merged with the English Language Development Scheme.

The English Language Development Scheme, from its earliest, minimalist role of providing extracurricular 'academic support' for black students, had a remarkable trajectory of growth and change in little more than a decade. First it moved to offering, in 1984, an accredited first-year course for second-language students, 'Learning, Language, and Logic' (3L - the first initiative of its kind in the country); then to becoming, in 1992, a fully-fledged academic department with a disciplinary base of Applied Language Studies, located first in the Arts Faculty and subsequently in the School of Education. By 1993 it was headed by a Professor and was offering undergraduate and post-graduate courses in its discipline as well as education specialisations for teachers of English as a second language.

Such was the rapid rise in the institution of a domain of knowledge that first emerged on the margins of 'mainstream' academia, fed by the 'access'- related needs of, initially, just a handful of 'disadvantaged' students. These needs were "a political instrument meticuluously prepared, calculated, and used" (DP: 26) in constituting both the students as more productive academic subjects, and the staff as more productive researchers, i.e. generators of knowledge: the English Language Development Scheme staff were frequent presenters of papers in ED-type conferences, generating extensive discourse from the close scrutiny they were able to exercise over learners and their practices in the small Learning, Language, and Logic tutorial groups, and their intensive reflection on their own academic practices.

Another initiative of the early 80's, aimed at addressing the mismatch between school-leavers' educational preparation and the unfamiliar academic demands of university, was the self-funded 'Bridging the Gap' programme run by the Centre for Adult Education, prior to the official, largely social orientation programme at the start of the academic year. Bridging the Gap was an academic skills orientation programme open to students from all school backgrounds who could pay the course fee, but was mainly attended by white students, initially because few black students were entering the university and later, despite their numbers increasing, because most black students could not afford it. After several years it was discontinued, ostensibly because of demand outstripping capacity. While its popularity demonstrated that 'academic skills' needs were not confined to 'disadvantaged' students, its closure may well have been because the Centre. politically, did not wish to be seen to be providing 'academic support' to the privileged sector of the student body instead of to 'disadvantaged' students, thereby further widening instead of narrowing the gap between these two groups. The problem of providing such support on a sustainable and systemic basis to all students needing or wanting it, was an institutional one and not central to Centre's aims of adult education provision.

2. The emergence of institutional management initiatives

The above-mentioned were discrete responses by specific units to pressures for change in the institution; likewise, discrete initiatives were emerging at UND. At a more general institutional level, in 1982 a "Statement of Management Policy Objectives and Strategies" was produced by the Academic Planning and Policy Committee, and approved by Senate and Council. Although the purpose was "to provide direction to all departments and personnel" and its eleven statements of objectives were supposed to be used "in planning the development and in the management of the University", the document was notably lacking in contextualisation and specificity. Its authors deemed it important that "each person actively strives towards the goal of the University", which goal was "TO SERVE THE COMMUNITY THROUGH EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING, LEARNING, SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH" (University of Natal 1982, Introduction, emphasis in original).

The document was an attempt to promote a greater degree of governmentality of the institution as a whole, its sub-units, and its individual members, but purely through rhetorical means: through exhorting members to identify with an ideologically-defined purpose (service to 'the community' and 'excellence') and to channel the activities of departments in accordance with particular ideological assumptions and values. These means were inadequate to their purpose; they did not bring into play the "political technology of the body" (DP: 30) that could harness and channel institutional productivity in the terms required.

The first of the eleven objectives: "To help meet the university educational needs of the whole community ..." defined a broad target group for the institution, but went on to pinpoint a key tension in doing so: "... while maintaining academic standards" (University of Natal 1982:1). Meeting 'university educational needs' implied, primarily, providing access to university-level qualifications; while the phrase 'of the whole community' implied targeting blacks and not only whites. This would mean an enormously-increased pool of *prospective* students compared to the institution's previous (statutorily-imposed) target group of white students, without any necessary increase in available resources; but only if existing racialised controls were either flouted by the institution, or relaxed by the state.

However, even if either of these two things happened, a larger target group did not automatically imply increased student numbers: the institution could choose to limit its growth rate, in which case changing its racial profile would mean replacing white students with black, not merely adding black students. The concern about maintaining 'standards' thus did not necessarily relate to plans to 'massify' provision: no such intention was stated. Rather, it implicitly signaled concern about the effects, and the (white) public's perception of the effects, of bringing into the institution (black) students whose school education had not been 'up to standard' compared with that of their white counterparts; and, indeed, of excluding white students so as to admit black students. The institution did not want to lose 'good' (i.e. educationally privileged) students from its traditional pool, either through fears about the quality of its education deteriorating or through a racist backlash from the white community. It wanted to retain existing academic norms (which, as

we have seen, were not even very high) while changing the racial norm of the student profile.

The phrase 'academic standards', however, denoted de facto those standards hitherto established by whites, since the institution had accepted (albeit under protest) its definition by government legislation as an institution for whites². And these standards were established under very different material and ideological conditions than those pertaining in black schools and universities. The catch-22 of the situation was thus that, by rejecting as inferior the standards set by a deliberately poorly-resourced system for blacks and insisting on maintaining its own established, 'superior' standards for black as well as white students (a seemingly egalitarian, deracialised stance seen as the only tenable position for a liberal institution espousing fairness and meritocracy), the institution would in fact lay itself open to the criticism of racial discrimination. It was accused of expecting black students to meet admissions and performance criteria set by whites, which they (the black students) had no voice in determining, which their prior education had not promoted, and which therefore disadvantaged them. The discrimination would be seen to apply on several fronts: barring students from access on the grounds that their matric results did not meet standard admission criteria; creating compulsory extra 'hoops' for black students in the form of academic support or academic development programmes; and measuring their academic performance according to the same criteria applied to English first language students who were both linguistically and educationally advantaged relative to their black counterparts.

The university, however, argued its commitment to offering qualifications of 'international standards' - standards supposedly established by an undefined, but implicitly western, 'international' higher education community. Natal University graduates' degrees should enable them to gain access to post-graduate study at reputable institutions elsewhere. Ironically, the country's increasing isolation gave the institution very limited access to the international HE community and limited direct knowledge of what might constitute 'international standards'. The strategies for attaining this objective were the use of external examiners - who, coming from other

² With the exception of the Medical School, as previously mentioned.

South African universities, would be as isolated from the international community as their Natal colleagues - and "Frequent review and assessment" (of course and degree offerings) "by Boards and Senates" (University of Natal 1982: 2). This meant only that the institution would adopt standard procedures to protect existing 'standards', not that it was actually readily able to access international reference points in formulating the standards.

This statement of objective in the 1982 document signaled the intensification of debates on 'access' and 'standards' which were to become prominent in institutional discourses, particularly those of Education Development, and particularly in the historically white universities, amongst which Natal was no exception. The tension between issues of access/equity and standards/ excellence continued to be "a central element of the debates around Academic Development and changes in higher education in the South African context" (Bulman 1996: 26). Thus, for instance, the Minister of Education, Minister Bengu, in 1995 argued that the idea of high standards had been used to keep blacks out of academic leadership (ibid.). The question of the relevance of 'international' standards to the local needs of the country was part of this debate.

What the insistence on maintaining of standards actually provided was the raison d'etre for the extension of disciplinary power over both aspiring students, in the selection process, and students and staff studying and teaching in the institution. Only through an intensive process of 'norming' of student and staff behaviours and performances could 'standards' be maintained, and this 'norming' had to occur at the micro-level of the teaching/learning interface more than anywhere else. Boards and Senates simply did not have the techniques at their disposal to ensure penetration of disciplinary power at that level. And yet, ironically, such measures were resisted by many Faculties and staff, not least because of the possibility of them revealing existing 'standards' as inadequate. The techniques whereby ED achieved, or at least partially achieved, this process of norming, and the resistances it encountered, are elaborated in Chapter Four.

To return to the 1982 document: a recognition that access to higher or tertiary qualifications alone was an inadequate response to society's educational needs was implied in another of its stated

objectives, viz. "To provide wider educational and related services to the community at large" (University of Natal 1982: 1). Here, targeting the 'community at large' was not so much about ensuring racial inclusiveness as it was about extending expertise beyond those sectors of the community immediately aspiring to university qualifications, to assist the poorer, less-educated sectors (which happened mostly to be black, anyway). This class was also to benefit from the work of the university, through its 'wider educational and related' services. This rather vague field of contribution was later to be gathered under the catchword 'development', an increasingly important aspect of the university's mission in the 90s which later gave rise to 'service learning' or 'community-based learning'. (Here, too, ED would pave the way through programmes such as its Community Internship Programme.)

Liberal ideological assumptions pertaining to the nature of the subject and the purpose and nature of higher education underpinned several of the 1982 objectives: "To create and maintain an environment for students and staff conducive to the further development of the whole person" (an objective which ED attempted to realise, as already said); "To reflect critically on the society in which it is situate" (sic); and "To strive for and maintain academic freedom and university autonomy" (University of Natal 1982: 1). These last two points, more directly political than the rest but only implicitly referring to the apartheid context, were an addition to the document by Senex, appearing in a different typeface than the rest of the document. None of the concepts such as 'standards', 'excellence', 'academic freedom', etc, were defined or contextualised, although the strategies linked with each objective provide some clues to how these concepts were being, or intended to be, interpreted. The elaboration and contestation of many of these concepts, an important process in the movement towards increased governmentality, was to occur primarily through ED discourse.

The remaining objectives of the 1982 Statement were: "To maintain the unity of the university at Council and Senate level while encouraging academic autonomy and administrative devolution for the two centres" (University of Natal 1982: 1) - a policy decision reflecting the tension inherent in the 'duality' of the institution since its inception, which was to be partially reversed a decade and

a half later, in the review of the VCR's initial decisions; "To ensure effective and efficient use of resources" (ibid.), a catch phrase heralding future rationalising responses to the intensification of financial pressures; and "To ensure a favourable image of the university" (ibid.)- which begged the question of in whose eyes this image should be favourable.

The document itself appeared to be an early attempt at constructing such a 'favourable image' of the institution. That it was subsequently presented by the authors of the 1989 Mission Statement as a predecessor to that document can be seen in that it is retrospectively, in the latter, given a title not originally ascribed to it, being labelled "the 1982 Mission statement"- a case, perhaps, of the 1989 administration attempting to give increased credibility to both documents, enhancing the status of the first and attaching the weight of history to the second in presenting it as a continuation and deepening of efforts begun by the administration's predecessors.

3. National developments in higher education and politics

At the time of the university producing its first (1982) 'Mission Statement', a document which alluded only in afterthought to the effects of government policy on the university, a softening of rigid separatism and a degree of rationalisation in the control of Higher Education was in fact taking place at government level. 1983 saw a Government White Paper on Education, followed by the University Amendment Acts which extended membership of the formerly all-white Committee of University Principals (CUP) to the rectors of the (ethnic) Universities of the Western Cape and Durban-Westville, and African Universities. The Universities Advisory Council was abolished and a new advisory council established with authority over Indian, Coloured and African universities and technikons as well; however, not all aspects of African institutions came under its purview. Also in 1983 a Committee of Technikon Principals was set up, membership of which was extended to African Technikon Principals in 1986.

These moves were in line with political moves towards an ostensibly more 'democratic' government which would co-opt the 'Indian' and 'Coloured' sectors of the population by extending the franchise to them, albeit in a 'tricameral' rather than a single parliamentary system,

but still exclude the Africans, who constituted the vast majority of South Africans. Participation in the 1983 tricameral elections was a controversial issue amongst white. Indian and coloured opponents of apartheid, in that some people viewed the elections and the proposed system as a step in the direction of full democracy, while others, regarding them as a divide and rule strategy, either voted against the tricameral system, making them strange bedfellows with those whose 'no' vote reflected a support of total apartheid, or advocated a total boycott. Blacks rejected the entire system as an attempt to co-opt Indians and Coloureds, a divide-and-rule strategy aimed at creating a more materially comfortable black middle class as a 'buffer zone' in the political conflict. In the event, the tricameral system was voted in and for the first time there was a form of direct representation in government of 'Coloured' and Indian South Africans.

3.1 Resistance in education and politics

These political changes did not dispel the ferment in the country's education system or quell political resistance. From mid-1984 onwards resistance in the schools escalated even as political resistance mounted in acts of increasing frequency and violence. By 1985 the government under PW Botha declared a national State of Emergency. The response of the government's political opponents to the banning of political organisations was to establish a broad front, the United Democratic Front, which as a popular movement with no elected leaders could not readily be acted against legislatively or politically.

Amongst the banned organisations was the South African National Students' Congress, consisting mainly of black students from tertiary institutions. Its progressive white counterpart, the National Union of South African Students, was less severely restricted: it was made a 'listed' organisation that could not be quoted or reported on. The strategic response of black students at the University of Natal was similar to the UDF strategy: they established the Black Students' Society, an ostensibly non-political, ideologically-inclusive organisation, to take forward the work of the Congress. In 1985, too, the National Education Union of South Africa was formed as a non-racial union of school-level educators affiliated to the United Democratic Front. Progressive university academics only followed suit somewhat later with the establishment of the Union of Democratic

University Staff Associations, to which the University of Natal's Joint (reflecting its 3 campuses) Academic Staff Association affiliated itself, a move contested by politically-conservative members.

In 1985 the National Education Crisis/Co-ordination Committee was established as a structure for bringing together a range of educational organizations within the United Democratic Front which, though pursuing disparate and distinct struggles, had common objectives. It served to link civic, educational, and political struggles against apartheid on a local, regional and national basis. The phenomenon of 'People's Education' had made an appearance by December 1985 when the Soweto Parents' Crisis Committee conference outlined the objectives and principles of 'People's Education'. A March 1986 National Education Co-ordination Crisis meeting in Durban confirmed the notion of People's Education as the desirable form of education for the country: education informed by democratic participatory processes involving learners and parents, which through its transformative values and participatory and experiential methods would empower people to resist exploitation and oppression and take greater control over their own lives. "People's Education for People's Power" was the popular slogan of the time³ (Wolpe & Unterhalter 1991a: 2-4, 9-11).

4. Enter the 'disadvantaged student'

In 1986 Natal University's Vice Chancellor, Prof C.V. de Booysen, produced a Preliminary Document entitled "Focus on Disadvantaged Students and Underdeveloped Communities" to generate funding to enable the university to address issues pertaining to 'disadvantaged' students and communities, including the establishment of an Academic Support Programme, student accommodation, and bursaries. What was actually meant by 'disadvantaged students' was those students coming from the politically unenfranchised sector of the population. This sector constituted the more than 80% of voteless South Africans with the poorest educational opportunities in a racially-segregated and inequitable system. They were also, as a result of systemic economic discrimination, the poorest people with the least exposure to the benefits of

³ For fuller discussions of 'People's Education' and its political context see, among others, Wolpe, Levin, Walker, and Gultig & Hart, all in Unterhalter et al (Eds.), 1991a; Badat, in Unterhalter et al (Eds.), 1991b: 18.

modernisation in the economy's small highly-developed sector. The term 'disadvantaged' euphemistically softened implicit political criticism of the systemic multiple discrimination and oppression suffered by this group - black South Africans.

What was more significant in the emergence of this discourse than its implicit depoliticisation of black students' circumstances, was its construction of a new, deficit academic subject, the 'disadvantaged student'. This subject was to be the first, immediate object for interventions of power-knowledge through the operations of ED. For the interventions to be justified, the subject needed to be constructed as deficient. (This process of definition, need identification, and intervention, as has been seen, had already begun in the work of the English Language Development Scheme.) Similarly, in relation to 'development' as part of the university's Mission, communities targeted for the exercise of power needed to be constructed as deficient or 'underdeveloped'. Nearly a decade later this construction of black students as deficient was to come under challenge from Academic Development practitioners in 'historically black' universities. The very strategy by which the problems associated with the intake of 'disadvantaged' students was initially addressed at UNP, in one specific local centre of power-knowledge relations, gave rise in other localised centres to a discourse which challenged that same strategy: thus exemplifying both the interiority of power-knowledge relations and the 'tactical polyvalence' of discourses to which Foucault drew attention (HS: 98,100).

The 1987 intake of 'disadvantaged', or black African students at 1st year level at UNP (excluding Education, Engineering, and Law) was 124 students: a very small minority on the campus. By and large they came from a context in which, by the end of 1986. "the disruption of schooling and the breakdown of the learning environment were worse than at any time in the history of Black education" (Hartshorne 1988: 8). Although labelled 'disadvantaged' they were, as Bulman points out in an attempt to balance the deficit notion, "exceptional" in several respects: among the small minority who had succeeded in matriculating under difficult circumstances, they were first generation university students "who had no idea what was expected of them" (Bulman 1996: 2).

Many, politicised by their experiences in educational and political struggles', wanted a university education to enable them to serve their communities by tackling the problems in the wider society. This was in sharp contrast with the majority of their white counterparts who were from relatively privileged economic and educational backgrounds; isolated from black people's lives and hence politically unaware, uninformed, and insensitive where their own privilege and others' oppression was concerned - incapable, as Nkomo put it, of conceiving of social relations different from those prescribed by their socialization (Nkomo 1990: 3); and taking university education for granted as an easily-accessible entitlement; 'something to do' while deciding 'what to do' with their lives.

For their part, many black students brought to the demands of university life critical and analytical skills sharpened by their engagement in political debate, informally or in organisations: democratic organisational experience, a capacity for co-operative work fostered both at home and in the broader community, and a spirit of 'ubuntu'⁵; also a sense of purpose and dedication, self-discipline, tenacity, and the ability to work extremely hard in pursuit of their goals. These qualities, however, often either went unrecognised in the university environment, were not easily transferred into the academic context, or were obscured by the label 'disadvantaged'. This is not to say that black students did not also bring problematic characteristics to their study situation: they were just as prone to engaging in activism without reflection or theory, as they were to theorizing without action, and the largely rote-learning Bantu education system had severe 'disabling' effects which students struggled to transcend.

Not all black students were, or wished to be, politically engaged: some who gained entry to universities like Natal were either from quieter rural areas relatively untouched by conflict and struggles in the schools, or chose tertiary institutions where they perceived disruption to be minimal so as to escape the high possibility of the loss of a year at university and a concomitant

⁴ The establishment and growth of the Congress of South African Students, in 1979 and the struggle of school students through this and other organisations is documented in Samuel (1990) and Hyslop (1988) and others and will not be dealt with in depth here.

⁵The quality of ubuntu stems from the traditional African concept '*umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*' a person is a person through other people; that is, personhood comes as a gift from other persons. See Shutte (2001).

loss of fees. Few in number as they were, then, black students were not a homogenous group. notwithstanding certain commonalities in terms of their oppressive political situation and the poorly-resourced, authoritarian education system they had been through.

4.1 A support service for disadvantaged students

Despite their small numbers, the stakes involved in admitting these black students were high enough for the University to invest some of its own resources (not external funding) in attempting to ensure their success. 1987 thus saw the establishment at UNP of the Student Support Services, a small unit consisting initially of only a Head (who resigned after six months and was only replaced six months later) and an administrative assistant, both in permanent posts. Its counterpart had already been established at UND a few years previously, as well as a permanent, university-wide post of Director of Student Support Services.

Among the first Student Support activities at UNP were the creation of a textbook loan scheme (many black students could not afford their own textbooks, and access to textbooks was deemed crucial for students' academic success); assistance to black students in finding accommodation. since many could not afford the cost of staying in university residences but the Group Areas Act and racial prejudice amongst white landlords also made off-campus accommodation virtually unattainable; and the establishment, in conjunction with the Black Students' Society and the Centre for Adult Education, of an 'alternative' Orientation Programme called 'Preparing for University', which involved senior black students in assisting entrant black students. Student Support thus prioritised environmental support issues. 'Preparing for University' did, however, concentrate far more on academic aspects (notetaking and notemaking skills, introductions to unfamiliar disciplines to facilitate curriculum choice, orientation to learning as a knowledge-making rather than a memorisation process) than did the existing official (student-run) Orientation Week with its heavy social programme.

The Internship Programme aimed to provide black students with academic development and enrichment opportunities while partially ameliorating their financial needs, through placing them

as research interns under staff mentors, most of whom were white. The students received an honorarium for assisting lecturers while learning more about the discipline, its research methods, and the requirements of an employment situation. The lecturers, through personal contact, could learn more about students' circumstances, educational backgrounds, life experiences and academic needs. Both staff and students' academic practices were expected to be transformed through this interaction.

External funding had to be elicited for the programmes,. The American 'Ford Foundation,' a significant donor, established race, gender, and developmental criteria for programmes. It also demanded longer-term strategies for sustainability, that is, for the university to integrate programme costs into its own budget, eventually eliminating reliance on external funding. In this respect the Ford Foundation, and other donors, constituted themselves players in the struggle for determining how resources could be used and the shape that programmes had to take, using the institutions' needs as a political instrument.

Not only student but staff needs had to be constructed. The Student Support /Staff Development Advisory Committee was created to give guidance to the work of the Student Support Services. Staff development, however, was thorny territory. Lecturers, accustomed to a high degree of autonomy and believing themselves experts in their disciplines, were generally disinclined to perceive themselves in need of professional improvement, least of all that which could come from Student Support staff, who mostly lacked high-level academic qualifications and were not Faculty-based. Seen as 'high school teachers' lacking disciplinary-specific expertise, Student Support staff faced the problem of gaining academic credibility amongst their peers. Many lecturers also perceived the possibility that 'staff development' would be linked with performance assessment, remuneration and promotion, and resisted both this subjection and the possibility of SSS staff imposing it. Some ways in which power relations played themselves out in this terrain are analysed in some detail on p. 145.

At a later stage, attempts were made (but never institutionalised) to track disadvantaged students.

Gunthorpe's statistics for the Pietermaritzburg campus' 1987 first year intake, compiled in 1993 for the period 1987-1992, reflected that of the 129 'exceptional-disadvantaged' (black) 1987 entrants, 22 (17%) graduated in minimum time (M), 26 (20%) in M+1 year, and 6 (4%) in >M+1; while 12 were excluded from their first faculty and changed faculty (a total of 16% changed faculties), and another 32 were excluded and left university; altogether, 49 of the 129, or 38%, were 'lost' to the university. Only 41% of the cohort of 129 had graduated after 5 years. (Gunthorpe 1993: 37; my percentage conversions).

These 129 were students who had not had the benefit of what Education Development had to offer, having entered university before Student Support and the Faculty programmes got underway, except for the English Language Development Scheme's course in academic communication skills, Language, Learning, and Logic, which most black students in Arts. Social Science, and Commerce would have been required to take. The 1987 results could thus be taken as some kind of benchmark against which to measure results of cohorts of students from 1989 onwards to see what impact ED had had.

The figures for UNP faculties are of interest. In the Arts degrees there were 60 African students, (17% of the total 1987 intake, i.e. all race groups). Of those, 25 out of 60 (40%) had graduated by 1991; 28 (46%) were 'gone', of whom 17 had been excluded altogether. By contrast 63% of the 235 whites had graduated, and 29% were 'lost' (Gunthorpe 1993: Appendix K, my %age conversions). In the Science degrees, of 17 African students (7% total intake) 7 (41%) had graduated and 8 (47%) were 'lost'. Amongst whites, 105 out of 196 (53%) graduated and 58 (29%) were 'lost' (Gunthorpe 1993: Appendix O; my %age conversions). Gunthorpe's statistics for length of time taken by those graduating in 1991 to graduate, reflect many gaps where there were no Africans graduating in certain degrees. They also reflect a much higher percentage of graduations in minimum time amongst white students than amongst African students. These figures not only illustrate the disparities between African and white access, retention, and success rates, they also reflect the fact that there were high failure rates even amongst white students.

4.2 Selecting disadvantaged students

The small numbers of African students reveal how few students from a Department of Education and Training (DET) background met the institution's automatic entry requirements, based on a points system related to results gained by students in the matriculation examinations. Poor matriculation results seemed, self-evidently, an index of the poor quality of Department of Education and Training schooling. But did that mean that there was a much lower percentage of the black population than of the white population capable of succeeding in university study? To have assumed this would have meant adopting a paradigm of racial inferiority/superiority, which the institution rejected. The assumption thus had to be that, irrespective of the quality of schooling, there must be comparable proportions of people potentially capable of succeeding at university amongst the different racial populations, and that there must be ways of finding those with potential, and dealing with the effects of their poor schooling.

Poor schooling, however, was only part of the problem, for a good examination system should have permitted comparable proportions of 'better' students to surface. But the Department of Education and Training matriculation results were far from reliable: besides the examination being notoriously corrupt and inefficient (riddled with cheating; and yielding, for instance, results for candidates who had died before ever writing the examinations), it also appeared to do little more than test the effectiveness of students' rote learning efforts. This Department's matric results thus soon came to be recognised as an inadequate indicator for performance at university, hence an inadequate selection mechanism. In sum, if matric points scores were to be the only means of access, student demographics would change but slowly; and it would not necessarily be the best students gaining access, or even students with any likelihood of succeeding.

To speed up the redress of racial imbalances and compensate in small measure for the abovementioned deficiencies, a selection mechanism termed 'Dean's discretion' was introduced. Deans could waive the 'points requirement' for admission if, in their opinion, a combination of factors like maturity, post-secondary training, and personal qualities (which they tried to discern from an interview) rendered an applicant likely to succeed in his/her chosen field of study.

4.2.1 Selection measures: Teach Test Teach

The subjectivity of this mechanism and the relatively high failure rate of 'Dean's discretion' students made its reliability questionable from an educational perspective, however. In 1988 an attempt to develop a rational, or theoretically-based access mechanism for the Humanities, Social Sciences and Commerce was made with the establishment at UND of an alternative selection programme, Teach Test Teach (TTT). This event constituted the insertion of the exercise of disciplinary power, with consequent knowledge-producing effects, into the university's selection and admission procedures; for Teach Test Teach was not only an 'affirmative action' programme serving both campuses, it was also conducted as a research project. It aimed at researching a means of identifying, particularly from amongst poor rural and working-class black students. those with the potential to succeed in university studies irrespective of their matriculation results.

The programme was based on Vygotskian theory. It attempted to disrupt the pattern of students' prior learning experiences to measure their ability to learn new material under carefully-controlled conditions of teaching and assessment informed by constructivist principles. Students' performances over a two-week period were carefully monitored and recorded and statistical analyses performed on the data. Students who made optimal progress as reflected in theoretically-informed interpretations of the data were commended to the Deans for admission to their Faculties. Data gathered from autobiographical writings submitted by the students (including information on their educational history and their motivation for choosing to study at university*) were combined with the data gathered from the actual Teach Test Teach process to make the final decision. As the research progressed in subsequent years the model was refined to develop its capacity to place students in the programmes most suited to their needs and capabilities, whether foundational or bridging programmes, or direct entry into degree programmes, or technikon rather than university study. In due course negotiations with technikons led to the latter accepting students recommended by the programme, even those not meeting standard entry requirements.

⁶ Here, Teach Test Teach was making use of 'the confession' as a truth-making technique. See a more detailed analysis of the place occupied by the confession in ED in Ch.4 p. 149-151.

Notwithstanding its theoretical base, Teach Test Teach met with considerable scepticism and resistance in its early stages, as well as facing the battle of finding funding. Indeed resistance was related if not proportional to its call on resources. Besides staff remuneration, there were the costs of bringing students from great distances and accommodating and feeding them for a two-week period, costs which students themselves had no means to bear. From the second year of the programme onwards, senior students who had themselves been selected to study through the programme were employed to orientate and mentor the Teach Test Teach students, and later to work in various aspects of the programme, including recruitment and tutoring. All these elements cost money; as did the production of materials for the programme. When it became evident, as student numbers increased, that the face-to-face model was economically unviable, the programme moved to distance learning mode, at which stage appropriate distance education materials had to be provided and tutors had to travel to various rural centres to offer the occasional tutorials in support of the materials-based learning process.

Teach Test Teach was an ambitious vehicle for achieving an ideological goal, that of redress in the institution's access mechanisms. More than that, though, it was a vehicle for the workings of power: it had a rapacious capacity for drawing on university resources in the form of staff time, and it subjected those staff who came within its ambit to immersion in the theoretical basis of its work, just as much as it subjected its students to processes of confession and of 'modification' of their cognitive behaviours through training exercises. It then measured this modification using scientific techniques and assessed the degree to which each student's modification reflected his or her 'normalisation' in terms of ability to perform the basic task demands typical of various university disciplines. And it produced an extensive discourse on access which was disseminated through publications and various conferences on access.

5. Intensifying institutional management

The need for more concrete institutional planning in the context of a changing environment produced the 1988 Walker Report which called for a short-term plan for academic departments, and during 1988-1989 Faculties were required to produce 5-year plans, an attempt to introduce a

new measure of control and accountability. In 1989 also the Roberts report proposed a restructuring of the academic year to allow a longer winter vacation, giving lecturers time to do research unburdened by the demands of teaching; for there was concern that the university lagged behind rivals like the University of the Witwatersrand and the University of Cape Town in terms of research productivity.⁷

5.1 The Mission Statement

1989 saw the production of 'The Role in Society of the University of Natal 1989 Onwards'. with a new Mission Statement that took account of current circumstances, issues and constraints. 'Mission Statements' were aimed at promoting institutions as having a focused political purpose. i.e. having a clear vision of themselves and their role and direction in society. They were the means by which an institution would translate its existence and raison d'etre into a discourse, encapsulated in a label, to engage the public - their own and the wider public - in constructing a persona for that institution. A Mission Statement was the public articulation of the institution constituting itself as a politically-engaged academic and educational 'subject', aimed at persuading people to enrol their children there and, importantly, funders to align themselves with it.

In delineating the changing circumstances since 1982 the document focused on the role of a university and its relationships to other tertiary institutions; the changing student population: the financial constraint (sic); the international scene; academic staff availability; and the perception of university 'openness'. It included policy statements formulated around issues of projected growth in student numbers, 'the community we serve', 'the matter of standards', 'autonomy and freedom', 'equal opportunity and affirmative action', teaching programmes, research, and 'environment and natural resources'; and it put forward structures and procedures for policy implementation. The Mission Statement itself featured as a kind of coda at the end of the document.

⁷This proposal was eventually only implemented in 1997, by which time its primary purpose was to allow for the offering of short, intensive income-generating courses, a reflection of the financial constraints the institution was facing.

It was stressed that this document "should not be seen to invalidate the 1982 MS" (University of Natal 1989: 20), the former providing "a useful reference, listing strategies in support of this 1989 Mission Statement" (ibid.). This was a curious notion, that strategies could be conceived seven years prior to the conceptualisation of the mission they supported: furthermore, that they could still be valid despite the changed context on which so much emphasis was being placed.

The first section of the 1989 document acknowledged that the 1982 Mission Statement "[o]n reflection ... has had very little impact on the planning process and has not significantly influenced decisions and actions on current issues" (University of Natal 1989: 1). In short, it had done little to bring about change. Possible reasons for this were: the 1982 Goal was a brief, broad statement of an ideal "with no reference to the particular circumstances of the University of Natal and the society in which it exists" (University of Natal 1989: 1), and the list of Objectives. Strategies and Actions little more than a comprehensive "wish list" formulated without taking into account social and financial circumstances of the day. This reflected a recognition that the struggle for change had to take on the localised, particular context, or ground; what was not yet sufficiently recognised was the need for a sharp focus on the figure, the body of the institution itself: this was the terrain which had to be penetrated with intensified relations of power for change to occur.

The 1989 Mission Statement was much bolder in its criticism of government policy than was the 1982 document. It delineated 'reality constraints' in ideological terms: "It seems clear that to describe a university as if it existed in a democratic, non-racial society in present-day South Africa is not facing the reality of the situation in which the University finds itself' (University of Natal 1989: 1) - a reality in which the Government "continued to implement its racially discriminatory policies and practices, and ... continued to curtail a wide range of human freedoms and civil liberties" (ibid.) while the University " ... continued to protest these governmental actions and policies and ... continued to press for the removal of the constraints upon the achievement of a democratic, free and just society for all the people of the country" (ibid.).

6. Liberal dilemmas

This stance may have been encouraged by the general climate of resistance and sense of possibilities for change in the country's political dispensation, but it was not without risk. The University, while impacted on for decades by the policies of the reigning Nationalist government had, by virtue of its notion of liberal education - and, perhaps more pertinently, to avoid hostile action from the government, such as the reduction of subsidies - to maintain neutrality in the party political sense. Equally, however, it could not in act or appearance or even implicitly through non-criticism, support or condone apartheid and especially the effects of apartheid on education, and still claim to be a liberal institution. Yet, insofar as it had indeed acquiesced to racial policies, it had betrayed its liberal ideology.

The tension of this paradoxical position had long been felt by the university. In 1966 it was articulated by EH Brookes in the institution's biography:

When we come to consider the effect of the University on the political life of the Province, we enter on a difficult and tempestuous subject. The University as such cannot have a political view nor support a political party. But it has had, in its corporate capacity, to battle through the attempt to take away the Medical School, to protest against the compulsory closing of its doors to non-European students, to strive to maintain University autonomy unimpaired, and all these struggles have been against one political party.

The University, it may be claimed, did not enter into the field of polemical politics until politicians interfered with the University (Brookes, 1966: 173).

Brookes had further proposed that "A University which produces a dull conformity to political orthodoxy, any political orthodoxy, has dismally failed in its calling" (ibid.) and claimed that "there is a distinctly greater awareness of the issues of democracy and of race and colour among the young people of Natal as a result of the activities of the University" (Brookes 1966: 174). Even government supporters, he bad argued, should welcome such awareness, for

Truth need never fear criticism. The intellectual activity of students is a matter for congratulation, and how unreal it would be to have sharp clashes of opinion on King Lear or Hamlet, on

existentialism or antinomianism, on the structure of the atom or the habits of the tree frog. and a scared silence on the everyday facts of South Africa and African political life (Brookes 1966: 174).

(In this formulation Brookes seems, contradictorily, to have both elevated 'Truth' to an absolute which no amount of criticism could dethrone, and perceived it in Foucaultian terms as a construct produced through academic debate.)

7. Financial forces

While the 1989 Mission Statement articulated the socio-political constraints and ideological imperatives rather more boldly than the 1982 document had, it was financial more than ideological issues that placed the survival of the university at stake. Again, this was not a new thing: the university began its history "under the most stringent financial considerations" (Brookes 1966: 118) and struggled almost continuously to 'balance the budget': a struggle the first fifty-five years of which Brookes records in his chapter on 'University Finance,' (Brookes 1966: 118-134) noting the particular difficulties arising from the multi-campus nature of the institution.

The financial issue was addressed in the 1989 Mission Statement through the race issue, i.e. by means of an analysis of the projected decline in numbers of white students entering university and the projected increase of African student numbers, which showed the long-term non-viability of physical provision along racially separate lines. The University of Natal would have to compete with other 'historically-white' institutions for an ever-diminishing pool of white students, which could ultimately lead to its demise ("By the year 2010, ... there will be ten ('white') universities maintaining buildings and plants appropriate to the needs of three times the number of students actually enrolled" [University of Natal 1989: 7]), while the limited number of 'historically-black' institutions would be entirely swamped by student demands: two residential universities and one distance university designed to cater for 18 000 students would have to accommodate some 350 000 students in 2010 (University of Natal 1989: 8).

The only rational response to these projections was argued to be the deracialising of universities:

The above scenarios for White and African universities are clearly not practical. The only feasible solution is to take a global non-racial view of the future provision of university education in South Africa and provide for an annual growth of approximately 3,4% in student numbers in all universities ... with each university being expected to provide for all race groups (ibid.).

The section entitled 'The financial constraint' concentrated on the reduction of government subsidy to the University and the damaging cuts consequently already made, arguing that the country's economy and other urgent education sector needs made for a bleak government funding scenario even in the medium- and long-term future. The financial implications of the 'global approach' solution and of provision for the increase in projected student numbers were not addressed; reference was only made to the difficulty of generating increased revenue from student fees: "The primary means for increasing revenue are student fees, income generating research projects and consultancies, and private sector donations ... The former is constantly under review and has probably been pushed to the limit, given the fee-paying capacity of the population and the need to remain competitive amongst South African universities" (University of Natal 1989: 4).

The need to scrutinise departments' financial viability closely, was, however, addressed:

[A] document pertaining to the development of a short-term plan for academic departments prepared in 1988 ... presented statistical criteria for examining the financial circumstances in academic departments in terms of costs and earnings with a view to providing pointers for the reduction of costs. The continuing planning process will need to take account of these financial analyses even though academic considerations must clearly remain paramount in determining how the available financial resources are to be used (University of Natal 1989: 4).

The document's authors quickly forestalled a predicted line of criticism by adding: "Similar analyses of cost effectiveness are being undertaken in the non-academic divisions of the University" (ibid).

This appearement notwithstanding, the proposed business-like approach to assessing the worth of

disciplines clearly constituted a threat to departments despite the reassurance about 'academic considerations', for there was no indication as to how academic criteria would be used to prioritise financial decisions, if indeed this concept made any sense. How could the academic worth of one discipline be prioritised above another to decide which departments had to lose resources? Would this not boil down to measuring disciplines as market commodities? And would this not constitute an assault on academic freedom?

The section concluded with an indication of steps already taken to commodify the University's 'knowledge and research expertise' by marketing these, but 'without prejudicing the academic objective of the University" and in a manner which would assist success in the 'research and development endeavour of the private sector" (University of Natal 1989: 4) rather than competing with the latter for business.

In terms of institutional change processes, then, the decade ended with many signals that the University was poised for substantial changes, but with no clear indication as to how these would be effected, or how staff (and students) would be affected.

8. Student Support and disciplinary power

8.1 Taking disciplinary power into the Faculties

On the Student Support front, 1989 saw the establishment of the first Faculty Co-ordinator's post, a permanent university-funded post jointly serving the Arts and Social Science Faculties. An English Language Development Scheme staff member was appointed to the post. The two Faculty Deans were involved from the outset in the decision to establish a Faculty programme, in appointing the co-ordinator, and in chairing (separate) Faculty committees which worked with the co-ordinator in conceiving and steering the programme.

The tactic adopted was one of imposing self-scrutiny and self-subjection. To ensure that departments 'owned' programme initiatives, they were required to establish their own committees to analyse problems and needs, design interventions to address these, and submit funding

proposals to the Faculty committee for assessing and prioritising. The co-ordinator both assisted them in doing this, and sat on the committee which judged their efforts. The pool of resources for which they were competing was 'soft' money - funding raised by the co-ordinator from external donors, who increasingly over time stipulated more stringent criteria, as previously mentioned. Tutors were soon appointed to offer additional tutorials in various disciplines, especially those with large student numbers and a high failure rate. Working in conjunction with the English Language Development Scheme and departmental lecturers, they designed tutorials which integrated discipline content with linguistic and cognitive skills development.

Attendance at these tutorials was voluntary; however a system was soon devised where students who had done poorly in the first semester were required to see the Dean at a 'mini-reregistration' at the beginning of the second semester, at which they were advised to reduce their course load, or attend support tutorials, or both - small penalities, but ones which elicited resistance in some students who failed to see the Dean, or disregarded his recommendations, whereupon Deans subsequently sought further means of coercion, making students' continued registration (or readmission after exclusion) contingent on the recommendations having been met.

In addition methods (usually involving testing) were sought whereby 'at risk' students could be identified early in the academic year and directed into the tutorials. All these strategies would bring 'disadvantaged' students under closer scrutiny and use the knowledge thereby generated about their learning practices and needs to facilitate, not only greater exercise of disciplinary power over the students in the immediate teaching/learning situation, but also the implementation of minor reforms to the degree system, eg. students being permitted to complete their degrees over a longer period of time than the norm. The principles underpinning these reforms correspond to various of the principles identified by Foucault as the "seven universal maxims of the good 'penitential condition'" (DP: 269) - principles of correction, classification, modulation of penalties, and so on. For instance, the tutorials provided for correction, the reduced course load for modulation of penalties.

Late in 1989 the university-funded Science Co-ordinator's post also came on track. This faculty adopted a different strategy from that of Arts and Social Science. It established a Science Foundation Programme which included foundational courses in Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry, and Biology; a Language, Learning, and Logic course tailored to the academic communication needs of science students (the 'individually alterable penalty' cf. DP: 269); and a compulsory but non-credit bearing component in study and examination skills. time and stress management, and vocational choice provided by a counselling psychologist based within the Science Faculty. She also offered an academic and personal counselling service to Foundation students and the Faculty at large. Foundation courses were carefully designed on a basis of constructivist learning principles and linked with one another in ways which facilitated an integrated learning process. Overall, the Science Foundation curriculum adopted a 'holistic' or 'total education' approach, subjecting the students, body and soul, in order to make of them people in whom scientific practices could be induced through degree studies.

A key principle informing the Foundation Programme was 'classification' (DP: 269). Certain students were being isolated and distributed into a particular group at a particular level of the degree (foundational, not yet worthy of accreditation) and in a particular space - the Foundation Programme was soon accorded its own 'home' classroom - with their own particular teachers. This classification was achieved through a compulsory alternative selection programme for all black students with matric results below the level guaranteeing automatic selection. This Joint Selection Programme for Science and Applied Science provided a service to the Agricultural and various Science Faculties on both campuses. Its strategies of eliciting biographical data and personal motivations, a two-week residential tuition and assessment programme in the core science disciplines, and tracking of individuals' progress were similar to those of Teach Test Teach. Students not selected for the Foundation Programme were recommended either directly into the degree programme, or to study at a Technikon, or not to enter the sciences at all. As in the case of Teach Test Teach, Deans were not, however, obliged to accept the Programme's recommendations; ultimately they had discretion over selection, and where to channel students.

The Science Foundation co-ordinator's post was located within the Faculty of Science and accountable to the Dean of the Faculty rather than to the Head of Student Support. The incumbent, a specialist in physics education, chose location in Physics so as to maintain her disciplinary research base, important for enhancing her credibility amongst scientists and increasing the prospect of the Faculty (including physicists, some of whom were particularly resistant) accepting the validity and value of the Foundation programme. This was by contrast with the initial location of the Arts/Social Science co-ordinator in the Student Support Services. reporting jointly to the Head of Student Support and the two Faculty Deans. Other Faculties - Commerce, Agriculture and the two postgraduate Faculties, Education and Law - did not receive university funding for co-ordinator's posts and were slower in initiating student support programmes. The Dean of Education claimed no need for it at the post-graduate level, Commerce and Agriculture had very few black students enrolling so felt few of the pressures experienced in Science and Arts/Social Science, and Law only later began to recognise a need for ED at undergraduate level.

8.2. Interfaculty Student Support programmes and disciplinary techniques

Interfaculty Student Support programmes were also developing. The Internship Programme gained its own externally-funded staff in 1989. Its focus was to "promote the academic and vocational development of those students who have been denied this in the past, to contribute to the development of the communities from which they come, and to promote change and development within the University as a whole" (University of Natal Internship Programme 1990 Annual Report: 4). It attracted increasing numbers of students from more disciplines, which required enticing more staff to act as mentors. The insights gained by these staff through interacting with individual students were intended to encourage them to make their lectures and courses more accessible to disadvantaged students generally. No systematic measures were instituted, however, to assess what impact such exposure actually had on the teaching practices of participant staff.

The Internship Programme was in fact converting the usual one-to-many staff-student ratio of the

conventional undergraduate teaching-learning context into a one-on-one interface, making it a more than usually dense 'transfer point' for relations of power, increasing the potential for reciprocal influence. Both student interns and their staff mentors had to complete application forms detailing project goals and task requirements, personal goals, and (for the intern) financial history and career aspirations; attend joint workshops, and sign contracts governing their conduct and responsibilities. They also had to submit reports on which interns' honoraria were contingent, and report any problems which could not be jointly resolved, to the co-ordinator for mediating.

These elaborate methods created a sense of both external and internal scrutiny of each mentor-intern duo, with the potential for contract violation by either one to be met with some form of censure or remedial intervention from the third party. But they also necessitated continual vigilance on the part of the co-ordinator to administer the programme effectively and monitor the dynamics of individual partnerships against potential exploitation or abuse - deliberate or unintended - by intern, mentor, or both; so that she was as much, if not more, subjected by her own supervisory measures as they were. The programme was later expanded to include administrative and community internships; at its peak, in 1997, it involved 71 students, and over time a number of interns went on to obtain jobs in the non-governmental organisations where they had served their internships, while others pursued post-graduate study leading to academic careers, a measure of the productivity of the programme's exercise of disciplinary power.

The 'sister' Student Mentor Programme, a variant on the Supplemental Instruction programme⁸, trained senior students to mentor groups of first year students in specific disciplines, by facilitating group discussions and modeling and mediating problem-solving. The course lecturers would meet regularly with the mentors for two-way feedback; the ED Co-ordinator would run introductory and 6-weekly training workshops with them, monitor their work and administer the contractual and financial aspects of the programme. Both the Internship and Mentor Programmes were funded by the Ford Foundation which specifically required the appointment of disadvantaged (but

⁸ An American programme begun in 1975 at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, targeting 'high-risk courses' rather than 'at-risk students' per se.

capable) students as mentors and interns, to help them consolidate their own background in the discipline while providing them with a small honorarium to ameliorate financial difficulties.

Preparing for University introduced a Leadership Training Programme in 1989 to train its student mentors (some of whom had been through Preparing for University themselves) in the skills needed to plan and run the programme in conjunction with staff, and to mentor first years more effectively. Students also served on the programme's steering committee. The training made possible a closer exercise of power over first year students as the mentors met with them twice daily in group sessions, but also subjected mentors to the exercise of disciplinary power. Both the mentor training and Preparing for University were informed by 'People's Education' ideas of experiential learning, critical thinking and democratic practice brought by students (and some staff) from their education struggle experiences.

'Preparing for University' led to most black students ignoring the official Orientation Week, also a student-run programme reputedly consisting mainly of parties and other forms of socialising alienating to blacks, and unaffordable to many of them. ('Preparing for University' charged only a nominal fee.) Consequently black and white students became established in separate social groupings from the time of their arrival on campus. This racial division was challenged on the grounds that a separate programme constructed black students as inferior and disadvantaged, or resulted in the perpetuation of apartheid by inhibiting racial integration. The programme's student committees annually had to debate, with mentors and new students, the rationale for its existence. They argued that neither the university nor the Orientation Week had created a welcoming and empowering environment for black students, who therefore had to take care of their own needs and establish solidarity in an unfamiliar, often alienating or hostile institution (see Odendaal-Magwaza 1991). The Orientation Week, under pressure of being labeled racist, adopted non-racist and non-sexist rhetoric; in due course it also introduced mentors, training them even more extensively than those of 'Preparing for University'. The latter's disciplinary measures were penetrating further into the student body.

The same 'total education' approach and principle of classification identified in the Science Foundation Programme, underpinned 'Preparing for University' notwithstanding its voluntary. extra-curricular nature. Its overtly political rationale drew on liberation struggle and People's Education ideology, effectively masking the intensive subjection of students. Supposedly targeting the university for correction, its function was in fact to correct students - first years, mentors, and the committee, whose academic, social, political, and personal behaviours were being normalised.

9. Challenges and critiques

Both the admission of black students and the creation of Student/Academic Support Programmes were resisted by those wishing to maintain the (racial or academic) status quo. They raised issues of standards and the need to maintain faculties' international reputations (cf. Jackson, cited in Bulman 1996: 47). The programmes were also, however, criticised by others for inhibiting the very changes they intended to promote. The early 'academic support' model of some activities at UNP and other 'historically-white' universities was seen to be based on a deficit notion aimed at enabling students to "bridge the gap' between a disadvantaged schooling system and the university" (Bulman 1996: 47) so as to maintain standards. Critics from the 'historically black' universities held that Academic Support Programmes were mere cosmetic reforms aimed at maintaining the status quo:

Student-focused programmes...have, understandably not been found to be appropriate strategies in a context where the majority of the students come from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds ... ASPs have the effect of insulating their universities from the realities of black schooling and from the demands of black communities in general, and thus serve to inhibit the fundamental institutional change required to meet developing educational needs (Hunter and Scott 1990: 137, cited in Bulman 1996: 61).

Strategies adopted by some to promote institutional change, were seen by others as hampering it. an example of the 'tactical polyvalence' of discourse identified by Foucault (HS: 100-102).

10. Towards constructing ED as a new field of academic enquiry

Given the different institutional contexts of 'historically white' and 'historically black' universities. and especially the majority/minority issue, it is unsurprising that different strategies were employed. The approach in the 'historically black' universities went under the rubric of 'Academic Development', and aimed at contributing to institutional change, not just 'fixing students'. The definitions and terminology of Education/Academic Development discourses reflected the different understandings and strategies operating in different institutions at any given time, and also shifted continuously, becoming both more encompassing and more specific as Education/ Academic Development reflected on and constructed itself over more than a decade. In 1993 Pavlich and Orkin distinguished between 'academic support' (seen as activities directed at developing students) and 'academic development' (developing teaching and learning environments, focusing on staff and curriculum development) (Pavlich and Orkin 1993: 1-11), but designated these two together 'educational development'. For Moyo, Donn, and Hounsell, Academic Development was the umbrella term which encompassed "student, staff, curriculum, research and organisational development initiatives" (Moyo et al 1997 Ch 1: 5). It promoted institutional change: Organisational Development was "assisting with the development of the institution (eg. through participating in Broad Transformation Forums, giving advice and support in implementing new policies and strategic objectives which concern teaching, learning and assessment)" (Moyo et al 1997: 14). These research-based studies reveal the process of ED being constructed through the production of discourse.

The 'historically black' universities formed an Association, SAAAD - the South African Association for Academic Development - which held its first annual conference in 1985. 'Historically white' universities also held an annual Academic Support Programmes conference and published proceedings in a conference journal. *ASPects*. In the late eighties discussions started about a single combined conference. This was a politically sensitive move as black institutions feared that white institutions would dominate, and the issues facing the two groupings appeared in a number of respects to be different. Initially, back-to-back conferences were held but in 1989 white universities abandoned holding their own conference and joined SAAAD. SAAAD

conference proceedings were published and in 1995 the first edition of the journal academic development appeared.

The launch of academic development publicly marked Academic/Education Development's endeavour to establish itself as a recognised field of professional. i.e. research-based. activity within academia. Its discourse (academic development 1995: I: 1) attempted to define Academic Development's objects of knowledge more rigorously (the generalised term 'student development', for instance, was discarded), and its content encompassed theoretical and methodological issues and debates on teaching/learning. 'Staff development', which had aroused hostility amongst lecturers, was replaced by 'professional development' (for both lecturers and AD staff). 'Organisational development' yielded to 'policy issues': the former perhaps seen as too generalised for Academic Development to appropriate as a particular (sub)field of knowledge. whereas Academic Development could claim both a stake in, and an expert contribution to make to, policy for Higher Education at both institutional and systemic level.

But this is to leap ahead in the chronological account. At the end of the eighties, UNP only had in place a small central Student Support Services unit and minimally-staffed programmes in three out of seven faculties. The internal debates were, however, already shifting from a 'support' to a 'developmental' paradigm; what that entailed, how it was effected, and the context in which it occurred is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 4

1990 - 1993

This chapter begins with an account of the national political and educational developments of the period 1990 - 1993, and some of their effects on the university, before resuming the change narrative per se. This is done in order to maintain coherence in the main narrative. It should be emphasised, however, that events on different levels were closely intertwined and impacted on each other in many ways. The chapter concludes with an analysis of how Education Development achieved its effects.

1. Political and educational developments in South Africa 1990 - 1993

Politically, 1990 was a watershed year. Increasing domestic and international political and economic pressure on the Nationalist government finally brought results: Nelson Mandela, icon of the African National Congress' struggle for liberation, was released in February, after 27 years of imprisonment. The African National Congress, other opposition groupings, and the South African National Students' Congress were unbanned, and the National Union of South African Students had its restrictions lifted. The latter two organisations in due course formed a single, non-racial organisation, the South African Students' Congress, which brought about the eventual demise of the Black Students' Society at UNP. It also cleared the way, on campuses with Congress majority support, for the principle of non-racial Student Representative Councils. The unbannings of political organisations set the stage for a lengthy period of delicate, complex and fraught negotiations, which often threatened to be derailed by incidents of political and state-sponsored violence such as the bloody 1992 Boipatong massacre, but finally led to a political settlement and democratic elections for a 'Government of National Unity' in 1994. The period was also a turbulent one for institutions of higher education.

1.1 Higher Education

The Union of Democratic University Staff Associations took the lead in Higher Education policy debates. Its 1992 conference on 'Transforming South African Universities: The Search for New

Policy and Strategic Directions' aimed to create "a coherent framework for transformation in higher education in South Africa, given national political and socio-economic imperatives" (UDUSA Conference Announcement 1992). It emphasised the potential impact on the universities of policies under discussion for a process of national reconstruction:

...universities will be unable to avoid the repercussions of chosen options for issues like their role in human resource development, the financing of tertiary institutions, the effects of economic restructuring on the development of research, science and technology, and the relationship between reconstructive policies and sustainable employment (ibid.).

Coming in the wake of the Boipatong massacre, conference rhetoric highlighted the role of universities in salvaging the country's social, political, and economic future, and the reasons why the debate on transformation was such a crucial and fiercely contested one. Congress resolutions addressed a variety of issues from democratisation, through access (this task group was chaired by an Academic Support staff person), affirmative action, mass action and violence, the use of Afrikaans, and others. The Union set up a National Post-Secondary Education Policy Forum to develop national policy positions and respond to national restructuring initiatives. It also established a Gender Forum, convened a joint symposium on admissions with the South African Association for Academic Development, and undertook a joint national investigation with the Education Foundation "to look into education provision for the majority of South African youth who do not complete school or those who want to improve their matric to gain entry into a university or technikon" (UDUSA NEC documentation May 1993:58).

The Union was a vigilant watchdog over transformation in individual institutions. The Vice President reported to its Congress in July 1993:

Contestations in the Natal region...centre primarily around issues of university governance. UDW [has seen] a 2-year struggle [to get a] proposal for a democratically-elected council approved by parliament; COMSA [UDW's combined staff association] has been vigorously and painfully contesting the democratisation of its senate, faculty boards and departments (UDUSA Congress Proceedings 1993: 70).

Of the University of Natal the Vice President reported, in true struggle parlance, that it had been "thrown into an unprecedented crisis with the removal of its principal by popular uprising" (ibid.) - a reference to Prof. Leatt's resignation. The University of Zululand had suffered "a more serious stand-off between students and management over the less than transparent process in the appointment of [a] Rector" (ibid.), while students at ML Sultan Technikon had lost a month of lectures in a stand off with their Council, demanding that the Council and management resign. The end of May saw homeland security forces under Bophuthatswana President Lucas Mangope's orders invading the campus of the University of Bophuthatswana and attacking and arresting student and staff anti-government protesters (UDUSA NEC documentation May 1993:57). Staff (including UDUSA members) and students were expelled from the institution. Their counterparts at various universities engaged in protest actions against this attack on individual freedoms and university autonomy, and UNP became host to an influx of the expelled students.

While university managements were under such pressures from within and without their institutions, they had also to overcome their own history of perpetuating divisions in the sector. The Committee of University Principals finally accorded "recognition as full members" to Vice Chancellors from the Homeland universities ("At long last it seems as if the whole family has been drawn together. Just a pity it took ten long and uneasy years to complete the process" opined the CUP Newsletter writer (CUP Newsletter 6:3: 3). It also conducted a Vice-Chancellors' workshop on "the demands of restructuring universities and the effects thereof on university management and governance" (CUP Newsletter 6:3: 2). 'Restructuring' embraced not only internal institutional restructuring but also the possibilities of systemic restructuring through reducing the number of universities in the country, merging institutions, or various other rationalising configurations. The Western Cape region, with four universities, drafted a proposal on the structured development of regional cooperation, while in Kwa Zulu-Natal a Regional Institutional Cooperation Project was established in mid-1993 between the Universities of Natal. Zululand, and Durban-Westville. This project was later to become the Eastern Seaboard Association of Tertiary Institutions, and to include technikons. The Technikons Act of 1993 placed technikons under the Department of National Education, on the same footing as universities, and allowed them to

control their own admissions and to issue degrees, thereby creating a new kind of institutional subject - by the end of the decade technikons were well caught up in the power-knowledge spiral and fast becoming recognised as productive centres of technical research excellence.

The early 90s saw the start of perennial financial aid shortages in the tertiary sector. To assist needy students, a 'Provision of Special Funds for Tertiary Education and Training' Act was prepared by a joint working group of the Independent Development Trust and the state. Registered companies were to be empowered to receive finance and enter agreements with tertiary institutions which could then administer loans granted by the companies. The Act, however, did not ameliorate the effects on students of severe state subsidy cuts in 1993, since the National Student Loan Scheme was only finally established in 1996.

The cuts created a vicious cycle: institutions struggling to balance the budget had little option but to impose fee increases, which led to a concomitant rise in unpaid fees, especially in the 'historically black' universities. The South African Students' Congress responded to the 1993 cuts with mass campaigning for a moratorium on financial exclusions and fee increases, and a call for the dissolution and democratisation of university councils and senates. Violent protests resulting in the temporary closure of some of the 'historically black' campuses, led to various donor-funded initiatives in student leadership and capacity building, including the establishment of a National Centre for Student Development and Student Leadership. At UNP the financial aid shortages were reported to involve hundreds of (mostly 'disadvantaged') students whose disadvantage was then compounded by registering late, missing lectures, and expending time and energy trying to find funding. Academic failure and exclusion left them with burdensome debts and no means of repaying them. The institution struggled to co-ordinate academic, residence, and financial aid selection procedures, and to control unregistered students and 'squatters'. 1993 saw a serious over-commitment of loan monies. These crises produced student-executive negotiations, collaborative problem-solving efforts, and commissions of inquiry; they also gave rise to xenophobic fears that foreign students taking residence places might deprive South African students, driving them away from the University of Natal to other institutions.

To determine whether the Mission Statement's goal of Affirmative Action was being met in the face of these difficulties, Student Affairs was requested to prepare a detailed breakdown in respect of the admission of African students. The Deputy Dean of Student Services, given overall responsibility for the social aspects of residences, held workshops on student participation in the administration and life of the residences, the role of wardens, and gender and race relations. The social fabric of the institution was under strain.

1.2 Schooling

Like the universities, schooling during 1993, especially in Department of Education and Training schools, experienced severe disruptions, notwithstanding the government's intention, announced early in the year, to establish a single non-racial Department of National Education by March 1994. The National Education Co-ordinating Committee pressured the government for months demanding a negotiation forum. Its threat to occupy white schools on 26 May brought a last-minute capitulation: on the 25th the government announced the establishment of a national forum. subsequently launched in July as the National Education and Training Forum, and the occupation was called off. The government's Education Renewal Strategy could not salvage the year's Std 10 examination results: the Department of Education and Training had a pass rate of 35%; the African pass rate (i.e. including the 'Homelands') was 39%, and matric exemptions stood at 7% and 8% for these two groupings respectively. This was the small pool of students eligible for university admission on the 'points' system. I return now to the university's efforts to address the issues arising from its admission of students from the Department of Education and Training and 'Homelands' schooling systems.

2. The coming of age of Education Development

It was clear by 1990 that the Student Support Services strategy, structure, and limited resources were inadequate to the task of meeting the academic and other challenges accompanying an increasing influx of black students; this could only be done on an institution-wide basis, adopting a 'developmental' and not a 'support' paradigm. The task was now being defined as that of transforming an 'underprepared' institution. Strategies had to be found for all Faculties to both

acknowledge and address the challenges, and for departments and individual lecturers to examine and change their courses and teaching practices: in short, for them to become less autonomous and more governable and accountable. The same applied to the service sector. The attitude of: 'If a black student has a problem, send him/her to Student Support' had to change.

In the face of these challenges and criticisms of an 'add-on' approach, the university pursued consultation and research aimed at formulating effective structural measures to address the problem. A conference examining whether an Intermediate Tertiary College was the 'solution' to Educational Development in the South African Universities failed to produce support from other universities for the idea. Reluctant to go it alone on a major restructuring initiative, and perceiving also the danger that an intermediate college, even if 'add-in' and not separate from the university, would merely replace Student Support and leave the undergraduate curriculum and staff to continue unchanged, the university abandoned the concept. The 'solution' it settled for was a University Education Development Programme consisting of an academically-focused Centre for University Education Development and Faculty programmes, the former to provide a research and information dissemination service to support the latter. The Centre itself was to have a Board chaired by the campus Vice-Principal, with Deans on it, a structure intended to have more status and 'teeth' than the merely advisory committee which had preceded it.

When the Board met in August 1990 to address the Centre's establishment, Student Support staff were not represented. On the agenda was the Constitution and Terms of Reference of the Board itself: the Centre's structure, aims and objectives, and the problems to be addressed; the relationship between the Centre and the Education Faculty (the latter seen as the Centre's possible academic home); collaboration with its counterpart UND centre; and communication with the academic community, now a more important target than students. An 'interim corporate directorate' was set up to manage the changeover from Student Support to the Centre. In the second Board meeting in October 1990 the Arts/Social Science and Science Co-ordinator posts were transferred to their respective Faculties, thereby requiring Faculty funding and responsibility for the posts, in line with 'mainstreaming' ED. Commerce was seeking funding for an ED post.

The Board met regularly in 1991 and in November Student Support was finally dissolved and the Centre established, with three posts: a Director, a Head of Staff Development (this post was immediately frozen on account of financial constraints) and a Head of Student Development. The Director's position was filled in May 1992; and the Head of Student Support became the Head of Student Development. 'Environmental support' concerns were channeled to the relevant Student Service departments, which were now required to serve all and not only the 'historically advantaged' students they had traditionally served. The broadened, generalised scope of these offices was reflected in the change of titles: the 'Bursaries and Scholarships Office' became the Financial Aid Office, the 'Residences Office' the Student Housing Office.

The Centre did not locate in the Faculty/School of Education as had been proposed. for although this move could enhance its academic credibility, it was thought that other Faculties might thereby be distanced from it. More problematic than interfaculty rivalries, however, would be access to resources: a Faculty base would mean competition with other departments for a share of the Faculty's already-limited cake, to the Centre's likely disadvantage. Centre academic staff were however accorded seats on the Education Faculty Board to tap into and strengthen synergy between their work and Education; they also gained seats on the ED Board. An overarching (i.e. university-wide) ED Co-ordinating Committee was to ensure coherence in the development of the programme across the two campuses, and co-ordinate fundraising. Both campus ED Boards were to "deal with matters of institutional development, curriculum development, staff development and student development within the university" (University of Natal 1991a). The work of Faculty ED Programmes could thus legitimately fall within the Board's ambit.

The Centre motivated for a research post for an academic database to monitor the progress of (mainly 'disadvantaged') students. A document with ED origins entitled 'American model: A University Education structure' (Schuster 1991), in essence a proposal for a new BA degree structure, prompted the ED Board to establish a Review Committee to examine, not the degree structure, but Academic Support Activities. Thus, ED as the watchdog over students and the change agent for departments and Faculties was itself to be subjected to scrutiny and pressure for

change. Reviews of ED structures and programmes became a frequent and time-consuming feature at both UNP and UND over the following five to seven years.

The anticipated funding source for much of the University Education Development Programme was the Independent Development Trust, which favoured an 'add-in' over an 'add-on' model of academic development. The latter, it believed, did not promote transfer of skills; placed additional time demands on already academically weak students; and left problematic lecturing methods unchanged. It would also become unsustainable as student numbers increased. The Trust therefore used financial incentives to promote the 'infusion' or integration of academic development, an approach which required collaboration between lecturers and academic development staff to redesign courses, sacrificing some of the content for a skills development component.

Trust funding, however, only materialised in 1992; whether for one or three years, was unclear. Progress within Faculties was also uneven: where Arts, Social Science and Science had already moved beyond an academic support model, Agriculture. Education and Commerce had not even established mandated ED Committees. The English Language Development Scheme was seeking an academic home in the Education Faculty, and funding for a Chair of Second Language Studies; by 1992 its status as an academic department had been approved and it became the Department of Applied and Second Language Studies. Besides continuing to offer Learning, Language, and Logic it developed undergraduate (and, subsequently, post-graduate) courses in Applied Language Studies, and, for the teaching diploma and the B.Ed., courses in English second language teaching.

During 1992 the ED Board endorsed the principle that "work involving education development should be integrated into the University's first year tutorial programme" (University of Natal 1992g). While this principle could be applied in the Arts and Social Sciences, Commerce, with few black students gaining access, had not yet begun to develop an ED programme. Slowly, however, Faculty ED reports were beginning to be provided to the Board. A report on the

success of the Arts/Social Science Student Mentor Programme elicited a call for proper evaluation, by which was meant, statistical evidence to back the claims of success in this fledgling programme. An ED Centre-Faculty Liaison Group was established to ensure that "a coherent overall University Education Development philosophy is being developed across CUED and the Faculty EDPs ... at the level of teaching, learning and research" (ibid.).

Students were claiming stakes where they could. In 1993, the Student Council took control of managing both 'Preparing for University' and its training programme for mentors, with the ED Centre providing only administrative and financial support, and training expertise. That year 259 students, approximately 50% of black 1st year entrants, attended Preparing for University.

By 1993 the following contract ED posts had been established and filled, funded by the Independent Development Trust: in the Centre, a researcher, evaluator, and database manager (and the 'unfrozen' Staff Development post was advertised); in the Faculty Programmes. Coordinators for Commerce (part-time, to set up a Foundation Programme). Agriculture (for 'schools outreach' to recruit black students), and Social Science, now separated from the Arts. A Mathematics Co-ordinator was appointed to establish a Mathematics Foundation Course for Social Science. Science. Agriculture, and Commerce. A preliminary regional meeting to discuss the idea of a coursework Masters in Education Development was initiated by the Centre's Director: another step towards establishing ED as a field of study in its own right. Attempts were made to get a dedicated university-wide ED fundraising post and to address ED funding in the Vice Chancellor's Review. The precarious position of ED staff and the need to include them in the establishment where possible, was acknowledged by the Vice Principal.

This period, which saw the establishment of the University Education Development Programme, was also the period in which the Vice Chancellor's Review shifted the techniques of the broader institutional change process from rhetoric to intensified exercises of control. We turn now to this story, before examining more closely how ED obtained its effects in the institution.

3. Intensifying institutional governance:

3.1 The Vice Chancellor's Review

In July 1991 the new Vice Chancellor, Prof James Leatt, appointed a Committee to implement an extensive Review (VCR). The Review, unlike the 1982 Statement, was not an ideological appeal for change: it was an exercise in 'democratic' coercion. Phase I, against the received wisdom of putting function before structure, would examine the university's governance system so as to streamline operations, which, it was argued, would release lots of energy into the system for Phase II, the functional/strategic planning process.

In Phase I the committee, through interviews and written submissions, elicited 'confessions' from those deemed, by virtue of their involvement in the various decision-making committees, to be best qualified to judge the system, diagnose its shortcomings, and propose possible remedies. Through this process of formulating and submitting their views to a select audience of listeners or readers, staff who were already subjected by the system (and simultaneously subjecting themselves and others to it) were subjected even further, notwithstanding the ostensibly voluntary nature of their submissions. This engagement already began to render participants more malleable and compliant towards forthcoming changes. The regular monthly distribution to employees of VCR Newsletters so as to democratise and render 'transparent' the change process, had a similar domesticating effect through subtly coercing staff members to inform themselves about and thereby engage with developments. These techniques were part of mobilising support for and reducing resistance to the changes to come. A British consultant was appointed advisor to the VCR, a case of expert knowledge being deployed in support of the extension of power throughout the institution.

In December 1991 the Phase I report recommended a thorough review of Council, the highest governing body of the institution. It also proposed the establishment of campus-based Vice-Principals (UNP's to be a part-time one) to take some of the workload from campus Principals, facilitating the latter fulfilling their roles as academic leaders and strategic planners for their campuses. In fact this would consolidate power in the administration. Similarly, limited devolution

of academic administration to campuses and Faculties was proposed, and endorsed by Council and Senate respectively, in May and June 1992. Power over knowledge reproduction, i.e. ultimate responsibility for academic decisions and the integrity of UN degrees, however, remained concentrated in a central seat, the Senate, reputedly the most inefficient of the governing mechanisms, and the one most resistant to transformation. (Only in 2000 did Senate finally shift from automatic membership to an electoral system, with its numbers reduced from 246 to 128.)

The March 1992 Newsletter outlined plans for Phase Π, a Strategic Planning Process entailing seven tasks: 1) A Mission Statement Review 2) An Institutional and Competitor Analysis 3) Technical Studies 4) Strategic Planning Options, which would pull together 2 & 3; 5) Strategy Approval by Senate & Council; 6) detailed strategy development, and finally 7) consolidation into a final plan. October 1992 was the deadline for completion.

For the Technical Studies, 9 planning papers were commissioned, on: political scenarios; external funding scenarios; student scenarios; land, buildings, and equipment; staff: learning/teaching methods; regional issues; international issues; and income and capital generation. The method for producing these differed from the 'confessional' approach of Phase I, relying more heavily on the academic authority, research expertise, and personal perspective of individuals selected to produce the technical studies. The strategic planning exercise was reviewing, not the management of people, but the production and distribution of knowledge, ostensibly the 'real' business of the institution. The accepted conventional 'games of truth' by which the university produced knowledge, i.e. scientific research and scholarly analysis, would generate the appropriate information on which to base strategic planning decisions. Legitimised knowledge-making methods were thus being deployed in the service of the extension of power, and this very deployment in turn served to legitimate the knowledge produced by the experts in their 'technical' studies. The term 'technical' implied the neutral, apolitical nature of the methods of study, effectively disguising power at play in the knowledge-making process (DPS: 240).

The May 1992 Newsletter included an analysis of external factors, foregrounding the likely

government approach to funding Higher Education, which would result in having to do more with less money; and the June Newsletter summarized the findings of the technical studies. Papers on these were presented in Open Meetings on both campuses, the stated objective being to hear from the Community about future strategic options for the University, a continuation of the democratic consultative process whereby staff were being drawn into consenting to change.

In August Council established a Review Committee under the Chair of Council, to consider its own role, function and composition. Other 'housekeeping' recommendations of Phase I entailed the disestablishment or merging of various committees. ED's Student Support Staff Development Advisory Committee, having singularly failed to promote staff development, was disestablished. and the Coordination and Liaison Committee was amalgamated with the Student Services Board.

The VCR Working Paper Phase II, 'Choosing a Focus', appeared in September, and the Newsletter Phase I and Phase II presented a model for organisational change, on grounds of which certain steps were motivated. The model was linear, additive, quite devoid of the messy recursiveness which generally characterises a change process, and implicitly saw change as the outcome of the intentional, subjective exercise of power:

change (Chorn, N. Wits Bus School, 1986, in Annexure B of University of Natal 1992c).

Irrespective of the congruence or otherwise between the model and the actual process it was supposed to represent, its inclusion in the newsletter was a strategy for legitimising the change process by demonstrating that it was informed by the expert knowledge of change managers.

Phase II proposed a strategy of 'Quality with Equity' with the University's goals being to dedicate its "excellence in teaching, research and development to progress through reconstruction" (University of Natal 1992c: v). It would serve South Africa, and the Natal KwaZulu (sic) region

by "delivering quality teaching" which would enable "students from all backgrounds to realise their academic potential and to obtain degrees of a continuing international standard". It would undertake "quality" research "to national and international standards", and provide "development services which meet its clients' needs" (ibid.).

This discourse of 'Quality with Equity' provided a superb mask for the exercise of power (HS: 86): 'Quality' carried connotations of excellence, value for money, the best on offer, and assurance of high standards, while 'Equity' carried connotations of moral goodness, social justice, humanism and humanitarianism. The strategy thus did not appear as one the implementation of which would effectively extend disciplinary power but as one which would offer the best both academically and politically.

The strategy would entail 3 major operational changes:

- 1. Curriculum reform relevant to the African context, producing the competencies society requires.

 This would include offering foundation courses and core curriculum options, a key ED activity.
 - 2. The creation of a learning environment conducive to academic success, through developing a supportive culture in departments and residences.

This implied the establishment of the material conditions/coercions which would achieve more effective subjection of both teachers and learners; again, a key terrain of ED engagement.

3. The integration of development activities into the mainstream so that teaching and research programmes would benefit from the work of hitherto 'stand-alone' centres and units (University of Natal 1992c: 45-46).

This third change would be the process of colonizing and utilizing the disciplinary mechanisms established in the 'development activities' of those centres and units, while simultaneously subjecting them to the discipline of being 'mainstreamed', which inevitably entailed closer scrutiny and control over their activities. Eleven strategic objectives were set to attain the goals, and the document also identified 8 necessary changes irrespective of the strategy adopted.

In September 1992 the 'Proposed structure of the Student Services Division, UNP' document supported implementation of the Phase I proposal for a unified division under a 'virtually

autonomous' Dean of Students, to whom would report the Directors of Student Affairs. Student Counselling, and the Head: Sports Administration. This would bring together under one umbrella the sections responsible for administration of academic matters (Student Affairs) and 'non-academic' aspects of students' university experience, including personal care and competitive and recreational sport - sections concerned, in sum, with 'the development of bodies'. The Dean of Students would indirectly, through his managerial responsibility for the various sectors of Student Services, be the students' pastoral Father.

The Student Counselling Centre, which had enjoyed direct access to the campus principal. unsuccessfully resisted their accountability being transferred from the highest level of management in academia to a lower level of management in the administrative/services sector, arguing that this was inappropriate to the professional nature of their work. Evidently they perceived the likelihood of their influence diminishing if they were placed at a greater remove from the perceived centre of power, which resided in academia or at least the administration of academia, not in the administration of services.

The administrative rationalisation of these bodies into one division constituted a 'congealment' of power, a process of localised entrenchment (embodied in a high level management post) in which the "phenomena, the techniques and the procedures of power...which enter(ed) into play at the most basic levels" (such as through counselling, control of students' financial circumstances, etc.). were "... invested and annexed by more global phenomena" (the rationalisation of administration of students' lives) "and the subtle fashion in which more general powers or economic interests" (those informing the Vice Chancellor's Review) were "able to engage with these technologies" - technologies relatively autonomous of power but also acting as its micro agents, its "infinitesimal elements" (DPS: 235).

In October 1992 a Senex sub-committee disseminated a report entitled 'Proposal for a New Degree Structure'. The 'American Model' proposal which had originated from a Physics ED staff member and on which ED had sought faculty comments six months previously, had filtered up

through the system to be co-opted by a higher body for filtering down again. If adopted, a new degree structure would contribute to effecting change at the level at which academic subjects were constructed. More flexible combinations of disciplines in more manageable modular bits would enable students to tailor their degrees to their personal choice; study for the degree would consequently produce finer differentiations in the individualization of graduates.

Some of the Review Committee's recommendations were not accepted, eg. the Research Committee was to remain a central one reporting to Senate. Furthermore, the number of executive posts was again to be increased by the addition of a Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research), with a brief that included 'development'. As was the case with the entrenchment of Senate's control over academic matters, governance over a key activity, i.e. knowledge production, was to remain located with a central seat of power, and indeed administrative power over this activity was being concentrated into a specific function at the centre. At this stage the number of executive-level management positions created had doubled from 3 to 6 in less than two years. A joint executive of Senate and Council, the University Planning and Resources Committee, was set up as the highest financial decision-making body, and Campus Executive Committees as the highest campus decision-making bodies. The ED Centre's Board was constituted a sub-committee of the UNP Campus Executive Committee, evidently to strengthen its influence.

On the academic front, some disciplines perceived government funding policies favouring the sciences as threats to their existence. The 'Duminy document' produced by a former Dean of the Humanities put forward 'The Case for the Humanities', arguing the importance of equipping students to deal with ethical questions concerning civil life. Looked at in Foucaultian terms, this was a case of identifying the function of the human sciences as the disciplining of students for the construction of their 'souls' (DP: 29). Indeed, ethics was coming to the fore as a field of study, and by 1998 a generous grant had been obtained from industry for the establishment of a Centre for Ethics Studies at UNP.

4. Biopower

4.1 Taking charge of time

"Discipline...arranges a positive economy; it poses the principle of a theoretically ever-growing use of time: exhaustion rather than use; it is a question of extracting from time. ever more available moments and, from each moment, ever more useful forces" (DP: 154)

"Power is articulated directly onto time; it assures its control and guarantees its use" (DP: 160).

Increasing governance was not only about increasing the number of executive posts or restructuring systems or institutions; it was also about power over the body, over the minutiae of daily academic activity and institutional life. In April 1993 the UNP Timetable Committee proposed doing away with a formally timetabled common lunch period for 1994. This was motivated as necessary to cope with the shortage of large lecture venues and the demand for increased course options; the added bonus of alleviating pressure on Residence dining halls, was also touted. Commerce first-year students would have a lunch break during period 6. their Arts/Social Science counterparts during period 7, and senior students one or the other. This meant that lunchtime meetings of student societies and governing structures, and gatherings of staff or students for social, academic, or political purposes would become fragmented. divided activities. This had considerable ramifications for students' capacity to organise. By March 1994 the SRC President's report to a Student Services Board meeting reflected the effects of the change. Proposing a common lunch hour on Wednesdays he argued that its lack was viewed by some students as hindering "the process of democratic participation ... crucial in the build up to the general elections" and as "an attempt to sabotage student mobilisation. However unfounded. such a perception is potentially dangerous and needs to be taken seriously... " (University of Natal 1994a).

The students were in fact correct in their perception that this small further tightening of the already "closely linked grid of disciplinary coercions" (DPS: 240) to which they were subjected, undermined their capacity for collective activities. The biggest problem was that it made the task

of finding common free time, something previously taken for granted because automatically available, a major time- and energy-consuming activity in itself: secondly, it exacerbated the existing compartmentalisation of students along academic lines; and thirdly, a smaller proportion of the student body could be targeted at any one time. On the other hand, the 'tightening' of the grid, aimed at assuring the "cohesion of [the] ... social body" (DPS: 240) was also a loosening up of individualising possibilities on the academic front, justified by student demand for increased subject choices and new permutations which would become available if flexible lunch times were adopted. The committee argued that if the proposals were not acceptable, "subject choices will remain limited ... [and] will probably have to be reduced... to alleviate the lecture venue crisis. In particular, the options for senior students to take one or two senior courses while repeating several first year courses will have to be severely restricted" (University of Natal 1993a Annexure C). Implicit in the last sentence was the benefit of the proposal (or the adverse consequences of its rejection) for 'disadvantaged' students, those most likely to fit the sketched academic profile of failing several first year courses. For them, the advantage would be not so much increased course options, as being able to reduce the potential length of time it would take to obtain the degree.

An overall effect of this timetabling move in conjunction with a more flexible degree structure, was to render students politically more 'governable' as docile bodies, and the institution as a whole more academically productive, under the guise of increasing students' range of options and reducing time taken to graduate. Requests for the reinstatement of a common lunch period became an annual feature thereafter. They emanated from both the students and those departments in Student Services like the Counselling Centre whose reach over students had also been curtailed by the change. One period per week was reinstated after the new faculty structures and programmes had come into place in 1999 but proved insufficient; invariably lecturers, bent on extracting maximum productivity from time and their students, would use it for academic purposes. The plans for 2000 proposed even more far-reaching conformity to allow for greater individuation: a university-wide timetable that would enable students to pursue courses on either campus by means of video conferencing.

Other technological measures of control which contributed to this effect included the BANNER Student and Financial Aid System to replace the existing Student Information Management System, to serve the basic student information needs of the University - i.e. the information needed for governing of students, identifying their status with regard to registration, payment of fees, place in residence, academic standing, etc. - and 'Smartcards', staff and student identity cards

which could be issued only once and revalidated at the beginning of each academic year... and which could be versatile - a multipurpose card for identity, after-hours access to buildings, parking and computer labs, studios, libraries, meal bookings, payment of university fees, and possibly even for information on courses taken and results obtained (University of Natal 1993b).

Thus, both students' identity and their capacity for action, whether of the most basic physical kind or of a sophisticated intellectual nature, was governed by an extraordinarily economical use of power through a small piece of hard plastic, in the use of which they had to become extremely disciplined. Without it, a student was rendered inactive and a non-person in any terms significant for the university and her own progress towards academic subjecthood.

Academic subjecthood was not easily attainable, as already seen from the statistics of students excluded or 'lost' to the system; but the university was beneficent. In March 1993 a Senate Readmissions Appeals Committee report was sent by Senate Executive to the ED Board for the latter to address the fact that

programmes, were being admitted into regular first-year courses, with many then failing so badly that exclusion followed; their appeal statements invariably mentioned the heavy workload and the vastly different study approach from that at school, added to which were environmental difficulties, usually of finance, accommodation and violence. This comment, if valid, suggests that new strategies are required, of which the new degree proposals are one. Another might be an early assessment of student achievement in their courses, with a view to assigning them to special programmes. (University of Natal 1993c).

ED was thus being assigned the humane task of developing the techniques required for the categorisation of certain students as special cases. They were students some of whose characteristics - their particular educational backgrounds, for instance - distinguished them as being 'disadvantaged' but who appeared by virtue of other features (reasonably good matriculation results) to have transcended their 'disadvantage' - only to demonstrate that they were, after all, delinquent and, like other disadvantaged students, required not only normalisation but early categorisation to enhance their prospects of normalisation.

4.2 'The least body of the condemned man..' (DP: 29)

The Senate Readmissions Appeals Committee was in fact the old Exclusions Appeal committee in more humanitarian guise. 'Delinquent' students who had been excluded under one or the other Faculty rule, whose progress towards academic normalisation had been too slow, had an automatic right to appeal against their exclusion. This was exercised by completing a form which provided space for a written confession on the reasons for their poor performance. Detailed transcripts of their entire academic career (including class mark records from the ED database when this was operational) were provided by Academic Affairs. Students were urged to seek the Student Counselling Centre's assistance in completing their appeal form, and to provide supporting evidence of claims of personal problems eg. chronic or untimely illness (a doctor's certificate), financial hardship (letter of retrenchment, proof of pension), a death in the family (death certificate). A committee chaired by the campus Principal with senior academics from various faculties, the Director of Student Counselling, the Head: Student Development, and members of the Students' Representative Council representing the students concerned, would then consider all appeals. Information disclosed in these meetings was stressed to be strictly confidential. Students' lives, as revealed in their confessions supplemented by information from previous counselling sessions (attendance at which invariably counted in their favour), were scientifically interpreted in a humanitarian spirit by the Counsellor, and meticulously scrutinised for possible evidence pointing to their potential for 'success' were they to be given another chance, either in their chosen or a different field of study. Such evidence had to bear on the factors which had apparently contributed to their failure. Thus, a student whose poverty

undermined her performance would have to provide some evidence that this could be eased sufficiently to make success a reasonable prospect. He who blamed previous educational disadvantage had to reveal individual effort to overcome this, eg. having attended ED tutorials, and show signs of improved results. The grounds for the original decision of the Faculty committee, chaired by the Dean, to exclude the student were also carefully scrutinised to determine whether the committee had applied their minds adequately to this special case.

In many cases multiple 'environmental' factors, often involving trauma and hardship (and sometimes interpreted through traditional beliefs, e.g. as being caused by witchcraft), were cited. taxing the committee to arrive at a judgement balancing compassion with pragmatism, scientific realism with tolerance, and the student's best interests (as construed by the committee) with the institution's need to uphold academic standards. Cases were referred back for additional information, clarifications sought, further investigations mandated: and decisions overturned, modified, or endorsed. 'Readmitted' students had a range of conditions (indiviually modulated penalties) imposed on them, usually including monitoring (surveillance) by the Dean or ED Coordinator. Even for those not readmitted the committee sought alternative remedies (penalties or curative measures): counseling on appropriate career directions or alternative study possibilities; counseling for abusive relationship or family problems; study by distance education for later readmission; and so forth. And these remedies were being proposed apropos of the "least body of the condemned man" (DP: 29), who would no longer be a student of the university, but whom the university did not wish to waste.

The techniques and procedures of this 'appeals' process were akin to those of the examination; only, the (usually 'disadvantaged) student under such minute scrutiny was not present in person, but a 'virtual subject' conjured up in absentia through evidence and the imaginations of the committee. The endless circles of discussion, advocacy, and argument created subjection not only of the student but of the (usually absent) Dean and his committee, as well as the readmissions committee themselves, who were being constructed as experts in judging the peculiar difficulties of those academic subjects most resistant to the university's normalising procedures.

Here then was a case of normalising power being institutionalised to the extent that the committee, whose task was to decide whether the student should be readmitted, were exercising their power so as to "judge, assess, diagnose, recognize the normal and the abnormal and claim the honour of curing or rehabilitating" (DP:304). This they did, not only in relation to the student, but also to the Dean and his committee. The activity of academic judgement had spread beyond the work of the Dean; committee members were teacher-judge, doctor-judge, educator-judge, 'social worker'-judge; on them "the universal reign of the normative" was based; and appealing students had to subject to it their body, gestures, behaviour, aptitudes, achievements (ibid.). Education Development and the Counselling Centre provided the techniques and knowledge for the exercising of judgement; in acting as advocates for the students they were masking power with humanity.

There was also room, at the other end of the spectrum, for a category of students who exceeded 'normal' expectations. The Social Science Faculty was concerned with the case of students capable of speeding up their academic progress if permitted: its summer school proposals included the idea of offering normal credit courses on 'an accelerated basis' during a 6-week summer school, thereby enabling students to complete their degrees over a two-year, six-semester period. This would require an amendment of the Statute and Senex had appointed a small committee to investigate the implications of the proposal before moving for such amendment. Such a move would introduce even further flexibility to the degree. The proposal, however, came to naught except insofar as a few random credit courses were repeated during the winter semester once it was established. The Social Science faculty subsequently, however, developed a foundation course for disadvantaged students. The 'disadvantaged student' was evidently a more useful subject than the 'academically excellent' student. (The latter's time was yet to come, at the end of the decade, with the introduction by the Dean: Student Development of an International Academic Honour Society of American origin, entitled 'Golden Key', to mark academically excellent students as special cases.)

With this proliferation of techniques and despite financial strictures the racial profile of the student

body at UN was slowly shifting. Eleven years after the 1982 Mission Statement's references to serving the whole community and admitting students with a reasonable chance of success 'irrespective of race', of a total student population of 15034 students, the proportion of whites was just over half - 51%. African students constituted 23%; Coloured students only 2%; and Indian students equalled Africans at 23%. These figures, however, were somewhat misleading as the great majority of Indian and African students were enrolled in the Medical School, and the demographic changes at UNP were not so rapid. Transformation of the staff profile in terms of its race/gender mix was to be addressed through the establishment of an Equal Opportunities/ Affirmative Action project. Significantly, its brief was research and policy development: the progress of 'social justice' in the form of redress through affirmative action was to become a field of enquiry. During January - September 1993, 21 staff appointments were made under the AA/EO policy: 12 were women, and 9 men; 8 were black, and 13 white.

5. Transformation pains

Thus far, then, the business of 'disciplining' and transforming the university seemed to be proceeding to some effect. But the Vice Chancellor's Review and its initiator were not popular in all quarters. Political tensions amongst both staff and students around Prof Leatt's appointment had been growing, and his treatment of some longstanding staff aroused resentment. In March 1993 he retired - was ousted, in the views of some - and Brenda Gourley, an Accounting Professor, was appointed acting Vice Chancellor. This did not halt the Review process which Prof Leatt had set in motion. The VCR continued under Gourley's direction, and decisions already taken were implemented. The April 1993 Newsletter reported that campus Academic Affairs Boards at UNP and UND were to take over the business of the Senate Executive (Senex). This apparently constituted a devolution of power to a 'lower' level; in fact it was effectively a more localised concentration of power. The newly-created Boards, to whom Faculty Boards would report, in turn reported to Senate.

Financial pressure on the institution was becoming more acute: with the 1993 decrease in state subsidy to universities, only 64% of UN's allocated subsidy was met. This had adverse

implications for ED's efforts to consolidate its position. Accordingly, ED posts and programmes needing funding were to be prioritised, and criteria identified to this end. In due course the prioritising sub-committee concluded that all existing programmes were necessary, and prioritisation undesirable. A funding document on the 'Function of, Staffing for and Costs of Development Activities 1993 onwards' was produced proposing the 'top-slicing' of ED costs from the campus budget. ED, it was claiming, should be prioritised before standard academic activities. These recommendations both belied and revealed ED's tenuous position. In July, the Director of the ED Centre, having struggled with both the ambiguities of his post's definition and personal illness, resigned and the Head: Student Development was appointed Acting Director. The Staff Development post was due to be filled in January 1994, but the appointee subsequently withdrew, and the post was never filled. This fluid state of affairs yet again rendered ED vulnerable to scrutiny. Faculty Boards supported the idea of ED Programmes being evaluated, and the Director of Academic Development from the University of Cape Town was invited to conduct the 'Scott Review' of ED at UNP.

The 1993 Students' Representative Council was redrafting its own constitution to establish a General Students' Council, but student representatives were absent from the formal Review decision-making processes, their participation awaiting recommendations from an interim Transformation Committee (University of Natal 1993b, 1993c). Meanwhile the 'VCR Strategic Planning Guidelines 1994-8' had been approved by Senate and Council, without student involvement (University of Natal 1993f).

Consultative forums were held at UNP and UND to discuss the proposals of Council's subcommittee on the future of Council. Predictably, notwithstanding students' demands that Council
be disbanded altogether, no change in its role and function was proposed, only its composition.

The king was not about to cut off his own head (Foucault 1980: 121): Council's governance
would continue unhindered, with merely a few changes in the ranks of the players. Senate, equally
predictably, approved the recommendations. The Student Representative Councils were
reluctantly obliged to accept the proposals, and urged their implementation by a sub-committee.

On 24 September, afternoon lectures were cancelled to allow for a planned mass action by students while Council debated the proposals behind closed doors. The campus Principal subsequently "commended the student marshals on their effective management of the demonstration and recorded his satisfaction with the manner in which the mass action had taken place" (University of Natal 1993f). Council approved its own transformation, insignificant as it was, and extended the terms of reference of an ad hoc committee considering the need for a Transformation Forum, to include implementation of the recommendations.

Neither the cancellation of lectures nor the students' docility met with universal acclaim. Staff members who were publicly critical of the closure called forth censure from the Vice Chancellor. The editor of the local newspaper was accused by a Physics staff member of allowing "his antagonism to dominate his opinions to the extent of castigating the University for closing for an afternoon" when it had only been taking sensible minimal action to pre-empt "what could have developed into an ugly and expensive melee which would have benefited only the more radical elements (to left and right) and those singularly unwilling to attempt the examinations" (Wang 1993) - a suggestion that resistance was as much about the disciplinary mechanisms of the education process as it was about the issue of the governing structure of the institution.

The protest notwithstanding, in October student participation in the VCR still awaited the setting up of the Broad Transformation Forum. Only in November did a meeting of representatives of all university constituencies decide that transformation was "a legitimate activity for a university and an ongoing process" (University of Natal 1994a); determine steps to be taken, and establish a facilitating committee. This, of course, was end-of-year examination time when students' personal individual subjection was bound to take precedence over their involvement in university governance. Thus, over an entire academic year the Broad Transformation Forum which, in students' eyes, was the only legitimate structure to drive institutional transformation, had not materialised and students had missed the boat entirely in the Review, where the substantive transformation was actually proceeding. Their non-participation could be regarded either as a sign of their disempowerment and marginalisation in the institution, or as resistance in its own right.

They were not the only ones marginalised or resistant. In October 1993 a sub-committee was set up to monitor Review developments in relation to the Education Development Programme, which appeared to be ignored and marginalised. Asserting ED as a key player in the change process required it to engage in surveillance of the major 'player', the Review, thereby drawing attention to itself, but hence also increasing the risk of being subjected yet again to review and to having change imposed on it.

By the end of 1993 various changes and restructurings had taken place: greater campus devolution in the Financial Aid Office; the amendment by Parliament of the definition of the seat of Natal University, enabling it to offer distance education; the amalgamation of Arts and Education into a Faculty of Humanities; specification of the Deans' authority over Heads of Departments in academic and policy matters; and the appointment (after an amended selection procedure to promote openness and ensure that the successful candidate had 'the support of the majority') of the first woman Vice Chancellor at the University of Natal, in December 1993. Shortly after, the executive gained another woman: an anthropology professor from the Durban campus was appointed the first Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Research and Development.

Having reviewed the developments in both ED and the Vice Chancellor's Review over the period 1990 - 1993, it becomes necessary to examine more closely this mechanism called 'Education Development' which the institutional change processes were able to co-opt, increasingly so during the period from 1994 onwards, and which also utilised those selfsame institutional change processes to advantage.

6. ED and the operations of power-knowledge

6.1 New subjects

As already stated, ED discourse gave substance to the broad category of 'disadvantaged student,' and in turn took its raison d'etre from the existence of these subjects. 'Alternative admissions' students formed sub-categories: Teach Test Teach, called TTT, students in the humanities, and Joint Selection Programme or JSPSAS (approximately called 'Jipsis') students in the sciences,

plus 'Dean's discretion' students. The techniques involved in these alternative selection programmes have already been discussed, on p. 96-97. The Teach Test Teach (later RAP - Regional Access Programme) and JSPSAS students' labels accompanied them as they went on to become 'bridging', 'foundation'/Science Foundation/SFP, 'extended degree' or 'degree' students. Other subject categories to emerge were 'exclusions' (students cast out by the system) of which there were two kinds: 'academic exclusions' - students whose practices were insufficiently transformed or normalised within a given time; and 'financial exclusions' - students failing to pay their fees. And, finally, those transformed subjects who successfully completed the required academic processes were recategorised into 'graduates', receiving public recognition of their transformation in the ritual graduation ceremony.

In the case of staff two new kinds of academic professionals were constituted: the lecturer who not only professed expertise in her particular discipline, but also in the *teaching* of her discipline, i.e. in 'physics education' or 'history education' at the tertiary level; and the tertiary (or higher) education specialist, who professed expertise in one or more aspects of the field of tertiary/higher education which cut across the disciplines: curriculum, including issues of course and curriculum design, materials development, language in the curriculum, learning/teaching, assessment; student development; professional (staff) development; evaluation and quality assurance; and generalised knowledge on matters of institutional policy, institutional change, tertiary/higher education policy and systems change. These subjects were formed through a duplication of the teacher-learner relationship. Already teachers themselves, staff were also required to become *learners about teaching/learning*. Thus they were subjected both in their role as teachers and in their role as learners; a second transfer point was imposed on the existing one, creating a doubling of power relations. Of these two new kinds of academic professionals, the former emerged as a result of existing kinds of lecturers - discipline specialists - being judged deficient by ED, and the latter as a result of staff appointed into Student Support/ED being judged deficient by lecturers.

Thus there were three 'deficient' subjects 'normalised' through the disciplinary powers of ED: the student, the lecturer, and the ED practitioner. How did this happen - how could it happen? Firstly,

how were 'deficient' students 'normalised'? Secondly, how did a process initially concerned with 'fixing the students' become a matter of fixing the staff? Furthermore, how could the judgement of a tiny grouping (ED staff) clearly in a marginal position in the institution, lead to effects on a majority grouping (lecturers) occupying a well-entrenched position of hegemony? And how was it that those whose task was to 'normalise' a particular group of students, ended up being normalised themselves through the judgement of others who were generally resistant to those students even entering the institution? And how did at least some of the resistant lecturers become new kinds of academic professionals?

6.2 Discourse production

The brief answer to these questions is: through the production of discourses, of 'truth' or knowledge about teaching/learning. The discourses produced by ED constituted the subjects: the subjects in turn produced further discourse, in a cycle of productivity. This cycle is, in Foucault's analysis¹, the fruits of disciplinary power at work. The fact that ED produced a proliferation of discourses on teaching and learning reveals its exercise of disciplinary power. Teaching/learning, from having been a matter largely disregarded in the discourses of academia, became increasingly spoken about under the 'ED regime' in the university.

That ED was impelled by a persistent will to knowledge is amply evidenced by numerous articles and conference papers pronouncing, or contesting, various claims about how to improve the effectiveness of teaching/learning processes. Whether these persistent investigations resulted in the constitution of 'true' knowledge; whether the discourses formulated 'the truth,' or falsehoods, about teaching/learning, is not the issue. The point is that ED did construct these truths through the methods it used, selected, imposed, and then proceeded to investigate in their effectiveness. It generated a 'micro-physics of power' in which the various players were caught up; it produced extensive effects, and it linked with other tactics to form strategies of transformation.

In The History of Sexuality Foucault revealed modern power as a productive, not a repressive, force, producing, and not prohibiting, discourses such as that of sexuality: "sex without the law, and power without the king" (HS: 90-91), sums up his positive view of power.

Foucault's views that the actual origins of new deployments of the mechanisms of power are never ideological but material, and that the ideological factors function as a mask which, in disguising, makes acceptable the naked exercise of power (HS: 86), suggest that the origins of ED were not in fact the political developments - the calls for equity - and that Bulman's (1996:138) notion that these 'stimulated' (rather than produced) ED is appropriately, if not sufficiently, cautious. Undoubtedly ideologies of affirmative action and equal opportunity motivated ED staff and were used to justify ED; they were part of its early discourses, and they presented both a humanistic and a humanitarian raison d'etre for it; but they were more its effect or cover than its cause. The question then arises, what were the actual material, 'humble' origins of the innovation/reform of ED as a new - or rather, greatly intensified - deployment of disciplinary powers in the university's teaching/learning processes? Would ED have emerged anyway even if there were no political developments of the kind which occurred?

The fact that activities and discourses like those of ED had already been emerging in HE elsewhere, albeit under different names such as Educational Development, Enterprise, Diversity - (cf. Bulman:18-26 and numerous others e.g. Moyo et al 1997 Chapter Two, Barnett 1992, Brew 1985, Ramsden 1988, Rowntree 1985), suggests that ED *per se* was a continuation of an existing process, rather than an innovation, and that this process was not contingent on South Africa's political developments. Elsewhere the proffered ideological motivations and accompanying terminologies may have been different- for instance Bulman identifies the discursive focus on 'Diversity' which emerged from increased access especially of 'minority' students in the USA (Bulman: 22) - but the same argument would apply: ideology is not what brought the changes, and indeed perhaps they were not really changes, innovations or discontinuities but intensifications of existing techniques; and it is the intensification which made them appear as innovations. These intensifications gave rise to ideological explanations, rather than the other way round.

It has already been noted (p. 68) that research on teaching/learning was a common factor between ED's work and that of Fundamental Pedagogics-oriented academic bureaux in Afrikaans institutions from the 1970s onwards, notwithstanding the differences in ideology and research

paradigms. Both ED and Fundamental Pedagogics can be located within the context of the proliferation of international literature over the last several decades of the twentieth century; a proliferation which suggests that there was an intensifying economic and political incitement for universities to *speak about* their most basic functions, viz. the production, reproduction and dissemination of knowledge. At the turn of the century the necessity for regulating Higher Education is being promoted as in the interests of society as a whole. The great distaste of, and resistance to, curbing what has (throughout the history of the university) been regarded as sacred, namely the autonomy of creating knowledge - sacred because it is seen as the very essence of the creative process of knowledge-making - is now beginning to yield to the imperative "to speak publicly" (HS: 24). Knowledge production and dissemination is increasingly being seen as "in the nature of a public potential" (ibid.) which calls for management procedures, for taking charge of by the analytical discourses of 'quality assurance' and 'quality audit'. If institutions of higher education are to be funded by the taxpayer, the taxpayer needs assurance that these institutions are producing value for money.

Resistance, however, is not easily overcome, and the will to knowledge continually reasserts itself in contestations over academic freedom. Resistance characterised the attitudes of many lecturing staff in the early phases of ED: they perceived ED to be about 'teaching', whereas their business was 'lecturing,' an activity of a different, implicitly higher order, and research. 'Teaching' was something done at school level; and, unlike at school, at university students' learning was the responsibility and the business of students, not lecturers. For lecturers to teach, and to be concerned about how the students learned, would be tantamount to 'spoonfeeding' students, which went contrary to the notion that university education was about autonomous study. The lecturer's discourse was - and should be, so they believed - about the content of their discipline, not about its teaching.

What ED constituted, and promoted, was "the recognized necessity of overcoming this hesitation" (HS: 24) to address matters of teaching/learning. ED required people to speak of teaching/learning, to

speak publicly and in a manner that was not determined by the division between licit and illicit, ... to speak of it as a thing to be not simply condemned or tolerated but managed, inserted into systems of utility, regulated for the greater good of all, made to function according to an optimum. (HS: 24).

Teaching/learning had to become "not something one simply judged" (ibid.) (as in the sense of 'how good were the students' results? What was the pass rate?'), but it had to be administered. managed, taken charge of by analytical discourses. As with sex in the eighteenth century, it had to become a matter to be 'policed', not so as to repress disorder amongst lecturers and students, but so as to realize "an ordered maximization of (their) collective and individual forces" (HS: 24-25). The university, like the eighteenth century state, had to "consolidate and augment, through the wisdom of its regulations", its internal power, which consisted not only in the university ('the Republic') in general, and in each of the lecturers and students who constituted it, but also "in the faculties and talents of those belonging to it" (HS: 24-25). ED had to concern itself with the faculties and talents of lecturers and students and make them serve "the public welfare", i.e. the interests of the university and the society as a whole. This result it could only obtain through gaining knowledge of those different assets, and, through such knowledge, regulating or controlling them.

It is unsurprising then that, over the decade in question, the evaluation portfolio in ED at the University of Natal moved to take on 'Quality Assurance' and 'Quality Audit' functions with alacrity, having reconstituted itself into a structure titled 'Quality Promotion Unit'. Quality Audit and Quality Assurance were specific mechanisms for policing and gaining knowledge about the assets of the institution and its members. And who could gainsay the importance of striving for 'Quality' in what one did, and in the institution as a whole?

6.3 Strategies of subjection

But this is to jump ahead, and it is necessary first to examine more closely how the ED regime intensified existing methods of subjection of students and staff. Regarding the latter, Foucault's

description of the school which was founded at the penitentiary of Mettray, is apposite. The purpose of the school was to train, not the prisoners over whom surveillance and disciplinary power was to be exercised, but prospective supervisors of the prisoners:

The essential element of its programme was to subject the future cadres to the same apprenticeships and to the same coercions as the inmates themselves: they were 'subjected as pupils to the discipline that, later, as instructors, they would themselves impose'. They were taught the art of power relations (DP: 295).

Disciplining the professors

A similar system has long operated in the university insofar as lecturers train post-graduate students as academics, amongst whom are the future cadres who will become academics, thus also lecturers, themselves. But this has been (and still is) training in discipline-specific knowledge, and particularly in research - the practices of knowledge construction - not in the teaching of the disciplines. Thus, disciples of Physics or Sociology, through supervised study and research at an advanced level, come to internalise and adopt practices which obey both general norms of academic study and research as well as discipline- or discourse-specific norms; practices which they themselves, if they become lecturers, will go on to impose on future 'undisciplined' students.

But, with the entry into the institution of increasing numbers of students whose prior subjection was different than what the lecturers were accustomed to, this training was to prove inadequate. Both the lecturers who dispensed this post-graduate training and the new lecturers they were producing were not equipped to 'discipline' these students. The cognitive and academic practices of 'disadvantaged' entrant students eluded the shaping effects of disciplinary power operating through the academic disciplines as hitherto taught. Lecturers experienced this elusiveness in the incomprehension and apparent incompetence of 'disadvantaged' students on all fronts: in understanding lecture content, in producing assignments and performing other theoretical and practical tasks, in writing tests and examinations. And, since they were failing to achieve the norm, these students had to be changed from delinquent learners (listeners, speakers, thinkers,

etc.) to learners able adequately to meet the long-established, often unexamined expectations of lecturers. In order for 'standards' to be maintained, students had to be made accessible to the lecturers' disciplinary powers, to be rendered susceptible to normalisation. And the established practices of lecturing did not penetrate the bodies and minds of the learners sufficiently to achieve this.

Lecturers, however, argued that 'remedial work' was not their responsibility. In fact, as noted, they were incapable of imposing the discipline of their disciplines upon the learners. The existing training processes for lecturers thus needed additions, amendments, and intensification. Discipline had to occur at the highest level of the professional hierarchy, training lecturers in the practices of imposing the discipline of their disciplines. The lecturers' own taken-for-granted subjection to and by the disciplines needed to be deconstructed, as did disciplinary task demands and the practices of transmitting knowledge to others; indeed, the very notion of knowledge 'transmission' had to be subjected to scrutiny. Both established and prospective lecturers required to be re-disciplined.

How then were the lecturers to become "subject ... to the same apprenticeships and to the same coercions" as the students themselves; how were they to be "subjected as pupils to the discipline that, later, as instructors, they would themselves impose" (DP: 295) - especially those who were not "future cadres", but already well-established lecturers? How was their resistance to be overcome, and by whom?

The answer to this could only be: by those already adequately disciplined themselves. But such subjects did not exist in the university context; they had first to be produced. Not only 'remedial' work but also the staff who did it were seen as 'not belonging' in HE. The latter were regarded as 'high school teachers' lacking in disciplinary expertise and qualifications. When billed as 'consultants', it was queried whether they had "workable answers to real problems of classroom situations e.g. large student numbers" (Bulman:104), since all their work was with small student groups, outside of the formal timetable, and not subjected to the constraints of covering syllabus

content. From these 'unqualified' staff ED practitioners, 'experts' in the discipline of teaching/learning, had to be constructed and to become recognised players of acceptable status in academia. Only then would they be fit to subject lecturers to disciplinary processes.

Disciplining the ED staff to discipline the professors

The identified 'need' ("meticulously prepared" DP: 26) of students to be transformed, was the means for this transformation of ED staff into experts. By taking on the responsibility for discerning, defining, and diagnosing the unfamiliar terrain of the students' 'problems' - and fashioning the disciplinary techniques to be applied to 'disadvantaged' students to normalise their academic practices, so as to ensure that 'standards' were maintained - ED staff would be inventing themselves as a new kind of academic, or an academic in new terrain.

Disciplining the students to discipline the ED staff to discipline the professors

Bulman's 1996 case study of Academic Development in five institutions (including the University of Natal, although it is not named) describes the strategies Academic Support and Academic Development staff initially employed in "enabling or facilitating change in 'underprepared' or 'disadvantaged' students (the deficit model)", and how these shifted to strategies aimed at organisational and institutional change, drawing in notions of change relating to teaching as well as learning (Bulman: 136-137). (Her text is also useful in providing examples of the discourse that was generated in, by, and around Academic Development, much of which reflects a conventional notion of power as repressive.)

Programmes in the 'academic support' phase initially tried to improve students' success rate with small-group 'adjunct' tutorials, offering some or all of the following: study skills; improved learning techniques and strategies; English Second Language skills, including reading and writing; mathematics skills; extra subject tuition and subject-oriented skills training; and, in some instances, computer-assisted learning (eg in a Plato Centre). One-on-one consultations of staff with students included issues of personal and environmental support. In several institutions much of this work was done by part-time, short-term contract tutors and did not either involve or

impact on academic staff in any direct way. In other institutions tutorials were run on a departmental basis, not separately, but departmental staff collaboration only occasionally existed.

Power at play

The power relations at play in these scenarios, while often construed as repressive, were complex and fluid. Tutors felt trapped between contradictory demands, students requesting them to reteach disciplinary course content presented in incomprehensible lectures. lecturers insisting that they teach only "language and study skills - remediation" (Bulman1996: 109). Acceding to the lecturers would result in students giving up attending the sessions. This, claimed Bulman. highlighted the tutors' powerlessness: though getting the 'inside picture' of problems and the failure of traditional methods from working with students in small groups, their marginalisation by the academics disempowered them from feeding back into the teaching/learning process. They became familiar with current debates around teaching and learning in Higher Education through reading and conferences, but their exclusion from offering 'staff development' prevented them from disseminating these debates amongst lecturers.

If this account is analysed in terms of power not as a property but as a strategy (DP: 26), the notion of the tutors' 'powerlessness' dissolves. They, the students, and the lecturers were all caught up in a network of power relations in which power was exercised, not possessed, by all the players. Power was not a privilege of the 'dominant class' of the lecturers but "the overall effect of its strategic positions - an effect that (was) manifested and sometimes extended" (DP: 26-27) by the position of the Academic Development staff and the students, the 'dominated' ones. Nor was power being exercised on the latter through an obligation to act, or a prohibition not to act, in a certain way; rather, as Foucault put it, power invested them, was transmitted by them and through them; it exerted pressure on them, just as they themselves, in their struggle against it, resisted the grip it had on them (DP: 27). The power relations were not bipolarised; they defined "innumerable points of confrontation, focuses of instability, each ... (with) its own risks of conflict, of struggles, and of an at least temporary inversion of the power relations" (DP: 27).

The tutors, in gaining first-hand access to direct, close interaction with students in a way lecturers did not in the large-class lecturing situation, were enabled to diagnose that the problem lay, not only or not primarily in the students' practices, but in the lecturers' practices. This meant that the lecturers were the ones requiring to be changed. But the tutors, in thus exposing *themselves* (far more intensively than did the lecturers) to the students whose practices the lecturers expected them to change, were in fact *themselves* being subjected to pressure. They were between two forces, students demanding from them the transfer of knowledge, lecturers refusing that they supply it. Yielding to either side would lose tutors the tenuous influence they had in relation to the other, the tenuous return pressure they were able to exercise, thereby reducing the possibility of redirecting the flow of power - or, of their being able to find a solution to the students' problems. as they perceived their task to be. And yielding to *neither* side would have placed tutors in a state of paralysis.

At this "especially dense transfer point for relations of power," (HS: 103) contrary to a conventional analysis of the situation, the balance of power lay, not with the lecturers, but with the students - those perceived by themselves and others as having the least status and formal power. If they withdrew their interaction, neither lecturers nor tutors would have cause to act. The tutors, however, were not 'powerless': yielding to the students' demands would gain them short-term relief from that pressure, making students their allies and ensuring them of work, albeit at the risk of increased conflict with lecturers. And, in giving in and teaching 'content' along with skills and language, tutors began to immerse themselves more within the discipline, to increase their subject knowledge and expertise. But in addition, so as to render the discipline more accessible to the learners and to subject the learners more effectively than did the lecturers, they also had to increase their understanding of the business of teaching, and learning, both generally and as it was happening in that situation, with those learners. They thus had to make the learners objects for investigation; they had to construct knowledge about the learners. And they had to make their own practices an object of investigation, so as to construct knowledge about the interaction between their own and learners' practices: to "enquire into the effects of (their) teaching on student learning" (Ramsden1992: 134). Doing so also required them to find and

engage with existing literature on the business of teaching/learning. These were the processes by which they came to be constructed as experts in what began to be constituted a new field of knowledge.

As Bulman's respondents observed, such a solution contained inbuilt contradictions: the more and the better the tutor taught, the greater would be student demand for her services; but equally, the less would be the pressure on the lecturer to improve or change his own practices; the easier it would be for him (and, in most cases, the tutor was her and the lecturer him, so the asymmetrical power relations of gender also came into play) to continue unchanged. This was the basis for criticisms that Academic Support was reformist in nature, buffering the institution from fundamental changes. Yet, even though the tutors may have aimed to bring systemic change, lecturers resisted granting credibility and relevance to the knowledge and skills the tutors were gaining in working with the students. This further created pressure for that knowledge to be legitimised through formalised, accredited learning processes.

6.5 Resistances

Reflecting on lecturers' resistance. Bulman's respondents termed them

a threatened species - [especially] the 'chalk and talk' lecturer who is used to dealing with a cultural group that he/she is familiar with, in a language that is his/her own ... [I]n most institutions this is no longer a reality...as people are threatened by the transition, they start intensifying the barriers around them ... (Bulman: 105-106).

They cited other reasons for resistance: academics didn't see the relevance of Academic Support/Development resources; were not prepared to invest the energy required by changes; had become territorial, and created boundaries between what was considered academic and non-academic, locating Academic Support in the latter category. These boundaries should have been "a matter of convenience for pragmatic, logistical reasons, [but instead] have become permanent, impenetrable and territorial ... [they are] magnified in any institution under threat" (ibid, 106).

The establishment of an academic database in the Centre to monitor the progress of disadvantaged students provides another example of ongoing resistance from lecturers, departments, and Faculty Boards. Lecturers perceived that their course results would be scrutinised, opening their teaching to question. The form of resistance varied from challenging the need for the database, to disputing almost all aspects of its functioning and management. The most effective resistance, however, was inertia in supplying sets of term marks for the database, without which it could not fulfil its function. The database was in conception a panoptical instrument (cf. DP: 200ff) allowing for close surveillance of both students and courses (and thus indirectly staff), and justification of corrective interventions; a research tool contributing to the production of 'truths' about 'knowable man' in the business of academic practice. It floundered, however, on the twin rocks of lecturers' resistance and various technological, financial, and staffing problems, including disputes over a research vs. an administrative definition of the post; and with its transfer to Student Academic Affairs after the Centre's disestablishment in 1994, it disappeared altogether.

The work of Gore (1993) is apposite in considering the lecturers' resistance. She addresses questions of academic culture and intellectual competition, examining the "regime of truth which produces, and is produced by, intellectual work in the university" (Gore 1993: 63). Differentiations are made within the academy about what constitutes scholarly, what political, and what pedagogical work. Particular interests are served by these differentiations, usually the interests of those people and discourses already in dominant positions in the academy. Education/Academic Development work, which was on the margins, did not meet the criteria of the 'regime of truth' as to what constituted 'scholarly', nor even pedagogical, work in the university; hence its stigmatisation as 'remedial' work. For lecturers to grant it credibility, would not have served their interests, for the implications even in the early Academic Support stages were that some of their existing practices needed to change.

Gore further identifies specific practices (scholarly work, research, lecturing) which actualize the relations of power within the academy. These power relations are linked to particular demands for disciplining the self: certain gestures, postures, and attitudes are considered to be in need of

styling (including, for instance, writing in a particular style: employing the discursive style of academia generally, or of a particular discipline). Academic Development tutors were perceived not to have subjected themselves to disciplinary styling. And, since institutions which integrate these practices both facilitate and constrain academic work, at different moments, then if institutions were to integrate Academic Development practices they would be tampering with established relations of power, actualized in, among other things, existing lecturing practices. Lecturers might have to begin to restyle *their* ways of writing (whether notes, or comments on assignments) or even their ways of speaking (e.g. during lectures) to accommodate the language needs which AD staff claimed students had. In doing so they would be reducing both their own power and status and those of the discipline, whose discourse was being 'simplified', or 'watered down'. Thus, though Academic Development might be facilitating 'academic work' (if lecturers could concede it as such) for students, it would be constraining it for lecturers.

For Education/Academic Development to become useful, to erode the resistance of lecturers and re-discipline them, it was essential for its discourses to be perceived as discourses of truth: as having the validity of scientific knowledge; for no other form of knowledge would have been granted credibility in the academy, whose business is the manufacture and distribution of scientific knowledge.

6.6 Methods of discourse production

6.6.1 The confession

Foucault's analysis of the production of discourse on sexuality, which he called *scientia sexualis* (HS: 58), provides a useful tool for the analysis of ED's methods of discourse production. He observed that the west had developed over the centuries "procedures for telling the truth of sex which are geared to a form of knowledge-power strictly opposed to the art of initiations and the masterful secret" (the latter being the procedures pertaining in *ars erotica*, the dominant eastern mode of discovering the truth of sex) (ibid.). The key act of the truth-telling procedures of *scientia sexualis* is the confession, one of the West's "most highly valued techniques for producing truth" (HS:59).

Foucault's account (HS: 58-63) of the historical trajectory of the confession in becoming a truth-telling procedure can be very simply summarised as follows: from originally being a confirmation, or guarantee of the status, identity, and value of one person as granted by another, confession subsequently came to mean self-disclosure: a person's acknowledgement of his/her own thoughts and actions. The power of authentication shifted from the other person to the individual concerned, "authenticated by the discourse of truth he was able or obliged to pronounce concerning himself". The role of the church was instrumental in effecting this shift. In this way the "truthful confession" became "inscribed at the heart of the procedures of individualization by power" (HS: 58-9); and through this mode western society has since, as Foucault said,

become a singularly confessing society. The confession has spread its effects far and wide. It plays a part in justice, medicine, education, family relationships, and love relations, in the most ordinary affairs of everyday life, and in the most solemn rites; one confesses one's crimes, one's sins, one's thoughts and desires, one's illnesses and troubles; one goes about telling, with the greatest precision, whatever is most difficult to tell ... One confesses - or is forced to confess ... by violence or threat ... Western man has become a confessing animal (HS: 59).

The confession was a central technique of ED, the 'confessing animal'. both the staff and the students - even prospective students. Teach-Test-Teach, the Joint Selection Programme, the 'Dean's discretion' selection mechanism, and Preparing for University's extractions of confessions from students have been demonstrated. The greatest effect of these confessions was not on the selectors or mentors, but on the confessing students, who already were being required to construct themselves according to the terms of the subtle coercions of the new field of forces they were entering in the university.

The rationale given for the widespread use of the confessional technique was that ED programmes and strategies designed to resonate with the prior learning of the students would be more effective in transforming the students' learning practices. Liebowitz applied this technique in designing an academic writing programme (academic development 1:1: 95). In her work and that of others (e.g. Jackson F.1995. Drewett M.1995) the particularities, minutiae, and the specific

localised sites of students' knowledge production also came under investigation. Researchers drew on examples of student writing and interviews with students 'to try and understand the complexities inherent in academic tasks, as well as the complexity of students' interpretive processes, shaped by their own prior and present learning experiences" (academic development 1996 2:1:1). In these instances three elements were under scrutiny: the requirements of the act of knowledge construction - the 'academic task'; the subjects who were 'subjected' by their engagement with these requirements; and the details of their individual processes of engagement/ subjection ('complexity of [their] interpretive processes'). Furthermore, the very act of lecturers scrutinising students in this research was a further subjection. The students were being constructed as individual subjects who were objects of knowledge.

"If we wish to ensure that the tasks we assign students are both meaningful and accessible to all our students, we need to root our curriculum development in a deeper knowledge of their expectations and assumptions about studying, as well as their prior knowledge of, the 'culture' of our discipline", argued Jackson (1988:163). If students' expectations, assumptions, and prior knowledge thus had to be revealed to the ED staff, means had to be found for them to confess their ignorance and confusion. Means such as discussion, written 'submissions' and questioning:

At the start of each new topic a major attempt has been made to consider the existing backgrounds of the students in the class. Open class discussion is used, as well as written submissions (done in lectures) to get a feel of what students know about a particular topic. Lectures then take as a starting point the area of ignorance or confusion. Most of the time there is an imbalance between the background/ knowledge of different students, but context provision can be interesting... by incorporating (it) in the lecture - through such methods as the questioning technique. (Drewett 1995: 143-44)

6.5.2 Creating delinquency

This concern with biographical elements and the scrutinising of prior learning experiences bears a striking parallel with the penitentiary process Foucault delineated in *Discipline and Punish* (DP: 252-254). For the convicted offender, the penitentiary apparatus substituted the 'delinquent', who

was characterized not by the single act of his offence, but by his whole life. The punitive technique bore not on his act, but on his life (psychology, social position, upbringing etc) in which could be sought the causes of his crime. The biographical investigation into this life, said Foucault, was what constituted or brought into being the delinquent, or 'dangerous' individual. The penitentiary technique related, not to the crime, but to the criminal's affinity with his crime. From this process of biographical investigation emerged a systematic typology of delinquents in which the delinquent was specified according to the norm; and from this emerged the science or 'discipline' of criminology. Biographical investigation was the means by which criminology was made possible.

In the case of ED, for the student who was unsuccessful in obtaining sufficient points for automatic admission to university (rendered a 'convicted offender' by the matriculation examination in which his performance was deemed inadequate) the university's selection apparatus substituted the disadvantaged student (the 'delinquent'), characterized not by the single act of failing to qualify for admission, but by his whole life. Alternative selection programmes and other ED programmes were corrective techniques that bore not on the student's failure to qualify. but on his life - his educationally, socially, economically, linguistically, culturally etc. 'disadvantaged background', in which could be sought the causes of his academic failure. The biographical investigation into this life, conducted through eliciting and analysing a range of personal and educational information from the student, was what came to constitute him as the 'dangerous' individual, that is, the 'at risk' student, who needed to be channeled into a special programme. The corrective technique applied in this programme had to bear on the student's affinity with his academic failure. Thus, ED programmes needed to 'resonate' with learners' prior experiences, frames of reference, individual learning styles, and language needs. From the biographical investigation (including past examination results and performance in entrance or alternative selection tests) ED developed typologies of learners with varying forms and 'degrees' of disadvantage, styles of learning, types of intelligence, etc. - and, through the construction of these 'disadvantaged' subjects, Education Development was made possible.

Later ED discourse reflects some awareness of and sensitivity to the implications attendant on the labelling of students as disadvantaged.. Ndebele pursued the 'critical debate' raised by Pavlich when "[f]ollowing Foucault [Pavlich] asked to what extent we construct the thing of which we speak. In other words, what are the educational effects of the labels we so readily fashion and fix to subjects in our institutions" (academic development 1:1:95). Ndebele criticised Academic Support's use of terminology such as 'disadvantaged' and 'underprepared' as implying "that there is an accepted, normal, advantaged, standard world outside of which is a minority of marginalised, disadvantaged people: the unfortunate victims of social progress ... [T]he 'disadvantaged people' become a sociological phenomenon requiring a professional, humanitarian, and curative intervention" (academic development 1:1:4). Masenya, too, challenged that AD at the University of the Witwatersrand attempted to exclude black students through constructing them as intellectually 'deficient' "rather than looking more closely at the unpreparedness of an institution faced with a multicultural and multilingual student body". His contention that anti-racist practices were necessary to challenge "a culturally imprisoning academic discourse" (academic development 1:2: 86) sounds an inadvertent metaphorical echo to Foucault.

The parallels between Foucault's observations of the penal system and ED are clear. From the 'outreach' support/tutorial programmes provided by some Academic Development units for learners still at school, to alternative selection programmes, to foundation and bridging courses; the techniques involved in ED made possible a 'systematic typology of delinquents' ie of delinquent learners, the 'disadvantaged' or 'underprepared' students who were specified according to the norm, and who made the 'discipline' of ED possible: a discipline which, once born, rapidly began to extend into and 'subvert' all the other academic disciplines. Chemistry, Historical Studies, English, etc., so that none was seen as adequate to learners' needs unless ED practices were integrated into them. Furthermore, *all* learners began to be seen as needing ED, if not because of the deficiencies of their educational backgrounds then to help improve their learning, and also on a principle of fairness - if ED meant better quality teaching/learning, then all students should benefit, not only a select few. Some proposed that all learners were in some measure deficient: for instance, Jackson citing Ballard and Clanchy (1988) to the effect that it was

shortsighted to assume that academic development processes were only necessary for English Second Language students: "literacy varies significantly with the context of culture ... It is never a case, beyond the most mechanical level, of individuals being literate or not literate. Rather, we are all more or less literate in different contexts of culture at different stages of our development" (Jackson 1995: 163).

It followed from this that if all learners required ED, whether through need or on grounds of equity, then all lecturers would have to be persuaded to engage with ED's task demands, redesigning their courses, integrating skills teaching into them, and generally improving the quality of their teaching and assessment practices. In addition, intuitively good lecturing could no longer be deemed sufficient; lecturers had to be able to articulate, in scientific educational discourse, what they did and how and why they did it when teaching, and present evidence of this in a portfolio by which they could be judged for purposes of evaluation, best teacher awards, etc. Their teaching had to become demonstrably scientifically-based.

6.6.3 Normalisation through scientificity

Foucault noted the historical connection between the birth of scientific psychology - the establishment of an entire new domain of knowledge - and the relatively trivial event of the founding of the penitentiary school at Mettray. Although apparently insignificant, the latter effectively signalled the completion of the formation of 'carceral' or normalising society - for Mettray reflected "the disciplinary form at its most extreme, the model in which are concentrated all the coercive technologies of behaviour" (DP: 293); it was a "parapenal institution...created in order not to be a prison" (DP: 294):

What took place at Mettray... was obviously of a quite different order [i.e. than the emergence of scientific psychology]. It was the emergence or rather the institutional specification, the baptism as it were, of a new type of supervision - both knowledge and power - over individuals who resisted disciplinary normalization. And yet, in the formation and growth of psychology, the appearance of these professionals of discipline, normality and subjection surely marks the beginning of a new

stage ... The supervision of normality was firmly encased in a medicine or a psychiatry that provided it with a sort of 'scientificity'; it was supported by a judicial apparatus which, directly or indirectly, gave it legal justification. Thus, in the shelter of these two considerable protectors, and, indeed, acting as a link between them, or a place of exchange, a carefully worked out technique for the supervision of norms has continued to develop right up to the present day. The specific, institutional supports of these methods have proliferated since ...; their apparatuses have increased in quantity and scope; their auxiliary services have increased, with hospitals, schools, public administrations and private enterprises; their agents have proliferated in number, in power, in technical qualification; the technicians of indiscipline have founded a family. In the normalization of the power of normalization, in the arrangement of a power-knowledge over individuals. Mettray and its school marked a new era (DP: 296).

'Scientific psychology' plays its role in the normalisation processes of the university, too: the work of student counsellors is one obvious example. But much ED work also took constructivist learning theory, based in the discipline of cognitive psychology, as its theoretical framework (see for instance Grayson, 1990, 1991), bestowing it with academic credibility and legitimacy. A theoretical base provided ED staff's 'supervision of normality' (of academic practice in students and staff) with 'a sort of 'scientificity''; the administration or whichever power within the institution had appointed them, gave them, if not legal justification (that came later, with state intervention), at least official legitimacy (whatever their legitimacy or credibility with lecturers might have been). And so, in due course, "in the shelter of these two considerable protectors" (cognitive psychology and institutional authority) "and, indeed, acting as a link between them, or a place of exchange, a carefully worked out technique for the supervision of norms" (DP: 296) - norms of teaching and learning more strenuously defined than hitherto - began to develop in the university.

6.5.5 Lifelong delinquency for lifelong learning

Foucault further averred that the prison "brings back, almost inevitably, before the courts those who have been sent there" (DP: 255). The prison not only fabricated delinquents, but made of them 'lifelong' delinquents; so far from actually reforming and rehabilitating them with its

extensive and intensive techniques of discipline, it stamped them into the mould of delinquency: so far from acting as a deterrent and from having the effect of reducing crime. it appeared to act as an incentive and to increase crime in those whom it had branded criminals. And, in the university, as noted earlier, all learners (whether 'staff' or 'students') are now exhorted to become 'lifelong learners'; learning up to a certain level of qualification or in a certain field is, sooner or later, bound to be inadequate; the learner will need to be brought back into the system to admit his/her inadequacy and pursue further his/her subjection to additional academic requirements, to obtain higher, or different, qualifications.

Those who locate the raison d'etre of ED in ideological motives - 'equal opportunity'. 'redress'. and so forth - may be offended by these parallels between the work of the prison and the work of ED. For Foucault, however, ideology, humanitarian motives, individual intention were not the issue. He argued that the universal use of the prison did not arise from an *ideological code* but from 'the mechanisms proper to a disciplinary power" (DP: 256) which mechanisms and their effects subsequently spread through all aspects of modern criminal justice, delinquency and the delinquents becoming "parasites" feeding on the system through and through. The eighteenth century reformers' version of penal justice, he said,

traced two possible but divergent lines of objectification of the criminal: the first was the series of 'monsters', moral or political, who had fallen outside the social pact; the second was that of the juridical subject rehabilitated by the punishment. Now the 'delinquent' makes it possible to join the two lines and to constitute under the authority of medicine, psychology or criminology, an individual in whom the offender of the law and the object of a scientific technique are superimposed - or almost - one upon the other (DP: 256).

The penal system, by fabricating delinquency, "gave to criminal justice a unitary field of objects, authenticated by the 'sciences', and thus enabled it to function on a general horizon of 'truth'" (ibid.). And so the prison became "the place where the power to punish, which no longer dares to manifest itself openly, silently organizes a field of objectivity in which punishment will be able to function openly as treatment and the sentence be inscribed among the discourses of knowledge"

Applying this one can argue that, however genuine the ideological motivations of the 'reformers' of higher education - i.e. ED practitioners and others promoting ED, such as the University Executive, ED funders - the reforms they promoted have arisen primarily from 'the mechanisms proper to disciplinary power', and not from the calls for equity and social justice. The failing student, the lecturer not equipped with good teaching methodologies, and even the ED practitioner herself, were the educational/academic 'monsters' to be 'rehabilitated' through ED; the individuals in whom the 'offender' and 'object of a scientific technique' (the discipline of teaching/learning) were superimposed on each other.

ED, whether motivated or stimulated by the desire for equity or not, was conferring on its practitioners the 'power to punish' both the 'disadvantaged students' and those lecturers who lacked a grounding in tertiary education. To do so, the practitioners first or simultaneously had also to subject themselves to 'punishment'. The tertiary institution is the place where this power "silently organize[d] a field of objectivity" (which, at UNP, had a trajectory of Student Support, leading to ED, with a focus on teaching, learning, curriculum and staff development; this in turn becoming Tertiary Education Studies, which then became Quality Assurance); a field in which punishment (subjection to the mechanisms of the disciplines of the above-mentioned field of objectivity) would be able to function openly as treatment (workshops, courses, programmes, etc. to improve people's learning and teaching) and the sentence be inscribed among the discourses of knowledge (e.g. being awarded a diploma/degree in 'tertiary studies' or 'tertiary teaching practice', and so forth).

Like sex. learning, or the whole educational process of the university became, in the regime of ED discourse, something to be "managed, inserted into systems of utility, regulated for the greater good of all, made to function according to an optimum" (HS: 24); it became "a thing one administered"; for, like sex, it was "in the nature of a public potential"; it therefore "called for management procedures" and had to be "taken charge of by analytical discourses" (ibid.). By the

end of the ED era, as the institution installed the Quality Promotion Unit. Performance Management and Appraisal systems, and so forth, the educational process had become something to be closely controlled, measured, optimised; it had become "a 'police' matter - in the full and strict sense ... not the repression of disorder, but an ordered maximization of collective and individual forces" (HS: 24-25).

The techniques and strategies described in the preceding pages developed and gained force during the entire ED era, including the period to be discussed in the next chapter. Chapter Five, which follows the further fortunes of ED as its discourses became more established, during 1994 - 1996, and then co-opted and subsumed by the institutional change process in the remaining years of the decade.

Chapter Five

Part I: 1994 - 1996

"A normalizing society is the historical outcome of a technology of power centered on life" (HS: 144).

"No 'local center,' no 'pattern of transformation' could function if, through a series of sequences. it did not eventually enter into an overall strategy" (HS: 99)

During the 1980s and early 1990s, as we have seen, the University of Natal had been moving towards establishing greater internal control over its own productive forces, with Education Development being instrumental, through the techniques of biopower and amidst considerable resistance, in eliciting increased effects in the terrain of teaching/learning, and the Vice Chancellor's Review beginning to insert the techniques of disciplinary power into the general scope of governance of the institution, attempting to bring its mechanisms "into the realm of explicit calculations" (HS: 143). These two processes were, up until 1994, largely still parallel; from 1994 onwards there was an increasing intermeshing between them, with the 'local centre' of ED transformation entering into the 'overall strategy' of institutional change. This internal process of articulation was primarily induced through a larger mechanism of external economic and political pressures exercised on the institution by the government which led, in turn, to the university as a 'local centre' of transformation entering into the 'overall strategy' of national transformation. There were also, however, global mechanisms for control of productivity with which the university engaged as it reshaped itself.

In Discipline and Punish Foucault identified three broad historical processes with which the formation of the disciplinary society was connected and of which it formed a part: economic. juridico-political, and scientific (DP: 218). The processes of that era have some resonance with both the smaller-scale situation of South African Higher Education and universities during the period of political transition in the 1990s, and the larger global situation. On the economic and

political fronts at both levels there were processes at work which were leading to. and formed part of, an intensification of the functioning of Higher Education institutions in 'disciplinary' modes. The disciplines, Foucault said, are "techniques for assuring the ordering of human multiplicities" (DP: 218) through trying to define a tactics of power fulfilling three criteria, viz: exercising power at the lowest possible economic and political cost, through low expenditure and "discretion, ... low exteriorization, ... relative invisibility, the little resistance it arouses" (ibid.): maximising the intensity and scope of the effects of this social power, without failure or break; and linking the 'economic' growth of power with the output or productivity of the apparatuses within which it is exercised (including educational apparatuses). In short, the purpose of disciplinary techniques was "to increase both the docility and the utility of all elements of the system" (DP: 218). This "triple objective of the disciplines" (ibid.) corresponded with an historical conjuncture which required an adjustment between the correlation of two processes: firstly, a process of considerable population increase (hence the need for ordering human multiplicities) and, secondly, a growth in the apparatus of production which became more extended, complex, and costly, and hence had to have cost minimised and its profitability increased.

These elements and the need for adjusting the correlation between them can also be seen to have been present in the 'historical conjuncture' that coincided with South Africa's political transition. in the form of increased numbers of students entering universities (a global, not only a South African phenomenon, described as the 'massification' of Higher Education) and requiring to be controlled and manipulated; and more complex and costly educational apparatuses needing to be made more profitable (also a global trend which was accompanied by demands for institutions to focus on their 'core business' only; to be more 'enterprising' i.e. to generate more income; and to be more accountable for their use of taxpayers' money). The actions of South Africa's new government towards universities during this period were, as we shall see, of a disciplinary nature which aimed to manage greater numbers while improving profitability through increasing both 'the docility and the utility of all elements of the system' (DP: 218). And, as already stated, the University of Natal was responding not only to government actions, but also to global opportunities which brought their own constraints.

1. Political and educational developments in South Africa 1994 onwards

The country's first democratic national and provincial elections in 1994 brought the African National Congress, in alliance with the Communist Party and the Congress of South African Trade Unions, into power at the head of a Government of National Unity. In the university's home province, KwaZulu Natal, the feared mass violence between the African National Congress and the Inkatha Freedom Party was averted, even with the latter gaining victory in the province. However, 'Rainbow Nation' euphoria over peaceful elections began evaporating as people realised that many of the new government's 'Reconstruction and Development' promises were unlikely to materialise. Dissatisfaction at the slow pace of change gave way to deeper disillusionment as the government shifted its economic policies to the neoliberal approach of 'GEAR' ('Growth, Employment and Reconstruction'), reaping accusations of abandoning its commitment to the poor. Fiscal stringencies extended to education: pre-election promises of free schooling for all were unrealisable, and the tertiary sector, faced with reduced subsidies. had to develop strategies for increasing its productivity.

Domestic difficulties notwithstanding, South Africa's status in and access to the international community were greatly enhanced. This facilitated the university's direct participation in 'global' discourses on education, which, along with new opportunities, brought new normative pressures: the Deputy Vice Chancellor's report-back from the first Global Conference on Lifelong Learning (supported among others by the Kellogg Foundation, a major ED funder), warned that the University of Natal needed to constitute itself a Learning Organisation promoting Lifelong Learning, or become irrelevant. It was not only students and staff, then, who were subject to being cast into a mode of delinquency from which they required redemption through lifelong learning; in order to offer such redemption, entire institutions had to recognise their own deficiencies and address these by shifting into perpetual 'organisational learning' mode. African Universities, in particular, were spoken of at an Association of African Universities Conference as being 'in crisis'. To avoid such a fate, in fear of succumbing to the spreading "plague" of "confusion and disorder" (DP: 199) that beset others, the University of Natal submitted to the "disciplinary projects" (ibid.) of global Higher Education with alacrity. Upon South Africa's

readmission to the Commonwealth in 1997, Prof. Gourley was elected Chair of the Association of Commonwealth Universities; the three KwaZulu Natal Universities subsequently bosted the Association's Council meeting at UND; and the University of Natal participated in its first 'Benchmarking Club' workshop, the purpose of which was for member universities to agree on a set of mutually acceptable measures of performance, which could be widely applied across different systems.

This notion of 'benchmarking' reflected the application to institutions of a new policy or "political anatomy" of the body (DP: 193). Under this policy the 'body' of the university was to be prepared for 'quality audits' to secure its survival according to 'international standards' of normality. Quality audits were checks on how well the institution was checking on itself, on the operations of all its component parts; they were material procedures for sampling and examining the institution's measures of surveillance, supervision, observation, and measurement of itself. They thus necessitated the institutional subject taking such steps to make itself "knowable" to itself and others, in the process becoming individualized through "definite relations of knowledge in relations of power" (DP: 305). The audits entailed a "technique of overlapping subjection and objectification" (ibid.); the audited institution would be the "object-effect of this analytical investment, of this domination-observation" (ibid.). Whereas previously only institutions of great prestige, i.e. those "with power and privilege" (Harvard, Oxford, Cambridge) were identified or "marked as individuals" (DP: 192), standing head and shoulders above all other institutions in the Higher Education landscape, in this new 'disciplinary regime' of the globalised late twentieth century, individualization of institutions began to 'descend' to the lower echelons, becoming a norm. The power operating through quality audits was (and is, as they continue to be implemented) "more anonymous and more functional", exercised "by surveillance rather than ceremonies. by observation rather than commemorative accounts, by comparative measures" (DP: 193) in which the benchmarks or 'norms' provide the points of reference. Under this policy the measure of the institution is taken by its 'gaps' rather than its deeds (ibid.). Measurement takes over from status, substituting, in Foucault's words, for "the individuality of the memorable" that of the "calculable" institutional subject (ibid.).

Converging with these international pressures, another, local set of homogenizing and individualizing disciplinary measures came into play throughout the education system. The Government required the integration of Education and Training via a ladder-like National Qualifications Framework incorporating all levels of education, and passed an Act which required institutions, including universities, to register their qualifications with the South African Qualifications Authority. This act of registration would allow for the "documentary accumulation" (DP: 189) of information about institutions by the government, thus making them examinable. 'formalizing' individual institutional subjects within power relations (DP: 190). At school level, the nineteen racially-based education departments were replaced in April 1995 by a single National Department and nine provincial departments, with all schools writing a common public matriculation examination irrespective of their resource base or the qualifications of their staff. class sizes, facilities, etc.; but the funding model, which relied heavily on the mobilisation of communities' resources, increased, rather than decreased, inequalities between schools. 'Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the twenty-first century' aimed, through an outcomes based approach, to move teaching and the curriculum from a predominantly academic, rotelearning model to a more relevant skills-based one. This, too, was to apply at all levels: the 'intended outcomes' of courses, certificates, diplomas and degrees, right up to PhD level, would have to be stipulated in explicitly measurable terms, a proposal some challenged as contradictory to the very nature of tertiary education. A National Commission for Higher Education was established to advise the Minister on transforming the system; it set about convening stakeholder conferences and receiving submissions. Universities were required to establish Transformation Forums. Governing Bodies, and codes of conduct and conflict resolution.

The University of Natal's submissions to the Commission were based on the Vice Chancellor's Review but also included contributions by Education Development; addressed many of the themes which were central to the endeavours of ED. such as widening access; and asserted the importance of university autonomy for academic development and 'a free society'. The Commission's draft 'Framework for Transformation' in turn supported the 'holistic' approach to ED, viz. that 'the academic development of students should not be seen in isolation from student

development in its broadest sense". But it simultaneously challenged the fact that in many countries "...the intellectual authority of academics has been generalised from the classroom to all other aspects of campus life" (National Commission on Higher Education 1996: 109) - thus identifying, and implicitly rejecting, the penetration of the power-knowledge cycle into all aspects of (campus) society. At the University of Natal this penetration was happening, but so was the reverse: the 'non-academic' aspects of the educational process and institutional life eg. financial aid, psychological counseling, etc.- procedures concerned with the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life - were increasingly informing 'academic' decisions, as has been illustrated in the discussion of the readmission appeals process.

The Commission made two proposals regarding Student Services: each institution had to have a Council with equal representation from staff/management and students, to formulate policy for Student Services (National Commission on Higher Education 1996b: 110); and restricted funding (within the formula) should be made available to Student Services for career, curriculum and personal counselling, guidance services and environmental support programmes (University of Natal 1996b: Annexure B). This was an acknowledgement that institutions had the task of taking charge of students' lives, not merely their academic capabilities: that they had to administer students' bodies, their "conditions of existence, probabilities of life.... individual and collective welfare" (HS: 142); that these were forces that could and should be modified, and distributed in "an optimal manner" in the space of the institution (ibid.). The Commission stressed the importance of a national Student Financial Aid Scheme, but the subsequent lengthy delays in establishing it contributed to financial aid shortages and extensive turmoil on many campuses. Student political organisations disliked the Commission's proposals: they wanted a de-linking of the criteria and processes for financial aid from those for academic selection, proposing that in KwaZulu-Natal the financial assessment of applicants be done by the recently-established Central Admissions Office, with institutions independently doing academic selection. The Commission did not concur with this separation of functions: the effectiveness for overall control purposes of the mechanisms for governing students' bodies and academic capabilities, respectively, lay in their articulation one upon the other.

The Commission's National Summit produced a Framework Agreement on the Transformation of Higher Education Institutions, and its August 1996 Report included, inter alia, proposals for a programmes-based definition of Higher Education which would facilitate institutional rationalisation. The final White Paper in 1997 proposed greater state intervention in Higher Education via 'co-operative governance' between the Department of Education and institutions. By 1998 this proposed intervention was extended further, to include a national quality assurance system linked to the National Qualifications Framework, and a Quality Committee. National Standards Bodies Regulations came into force that year, laying down the requirements and procedures for qualifications to be registered on the National Qualifications Framework. All these mechanisms meant that the near-total autonomy which higher education institutions had enjoyed for so long, was being curbed in the national interest, as interpreted by the state. Institutions' productivity had to be channeled according to specific norms; their conduct had to be transformed into "a concerted economic and political behaviour" (HS: 26). Just as, in the history of sexuality. it had become "essential that the state know what was happening" (ibid.) with the reproductive capacity of the individual, the use individuals made of their sex, and that they should become capable of controlling their use of it, so with the knowledge- and graduate-producing capacities of institutions: these "became an issue, and a public issue no less" between the state and individual institutions; and then "a whole web of discourses, special knowledges, analyses, and injunctions" (HS: 26) settled upon the institutions through the mechanisms of the National Qualifications Framework, Quality Committee, and so forth. The University of Natal, as we shall see on p. 186-187, had a ready resource to hand to enable it to meet these injunctions: Education Development.

The government (like the prison) was "not alone" in its efforts; support was to materialise in the form of the Centre for Higher Education Transformation, an independent organisation set up with UDUSA involvement and funding from Ford Foundation, another key ED funder. The Centre served somewhat as an "auxiliary service" (DP: 296) or "carceral" mechanism" intended to "alleviate pain, to cure, to comfort" (DP: 308) individual institutions in their difficult process of transformation; through training, conferences, publications, and research which targeted universities themselves, it tightened the mesh of power relations operating to effect the

normalization of institutions. Its National Conference on Leadership and Effective Management in Student Services led to a move towards creating a National Association of Student Service Providers aimed at increasing the effectiveness of Student Services operations in institutions. At UNP, by then an audit of the Student Services Division was being conducted by the Quality Promotion Unit. The university was establishing its own internal panoptical measures.

While state reductions in HE funding and financial aid compelled increasing productivity from institutions (and students) through requiring them to do more with less, the cuts also produced financial crises and turbulent student protests which both escalated racial tensions and disrupted the everyday business of the institutions, for most of the decade. The University of Natal doubled its 1994 financial aid provision to R11m, adding a further R6m for new students from its reserves, and was also donated R1m for bursaries and loans for 85 'financially disadvantaged students', some in Science and Commerce at UNP. This was seen as "a tribute to the excellent results achieved by the University, particularly in its education development and foundation programmes' (NU Partners 5: 2: 6). Education Development, like delinquency, was proving to be economically profitable.

The University of Natal actively promoted to the Minister, on the occasion of his visit, its own transformation efforts and engagement with the government's Reconstruction and Development Programme; challenged the differentiation between 'historically black' and 'historically white' universities underpinning state subsidies, on the grounds that, its history notwithstanding, it had an overall majority of black students: and highlighted the financial aid crisis and the lack of subsidy for education development. These advocacies regardless, protests continued into 1996, with students also rejecting the Quality Index system (a newly-introduced method of rating students' academic progress, linked to which was allocation of financial aid) and the Banner Student Information System, both of which were significant mechanisms of disciplinary power that had infiltrated the management or administration of student learning. Perceived racism in the marking of examination papers and in the operations of the Senate Readmission Appeals Committee also came under attack; such disciplinary mechanisms had to be perceived to be

operating with total impartiality.

The university implemented both 'lenient' and less lenient measures of penalty to deal with these crises and protests. To reduce financial aid losses, ED was used to test students' skills so as identify 'at risk' students early and subject them to ED interventions: and academic or other support was linked to the continuation of students' funding (University of Natal 1996a Annexure E). Less humanely, the police with their batons, teargas, and dogs were called onto campus to contain protests. The crisis deepened, however: 1997 subsidy and financial aid cuts meant that even students who were meeting academic progression criteria would be excluded; this prompted further protests. The university was placed in the "totally intolerable situation" of having to "refuse admission to entrant students, almost invariably black, without the means to pay for university education who would have gained automatic admission to the faculties of their choice had they been able to afford the fees" (University of Natal 1997b). An informal network of 'progressive' staff ('PUN') held extensive e-mail discussions and attempted unsuccessfully to dialogue with students about uniting with staff in a General Assembly convened by the Broad Transformation Forum, rather than pursuing violent protest. Their letters reflected the extent to which ED discourses on access and staff development had become part of the wider institutional discourse, central to notions of transformation, and providing a humane and 'progressive' ideological mask for the exercise of disciplinary power. Eventually, the government allocated additional Financial Aid; but not long after the protests ended, UNP installed a 24-hour computerised closed-circuit TV monitoring system for Residences; an intercom system; turnstiles at each unit, accessed through personalised magnetic strip cards; and enclosed virtually the entire campus with perimeter fencing. These technological measures were purportedly to increase security; in effect they also restricted freedom of movement and allowed for greater control in the event of any further mass marches. In real, physical terms, the campus was becoming an increasingly panoptical environment, an "enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point" (DP: 197).

Other internal problems during the years 1993 - 1996 included accommodation problems, white

students taking flight from residence, student suicides, and increased crime rates. Perennial problems with the Students' Representative Council ranging from intimidation, undemocratic practices, and corruption, to failures to rewrite the constitution, led to the introduction of codes of conduct for the Councils and for mass protests. The Pro-Vice Chancellor's post was created in 1995 to establish tighter discipline over student government, especially to ensure fiscal accountability. Constitutional changes introduced a General Students' Council, created new portfolios in Academic Development and 'Reconstruction and Development Projects', and attempted to widen the student council's transformation focus to include curriculum development, but with little success.

There was another, growing long-term threat to the university: an epidemic akin in its capacity for destruction to the plague, the plague which as a form of disorder "at once real and imaginary" had, as Foucault put it, the discipline of the panopticon as its medical and political correlative (DP: 198). Increasing awareness of and a proliferating discourse on the implications of the HIV/AIDS epidemic led to the revision of a 1991 document to state that:

The University has a responsibility to safeguard its interests as well as those of its staff and students by providing them with information relating to the causes and effects of AIDS, and precautions which would minimise the chances of infection. Also it has an obligation to inform staff and students of its attitude towards those who have become infected (University of Natal 1996a: Annexure C).

The new University AIDS Policy Guidelines specified that there would be no screening of staff or students; confidentiality would be upheld; and education provided through up to date programmes on AIDS. There would be no dismissal of infected staff (as some feared), but disciplinary action would be taken against anyone who refused, after appropriate counselling, to work with HIV-positive people; and precautions would be taken against exposure, with special prevention and management procedures for high-risk departments. An AIDS management task group "to oversee and assist in the management of established cases of AIDS among students and staff" (University of Natal 1996a: Annexure C), and an AIDS support trust fund for services decided on by the Task

Group, would be set up. The policy would periodically be revised.

Whether the gravity of the situation was fully comprehended or not, the university would need to muster techniques of biopower to an ever greater extent to deal with a disease which still, nearly a decade later, constitutes a threat to the life of the human species every bit as serious as that of nuclear holocaust. The biological existence of the entire population was, and is, equally at stake (HS: 137). To this end, the university's discourse on HIV/AIDS would proliferate remarkably. Its immediate task, however, was to carry through the transformation process on which it had already embarked.

2. VCR and Education Development in the University of Natal 1994 - 1996

The period 1994 - 1996 saw the strategic mutual co-option of ED and the Vice Chancellor's Review, and the former's reinvention as the Tertiary Education Studies Unit. On the ED front this began with a debate on the Scott report's proposed options for ED structures. Influential academic staff queried whether an ED Centre was needed at all, or whether scarce funding should not rather be channelled to Faculties. The Centre staff's alternative proposal highlighted ED's role in implementing the Vice Chancellor's Review, arguing for maintaining a central unit while 'mainstreaming' ED work in the faculties, and for the amalgamation of the Director's and the part-time Vice Principal's posts into a full-time executive post responsible for Education Development. Only under the authority of an executive member would ED have the credibility and power it needed to achieve the necessary transformations in teaching/learning, so they believed. ED staff from UNP and UND subsequently held a joint workshop to clarify policy and direction for ED, only to find that the VCR's May report, 'The Planning Guidelines 1994-1998' addressed ED, not under its own rubric but in terms of 'Ensuring Quality'. Not yet ready to be thus subsumed to a new discourse, ED staff asserted the importance of ED through proposed amendments entitled 'Education Development and the VCR Planning Guidelines'.

Where ED was dismayed at being ignored in its own terms, 'The Planning Guidelines' elicited concern from Faculties for being far too prescriptive. Nevertheless, despite resistance, some

departments embarked on establishing multidisciplinary schools: the School of Development Studies and the School for the Environment at UND, and the Schools of Environmental Sciences and Rural Community Development at UNP.

The ED proposal for combining UNP's Vice Principalship with the ED Director's post came to fruition in 1995. The new Vice Principal was previously "a member of the Science Education Development Programme" and would have responsibility for Education Development on the Pietermaritzburg campus (University of Natal 1995a). A Deputy Vice Chancellor (Planning and Resources) and a UND Vice Principal were also appointed; the latter, coming from the Directorship of the Centre for Applied Science and Mathematics Education, was also Chair of the Planning Committee of ED at UND, and its Acting Head. Despite the much-touted financial constraints facing the university, which had seen support sector retrenchments in May 1995, its executive positions had thus increased yet again, from six to eight, with two being occupied by people who had been directly involved with, and continued to hold positions of responsibility for. ED. Institutional change processes and ED were becoming ever more closely linked.

A key area of discourse linking them was curriculum development. Given that the curriculum is the mechanism through which the function of academic 'training' occurs, in order to 'produce bodies that (are) both docile and capable' (DP: 294), curriculum development provided a strategic point of articulation between the "micro-physics of power" operating through ED and the more macro concerns of the Vice Chancellor's Review. Two VCR Curriculum reports addressed macro level issues: a January. 1995 one on 'Curriculum Reform: A Vision for the University of Natal'; and one focusing on Curriculum in UK Universities. In August a VCR Committee on Curriculum Reform Matters was established by Senate. At the micro level of teaching/learning and assessment practices, the introduction of the new semesterised degree system generated a need for expertise in course design since, as ED warned, existing courses could not simply be 'cut in half' but needed to be properly restructured. They had to integrate sound educational principles so as not to prejudice 'disadvantaged students' who often failed their first semester examinations but improved markedly in the second semester. ED staff had the

necessary expertise to engage academic staff in this business of redesigning courses.

There were other minor strands in the curriculum theme, such as the idea, originating in the Student Mentor and Internship Programmes, of giving academic recognition to students' services in the community and their participation in university committee structures. This was mooted in the Student Services and ED Boards, whence the UNP Academic Affairs Board initiated a discussion in Faculty Boards regarding possible formal accreditation of the work and life experiences of students. Later, this concept was to be picked up in the discourse of 'service learning' through the mechanism of 'Community-Higher Education-Service Partnerships', another initiative aimed at curriculum transformation. ED's prime focus during this period, however, was how to overcome resistance to 'mainstreaming', i.e. how, successfully, to integrate itself into courses and curricula. Insofar as it constituted the discipline of teaching the disciplines; insofar as it had a function of supervision or surveillance over the minute particulars of the behaviours of both teacher and learner in the teaching/learning process; in those terms, it had to become "a special function, which had nevertheless to form an integral part of the production process" of teaching/learning, "to run parallel to it throughout its entire length" (DP: 174), with ED staff as the indispensable "specialized personnel... constantly present and distinct from the workers" (ibid.). To encourage 'mainstreaming', incentives for professional development were needed. In 1995, a Distinguished Teacher Award was established; ED staff sat on the committee and devised the criteria for the award. To boost the quality of candidates' submissions, the evaluator subsequently produced a document on 'Compiling a Teaching Portfolio', the first 2 pages of which were included in the Staff Promotion Booklet and the worksheet made available to Faculties through the Human Resources Division. The portfolio required staff to submit both detailed confessions about their educational philosophy and practices, curriculum development and course design work, and ED-related research, and evaluation evidence reflecting students' views on their courses and teaching. Staff wishing to be recognised for their excellence, had to do things the ED way.

Qualifications were another form of incentive, requiring even greater subjection. To tempt

lecturers, who already had Masters or PhD degrees in their own fields, to repeat their subjection in an unrecognised domain was not easy; junior ED staff, however, were a more susceptible target. But the relevant qualifications did not exist. Accordingly a group of ED staff collaborated in an SA Association for Academic Development initiative which, through a British Councilfunded link with Sheffield University, established the Regional Institute for Tertiary Studies. A virtual structure, the Institute offered a UN-approved post-graduate certificate, diploma, and Masters in Tertiary Education Studies, collaboratively taught by staff from KwaZulu Natal institutions. This was the first formalisation of ED qualifications aimed at the professionalisation of, staff development; a "first training college in pure discipline" (DP: 295), that is, the pure discipline of imposing the disciplines on students. It struggled, however, to gain recognition within the three institutions, particularly from Education Faculties, who perceived their professional jurisdiction to be threatened.

ED still retained concerns with student access. In October 1994 the Teach Test Teach programme launched its Foundation textbooks, the "fruit of cooperation between academics from core disciplines who wrote the content and academics in education development, who mediate between students' capabilities and the demands of degree study" (University of Natal 1994c). Its claims to academic credibility thus consolidated, the programme expanded its reach during the next two years to become the Regional Access Programme operating through the Central Admissions Office. (By 1998, however, there was a decline in the number of students recruited through the Programme.) A minor access intervention was the ED Centre's one-year contract research post in selections/admissions policy, which focused on retention rates of 'disadvantaged students' beyond first year level, revealing the interdependence of effective selection and ED, but also concluding that there was a need for ED to continue at the upper levels of degree study. This was necessary since 'life' (the academic practices of students) beyond first year level was constantly 'escaping' the teaching techniques that attempted to govern and administer it (HS: 143), and the operations of disciplinary power therefore also required intensification at that level. These findings, however, were not translated into either policy or practice.

Faculty developments in 1995 included the partial 'mainstreaming' of the Science Foundation Programme i.e. its courses being taken over by their home departments and gaining partial accreditation. The importance of the programme was highlighted by the fact that despite its alternative selection methods, science registrations had declined by 7%, in a trend counter to government priorities but difficult to remedy given the poor quality of science and maths teaching in the schools and the very low number of matriculants with these subjects. Social Science decided also to develop a foundation course for the faculty. These foundation courses or programmes constituted the imposition of disciplinary time on tertiary pedagogical practice (DP: 159): the breaking-down of the time allocated for completion of a degree, to include a 'temporal segment' at the lowest level of the hierarchy of stages of development, dealing with the simplest or most foundational concepts and tasks; at the end of which an examination would show "whether the subject has reached the level required" for him/her to proceed to 'proper' degree studies (cf. DP: 158, 159).

Despite these developments, the existing ED structures already appeared inadequate and ineffective for the 'mainstreaming' of ED. In October 1995 a discussion document proposed various measures to coerce faculties and departments into 'taking ownership' of ED: Faculty Education Committees chaired by Deans; the monitoring of Faculty ED Programmes by the Vice Principal; Foundation Courses to be incorporated in overall degree programmes, not as 'add-on' measures: the inclusion of ED in departmental reviews; and research programmes in discipline-specific education. This last measure affirmed that the teaching/learning of disciplines was a legitimate domain of knowledge production.

The main proposal in the document concerned a reconceptualised central unit, the Tertiary Education Studies Unit, whose role would be "developing sufficient capacity within the departments and faculties to ensure that the tasks of mainstreaming are worked on in an optimum fashion" (University of Natal 1995c). This was approved by the UNP Academic Affairs Board in November (University of Natal 1995d: Annexure K), and a constitution and terms of reference for the Board were approved by Senate the same month. The issue of the unit's location was

unresolved, and staffing was to be addressed in the context of Independent Development Trust indications that only 60% of the funds allocated in 1995, would be available to UNP for ED in 1996. The Tertiary Education Studies Unit was then formally established in February 1996, but already faced financial difficulties.

Two subsequent events reflected a further tightening of the ED/institutional change liaison: in March 1996 the UND Education Development Board recommended the disestablishment of the university ED Committee, handing its responsibilities to the VCR Committee on Curriculum Reform; and the ED Board expressed concern that UN had not made submissions to the National Commission regarding the National Qualifications Framework, a matter which impacted on the entire institution. A research meeting on the topic was proposed: the beginning of a new power-knowledge spiral which enabled the full cooption of ED (Tertiary Education Studies) staff's expertise into the 'mainstream' of curriculum reform, albeit in the service of technicist, bureaucratic state requirements.

'Student Development' was to take a different direction. The possibility was mooted twice in 1995 of disaggregating it and relocating its 'non-curriculum based personal development' aspects within the Student Services Division; either in a unit managed by an Assistant Dean: Student Services or the Head: Student Development, reporting to the Dean of Student Services; or incorporating them into the Student Counselling Centre. The first step in this direction was the structural (not physical) relocation of the Internship and Student Mentor Programmes, under the rubric 'Work Study Programme', from the ED Centre to Student Services in August 1995. The number of mentors and interns increased by 20, but Ford Foundation funding was to end at the end of 1996, so alternative sources were needed if the programmes were to continue. The post of Head: Student Development remained in the Tertiary Education Studies Unit, its job description generated by the incumbent of the post and still focusing on. a 'holistic' approach to Student Development.

The Faculty of Arts, concluding that it had sufficiently 'mainstreamed' Education Development,

disestablished its ED Co-ordinator's post and the co-ordinator's expertise was harnessed to a Distance Education initiative, the latest strategy for increasing university access for 'nontraditional', i.e. poor, working, rural, and mature students. The discourse of distance education, itself a splintering off from ED, soon transmuted, as seen from the document "Towards Open Learning at the University of Natal: A Mixed Mode Learning System". 'Open' or 'Mixed Mode Learning' required for its successful subjection of learners the application and further refinement of much of the technical expertise developed in ED in areas such as course and (particularly) materials design, assessment, mediated learning through text, and so forth. This meant that faculties, departments, and lecturers had to be subjected, yet again, to modifying their processes of administration, course delivery, teaching, examination, student support, etc. Unsurprisingly, they displayed considerable reluctance to engage, and few departments embarked on this trajectory. But by 1997 UN had entered into an institutional agreement with the SA Institute for Distance Education (another 'auxiliary service') to identify a strategy for expanding programmes that could use an open learning approach and to develop a University infrastructure for supporting such programmes. Although the Open Learning Initiative struggled to generate interest in the offering of 'mixed mode' programmes, the agreement was renewed in 1999, noting the need for a long-term strategy, including an effective staff development unit.

While the student demographic profile was changing, the academic staff profile remained largely white, and male-dominated at the upper echelons. In June 1995 an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity policy was approved for academic staff advancement (i.e., to change the race and gender profiles of staff) through the establishment of 10 new externally-funded posts each year for 5 years to assist 'previously disadvantaged' South African academics, who were to be given priority where appropriate as establishment posts became available. The subject 'disadvantaged student' had now given rise to a new subject, 'previously disadvantaged academic'. 102 bursaries were also to be offered over a 5-year period for graduates and senior students, and 30 junior lectureships to South African post-graduate students from 'disadvantaged backgrounds' (University of Natal 1995e).

The restructuring of different sectors of the institution brought new nomenclature. Thus Public Affairs was renamed the Communication and Publicity Division. The Personnel Division became the Human Resources Division: staff were now explicitly to be regarded as 'resources' at the disposal of the university. Campus Security Services (previously Protection Services) became Risk Management Services, a title reflecting both the escalating crime rate in the university and a renunciation of any ostensible capacity to protect people, or offer them security: the most that could be guaranteed was an attempt to contain the degree of risk.

In terms of the government's requirements, the University Council's transformation to a more representative body was being negotiated with existing and prospective members. A March 1994 'Transformation' workshop included topics such as national education restructuring; university restructuring and 'historical lessons' on it; national economic restructuring, national and regional political analyses and scenarios; a KwaZulu Natal urban/rural trends analysis; and the way forward for the University. In April 'Transformation: A Report on Progress' was issued by Public Affairs. 'Transformation' was generating considerable discourse. The students' representative council, despite not being able to manage its own internal affairs, also held a Transformation conference. Commissions passed resolutions on University Governing Structures; Access & Demography; Students Structures & their Capacity Building for Transformation: UN Students Role in Societal Reconstruction and Development; Curriculum Development; Residence Transformation; and the Conference designed a proposed structure for the government-mandated Transformation Forum. In September the university executive and students' council representatives agreed on an interim committee to decide on the process for setting up the Broad Transformation Forum. But power struggles in the students' council elections further impeded progress. In April 1996 Senate and Council finally approved a proposal for the Broad Transformation Forum, and it was launched on both campuses in May. Its launch at UNP had a funereal rather than a celebratory air: a dismal non-event attended by a poor straggle of staff and even fewer students. The Forum was set up as a 'super body' to which the Curriculum Development Forum; the Finance, Admissions, Affirmative Action, and Residences Committees; Governing Structures - the Senate, Students' Representative Council, Council, and various other bodies reported. Seven task groups were to

deal with the business of the Forum, which had to meet 6-weekly. A media group was to keep the university informed of its work.

What was meant by 'transformation', and how did the Forum contribute to it? According to Wedekind (unpublished seminar notes¹) the term had become a 'catch-all' used to mean. variously: a synonym for Africanisation of both staff and curriculum; a synonym for relevance: the transformation of teaching and research; the expansion of access; changing the bureaucracy and unfriendliness of the institution; changing governance - a major, and often sole focus, especially for students; and even renaming of buildings, a "trivialised approach". The Forum was based on the questionable assumptions that 'sufficient consensus' (its mode of decision-making) was possible, and that constituencies represented by the various sectors (all given equal weight) were homogenous. And the Forum was slow and cumbersome in the extreme. The university's 39 members represented staff associations, students from 3 campuses, the executive, Senate, non-Senate academics, Deans, Council, and Convocation; and the second sphere, to shape had representatives of various interest groups: City Councils, Trade Unions, Chambers of Trade and Industry, Non-Government Organisations. Obtaining a quorum was in itself a feat.

The Forum never in fact addressed the meaning of transformation, but more than that, it developed no mechanisms for the transmission and exercise of disciplinary power even within its own ranks, let alone in the institution it was seeking to transform. It existed to appease the students and the government, and as such had undefined responsibilities, no particular agenda, and no programme. 'Democracy' demanded that decisions affecting a sector could not be made without that sector's representatives, unless they were absent for two successive meetings. Driven by student demands, most of the Forum's attention went to governance (Council's restructuring), renaming of buildings, and crisis management. Students expected its decisions to be binding, but it had no power to supercede Senate; it could only put proposals to the latter, and no mechanism existed for breaking deadlocks between the two bodies. The chair was supposed to rotate

¹ The discussion which follows is based largely on these notes.

between the sectors but in practice, for lack of planning, was always a member of the executive. As Student Councils changed annually, the student sector representatives changed, resulting in a lack of continuity. During 1994 they withdrew from setting up the Forum, suspicious of it being hijacked by 'management'; and they engaged only reactively, failing to canvas support from wider sectors. All in all, the Forum was a mere sideshow serving to distract from the real act of the Vice Chancellor's Review. Its failure to accomplish any significant change may be subscribed, not least to the absence from its overall modus operandi of the mechanisms of disciplinary power.

'Transformation' of a different kind was occurring on the technological front, with new developments in various sectors: the upgrading of UND and UNP Library computer systems: a live international video link-up on the Internet to "demonstrate how technology has made the world seem smaller, while pointing out that we are all interconnected ecologically" (University of Natal 1994c); and progress in establishing a computerised Campus Information System to incorporate information required by students for registration, which it was hoped could be done online by February 1996. When complete the System would "contain almost all the information anyone may need on the University... almost everything published by and on the University would eventually be included" (ibid.). This was a vision of the university constituted as virtual subject-object through the electronic capturing of its own discourses²: a "whole archive" (HS: 38) in which one would be able to seek out data pertaining to "the movement of (the university's) formation as a discourse in the process of consituting itself" (ibid.) were one disposed to write a monograph history on it.

Part II: 1997 - 1999

1. The Vice-Chancellor's Review reviewed

1.1 Restructuring

As already described, 1997 brought the severest financial crisis the university had yet faced.

²Two years later, an entire edition of the glossy University of Natal FOCUS (9: 1) was dedicated to information technology in the institution.

Consequently, only 3 years after Phase I of the Vice Chancellor's Review had been completed, the University Planning and Resources Committee, itself a product of that process, decided to review the Phase I outcomes, so as to propose alternative structures aimed at reducing the budget. This time the review included *academic* as well as administrative and management structures; it also had to produce parameters to help identify ways of reducing costs, and to advise on processes for strategic financial decision-making.

The process of review, as if galvanised by the stresses of subsidy cuts and protests, was swift. with few concessions to democracy; the recommended interventions, invasive and incisive. By May 1997 the Restructuring Task Group had produced a report "with far reaching implications that has caused not a little consternation in some quarters of the University" (University of Natal 1997c) and which had "the University returning to a single budget, and centralised control and accountability for such budgets" (sic) (ibid.). The report addressed the overall existing context, including technological change, and made 14 recommendations aimed primarily at effecting savings of at least 20%. These included centralising administrative activities, services, and academic activities (a reversal of what had previously occurred); replacing Faculties with Schools of cognate disciplines and amalgamating existing departments into new ones; devising a formula for resource allocation to viable teaching programmes, and discontinuing 'non-viable' courses. The university executive's size and portfolios would be examined, and committees and cost reduction procedures streamlined. Academic Affairs and Budget Allocations Committees and a Strategic Planning Office were to be established, the latter to ensure that project management mechanisms were in place and all recommendations implemented, including performance management and quality assurance; the formula for staffing and resources allocation to departments had to include Quality Assurance costs. Income generation policy was to be finalised in order to promote research and facilitate open learning, part-time and off-campus teaching initiatives. Education Development did not escape the review: its staff numbers were to be reduced, its structures centralised, and norms established for future planning.

In these recommendations lay the answer to the question that academic staff had posed eight

years earlier: what was meant by 'academic criteria', or rather, how would priorities be determined between different disciplines, i.e in deciding from which departments' resource allocations cuts should be made? The answer had, as people feared, been found, not in any ideological conception of what should constitute a university education, but in 'the market': which disciplines were in sufficient demand to justify maintaining their present level of provision? But that raised a further question: what constituted 'sufficient demand', 'viable courses,' and how would that be decided, and by whom? The answer to this question lay in statistics. 'Statistical activity' was undertaken to identify 'viable' and 'non-viable' departments, and the members of the executive visited those likely to be affected, i.e. some or all of whose courses would have to be scrapped and/or staff members retrenched, and those departments facing closure altogether. The academic productivity of departments was being taken as an object for analysis and intervention; the political economy of their teaching/learning activities was being placed under scrutiny as a public issue in the institution (cf. HS: 26). These measures elicited extensive resistance and discourse, as we shall see in the next section.

By June the UNP Science and Agriculture Faculties had decided to merge and form several schools; by the following March, the UND and UNP Law Schools were forming a single Faculty; and the Humanities, Social Science, and Commerce Faculties were amalgamating into the Faculty of Human Sciences. Various configurations were likewise formed at UND. In order to tighten up management of Faculties a document was produced spelling out 'The Role of Deans' and their responsibilities for quality assurance, preparation for external audits, ensuring programme conformity to the requirements of the NQF, and satisfactory standards in all courses and higher-degree programmes, including satisfactory methods of assessment. Deans had to ensure the availability of accurate student data to provide the information and statistics necessary for quality assessment and development. They also had responsibility for staffing matters, a cascading "performance development" system which entailed setting of agreed performance objectives, monitoring of progress towards those objectives, and staff training needs identified through this process. It was the Deans' duty to establish or have access to a data base where the progress and productivity of staff in the Faculty can be measured. In short, Deans were to become managers

first, academics second. The idea of a panoptic data base which the Centre for University Education Development had introduced in 1994 to monitor students' academic progress, and which staff had resisted so strongly, was returning in different guise, now directly as an instrument of staff's own subjection.

In the midst of such time-consuming restructuring activities and governance measures, the business of teaching/learning was continuing, albeit not quite as usual. Space had to be made for the first UN Winter School in July-August. The academic year was restructured into 3 'terms', shortening the two semesters for the formal curriculum (the final semester had barely 3 months of teaching time) and thus further increasing the pressure on staff and students. However, only a handful of regular courses were offered during the winter semester, which meant that supplementary examinations, largely regarded as a waste of time, could not be eliminated, as had been intended; instead, the academic year now required supplementaries for each semester; and income-generating short courses targeting the lucrative international student market became the order of the day for the winter semester. Neither did the eight weeks in which lecturers were freed from the tyranny of the timetable result in greater research productivity, another intended outcome of the winter semester. This was yet another example where 'life', this time in the form of the academic productivity of staff, was constantly escaping the techniques that governed and administered it, rather than being integrated into them (HS: 143).

1.2 Resistance to restructuring

We have seen the numerous resistances of students to the imposition of various mechanisms of disciplinary power, from the timetable to the Quality Index to financial aid practices and measures of fiscal control. Foucault pointed out that, where there is power, there is resistance, which is "never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (HS: 95). In fact, power relationships depend on "a multiplicity of points of resistance: these play the role of adversary, target, support, or handle in power relations" (ibid.). So it was with staff, too: August 1997 saw the surfacing and

³ indeed, research outputs declined in the last years of the decade, as the new Deputy Vice Chancellor: Research reported in 2001.

organising of resistance to restructuring. A group of 'concerned academics' established the Academic Restructuring Committee (ARC), not in open defiance, but so as to "participate in the Restructuring process and ... search for the best plan, in consultation with the University community, through open discussion and constructive debate, in a positive spirit" ("ARC" Email Alan Matthews 5/8/97) This committee was formed during a meeting of the Durban timetabling committee. Once again the lowly timetable played a precipitous if unintended role: the committee's discussion "became focused more on Restructuring than on timetabling" (ibid.), and ARC was born.

ARC's invitation for comments from academics, support staff and students, to "express (their) opinions on the present restructuring process, and on any suggestions for improvement" (ibid.) elicited over two months a deluge of e-mail (none from students) re the restructuring proposals. Several letters from overseas academics, rallied by their Natal colleagues, also protested against the philistinism of the proposed cuts to their particular disciplines. Meetings were held (the largest attracting almost three hundred people, a phenomenon seldom if ever matched by the staff association), and resistance intensified even as ARC declared itself "not a rebel group" but a channel for open expression of ideas.

A great range of issues surfaced in these letters. They pertained broadly to: the top-down approach to decision-making, fiercely resented; that restructuring should be based on academic not financial considerations; the vision and/or model of a university and the nature of university education, including the role of the Humanities and the threat to it; the financial crisis: the relative allocation of resources for staff compensation between academic and non-academic sectors; the role of technology in UN's future; what constituted 'viability' of departments and courses, and contestation over the validity of data on which decisions were being based; the proposed closures of departments, abandonment of course offerings (mainly in languages), retrenchments of individuals, and the threat to academic tenure; the relationship between university autonomy and government requirements; and the negative impact of the cost-cutting and restructuring on the university's image and on staff morale. Only one correspondent proposed a united public protest,

varying degrees of acceptance of the government's reduction of subsidies. The rest demonstrated varying degrees of acceptance of the government's agenda of transformation, equity, and redress, or concentrated only on the internal process, criticising the executive bitterly for high-handed decision-making. Much as ARC provided a vehicle for mobilising collective resistance, each of the resistances was "a special case": some were "possible, necessary, improbable": others "spontaneous, savage," and so forth; still others, "quick to compromise, interested, or sacrificial" (HS: 96); all existed within the strategic field of power relations (ibid.) which the review had activated.

The protests and mobilisation of resistance were not without effect, and although some retrenchments occurred and some courses were discontinued, for the most part compromises were struck. In December the Classics Department reported that it had been "salvaged...with all its personnel remaining employed until their normal retirement dates" (University of Natal 1997a) and that "the department is looking forward to increased contact and collaboration with English and Theology" (ibid.) - the strategy for its salvation being an agreement to contribute to teaching courses in those departments. The Humanities Newsletter of December 1997 reflected a central ideological reason for resistance in its 'Guest Column: Living in Lilliput': "As cost-effectiveness took disproportionate precedence over mind (and how best to educate it), anything remotely resembling some quickening idea of what a University could or should be simply dissolved amidst the petrific cliche and verbal gesturing of these lexical ledgermen" (ibid.).

By September 1998 the Vice Chancellor in her newsletter was lauding the "new sense of purpose" she perceived within the institution, as faculties and schools, "building on the creativity ... unleashed by the debate of the past year," began making new courses and degree structures available. While promising that the university would change and grow "to reflect demands not only of our own economy but of global forces as well" she nevertheless warned that there was "a limit to the extent to which we can keep on adding to our existing operations without doing any subtracting. Higher Education has become a highly competitive business and we can no longer expect to be protected from this reality". The globalised 'market' in which the university now saw

itself competing, and the fact that it "had also been harmed in some segments of public perception by the process of restructuring" (Vice Chancellor's newsletter. September 1998) meant that, cost saving necessities notwithstanding, substantial money now had to be spent on marketing the institution. The ensuing campaign gave the University of Natal a very different image than the one it had promoted in its 1989 Mission Statement: the opening gambit, under the slogan 'The power to succeed' was a full colour action photographic image of 'Superman' revealing the university's coat-of-arms emblazoned on his vest. This was the new 'academic subject,' the new norm of the future which the university was promoting: the celluloid superhero of late twentieth century myth, the embodiment of the world's fantastical salvation from all manner of ills. That he was also white and male, contrary to the university's 'affirmative action' policies, did not fail to go unnoticed; the campaign, however, reaped a Golden Arrow best advertising award.

In the midst of restructuring, resistance, and the creation of a new globalised image, other facets of institutional change continued, with further techniques and mechanisms of discipline being entrenched or put in place. A Grade Point Average system replaced the Quality Index which had been abandoned in the face of student opposition; it performed the same function. Technology was increasingly being used to solve problems of both the 'governing of bodies' and the production of graduates for 'the global era': a new Student Academic Administration System made extensive use of computer technology systems, including the Internet, and incorporated the Central Admissions Office; and the executive document 'The University of Natal as a Digital University' proposed "a way of rethinking the theory and practice of the UN's core and non-core teaching functions" (Bawa 1999). Implementation of the proposal would signal that the university was "serious about preparing its students for the workplace and to be full participants in these global developments" (Bawa 1999). Notably, it would require resources to be put into staff development, especially for materials writing for online and other technological forms of delivery appropriate to mixed-mode teaching/learning.

Student government, especially at UND, continued to be resistant to disciplinary measures and clashed with the Pro Vice Chancellor, claiming that his Office had been "manufactured with the

sole purpose of stripping off (sic) powers from students, thus undermining student governance ... (Professor Zulu's) job description does not exist... "It is likely that such behaviours contributed to the ongoing decline of student interest in student government, as demonstrated by the low election polls and attendance at student body meetings. Financial Aid continued to be a source of discontent. The Colleges of Education were included in the national loan scheme, hence the 'slice' of the pie for universities decreased even further. From 1999 applications for Financial Aid were judged on a newly-developed national means test. Ranking thereafter would be by academic performance and progress, according to a new formula which assessed the ability of the students to complete their degrees in 'M+1' years. Students could not escape the workings of biopower if they wished to become academic subjects.

2. Education Development reviewed

2.1 From Education Development to Quality Promotion: contestations around Staff Development

The 1997 Task Team's recommendations had assigned Education Development *per se* a status marginal to academia but nevertheless made it a target for normalising measures. The threat of rationalisation deepened factional divides between ED staff with differing ideological approaches to staff development, and necessitated a struggle for survival, such that much of the remainder of this account reflects the "innumerable points of confrontation, focuses of instability, each of which has its own risks of conflict, of struggles, and of an at least temporary inversion of the power relations" (DP: 27) which came into play as people struggled to hold onto their tenuous positions. The Tertiary Education Studies Unit launched a post-graduate Certificate and Diploma in Tertiary Education through the Education Faculty. in competition with the existing Regional Institute's post-graduate Diploma in Tertiary Education (a UND-dominated initiative) for a relatively small pool of potential students. The ED Board noted that there was "a proliferation of programmes all serving a similar function such as this one ...discussions with respect to rationalisation should take place" (University of Natal 1998a), including consideration of regional and possibly even national interests.

Besides the Certificate and Diploma programmes, the Tertiary Education Studies Unit was focused on outcomes-based course design and assessment, alternative assessment procedures, development work for distance education; evaluating the Education Department's shift to materials-based teaching; student course evaluations; in-depth project and ED Programme evaluations, and development work with respect to 'promotions in teaching' to counter the prevailing perception that only research counted in career advancement. Through these activities ED was becoming an integral element of the procedures shaping the successful lecturer.

Mainstreaming of ED had not taken place in all disciplines, as planned; the Review acknowledged this when it merged the two ED Boards, mandating education development as the "main thrust" of the new Board. The establishment of the National Qualifications Framework and its associated structures, however, created a universal 'need' for curriculum and course development, finally enabling ED to gain its disciplinary subjecthood. The task of manipulating and categorising existing qualifications in conformity with the requirements of the various levels of the Framework. and of negotiating agreement amongst staff and faculties, which had differing parameters for lengths of courses, credit point requirements, notional study hours per course, etc. etc., was a major and time-consuming one. So was that of reconceptualising courses and degrees: intended outcomes had to be meticulously described, assessment practices demonstrably linked to these, all requiring extensive debate and documentation. These tasks were not "driven ... by the ideals of critical theory" (Boughey, C. et al 1998) as had been the case with ED, but by "the technicist discourses of economy and efficiency within the national government" (ibid). Nevertheless, they required the very kinds of expertise which had been developed through ED, thus placing ED knowledge in demand and giving it a credence it had previously lacked. The key difference was that it was no longer called Education Development.

The Tertiary Education Studies Unit curriculum researcher and evaluator delivered themselves to this cause from 1998 onwards. They sat on national committees, debating the meaning of quality and negotiating for a less technicist approach to defining the outcomes of higher education qualifications; facilitated national and institutional workshops with Vice Chancellors, Deans, and

lecturers; produced conference papers, and technical forms for staff to complete; and generally, at the behest of the executive, pushed and pulled the academic resources of the institution to considerable productivity in (somewhat negotiated) compliance with government demands. In June 1998, following on the government's proposal for a national quality assurance system, the Quality Promotion Unit was established, with a university-wide brief. The evaluator and curriculum posts were transferred to it, their incumbents being appointed as Quality Promotion Unit manager and curriculum development specialist, respectively. The latter's work was to assist in the development of 'a comprehensive quality assurance system'; to assist academic staff with programme development and quality assurance aspects of registration on the NQF; liaise with external bodies i.e. the South African Qualifications Authority, the Education and Training Quality Assurers, and the National Standards Bodies; and disseminate information within the institution (University of Natal 1998d). These functions were to be carried out through the running of informal workshops and formal academic programmes; consultancy services; producing materials such as handbooks and guidelines for staff; running forums for the sharing of good practice; and serving on the relevant committees (ibid.) Through these measures the 'training college' begun with the Masters in Tertiary Education course, was to be institutionalized by the Quality Promotion Unit; but in its dispensation, curriculum development had become integral to a larger overall strategy (HS: 99), and was entirely defined by and subsumed to the technical requirements of Quality Assurance and the National Qualifications Framework. Additional posts were created and filled by TTT/ Regional Access Programme and University of Zululand AD staff. Despite the much-proclaimed financial stringencies of the day and the retrenchments which had taken place, all the posts (including the Manager's) were defined as academic establishment posts, their costs born by the university. The university's 'police force' had to be permanent, and adequate to the task of establishing detailed knowledge of the assets. faculties, and talents, of the university's staff members and ensuring that those means served the institution's 'public welfare' (HS: 25).

The question of posts was not easily separable from that of incumbents. The evaluation and curriculum posts and appointees transposed relatively easily to the new structure, but not all ED

posts could be dealt with in this way. Either the focus which individual staff had given their posts and their particular areas of expertise did not fit with what was being proposed in the new dispensation; or they were in ideological disagreement about 'Quality' (and the particular way it was being addressed) as the new direction for ED; or they were caught up in infighting about power issues. In terms of labour legislation they could not, however, easily be dismissed. retrenched, 'retooled' or obliged to accept changed conditions of employment - and the staff concerned armed themselves with legal advice to this effect. And yet, with the object of rationalisation being money saving, it would also not be easy to justify retrenching lecturing staff from the disciplines while leaving ED posts untouched. There thus followed a protracted battle over what should happen to the ED posts, and to the staff themselves. A proposal by the Deputy Vice Chancellor: Academic (who had previously been the UNP Vice Principal responsible for ED) to disestablish UND's central Education Development structures (the Division of Tertiary Education and the Education Development Unit) and the Tertiary Education Studies Unit was defeated in Senate as a result of vigorous lobbying by ED staff whose positions were unresolved. Their counter-proposal, that a sub-committee be established to examine staff development needs and propose a structure and resources to address these, was approved.

The priority areas identified by the sub-committee for academic staff development were: induction/ orientation programmes and mentoring for new staff during their probationary process; support for staff whose teaching earned low ratings in the quality assurance process; workshops on initiating research projects on teaching; offering of formal qualifications in Higher Education Studies; and the establishment of a university-wide resource centre on Higher Education. The central ED structures including the Tertiary Education Studies Unit (which had in any event by then de facto ceased to exist) were to be disestablished and a Centre for Higher Education Development (lobbied for by UND's ED staff) set up in the UNP School of Education; the current staff of the two UND central ED structures would be eligible to apply for posts in the Centre. A standing committee would help co-ordinate the Centre's activities with those of the Quality Promotion Unit and the new Centre for Information Technology in Higher Education; 'a common framework' for quality issues and staff development was deemed essential. Almost every

one of the Centre's proposed activities reflected the upwards transposition of disciplinary measures first employed under the ED regime in relation to 'disadvantaged students', to staff.

Some targeted 'formerly disadvantaged academics', a new subject category; others, all staff.

2.2 From Education Development to Student Services: contestations around Student Development

The need for students to be disciplined was no longer a necessary pretext or vehicle for staff to be disciplined: the latter could now simply be targeted directly. But, although Student Development had served its purpose in academia, it could still be useful elsewhere: in Student Services, now being affirmed, under scrutiny of the Review, as a "core business" of the university. To serve this core business the two Deans' posts were retained, but one reconstituted as the Dean: Student Development. In similar vein to the 'mainstreaming' of ED, Student Development was promoted as an approach that should infuse the work of all departments within the Division: not only the Counselling Centre, but also the Campus Health Centres, Sports Unions, Student Housing Office and even Financial Aid had to render their services in such a way as to contribute to the holistic development of students. To promote this the Dean: Student Development launched a 10-session certificate course in Student Service management for Student Service Providers. The same upward transposition of disciplinary measures from students to staff which had occurred in ED, was happening in Student Services, but since the course was not initially conceived within the formal accreditation requirements of the university nor scheduled into the formal timetable, thus failing to implement the techniques of disciplinary power, its initial effects were limited.

An overall Task Team and specialised working groups had been set up by the Review to 'right-size' and 're-engineer' the Student Services Division to effect the required 20% cut in costs. The Student Services Boards were in 1998 reduced to one Board, meeting alternately between the two Centres under the Deputy Vice Chancellor: Students and Transformation. According to state requirements it had to deal with substantive policy and procedure issues, and could (theoretically, at any event) inform funding allocations in Student Services, something which had previously been done administratively. Problems in meeting the government's requirement of equal student

and staff representation arose immediately: campus equality was privileged over staff-student equality, creating a structure top-heavy with staff. Inevitably, student participation in the Board did not flourish.

The location of the Head: Student Development post became a matter of contestation. A proposal to relocate it under the pro-DVC Student Governance was rejected by students, wary of an increasing bureaucratic hierarchy of control over them and preferring to have direct access to the top'. The extent to which the discourse of student development had established its strategic usefulness, however, became manifest in its co-option by the Student Counseling Centre. which now claimed that all the Centre's work was essentially about 'student development'. Student Development would give students a "new outlook on life" through attending workshops and support groups on everything from the most personal and difficult-to-confess aspects of self (such as "feelings of attraction for people of the same sex") through self-discipline and self-shaping (time management, study skills, self-awareness, career development) to group-based identity issues (foreign students' group, women's leadership training) (SCC leaflet). This highlighted conceptual and ideological differences in the various understandings of student development - the Centre's psychological paradigm vs ED's broader education-based, critical interdisciplinary approach - which blocked agreement on locating the Student Development post in the Counselling Centre. A 'professional' requirement that all the latter's staff except administrators be qualified counseling psychologists: issues of levels, type, and permanence of post, conditions of service, the personalities involved, and so forth, were all additional complicating factors.

The issue was settled strategically by reconceptualising the post to serve all the campuses, and to be located in an Office of Student Leadership Development under the Dean of Student Development. The appointee, who remained in the post, resisted its reclassification from academic to non-academic. The issue was a disciplinary one in two competing respects: the nature of the work itself - was it academic or non-academic?, and the problem of consistency in categorising staff for rationalistic administrative purposes (Student Services posts were all categorised 'non-academic'.) There were also financial stakes: non-academic posts cost less as

they did not carry a sabbatical leave entitlement. And, although a decision on the retention and location of the post had been made, the power politics remained unresolved, and there was pressure for clarification and definition of the concept and domain of 'student leadership development' - what it was, for whom, how it could be delivered, etc.- which gave impetus to the emergence of a new sub-discourse of ED, viz. student leadership development.

The work of this new office was not confined to students in elected leadership positions only - all students' potential for leadership was to be developed, and in terms of the university's strategic initiatives the office, with its one full time academic and one part-time administrative post, was required to deliver services to all the campuses. By the year 2000 intercampus, interdisciplinary co-curricular courses in Leadership Development were being mounted, with the collaboration of certain academic disciplines and most of the Student Services departments. Disciplinary power was now being exercised in the production of new kinds of subjects, viz. 'student leaders' and 'future leaders'. Students themselves took to their subjection by this new discourse with enthusiasm, although many members of the Student Councils showed considerable resistance. The Internship and Mentor Programmes were later reclaimed by the Student Leadership Development Office. 'Preparing for University', after 10 years of existence, merged with the Orientation Committee, offering a single Orientation Programme for all students. Along with its accompanying training programme for Orientation mentors, it also found its home in Student Leadership Development.

In considering the history of these various developments in ED, analysing "the singularity of events" (Foucault 1984a: 76), their logic, which may retrospectively appear imminently reasonable, is in fact seen to have about it something of what Foucault observed about the history of reason itself: the events have derived largely from chance; from "the passion of scholars, their reciprocal hatred, their fanatical and unending discussions, and their spirit of competition - the personal conflicts that slowly forged" the emerging new discourses of ED, which began to serve as new "weapons of reason" (Foucault 1984a: 78) in the life of the university. The "exteriority of accidents" is seen - at least in part - to be "what lies at the root" (Foucault 1984a: 82) of the

coming into existence of disadvantaged students, curriculum specialists, student development specialists, quality managers, new educational practices, and so forth. Although at a more micro or localised level than the larger scale 'Emergences' Foucault was speaking of, the emergence of these specialists and their discourses and practices was produced through what Foucault termed a particular stage of forces struggling against each other or embroiled in an extended battle against adverse conditions (Foucault 1984a: 83-84). The 'species' of ED engaged in intensive struggle for academic credibility; in the process of finally becoming established, individual differences emerged; there was a struggle "of egoisms turned against each other, each bursting forth in a splintering of forces and a general striving for the sun and for the light" (Foucault 1984a: 84). The new discourses of Quality Promotion, staff development, student development and student leadership development, were the new egoisms each seeking its place in the sun, and each in turn bound either to give rise over time to yet further splintering of forces, or to disappear quietly.

In July 1998 the first summit of Vice Chancellors and senior managers of the Eastern Seaboard Association of Tertiary Institutions had made a commitment to a "single, co-ordinated, learner-centred system of HE in the region". Two possible model options were identified for the system: a "single federal institution" or a "single unitary institution". The institutional subject had to be prepared for a further transformation. By July 1999 the new Minister of Education issued a 'Statement of government intention' which included the following:

As our policy documents make clear, it is vital that the mission and location of HE institutions be re-examined with reference to both the strategic plan for the sector, and the educational needs of local communities and the nation at large in the 21st. century. This complex and difficult exercise is likely to result in mergers between some institutions, and decisions to change the missions of others. It is well known that institutions find it very difficult to come to such decisions on their own. Provided the investigation has been thorough and consultation has been undertaken fully and in good faith. I will not hesitate to take the necessary action with all deliberate speed.

One consequence of such mergers and rationalisations was likely to be further job losses in the HE sector. But, for the meantime, the cloth had already been cut at Natal University.

Conclusion

"Traditional history is given to a contemplation of distances and heights: the noblest periods, the highest forms, the most abstract ideas, the purest individualities. It accomplishes this by getting as near as possible, placing itself at the foot of mountain peaks, at the risk of adopting the famous perspective of frogs.

Effective history, on the other hand, shortens its vision to those things nearest to it ..." (Foucault 1984: 89).

In the aforegoing pages I have recorded and analysed the processes of Education Development and institutional change which occurred in the University of Natal, mainly on its Pietermaritzburg campus, during the decades of the 1980s and 1990s. In the latter of these two decades South Africa underwent a turbulent political transition from an apartheid to a democratic state but continued to face enormous political, social, and economic problems, 'transformation' challenges which university graduates are expected to play a leading role in addressing.

The analytical framework I have used to reflect on the university's change processes is that provided by the ouevre of Michel Foucault: the analytical tools, genealogy, archaeology, and ethics with their central concepts of power, knowledge, and the subject: the data for analysis, the social and discursive practices of the above-mentioned change processes, including also everyday institutional practices. This approach, applied also to elements of the earlier history of the university in South Africa, reveals both a singular continuity in the university's normalizing power practices, and the 'penal' nature of techniques such as the examination which are integral to the subject-producing function of these practices.

In doing such a study of the field within which I myself worked for over ten years, viz. Education Development. I have been enabled to reflect on the events of the times, on my own practices, and on the ways in which I have been caught up in (and 'penalised,' and 'produced.' by) the practices of the institution, from a different perspective than that which previously informed my thinking and practices, viz. critical social theory; and have myself been changed in certain ways, in my self-understanding, my view of the world, and my practices. In that sense I am a product of those

same discourses.

The institution I have been analysing, the university, is an apparatus for producing and transmitting 'truth', or knowledge, in the form of scientific discourse. This knowledge is applied by (among others) another 'product' of the university, its graduates, to solve social problems. By virtue of the force of the rules it follows, the truth-producing function has the power to constitute and reconstitute human subjects and their institutions, and the ways those subjects understand themselves and their institutions. My analysis has uncovered and problematised the 'regime' or 'general politics' of truth which the university produced, not about 'the world out there', but about itself as an institutional subject, and about its 'academic subjects', the staff and students who laboured, and continue to labour, within it according to the types of discourse which the university itself accepted and made function as true during the era under study. I have, at least in some measure, produced a critical ontology of the university.

My analysis has shown that, from an initially marginal position, the mechanisms, techniques, and procedures of Education Development were increasingly accorded value in establishing truth about the institution, and its practitioners increasingly gained the status of those who were "charged with saying what counts as true" (Foucault 1980d: 131). I have also demonstrated that the 'truths' of the institutional change process, and particularly those of Education Development, were "subject to constant economic and political incitement" (Foucault 1980d: 131-132). There was a continual economic and political pressure to generate truth or knowledge as to how the teaching/learning function of the institution could be made more productive with less effort, that is, with a more economical, or rational, use of power over those engaged in this function. I have shown that both ED and the institutional change processes were the issue of ongoing political debates and social confrontations, or "ideological' struggles" (Foucault 1980d: 131) involving staff, students, executive, and others beyond the university, including organised workers and government.

The entry into the institution of increasing numbers of 'non-traditional' students, that is, black

students from different educational backgrounds than their white peers, was one of the incitements for this production of 'truth'. Others were financial constraints, national political and international higher education developments, and the forces of globalizing material, social, and political economies, themselves inciting and incited by, among others, the development and spread of information technology: the techniques of which were also co-opted by, and caught up in the contestations of, the university's change processes.

Initially, the practices of Education Development held little sway in the institution. However, as its practitioners increasingly adopted the mechanisms and procedures which were already accorded value in establishing truth in the university, viz. the techniques of research, and applied these to the objects of teachers, learners, teaching/learning practices, and themselves and their own practices in this field, they generated more extensive discourse which increasingly brought into play the exercise of disciplinary power and began to gain the force of 'truth'. The more these mechanisms and procedures were formalised, e.g. in the construction of accredited courses, the greater force they gained.

The discourse of Education Development which was thus incited to establish itself through a continual struggle against denials, refusals, and resistances, was 'new' insofar as its objects (staff, students, and their practices) had previously been taken for granted rather than being subjected through close scrutiny to become objects of knowledge. The 'new' subjects produced by the discourse were 'disadvantaged students' (and various sub-categories); specialists in tertiary education, eg. 'Physics education specialist' (as opposed to merely 'Physics lecturer'); and 'Education Development practitioners'. The aim of their subjection was for their practices to be increasingly governed toward greater academic productivity. Students who were 'undisciplined' in terms of the knowledge-making behaviours required of them by the university, were reshaped in their practices to comply with university requirements. Staff who were 'undisciplined' in terms of the behaviours necessary to undertake this business of reshaping students' academic practices, were reshaped in their practices of imposing practices, by fellow staff; who, regarded in their turn as 'undisciplined' in the primary academic practices of the disciplines, had to become disciplined

in the new field of the imposition of academic practices.

Much as there was resistance to this exercise of disciplinary power, the 'new' subjects were rendered more politically compliant than previously they had been: their resistance was the medium for the exercise of disciplinary power. This occurred insofar as students' energies were governed by the entire educational apparatus of the institution, and particularly the 'holistic' ('total education') approach of Education Development interacting with disciplinary power operating through other structures like Student Services and the timetable, towards academic productivity rather than political challenge; and the energies of lecturing staff were directed into obtaining new qualifications and constrained to account for their academic practices and the outcomes thereof, entailing a relinquishing of a measure of the autonomy or 'undisciplined practice' they had previously enjoyed. Education Development staff, even more than the lecturers, were subjected through their interaction with other players and forces to a continual accounting for the effects of their practices, and were coerced into self-constitution as more highly qualified practitioners, theoretically and practically.

My account has demonstrated that ED produced its effects of 'new' academic subjects through developing and employing increasingly sophisticated techniques and tactics of power-knowledge for the supervision of norms in student and staff academic practices. These included techniques of the confession in selection procedures (e.g. Teach Test Teach) and investigations into teaching/learning practices; biopower in the structuring of people's time and targeting of their practices of self-management (the 'holistic' approach of Preparing for University and the Science Foundation Programme as examples); the creation of delinquency ('disadvantaged students', 'exclusions', 'lifelong learners') and the use of various penalities (further qualifications, continuous assessment, additional tutorials, supplementary examinations, foundation courses and many more); and normalisation through scientificity (the employment of scientific theory and research in designing, implementing and investigating and explaining teaching/learning processes).

These tactics and techniques, presented as 'empowering', effectively introduced a tightening of

controls over people's behaviours and ways of being. They were not new per se. although the participatory, experiential and reflective 'humanistic' mode of targeting 'the whole person' introduced by ED from the terrain of non-formal education (including 'People's Education' in the political liberation struggle) was uncharacteristic of and called into question the regime of truth governing the academy's existing academic practices, and as such was resisted. This mode, these tactics and techniques, represented a shift towards greater individualization of subjects through power-knowledge. Overall, ED practices constituted an intensification, deepening, and refinement of the exercise of disciplinary power over both learners and teachers at the teaching-learning interface. This produced a proliferation of discourse, which in turn further increased the techniques of control, thereby individualizing subjects further.

I have further demonstrated that through this capacity for the mutually-generative production of discourse and normative shaping of subjects and their practices. ED as an apparatus linked with the mechanisms of the Vice Chancellor's Review and various administrative processes to produce a more general mechanism of institutional control. This overall mechanism worked to construct the university partly as a transformed institution according to the political rhetoric of the time, but also as a panoptical institution: one geared to greater efficiency, productivity and 'international competitiveness' through an increased degree of government, or management, of its staff and students. To this end it employed among other mechanisms the discourse of 'Quality' which directly co-opted the techniques of ED. The staff who moved from ED to the Quality Promotion Unit, were vehicles for this ongoing transmission of disciplinary power.

In these terms, then, the study demonstrates that ED's contribution to change was as a mechanism for the exercise of specific tactics and techniques of power which operated at the micro level of individual subjects. First to be enmeshed in this 'micro-physics of power' were ED staff and 'disadvantaged' students, then lecturing staff. Through this network of power relations ED conditioned - sometimes facilitated and sometimes constrained, but on balance facilitated - the deployment at macro level of institutional change processes. At the same time the macro level strategies affected the operations of ED, sometimes promoting, sometimes hampering them, but

always exerting on them pressure for change. There was thus a 'double conditioning' in the interaction between the exercise of disciplinary power at the micro-level, and broader strategies of power at the macro or institutional level, each being affected by the other. The curriculum in the broadest sense of the term, the vehicle for the transmission of knowledge and the production of subjects, became the chief nexus of this interplay of power.

In all this I have demonstrated the parallels between the history of prison reforms analysed by Foucault, and the university reform process. The rules of power relations as identified by Foucault have been revealed through both ED and the institutional change process. That is, power was not a static property but operated through numerous matrices of transformation in the institution. It operated in its own specificity and not in terms only of (government or university) legislation and structures. It worked not through sovereign edicts of the executive but 'from the bottom up', through the smallest mechanisms, like timetables, journals, and other confessional practices. It was a non-subjective yet intentional form of power, operating on and through people: people, their subjectivities and behaviours, were the product-effect of the action of this power, rather than power being the product of people's agency. As such, power had positive, or productive, rather than negative or repressive effects.

The tactics of disciplinary power identified in the educational reform process are manifold. There was a multiplication of ED discourses, around staff, student, curriculum, and institutional development; these further proliferated into heterogenous discourses on Open Learning, quality assurance, and student leadership development. Tactics of observation and supervision, correction and prescription of the behaviours of staff and students, and classification and categorisation of their identities, including the identification of 'exceptions and perversities', were all deployed. Control was effected through ever deeper lines of penetration of these tactics into the institution. There were incitements to discourse through denials and refusals on the part of lecturers, students. ED staff, management, and processes like the Vice Chancellor's Review. People's behaviour became both an object of analysis and a target of intervention for modification.

As Education Development extended this spiral of power-knowledge productivity, it entered into an increasingly symbiotic relationship with the mechanisms of the broader institutional change process, until its truths were incorporated, albeit unevenly, into the truths of the everyday practices of the university's regime of truth.

My analysis, then, has explained ED, not in the ideological terms according to which it presented itself, i.e. as a progressive force for a 'humanising' transformation of the university to a more democratic, non-racial, equitable institution, although it may have had such effects; but in material terms, according to its practices. I have demonstrated that it functioned as a tightening of controls over people's behaviours and ways of being, through the use of power practices, particularly those of a confessional nature. But ED as a specific mechanism has now disappeared. In its place are new mechanisms, new structures, many of which continue to employ the discourses of ED.

My analysis has shown that, notwithstanding the disappearance of Education Development, its tactics and techniques have to some extent become embedded in the everyday teaching/learning practices of the institution, and it has brought certain shifts in the institution's 'regime of truth', primarily insofar as the 'discipline' of teaching/learning at tertiary level has become both a credible and an accreditable field of knowledge, and the 'autonomy' of lecturers is no longer something to be taken for granted; a higher level of accountability is now expected of them.

Nevertheless, despite the effects of governmentality produced through two decades of intertwined ED and institutional change processes, and the continuing promotion of those effects through other processes like 'Quality Promotion' and 'Quality Assurance', at the end of this period a degree of elusiveness persists amongst the targets of disciplinary power at both individual and institutional level, as currents of resistance irrepressibly continue to circulate through the social system. This is seen, for instance, in the margin of academic failure tolerated amongst students, now less of a focus for intensive intervention than before; in the lapsing of intensive training and supervision of tutors; in the lack of interest amongst staff for participating in the student mentor programme. And, with posts for specialist staff disciplined to address those issues and implement

those programmes having been redeployed or discontinued, the elements or vehicles through which disciplinary power at that micro-level circulated have been diffused and dispersed. There is no longer as intensive and concentrated a deployment of power-knowledge operating 'from the bottom up' in the institution at large as there was in the ED era.

On the other hand, it is the case that those ED programmes which were from the outset located most firmly in existing academic structures and adopted the 'total education' approach most assiduously, like the Science Foundation Programme, continue to function and expand; albeit without specialist selection mechanisms, consequently, their productivity of student subjects risks reduction. They tolerate a margin of failure which, half a decade ago, would not have been tolerated. Nevertheless, they feed off the 'need' generated by an ever more technologized society and global economy, for converting 'disadvantaged students' into graduates in the sciences, to the extent that a massive donation has been secured to build a centre entirely dedicated to the Science Foundation Programme.

Student Development and student leadership development, having been consigned to the margins of academia in the Student Services Division, are effectively beginning the same cycle of power-knowledge productivity anew, the former targeting the staff of the Student Services Division to subject them, through accredited professional development programmes at the post-graduate level, the more effectively to subject students in the many 'non-academic' dimensions of their lives. Motivations are afoot for Student Services staff to be afforded the same facilities for research accorded their 'academic' counterparts. The instrument of a 'parallel transcript' will be the means for the disciplining of students in their 'co-curricular' activities. Student leadership development is similarly beginning to generate discourses amongst students, but also drawing on other disciplines to generate these discourses, and moving in the direction of accrediting students' subjection to its terrain of activity.

The political themes of transformation still surface in institutional debates and decision-making structures, although more sluggishly and less frequently as normalisation of the institution for the

era of global capitalism increasingly takes hold - as the "far-reaching, but never completely stable. effects of domination" (HS: 102) assert themselves. The next stage in the 'transformation' of the University of Natal, as we have seen, is likely to be its 'rationalisation' with the University of Durban-Westville, for purposes of which, at the time of writing, a process of subjection is already underway in the form of a special task group headed by a new Acting Vice Chancellor.

The overall view of the university of the past two decades that has emerged from the analysis in this study is that of an institutional subject exercising, through a mix of resistance, subjection, and self-subjection in a continually dynamic interplay of power relations both internal and external, the freedom to govern or construct itself as a different kind of institution. How judicious the 'mix' has been, is no doubt contestable; but to the extent that this freedom of self-governance was exercised through democratic procedures entailing 'minimal domination' of staff and students (also a controversial question, particularly as regards its processes from 1997 onwards), the University of Natal was operating on a set of ethical principles of 'correct care for the self' which translated into relative internal social stability in a context of often extreme turbulence. That this stability has appeared to increase during the latter period should not be viewed with complacency: it may signify a decline in the effort of ethical self-construction, a succumbing to the norms of global capitalism, suggested in the superman image, which may yet reap adverse consequences.

The account I have given of the university's change processes and the making of academic subjects through the exercise of disciplinary power gives rise to many questions 'needing' to be addressed in the current context of the society and 'the role in society of the University of Natal'. From my own personal perspective (as shaped by this study) the most interesting ones fall within the elusive terrain of ethics, the shaping of subjectivities, and flow from the overall question: Does the institution's current 'regime of truth' produce freedom-practising subjects, 'ethical subjects' in the sense in which Foucault employed the term, that is, subjects who take responsibility for governing themselves, for inventing themselves? I regard this question, particularly as it applies specifically to students, as being central to the 'domain' of my own work, student leadership development, the aim of which, for me, is to experiment continually with how the institution can

construct itself so as to produce such subjects.

Student leadership development is about producing ethical subjects in that it is about governmentality: about developing students' individual and collective capacity to govern themselves, individually and collectively, in the institutional context through the practices of freedom, the ethic of 'care for the self' which is simultaneously an ethic of care for others, of minimal domination of others. We have seen in the account of the 1980s and 1990s that, although students may have moved towards greater governmentality in terms of their academic practices, in the terrain of student government *per se* there were many problems, some arising from a lack of capacity for 'the practices of freedom' on the students' part, some from the ways in which the university constructed the educational environment within which students had to govern themselves. There were also problems at the level of individual students' practices of self-governance as these pertained to relations with other students from diverse backgrounds and issues of safety and security; and in the domain of sexual behaviour poor self-governance made, and will continue to make, the threat of HIV/AIDS proportionally the greater.

Given the university's Mission Statement and its commitment to serving the wider community, it is desirable that the effects of governmentality which student leadership development and the institution as a whole induce in students, should be such that students carry their capacity for the practices of freedom beyond the boundaries of the institution and university life into their homes, their communities, their future places of work, and civic society - what in ED parlance would be referred to as 'transfer'- so that they contribute through their leadership (of self and of others) to the transformation of the broader society.

At the crux of the question of whether the university produces, or how it can produce, ethical subjects lies the question of how it as an institution defines and creates its own internal 'practices of freedom'; or at least - and this question is a factor of how the institution governs itself and how it governs its subjects - how it can create the conditions within which such practices on the part of students and staff can flourish.

Foucault's work on ethics suggests some general directions here, and the account of the previous two decades has touched on pertinent areas which could be investigated in greater depth. To examine more closely to what extent the institution is engaging in the 'ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom' one could focus specifically on the issue of how, by what practices, in its internal and external engagements, in the discourses it generates, the university makes explicit and analyses its own history, enquiring what has made it what it is; and to what extent it actively engages its staff and students in such processes. One could look for evidence of a critical stance to its own historical limits and to the subjections currently apparently being imposed on it; for signs that it is actively resisting these, pushing them outwards to create new possibilities - actively constructing a 'critical ontology of the self', engaging in a creative experimental approach to transforming itself.

Taking account of the country's history of racialised unequal power relations and the way these shaped individual subjectivities, one could investigate how, if at all, the institution's social and discursive practices, both curricular and co-curricular, challenge both black and white staff and students to reshape their subjectivities towards equality and away from inferiority and superiority: away from authoritarianism and towards minimal domination, and respect and care for self and others. One could seek evidence as to whether curricula and institutional forums and decisionmaking bodies identify and critically analyse the new relationships of power that have emerged after the political revolution, and how to control these, or whether conformity to these is simply taken as a necessity. In this regard, the institution's response to the new orthodoxies which the current government is pursuing in higher education, could bear close scrutiny: is the university in danger of becoming merely politically compliant? In addition, is its regime of truth such as to merely produce politically docile, academically productive subjects or does it demand of staff and students that they engage in the business of defining and developing the 'practical forms of liberty' needed in our society? Does it require students to take responsibility for social transformation in the everyday affairs of the institution (safety and security, the teaching-learning process, student political activity, etc.) themselves; or do its practices encourage the abdication of responsibility to others, especially 'government' (of the student body, or the university, or the country)?

These are large questions, and in identifying topics for further research one should take account of the need to start with localised centres of power-knowledge. There are (at least) three particular aspects in the task of producing ethical subjects which interest me and which. I suggest, warrant immediate further investigation. The first relates to the very subject which Foucault chose to focus on in his study of the production of discourse, viz. sexuality. In Chapter Four I outlined, albeit briefly, the crisis of HIV/AIDS which threatens the future survival of the society and therefore also of the university. How can the university produce subjects who govern themselves ethically in their most intimate interpersonal relationships such that they care for themselves - and others - first and foremost at the level of basic survival, while still nevertheless pushing outward the boundaries of historically-imposed cultural and other limits on sexual self-discovery and self-invention? The evidence, to date, suggests that the discourses that have been generated around HIV/AIDS in the university and the society are not producing the self-disciplined, self-caring subjects they aim to produce; instead, resistance is high, and behaviour patterns remain of a high-risk nature. This question goes to the heart of individualization and power relations, especially in the terrain of gender.

The second area pertains also to relations of power at both interpersonal and structural levels, in the terrain of race relations, which may be construed broadly under the catch phrase 'diversity' to include not only relations between 'black' and 'white' students but also students of diverse ethnicities, nationalities, religious persuasions, language and cultural backgrounds, and so forth. The history of the country and of education, as we have seen, has promoted separation, isolation, ideologies of superiority/inferiority, domination/subordination, conflict, and the construction of differing subjectivities amongst people of differing backgrounds. Placing students together on campuses, in residences and in lecture rooms does not automatically transform their 'habits of soul' in relation to themselves and others. Yet the university needs to produce graduates whose subjectivities are transformed such that they will contribute to the healing of our fractured society and the reinvention of the 'South African' subject, who is also simultaneously an 'African' and a 'global' subject. How can this task be tackled?

The third area has to do with the challenge of constructing students as subjects who exercise freedom in the very process of their own construction as academic subjects, that is, subjects who engage with the institution regarding how it governs them, particularly in terms of choice regarding what may be learnt, by what means, with whom and from whom, through what language medium, where, how, and why; how learning is to be recognised, what should be recognised as learning, and so forth; in other words, subjects who question the university's 'regime of truth' regarding what constitutes 'an academic subject'. Investigating how this complex challenge may be pursued would in itself be a complex challenge.

With regard to how these questions may be grappled with, the obvious 'localised centres' for data collection for such studies would be the curriculum, perhaps localising further to specific disciplines and courses; the operations of Student Services and the terrain of co-curricular activities, including the mechanisms for involving students in decision-making. This study has suggested that the greatest effects are produced through the exercise of disciplinary power, and that disciplinary power circulates most vigorously at the teaching/learning interface, and wherever individual subjects are taken as objects of knowledge. The social and discursive practices operating in the terrain of the proposed areas for study, viz. sex and gender relations, race relations, and student participation in curriculum formation and institutional governance; and the effects of these practices, should therefore be closely scrutinised, not with a view to merely increasing control over students' political energies, but with a view to promoting students' engagement in the 'practices of freedom'.

In concluding, it must be acknowledged that many who were players in the events recounted in this study may take issue with my analysis of the 'archive' of the University of Natal's history during the 1980s and 1990s. They may question why this event was referred to and not that one; why specific documents or discrete items of data were included and not others; and so forth. They may, indeed, dispute the validity of Foucault's analytic or consider my application of it to fall woefully short. To such responses I would only reiterate that what I have attempted to do is to adopt what, for me, has been a creative, experimental approach (Foucault 1984b: 50) to the

difficult task of contemporary historical analysis; that in doing so I have perhaps at times fallen into adopting "the famous perspective of frogs", as Foucault so colourfully characterised the approach of 'Traditional history'; but that, throughout, my endeavours have been to "shorten [my] vision to those things nearest" to me in an attempt to render an 'effective history' as 'truthfully' as the measure of my disciplinary subjection to date enables me to do: and that it is not only desirable but also, on account of the 'will to knowledge', inevitable that others should raise challenges to what I have rendered.

Bibliography

Works by Michel Foucault

- 1974 'Human Nature: Justice versus Power' in Reflexive Water: The Basic Concerns of Mankind. Ed. Fons Elders (London, Souvenir Press)
- 1980 Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 Ed. C. Gordon (Brighton, Harvester)
- 1980 'Prison Talk' in Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 Ed. C. Gordon (Brighton, Harvester)
- 1980 'Truth and Power' in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* 1972-1977 Ed. C. Gordon (Brighton, Harvester)
- 1980 'Two Lectures' in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* 1972-1977 Ed. C. Gordon (Brighton, Harvester)
- 1981 The History of Sexuality: An Introduction (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- 1982 'The Subject and Power,' Afterword to H.L Dreyfus & P. Rabinow Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics (Brighton, Harvester)
- 1984 The Foucault Reader Ed. P. Rabinow (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- 1984 'Nietzsche, Genealogy. History' in P. Rabinow (Ed.) The Foucault Reader (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- 1984 'What is Enlightenment?' in P. Rabinow (Ed.) The Foucault Reader (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- 1986a Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (Harmondsworth, Peregrine)
- 1986b 'Disciplinary Power and Subjection' in S. Lukes (Ed.) Power (Oxford, Blackwell)
- 1987 'The Ethic of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom' an interview with Michel Foucault on January 20, 1984 conducted by Raul Fornet-Betancourt, Helmut Becker, Alfredo Gomez-Muller transl. by J.D. Gauthier, S.J. in *Philosophy and Social Criticism* Vol. 12

Secondary Literature: Books

Ashley, M. 1989 Ideologies And Schooling In South Africa (Rondebosch, S.A.T.A.)

Ball, S.J. (Ed.) 1990 Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge (London. Routledge)

Barnett, R. 1992 Improving Higher Education (Bucks., Open University Press)

Behr, A. L. and MacMillan, R.G. 1971 Education in South Africa (Pretoria, van Schaik)

Brew, A. (Ed.) 1985 Directions in Staff Development (Buckingham and Bristol, P.A., Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press)

Brookes, E. H. 1966 A History of the University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg. University of Natal)

Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. 1982 Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics (Brighton, Harvester)

Duke, C. (undated photocopy text) The Learning University (London, Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press)

Eribon, D. 1993 Michel Foucault (London, Faber & Faber)

Gore, J. 1993 The Struggle for Pedagogies (New York, Routledge)

Horrell, M. 1968 Bantu Education to 1968 (Johannesburg, SAIRR)

Hoy, D. C. (Ed.) 1986 Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell)

Hyslop, J. 1988 'School Student Movements and State Education Policy 1972 - 1987' in Cobbet, W. and Cohen, R. (Eds.) Popular Struggles in South Africa (London, James Curry)

Jepson. B.T. (undated self-published text) Negotiating for a New South Africa Part 1 The Negotiation Process

Leistyna, P., Woodrum, A., Sherblom, S. (Eds.) 1996 Breaking Free The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series No 27. Cambridge

Nasson, B. and Samuel, J. (Eds.) 1990 Education from poverty to liberty (Claremont, David Philip)

National Board of Employment, Education and Training, Australia 1994 Developing Lifelong Learners through Undergraduate Education Commissioned Report No. 28 (Canberra, Commonwealth Information Services)

Nkomo, M.1984 Student Culture and Activism in Black South African Universities (Westport, Greenwood Press)

- (Ed.) 1990 Pedagogy of Domination. Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa (New Jersey, Africa World Press)

Pavlich, G. and Orkin, M. (Eds.) 1993 Diversity and Quality Academic Development at South African Tertiary Institutions (Johannesburg, CASE)

Perry, W.G.1970 Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years (NewYork, Holt, Rinehart and Winston)

Ramsden, P. 1992 Learning to Teach in Higher Education (London and New York, Routledge)

Rowntree, D. 1985 Developing Courses for Students (London, Harper & Row)

Shutte, Augustine 2001 *Ubuntu An Ethic for a New South Africa* Pietermaritzburg, Cluster Publications

Simons, J. 1995 Foucault and the Political (London, Routledge)

Smart. B. 1985 Michel Foucault (London, Tavistock)

Unterhalter, E. and Wolpe, H. et al (Eds.) 1991a Apartheid Education and Popular Struggles (Johannesburg, Ravan Press)

Unterhalter, E., Wolpe, H. and Botha, T. (Eds.) 1991b Education in a Future South Africa Policy Issues for Transformation (Houghton, Heinemann)

v. d. Merwe & Welsh (Eds.) 1977 The future of the university in South Africa (Cape Town. David Philip)

Vintuge Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman)

Secondary Literature:

Journals, Articles. Conference Proceedings, Government Publications, Organisational Documents, University Documents, Unpublished Articles

academic development 1995 1:1, 1:2

academic development 1996 2:1. 2:2

academic development 1997 3:1 (Special Issue: Professional Development), 3:2

African National Congress Education Department 1994 A Policy Framework for Education and Training Draft Discussion Document (Braamfontein)

Aitken, R. 1987 'Grappling with the problem of personal agency in knowing and learning: perspectives from the discipline called "English" in an African context' in *Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration* 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman)

Appel, S., Harley, K., Wedekind, V. (Eds.) *Journal of EDUCATION* 1993 18:1 (Pietermaritzburg, Faculty of Education, Natal University)

Bawa, A. C. 1999 'The University of Natal as a Digital University'

Blocher, D.H. 1978 'Campus Learning Environments and the ecology of student development' in Banning, J.H. (Ed.) Campus Ecology: A Perspective for Student Affairs. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Monograph.

Booysen, C. de V. 1986 'Focus on Disadvantaged Students and Underdeveloped Communities' (University of Natal)

Boughey, C. et al 1998 'Can SAAAD survive? Reflections from KwaZulu-Natal on Collaboration, Capacity Building and the Future' (unpublished SAAAD conference paper)

Bradbury, J. 1991 'A Profile of the University of Natal a record of the experiences of TTT students' (TTT Programme, University of Natal)

Bradbury, J. & Griesel, H. 1992 'The Development and Production of Knowledge' A foundation course in the Faculty of Social Science. (TTT Programme, University of Natal)

Brown, R. Bart, M. 1990 'Student Development: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow' in Evolving Theoretical Perspectives on Students. New Directions for Student Services Series # 51. (San Fransisco, Jossey-Bass)

Buckland, P. 1981 'HSRC investigation into Education: Another brick in the wall?' in *Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21* 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman)

Bulman, F. A. 1996 'A Regional Study of Academic Development and its Roots in Academic Support.' Unpublished Masters dissertation

Bitzer. E. (Ed.) 1997 Unity within diversity: Maximising learning on South African campuses. Proceedings of a Multicultural Conference (Bloemfontein, University of the Free State)

Christie, P. 'Equality and Curriculum Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa' in Appel, S., Harley, K., Wedekind, V. (Eds.) Journal of EDUCATION 1993 18:1 (Pietermaritzburg, Faculty of

Education, University of Natal)

Cloete, N. and Muller, J. 1987 'The Invisible Hand: Black Admissions and the Politics of Exclusion' University of the Witwatersrand, preliminary draft.

Committee of University Principals Newsletter 1993, 6: 3

Committee of University Principals Newsletter 1994a, 7: 2

Committee of University Principals Newsletter 1994b 7: 3 & 4

Craig, A.P. 1990 'The Production of Knowledge' (TTT Programme University of Natal)

Crewe, M. 1981 'Why can't the English?' in Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman)

Davidson, A. 1986 'Archaeology, Genealogy, Ethics' in Hoy, D.C. (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 221-233

Deacon, R. & Parker, B. 1995 'Education as Subjection and Refusal: An Elaboration on Foucault' Curriculum Studies 3:2 109-122

de Clerq, F. 1983 'High-skilled manpower, Education and work in Bophuthatswana' in Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 110

Department of Education 1997 'Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the twenty-first century'

Discourse July 1994 Newsletter of the Academic Development Programme, Rhodes University

Discourse 7: 1. May 1996 Journal of the Academic Development Programme, Rhodes University

Discourse 8: 1. May 1996 Journal of the Academic Development Centre, Rhodes University

Drewett, M. 1995 'Course Design Change: A Necessary Way Forward for Academic Development in South African Universities' in academic development 1: 2: 141

Dreyfus. H.L. & Rabinow, P. 1986 'What is Maturity? Habermas and Foucault on "What is enlightenment?" in Hoy D.C. (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 109-121

Drum, D. 1980 'Understanding Student Development' in Morrill, W. Hurst, J. Oetting, E. Dimensions of Intervention for Student Development (New York, John Wiley & Sons)

Duminy, A. 'The Case for the Humanities', University of Natal

Duminy, A. 1995 VCR Curriculum Development Report on a Visit to UK Universities

Duminy, A. and Lund, J. 1995 VCR Curriculum Development Curriculum Reform: A Vision for the University of Natal

Education White Paper 3. A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education. Higher Education Act No. 101, 1997

Ellsworth, E. 1989 'Why doesn't this Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy' in *Harvard Educational Review* 59: 3 297-324

Fried, J. 1995 'Border Pedagogy: Reshaping Our Ideas of Teaching and Learning' in Fried. J. & Associates Shifting Paradigms in Student Affairs (Maryland: American College Personnel Association)

Gordon, C. (Ed.) 1980 'Afterword' in M. Foucault Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 (New York, Pantheon) 229-259

Gourley, B. 1994 Vice-Chancellor's Installation speech, University of Natal

Gourley, B. 1996 'Universities in the 21st Century: Education in a Borderless World. Pedagogy or Politics' Speech delivered in Singapore

Gourley, B. 1998 Vice Chancellor's letter in University Notice from EMail Moderator 1/10/98

Graaff, J. and Lawrence, M. 'Twice upon a Kenton: methodological reflections on the liberal-radical education debate' in *Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21* 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 32

Grayson, D. and Inglis, M. 1990 The Science Foundation Programme Report SFP 1-90. unpublished report, University of Natal

Grayson, D. 1991 The Science Foundation Programme Report SFP 1-91, unpublished report. University of Natal

Green Paper on Higher Education Transformation

Gunthorp, J. (Ed.) 1993 'Equal Opportunity/redress at the University of Natal 1992' A report

Habermas, J. 1986 'Taking Aim at the Heart of the Present' in D.C. Hoy (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 103-108

Hacking, I. 1986a 'The Archaeology of Foucault' in D.C. Hoy (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 27-40

- 1986b 'Self-Improvement' in D.C. Hoy (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 235-240

Hartshorne, K. 1988 'The Current Crisis in Education against the background of the ideological-political situation in South Africa' photocopied paper

Hoskin, K. 'Foucault under examination: the crypto-educationalist unmasked in Ball. S. (Ed.) Foucault and Educational research 1990

Hoy, D.C. 1986 'Introduction' in D.C. Hoy (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York. Blackwell) 1-25

Hunter, P. 1981 'The participation debate: Strategies and implications' in Vintuge Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 22

Hyslop, J. 1990 'Schools, unemployment and youth: origins and significance of student and youth movements, 1976-1987 in Nasson, B. and Samuel, J. (Eds.) 1990 Education from poverty to liberty (Claremont, David Philip)

Israel, C., Lockett, M.S., Beard, P.N.G. (Eds.) 1990 Proceedings of the University of Durban-Westville Admissions Conference

Jackson, F. 1995 'Acquiring Applied Linguistic Discourse: the Role of Diverse Writing tasks for Academic Development in a Post-Graduate Degree' in academic development 1: 2: 153

Journal of EDUCATION 1999: 24 (Pietermaritzburg, School of Education, Natal University)

Kant, I. 1996 'An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?' in L.E. Cahoone (Ed.) From Modernism to Post-Modernism: An Anthology (Oxford, Blackwell) 51-57

Kell, C. 1991 'Activists and academics: the role of the liberal universities in research for the democratic movement' in Unterhalter et al (Eds.) *Apartheid Education and Popular Struggles* (Johannesburg, Ravan Press) 146-155

Khotseng, B.M., Matlou, M.D. and Mahlomaholo, M.G. 1986 'The pedagogical character of the struggle' in *Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21* 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 161

Kitchin, F. and Frame, J. (undated) Mentoring in the University Context: A Guide

Kuh, G. Vesper, N. Krehbiel, L. 1994 'Student Learning at Metropolitan Universities' in Smart. J.C. (Ed.) Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research Vol. X (New York, Agathon Press)

Levin, R. 1991 'People's Education and the struggle for democracy in South Africa' in Unterhalter et al (Eds.) Apartheid Education and Popular Struggles (Johannesburg, Ravan Press) 117-130

Luckett, K. 1998 'Programmes Hand-book: Guidelines for Programme Design, Specification. Approval and Registration at the University of Natal' (Tertiary Education Studies Unit. University of Natal)

Luckett, K. and Luckett, S. 1999 'Reflections on a Service-Learning Curriculum' Journal of EDUCATION 1999: 24 (Pietermaritzburg, School of Education, Natal University) 81

Luckett, K.2000 assisted by the SAUVCA Level Descriptors Task Team 'A SAUVCA Position on Level Descriptors for the HET Band & the Mapping of HE Qualifications to NQF Levels) 2nd Draft unpublished document

Marshall, J. 'Foucault and Educational research' in Ball, S. (Ed.) Foucault and Educational research 1990

Masenya, D. 1995 'Reconceptualising the Academic Discourse: Underprepared Students or Institutions or Both?' in academic development 1:2, 86

Maughan-Brown, D. 1995 'From Teaching to Learning: A new paradigm for higher education' in *Journal of Education* No. 20 (Pietermaritzburg, School of Education, Natal University)

Maughan-Brown, D. 1999 'The Department is dead. Long live the School' in *Journal of EDUCATION* 1999: 24 (Pietermaritzburg, School of Education, Natal University) 65

Mdluli, P.1987 'Ubuntu-botho: Inkatha's 'people's education' in Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 90

Moll. 1. 1981 'To get technical about peoples' education: a response' in Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 86

Molobi, E. 1987a 'Academics and the struggle for a democratic education' in *Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21* 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 103

Molobi, E. 1987b 'South Africa: Education Under Apartheid' in *People's Education: A Collection of Articles from December 1985 - May 1987* (Cape Town, Centre for Adult and Continuing Education. University of the Western Cape)

Moore, B. 1994 'Multicultural Education in South Africa: Some Theoretical and Political Issues' in *Perspectives in Education* 15:2, 237-263

Morphet, T. 1992 'My life was a transfer' in Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association

Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 283

Morrill, W. Hurst, J. Oetting, E. 1980 'A Conceptual Model of Intervention Strategies' in Morrill. W. Hurst, J. Oetting, E. Dimensions of Intervention for Student Development. (NewYork. John Wiley & Sons)

Moyo. C., Donn, G., and Hounsell, D. 1997 'Academic Development and Strategic Change in Higher Education', SAAAD Discussion Report

National Commission on Higher Education 1996 'A Framework for Transformation' Discussion Document (Pretoria, HSRC)

National Consultative Conference on Education 1986 Resolutions. National Education Crisis Committee, Durban.

Ndebele, N. 1995 'Maintaining Domination through Language' in academic development 1:1

NEPI 1992 Post-Secondary Education Report (research group report)
Noruwana, J. 1980 'Through the keyhole - Education in South Africa for the future' in Vintage
Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller
Longman) 16

NU Partners June 1994, 5: 2

Nurnberger, K. 1997 e-mail letter to all staff

Odendaal-Magwaza, M. 1991 'Appropriate orientation: a first stage in education development' in SAAAD 91 Conference Proceedings. Starfield, S.(Ed.)1991 (Johannesburg, Academic Support Programme, University of the Witwatersrand)

Odendaal-Magwaza, M. 1996 'Student Development and the Student Role in Higher Education: Broadening the Debate' in Jo-Anne Vorster (Ed.) Student Contributions to Learning Conference Proceedings Selected Papers (Grahamstown, Academic Development Programme, Rhodes University)

Odendaal-Magwaza, M. 1998 'The Image of the University of Natal and its Students Summary Report on existing research findings' unpublished report

Parkinson, C. and Mattson, E. 1993 'On the Margins of Marking: Curriculum Development through Analysis of Staff Assessment' in Appel, S., Harley, K., Wedekind, V. (Eds.) Journal of EDUCATION 1993 18:1 (Pietermaritzburg, Faculty of Education, Natal University) 33

Perspectives in Education 15:1 (Ed.) Pendlebury Summer 1993/94

Piper, L. 1997 letter in The Natal Witness 20.2.97

Poster, M. 1986 'Foucault and the Tyranny of Greece' in Hoy, D.C. (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 205-220

Prozesky, M. 1999 'The Quest for Inclusive Well-Being: Groundwork for an Ethical Renaissance' Inaugural Lecture, University of Natal

Rabinow, P. 1984 'Introduction' in P. Rabinow (Ed.) The Foucault Reader (Harmondsworth, Penguin) 3-29

Rajab, D. 1999 'Perspectives in Student Development' unpublished paper, University of Natal

'Reinventing the wheel. Can we make Supplemental Instruction appropriate for our South African Context?' (No author, no date; source UNP Student Mentor Programme)

Robertson, S.-A. (Ed.) 1995 In Pursuit of Equality Kenton Education Association, Juta

SAAAD 91 Proceedings of the 6th Conference of the South African Association for Academic Development. Starfield, S.(Ed.)1991 (Johannesburg, Academic Support Programme, University of the Witwatersrand)

SAAAD Conference Proceedings 1993 Finding our Voices

SAAAD Conference Abstracts 1996

Schreiner, G.D. and Crossman, T.D. 1993 'Report of Commission on Co-ordination of Admission Procedures' University of Natal

Schroenn, J., Fuzile, L., Mthethwa, N.1994 'Report on the 1993 Supplemental Instruction Programme' Department of Economics, University of Natal at Pietermaritzburg

Schuster, D. 1991 'American model: A University Education structure' University of Natal

Smart, B. 1986 'The Politics of Truth and the Problem of Hegemony' in Hoy, D.C. (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 157-173

'Student Support Services' 1990. Photocopied newsletter of the Student Support Services.

Taylor, N., Muller, J., Cloete, N., Narsing, Y. 1983 'The first and last interpreters' in *Vintage Kenton A Kenton Education Association Commemoration 21* 1994 (Cape Town, Maskew Miller Longman) 133

Thomson, C. and Inglis, M. 'Peer Group Learning Whose responsibility?' in Appel, S., Harley, K., Wedekind, V. (Eds.) *Journal of EDUCATION* 1993 18:1 (Pietermaritzburg, Faculty of Education, Natal University) 47

UDUSA 1992a Congress Proceedings

UDUSA 1992b Conference Announcement

UDUSA 1993a May NEC documentation

UDUSA 1993b July Vice President's Report, Congress Proceedings

UDUSA news October 1995

University of Missouri-Kansas City Center for Academic Development 1992 'Supplemental Instruction (SI) Review of Research Concerning the Effectiveness of SI from The University of Missouri-Kansas City and Other Institutions from Across the United States'

University of Natal Academic Planning and Policy Committee 1982 'Statement of Management Policy Objectives and Strategies'. Annexure to Minutes of Senex 30/3/82. University of Natal 1988 Walker Report

University of Natal 1989 'The Role in Society of the University of Natal 1989 Onwards'

University of Natal Internship Programme 1990 Annual Report

University of Natal 1991a Senate Minutes, 8/5/1991

University of Natal 1991b Vice Chancellor's Review Phase I Report

University of Natal 1992a VCR March Newsletter

University of Natal 1992b VCR May Newsletter

University of Natal 1992c VCR Working Paper Phase II 'Choosing a Focus'

University of Natal 1992d VCR Newsletter Phase I and Phase II

University of Natal 1992e 'Proposed Structure of the Student Services Division, UNP'

University of Natal 1992f Senex sub-committee report 'Proposal for a New Degree Structure'

University of Natal 1992g Pietermanitzburg Education Development Board Minutes

University of Natal 1993a May Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1993b May Student Services Board Minutes

University of Natal 1993c August Student Services Board Minutes

University of Natal 1993d Annexure I Report of Meetings of the Senate Re-Admissions Appeals Committees, Durban and Pietermaritzburg, January-March 1993

University of Natal 1993e VCR August Newsletter

University of Natal 1993f October Student Services Board Minutes

University of Natal 1994a March Student Services Board Minutes

University of Natal Public Affairs Division 1994b Transformation A Report on Progress

University of Natal 1994c NU INFO 4:11

University of Natal 1994d August Pietermaritzburg Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1995a NU INFO 5:1

University of Natal 1995b May Pietermaritzburg Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1995c October Pietermaritzburg Education Development Board Agenda

University of Natal 1995d November Pietermaritzburg Academic Affairs Board Minutes

University of Natal 1995e NU INFO 5:4

University of Natal 1996a May Pietermaritzburg Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1996b August Pietermaritzburg Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1997a Humanities Newsletter No. 11

University of Natal 1997b Vice Chancellor's Newsletter, February

University of Natal 1997c May Pietermaritzburg Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1997d September Pietermaritzburg Education Development Board Agenda

University of Natal 1997e October Pietermanitzburg Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1998a March Pietermaritzburg Education Development Board Minutes

University of Natal 1998b March Pietermaritzburg Student Services Board Agenda

University of Natal 1998c November Pietermaritzburg Student Services Board Minutes

University of Natal 1998d Advertisement Ref. P26/98

University of Natal FOCUS 9: 3, 1998 (Globalisation Edition)

University of Natal 1999a NU info 9:2

Vice Chancellor's letter in University Notice from EMail Moderator 1/10/98

Vice Chancellor's newsletter, February 1997

Vice Chancellor's newsletter, September 1998

Wang, D.1993 'Last Writes' in NU INFO 3: 10, University of Natal

Walker, M. 1995 'Editorial' in academic development 1:1

Walzer, M.1986 'The Politics of Michel Foucault' in Hoy, D.C. (Ed.) Foucault: A Critical Reader (New York, Blackwell) 51-68

Webbstock, D. 1997 'Quality Assurance with Respect to University Teaching in South Africa: a narrative analysis' in Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 22:2 173

Wedekind, V. The Broad Transformation Forum (unpublished seminar notes)

Welsh, D. and Savage, M 1977 'The University in Divided Societies: the Case of South Africa' in v.d. Merwe, H. and Welsh, D. (Eds.) The future of the university in Southern Africa (Cape Town, David Philip) 130 - 147

West, G. 1996 'Power and Pedagogy in a South African context: A case study in Biblical Studies' in academic development 2:1

White Paper on Education March 1995

Wolpe, H. 1991 'Education and social transformation: problems and dilemmas' in Unterhalter, E., Wolpe, H. and Botha, T. (Eds.) Education in a Future South Africa (Oxford, Heinemann)