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Abstract
In general, African nations, from the mid-20th century onwards, have witnessed an increasing and massive expansion in the university sector. By the first decade of the 21st century, as the sector expanded even further, so did the pressure for policy reforms increase from across the globe and the African regions. These reforms were established as instruments for advancing national development, namely, within the trajectory of reducing poverty through sustainable (economic and social) growth. Drawing on the East African nation of Tanzania, this article focuses on the implementation of a policy reform in three public universities. The reform (framed within the policy narrative of strategies for growth and the reduction of poverty), is referenced in Swahili as “Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kupunguza Umaskini”. The dynamics associated with the implementation process are interpreted within the framework of Michel Foucault’s theory of Governmentality which is premised on a particular form and exercise of power relations. In this respect, the article seeks to understand how the reform was drawn upon as a regime of governance, namely, as regulating behaviour in three universities in Tanzania, with specific reference to the mandates of ‘access’ and ‘quality’.
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Résumé
En général, les pays africains, à partir du milieu du 20e siècle, ont connu une expansion croissante et massive du secteur universitaire. Au cours de la première décennie du 21ème siècle, alors que le secteur se développait encore davantage, la pression en faveur de réformes politiques augmentait dans le monde entier et dans les régions africaines. Ces réformes ont été définies comme des instruments permettant de faire progresser le développement national, à savoir dans la trajectoire de réduction de la pauvreté par une croissance durable (économique et sociale). S’appuyant sur la Tanzanie, pays d’Afrique de l’Est, cet article porte sur la mise en œuvre d’une réforme des politiques dans trois universités publiques. La réforme (inscrite dans le discours

1 We are aware of the shifting terminology for that of ‘university’ and ‘higher education’ and thus alert the reader to the fact that at times the terms are used interchangeably in the article.
politique sur les stratégies de croissance et de réduction de la pauvreté) est appelée en swahili «Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kupunguza Umaskini». Les dynamiques associées au processus de mise en œuvre sont interprétées dans le cadre de la théorie de la gouvernementalité de Michel Foucault, fondée sur une forme et un exercice particuliers des relations de pouvoir. À cet égard, l’article cherche à comprendre comment la réforme a été élaborée en tant que régime de gouvernance, c'est-à-dire en tant que réglementation du comportement dans trois universités en Tanzanie, avec une référence spécifique aux mandats de «l'accès» et de la «qualité».

**Mots clés:** universités; Établissements d'enseignement supérieur; Gouvernementalité; Puissance; Accès; Qualité; Banque mondiale; Réduction de la pauvreté; Gouvernementalité globale.

### 1. Introduction and background

Within Africa generally, the university sector witnessed some growth in the period between the second half of the 20th and the first decade of the 21st centuries. In this regard, on the one end of the continuum, colleges were changed to the status of universities; while on the other, new public and private institutions were established to meet the access demands of the post – independence period. At the same time, and, as a consequence of global processes, universities in Africa, were also subject to various reforms. In light of this backdrop, the East African nation of Tanzania was no exception insofar as by the end of the 20th century, Tanzania witnessed the growth of the university sector, along with attendant reforms. In this respect, the Tanzanian Development Vision 2025 is the bedrock policy initiative that envisaged the growth and trajectory of Tanzania as a middle income level economy. Closely tied to this, but nonetheless and parallel to the World Bank’s externally originated poverty reduction strategy, is the internal (i.e. national) strategy for reducing poverty through sustainable growth, which in Swahili is framed as “Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kupunguza Umaskini” (*hereafter referred to as MKUKUTA*). At this point, it is important to note that this (national) initiative is framed within the World Bank’s structural (adjustment) programmes for Sub-Saharan African countries, of which debt relief and or rearrangement was also a key component. In summary, within the framework of the World Banks’ programme, more specifically, around the poverty reduction, the MKUKUTA initiative has undergone two iterations, first in 2005 and then again in 2011. Sandwiched in between this period (in 2010), is the operational offshoot, namely, the Higher Education Development Programme. The overall focus of the MKUKUTA is on the equitable growth and governance of Tanzania; it is an instrument for mobilizing efforts and resources towards targeted poverty reduction outcomes and economic development. In this respect, higher education is discursively framed as a vehicle for social and economic development, with specific linkages to a country’s science and technology systems, which in turn would contribute to poverty reduction (United Republic of Tanzania, Vice President’s Office,
2005:9). Thus, the interest of this article is how the MKUKUTA reform was drawn upon as a regime of governance, as a way of controlling, i.e. regulating behaviour within the domain of higher education in the Tanzanian context. We now outline how we approached the data for the article.

**Approaching the data**

First, a brief note on the wider study on which this article is based. The data for this article has been extracted from a broader qualitative doctoral research project that had as its aim, the overall perceived responsiveness of administrators, managers, national and international decision-makers, and academic staff who had been involved in the implementation of the MKUKUTA at three public universities in Tanzania. Within the framework of a case-study design, it drew on qualitative methods and techniques (Denzin, 2002:2), gathering the data from an analysis of relevant historical documents and interviews with selected individuals numbering forty from the university, government and international donor organisations. All ethical guidelines were followed. The interpretative framework was formulated from the ideas of Michel Foucault specifically as this pertains to the concept of ‘governmentality’. This will now be addressed.

**Interpretive framework: Governmentality**

The concept of governmentality has been the subject of much debate and well-rehearsed (see Gordon 1991, Rose 1993, Dean 1998) and it has also been applied to higher education (see Fejes 2006; Fimyar 2008). At the point of oversimplification, these debates focus on the behaviour/actions of individuals and practices of institutions within a global neo-liberal economic framework. In broad brushstroke terms, the concept of governmentality is defined as a regime or technology of power through which oversight around behaviour and practices of individuals and institutions, is exercised. When brought into the orbit of higher education, the latter is a site in which a particular regime of power directs and redirects behaviours through particular norms and values, processes of normalisation. From this angle, the term governmentality is premised on the broad principle of the “conduct of conduct” (Foucault 1982:220). In other words, it is about how behaviour/actions/practices are directed (and or comported) in a particular and rational manner, over a population in a specified period of time (see Rose, 1996; Dean 1999:198). An important dimension that holds together these practices and comportment, is one that has to do with the concept of power.
Concept of Power

For Foucault, power does not need to be located in a particular, central source, for example, in the state (Foucault 1980b), instead power should be seen as a productive network that is running or working through the whole social body, both individually over whole populations (Foucault, 1980b). In addition, there is also the notion of power as enactment in multiple ways, this implies that power is equally exercised through diverse forms that take the shape of ‘resistance’, ‘freedom’ as well as ‘regression’.

Following on from the above, power is exercised through processes of normalisation, control, surveillance, and regulation. In effect, the various ensembles of institutions and individuals are therefore mobilised through apparatuses, i.e. ‘dispositif’. Within the framework of power as a form of regulation and control, Foucault understands power as being dependent on the way “some act on others” (Foucault, 2000:340). In addition, “power is viewed as a capillary” (Foucault, 1980:39). In this regard, as a type of ‘capillary’, the exercise of power is understood from “the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions, attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives” (Foucault, 1980:39). Within this perspective of power, there are also a range of interest groups or components involved in helping to regulate (or, establish) the conditions, for power to transverse.

With respect to the above, one of the sites in which power is exercised by governmental apparatuses is through reform initiatives in higher education (see (Fejes 2006; Fimyar 2008). In this regard, we observe that there have been few investigations in the higher education policy research area, more especially in the African sub-region countries, that has applied Foucauldian concepts. Against this background, the aim of the article is modest, insofar as it hopes to contribute to further research in this area, working within the Foucauldian framework of governmentality. More specifically (as outlined earlier), we are interested in terms of how the MKUKUTA policy unfolds in practice. We are keen to understand what characterises the processes that enable it as a reform, in the words of Foucault (1982, 1988), to become an instrument of governance through which the state then exercises control over its higher education citizens (i.e. population)?
Discussion of the findings.

Origin and ownership

One of the key findings in this study is about the modality of power as it pertains to the exercise and implementation of the MKUKUTA policy reform in the Tanzanian higher education context. This is now addressed.

As outlined above, one of the key components of Foucault’s approach to power is that it is not resident in a single source. In this study, when selected individuals representing various interest groups were probed for their engagement with the MKUKUTA initiative, the data yielded responses that tended to focus on power as being dispersed rather than it being located in a single source. In this respect, the responses suggest that the origin and establishment of the MKUKUTA is local and internal rather than international and external. Thus, even though as outlined earlier, the reform is an offshoot of the World Bank, it is appropriated by the national context. As a consequence, this results in a condition to suggest that there is ‘no single source’ of regulatory power. In this respect, we are confronted with the complexity of power as not residing in single source, but having multiple sources (Foucault, 1980b); or if it is single (as in the World Bank), then it has ‘left’ its source of origin and is now dispersed more broadly and across diverse angles.

Flowing from the above, a further finding of this study is around the tension relating to the ownership of the MKUKUTA policy document, more specifically in terms of the source of the ownership of the initiative. In other words, the contestation is around the notion of social agency as this pertains to ownership of the reform. As outlined earlier, the initiative has its roots in the World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (2000) which was made obligatory for impoverished sub-Saharan African countries. What is interesting is that in the Tanzanian context, the proprietorship of MKUKUTA seems to be contested. For example, some of the respondents in this study mentioned that there was a sense of “pride of place”, confidently terming it as “our MKUKUTA”, framing the policy as a “local initiative of the Tanzanian government”. In this respect, there are interesting narratives regarding the contestation as to whether it is internally or externally owned.

First, the respondents perceived the initiative as a ‘national-asset’, despite, in the face of the ‘source’ having originated externally. In other words, although the development aid seed was planted by an external aid agency (i.e. as a single source), the mentality is such that it is thought of in a local/national proprietary terms. Working within the framework of Foucault’s concept of governmentality, we observe that the thinking / mentality (in this case, the perception) around the reform for governing, is such that an
external, global donor aid practice, is internalised and rationalised in the local context. In this way, by internalising and rationalising the initiative, the behaviour of the institutions and the individuals are such that the reform is self-regulated. Consequently, the latter becomes a normalised facet of everyday institutional practices.

From the above, we observe that there are contradictory narratives around the exercise and location of power. On the one hand, it is not completely centralised in a single source, radiating downwards, but instead, is dispersed. At the same time, national policy makers (the Tanzanian state agency) perceive and assume central ownership. In this regard, there was a view that it (the reform) would cascade down in a conventional, linear-type manner, “that it would be implemented by all institutions and agencies”. What is noteworthy though, is that when this perception was triangulated with different categories of respondents, it yielded accounts to suggest that it was travelling/transversing from diverse sources in and from multiple angles.

**Power to act on the action of others: the ‘conduct of conduct’**

As outlined earlier, a key principle that underpins the notion of governmentality is about “the conduct of conduct or the power to act on the action of others” (Foucault, 1982: 220). In this study, what we have observed is that one of the ways in which the government is steering, or, “acting on the action of others” (Foucault, 1982), is through expanding the higher education system as a component of the MKUKUTA reform. Effectively, therefore, the steerage of institutions is occurring through the mandate of access and expansion which is linked to the massification of higher education institutions. Given this, the mandate, including the stipulation of goals and objectives, is an instrument to steer institutions in the direction of expanding their enrolment base, more specifically oriented towards the ‘catchment’ of those social categories that were previously excluded. In light of this, the institutions that formed the focus of this study are recruiting young women into higher education. We find this interesting insofar as this phenomenon is occurring against the backdrop of the African and in this instance, the Tanzanian context of patriarchy (Lihamba, Mwaipopo & Shule, 2006; Akosua, Beoku & Osirim, 2008 Myenzi, 2009) which places a higher value on the social and economic contribution of men over that of women. This (i.e. implementation of the reform) culminates in a set of conditions that disrupts patriarchal values and practices and in so doing, normalises access for women into higher education. Within the Foucauldian framework, it is therefore becoming ‘normal’ (Foucault, 1979) for institutions to target young women to pursue studies in higher education and thus the mandate has the inadvertent effect of ‘chipping’ away at the conservative gender roles that characterise African society.
Power as a form of resistance

One of the arguments posited by Foucault (1980), with reference to the notion of power, is that “wherever there is power, there is resistance; and yet, or rather for that very reason, resistance is never in an exterior position of exteriority with regard to power” (Foucault 1980:93). When we measured the responses regarding the familiarity and knowledge about the reform initiative, the commendations (as outlined earlier around ‘pride of place’) ran alongside certain signals of dissent. In this respect, the monologue voices, while not overtly critical, commented tersely as in ‘no, I do not know’. In this respect, some of the respondents seem to show a lack of knowledge (and / or ignorance) about the contents of the reform. Moreover, when the study probed for one of the elements of the initiative that had as its focus, that of access, some of the respondents mentioned that they “did not have any information”.

State regulation of the access initiative as a form of ‘capillary power’

A further dynamic aspect of Foucault’s concept of power, is that, in addition to being multiple and dispersed, it also has a ‘capillary-type’ quality. This means that power is exercised over individuals and institutions by engaging every aspect of their being and bodies and this affects their actions, attitudes, discourses, processes and everyday lives (Foucault, 1980). This capillary-type quality associated with the concept of power can also be applied to the exercise of the ‘access’ component of the reform as it infiltrated the selected public universities in Tanzania. With due respect, this study was sensitive to the principle that access is regulated for “continuous improvement within a state agenda that is credible and desirable” (Morley, 2003:13), the combination of which resonates with the objectives of the MKUKUTA (i.e. as found in the study). However, on analysing the responses and the relevant documents, there are indications that the state regulation of the access component in public universities through its various mechanisms assumes the form of ‘capillary-type’ power relations. In other words, it (the discourse) is like a filament that nests in all the practices and communications in order to ensure that increasingly more Tanzanian youth have access to higher education. In this way, higher education is provided for their private and public good (Attach et al, 2009). The access component (or, mechanism) is an instrument that takes the form of capillary power, which is then exercised in ways to ensure ‘continuous improvement’ with the state programme. In framing this as the alleviation of poverty, by consequence, ensures that economic development will be realised in alignment with the Tanzanian National Development Plan.
In further unpacking the mandate of ‘access’ there are various elements, one of which includes the notion that education and training is linked to employment, i.e. the development of skills for the market (i.e. employment). Working within this framework, the discursive narrative in the mandate is such that access (to education and training) is intended as a pathway for social mobility. In light of this, university education is seen in an instrumental sense as being directly related to skills development (i.e. the market). When this approach is understood within the Foucauldian framework, then we observe that the notion (or, implementation) of access (seeking to expand the system) also acts in a capillary-like modality. By this is meant that the access mandate in a capillary way ‘works’ to align the practices of universities with that of global tendencies which is about the massification of higher education by the state. Thus, this modality of power, i.e. the capillary-type shape, was found to reach into the thoughts and practices of the respondents from diverse positional and authorial bases. There were indications that this was not only in terms of direct compliance, but that it was also self-regulated and normalised in the case of the individual. In other words, the mantle of the MKUKUTA was assumed in a somewhat normalised and unobtrusive (our emphasis) way in the everyday practices.

**State regulation of institutional funding: a panopticon**

A further finding from the study, is about how the allocation of state resources becomes a mechanism, namely as a form of surveillance. In this respect, there appears to be a direct link between the allocations of funding by the state with components of the reform mandate. This is evident (from the documents and interviews), that insofar as public universities are state funded institutions, they are required to conform to the conditions that are attached to state funding. Thus, the state in its exercise of power, regulates the allocation of funding to these public universities, subject to the conditions (and or principles) specified in the reform.

When seeking to understand some of the aforementioned institutional practices as they are regulated by the state, more especially as this pertains to the allocation of resources (that is funding allocations), the concept of ‘panopticon’ (which is sometimes referred to as a form of surveillance), comes to mind (Foucault, 1979). Now, while we are aware that the concept of panopticon is a form of surveillance (i.e. a perfect eye), that Foucault applies to the prison system, (Foucault, 1979), it has some resonance with the state practices around governance, more specifically, insofar as the state conducts its monitoring and control of institutions to ensure the implementation of the state’s social mandate of expanding the system. In the words of Foucault (1979), the ‘surveillance eye’ ensures that the institutional practices are in accordance with those required in terms of the implementation of the policy reform. In other words, there is a sense in which
through the monitoring and evaluation systems, that social control is then embedded inside the practices of the institution. In this respect, the concept of surveillance plays itself out as a form of state regulation of institutional funding to ensure institutional accountability with regard to their engagement with the reform.

When mining down into the data, some of the responses from the state institutional actors about the access element, show that to steer universities adequately, the state has ensured that university activities are only financed when there is evidence of a direct linkage to the reform's objectives. In other words, there are strong indications from the thrust of the responses to suggest that “funding is only allocated once there is evidence of forging linkages with the elements and principles as specified in the reform”. What we found of further interest is that this regulation functions in a capillary- type way. In this respect, alignment to the objectives is threaded through a co-ordinated strategy beginning from the state’s national purse (Treasury), to the Commission/Ministerial body for Science and Technology and then administered through a national research agency. In light of this (i.e. in order to achieve self-compliance), one percent of the gross domestic product is disbursed through competitive bidding by universities, with one of the key criterion being that of alignment of research area with the MKUKUTA objectives. Thus, the linkage of these funding streams to the reform, is an aspect of surveillance, (Foucault 1979) through which the state ensures that universities are normalised or steered to implement the reform initiatives in the MKUKUTA policy document. In other words, the practices that surround compliance to the latter, means that it (i.e. MKUKUTA reform) assumes the form of a panopticon, which in Foucauldian terms is a technology of surveillance.

The concept of panopticon, surveillance and institutional accountability

Following on from the above discussion, the overall study suggests that the ways on which the MKUKUTA is sutured into the various operational regulations show signs that mark the practices of a pantopticon. In other words, it is an apparatus of surveillance over (Foucault, 1979) public universities, to ensure that the reform is self-regulated and normalised. In this way, the state ensures some form of accountability through institutional practices and activities. The question arises as to the extent to which universities are still able to maintain autonomy. This is important considering that autonomy is a key principle of public universities, which entails their ability to teach and research without interference from the state. It seems then, that the state, in drawing on practices and technologies of surveillance, that is, it normalises compliance (or, arguably alignment), in order to ensure accountability of the public universities to the reform. In this way, the components of the reform are, in a capillary-type way, discursively dispersed
throughout the regulatory/operational plans. In this way the state exercises its power (or, one could read it off as intervention), to ensure the accountability of public universities to state priority policy objectives and simultaneously, there is self-regulation on the part of individuals and institutions.

**Establishment of quality assurance strategies as a form of surveillance**

One of the ways that the state seeks oversight of academic practices in universities is through the establishment of quality assurance processes that assume the form of surveillance. In this regard, the quality assurance systems are set up to ensure a coordinated oversight of the quality of education being offered at universities. We found that the state, in their regulation of universities at the institutional level, has also coordinated the establishment of quality assurance systems to ensure that the dimensions of the academic project “satisfies a high standard”. In this respect, the state regulates by institutionalizing quality assurance systems to oversee aspects of curriculum, the nature of training, aligning these with the market and global curriculum practices.

We found that this process assumes a ‘surveillance-type eye’ that reaches down. Thus, the regulation by the Quality Assurance Directorate is such that it exercises oversight around curriculum, lectures, examinations, seating arrangements in the classrooms, examination rooms, as well as practical work-based activities. In conjunction, further dimensions of the academic project such as audits, reviews among others, become objects of surveillance (Foucault, 1979:184).

With respect to the curriculum, part of the review process includes the involvement of intra-university units. In addition, as pointed out earlier, universities have involved stakeholders, even extending the composition of curriculum boards and collaboration structures to include those of global experts. This ‘gaze’ and form of social control is extended on a regional basis. In this regard, it is important to note that the Quality Assurance Directorate inside the university formed part of a consortium structure of Quality Assurance at a regional level. The aspect of social control vis-à-vis quality assurance is within a specific geographical node, bringing us to the concept of global governmentality.

**Regulation of the MKUKUTA objectives as a form of global governmentality**

Foucault’s concept of governmentality, i.e. as a technology of social control has also been extended to practices at a global level. This, (i.e. global governmentality) refers to the functions of the supranational agencies (with the World Bank as one example) that are formerly or informally involved in the regulation of higher education activities at a local independent state context (Dean, 2002). In this respect, the World Bank is
involved in steering public universities through their intervention relative to funding and the allocation of resources (Dean, 2002). The latter range from actual funding and support, for example, from the financing of science, technology and higher education initiatives through to the provision of curriculum review experts (Hayward, 2006).

The combination of these factors premised on the key condition of (more specifically, that of higher) education in the reform, illustrates the way in which the concept of global governmentality is practised on the ground at the level of the nation-state. This form of steerage is structurally linked to the World Bank’s perspective that higher education is critical for economic development (Bloom et al, 2006). It is worthwhile to note that the poverty reduction strategy papers of the World Bank are also sanctioned by the broader donor community. The implication here, is that the framework document provides a compass for higher education activities undertaken by the donor-community.

In the light of the above, the causal relationship drawn by the World Bank between higher education and economic development, is a way of exercising in Foucauldian terms, a form of global governmentality. This means that the global agency is somehow determining for the independent nation states the need to link their higher education activities to economic development. As part of this overall strategy, it might be worthwhile to note that there has been a shift in the emphasis that the World Bank and other international funding agencies have placed, from primary, to that of higher education. The significance of this, show how international funding agencies have exercised their control and authority ‘on the ground’ that in turn can be seen as an instance of the practice of power and a form of global surveillance. It is interesting to note how the latter unfolds at the institutional level, as a means to generate income.

In interpreting the mandate of access, an argument could be made that through the normalisation of institutional activities such as expanding enrolments, universities are in effect also able to generate third stream income. By normalising institutional activities (such as access in terms of increased enrolments), this means that in the process of state regulation, the institutions tend to subvert this to their own ends. In other words, the trend is that universities as autonomous institutions have normalised the access mandate independent of state regulation for the benefit of generating income.

**Practices of autonomy: income generation**

A critical look at institutions and the debate around autonomy can be located within the discussion on Foucault’s concept of power, which is that the concept and practices are such that they arise from “innumerable points” (Foucault, 1990:94) that in some senses radiate in different directions. We would now like to show how the multiple sources of power and its radiation in different directions unfolds (Foucault, 1980) which the institution then uses as a means to generate income.
Some of the ways that public universities in this study have normalised the access initiative for income generation includes, establishing evening programmes for private fee-paying students, establishing demand driven short courses that will attract a fee-paying clientele and also engaging with donor projects that attract extra funding. There is also the example of the establishment of new campuses and colleges that offer evening programmes at post-graduate level. New campuses and colleges are established to attract private fee-paying students and fees from government sponsored students on the higher education students’ loan scheme. The tuition fees for these students become a source of funding in addition to that from the national fiscus and the budgetary allocations. What is interesting, is that in the context of fiscal austerity measures impacting on universities globally and more specifically in Africa, the state steerage of universities in the direction of the reform, orients institutions in multiple directions to tap into alternative sources of funding. Thus, the process of normalising access as in accordance with the reform, has co-simultaneously facilitated the accumulation of additional funding at the institutional level. In other words, what could be termed as potentially, the original ‘source’ of the power (i.e. the reform), has of itself dispersed, with the lines and forces of power shifting in another direction (Foucault, 1980b). In seeking to understand how this occurs, we draw on Foucault’s concept of ‘dispositif’ (Foucault, 1980; 1991).

**Institutional regulation of resource allocation: ‘dispositif’**

The concept of ‘dispositif’ refers (albeit simplistically) to the ‘heterogeneous ensemble of the institutional practices and regimes, their laws, administrative measures, and power relations all of which are connected through a web of networks’ (Foucault, 1980). This implies the (power) relations sutured through the ‘dispositif’ that governs the practices (including the rules) related to oversight in the direction of the reform, are dispersed in the network of state’s agencies, as each regime of power seeks to steer the universities in the direction of the reform. This, (dispositif), as a field of forces (Foucault, 1980; 1991), is operative in the domain of resource allocation. When the latter is assessed in the context of fiscal austerity measures, there are challenge for public universities. In this study it was found that, discursively, resource allocation framed in human and material terms, is specified respectively as skills development and infrastructural facilities. When one applies this to the concept of dispositif, the evidence from the study suggests that in the multiplicity of power relations and the dispersal of the reform’s mandates through and within the regimes of powers (i.e. the direction in which power travels, ruptures and even, breaks), the institutions are (in diverse and multiple ways) thereby able to access resources. The dispositif, is therefore much like an ensemble-type apparatus that exerts itself in the different (power) nodes, through which resource allocation can then be manipulated, accessed and in the process normalised. The latter operates in the framework which is defined by Foucault as the “existing modality of government” (Foucault, 1991:102) that refers to the conditions to enable the actualisation
of the rationalities of the reform. One of the findings in this study pertaining to the access and quality mandates shows that the MKUKUTA policy mandates are optimally actualised within an environment where institutional needs around the dispositif - which in this case refers to the power arrangements that exists for the disbursement of resources - are met.

In light of the above, the normalisation phenomenon (in the dispositif), comprises of the “individualizing operation of power” (Foucault, 1991:102) which suggests a critical element in the administration and regulation of a (higher education, our emphasis) population. In this instance, it is also about steering individuals in the direction of the access and quality mandates of the reform. In other words, individuals are oriented towards self-regulation in order to optimise their chances to access the provision of resources by the state. However, actualising and self-regulation was not without its challenges, especially as this pertains to expansion and its impact on staff-student ratios. In this regard, it was mentioned by a respondent that “there was a need for the employment of academic staff to cope with the rising enrolment”. In a similar vein, a respondent also noted that there “is the need for skills development, i.e. academic staff developing the required competencies”. This was mentioned by respondents as staffing capacity constraints, namely, the importance of training and retraining of staff and the recruitment of qualified academic staff. Thus, when the latter is interpreted within the parameters of the dispositif, we observe how the aspect of staff capacity is integrally tied to actualising the quality component of the mandate.

The study shows that within the limits of the national fiscus with its decline in funding for universities, accessing donor funding is therefore necessary. It is important to note that the latter is supposed to be the primary domain of the nation-state. This means that global governmentality involves the engagement of nation states with international aid partners, who finance institutions. From the angle of Foucault’s theory, therefore, it is financially rational. As a consequence, the intervention by international aid agencies, inadvertently, establishes practices for global governmentality to ‘work’. This means that the dispositif is thus mutually constituted and harnessed by the nation state and donor-based networks. In light of this, the study shows that the (increasingly normalised) intervention by international aid, through donor financing in nation-states, enables the exercise of power relations associated with global governmentality.

Engaging with the access mandate to exercise institutional freedom

As we are seeking to show in this article, there are multiple ways in which the concept and practice of power functions/unfolds in relation to the mandate of access. A further way within which this form of power is exercised is around the subcomponent of freedom. The study shows that public universities in Tanzania engaged with the reform within a framework ‘power as freedom’, as against the exercise of ‘power as resistance’. In light of this, these institutions sought to engage with the mandate of access in ways that enabled them to
influence the scale of the respective institutions. This brings us to the aspect of autonomy, which we wish to highlight, within the framework of Foucault’s concept of ‘freedom’.

As autonomous institutions, public universities exercise power in an environment of freedom that is independent of the state. Foucault has the view that power operates within an atmosphere of freedom (Foucault, 1980). In understanding power as freedom, Foucault, (1980) argues that power should not be related “only to as a force that says no” (Foucault, 1980:89), but also indicates that “power traverses and produces things, induces pleasure, and forms knowledge and is achieved through a network of power relations” (Foucault 1980: 119). In this respect, it is argued that in the exercise of power, there is the aspect of freedom and resistance. In relating the Foucault concept of freedom to that of universities in this study, it has emerged that while the state regulates institutional activities through the MKUKUTA, public universities engage with the mandate within the environment of freedom that is sometimes independent of the state and which is not at the point of resistance. In seeking to understand the concept of freedom, there is the need to include the principles of independence and autonomy that underpin the actions of individuals and institutions. This is important in considering how the notion of ‘freedom’ is related to that of ‘power’. The latter is implicated in the activities of the persons, institutions and agencies that it operates. The implication is that the population where the concept of power relations operates have the freedom to take action or the option of resistance concerning state regulations of its activities within the practices and rationalities of governance. Public universities have in their exercise of power through their freedom to react either in the affirmative or negative and in so doing given birth to the many “array of possibilities that paves the way for diverse response and results” (Foucault, 2000:340) around engagement with the mandate of access.

Conclusion

As outlined in our introduction, this article takes it sustenance from a larger doctoral research project that had as its focus the interpretation of a Tanzanian higher education reform within Foucault’s concept of Governmentality. In this respect, we offer a few tentative conclusions that could contribute to further research. Firstly, the reform is an instrument for the steerage of institutions, in ways that align the activities towards rational governmental practices (Foucault, 1991). These are mutually constituted by institutional, system-wide nation-state and international aid agencies. Through the exercise of power flowing from diverse sources, this process tends to normalise over time. A second concluding comment, is that the exercise of power is also productive, which institutions use to their advantage. In this respect, the access component of the mandate was used to benefit institutions certainly in terms of enabling and facilitating further growth and expansion.
Our final comment is about the tension that institutions experience between implementing the two components, namely access and quality, which then culminates in quality being compromised.

Despite the institutional responses to state policy, issues of quality of education being offered have remained questionable with the increase in access and hence a tension exists with regard to the mismatch between the increasing access and the observed challenge of quality. It is questionable in the sense that the idea of what constitutes quality was not established and there are no identifiable and agreeable measures of quality between the state and the universities. This article therefore, reveals on one hand state interests in increasing access while neglecting the issue of specific funding allocation to public universities for access and quality engagement. There is therefore an existing tension between the state policy on the access initiatives and the corresponding quality of education being offered in the higher education institutions.
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