Introductory thoughts

Ágnes Kövér and Gaby Franger

> We have to 'review and reconsider the interchange of value between university and society; that is to say, we need to rethink the social relevance of universities'. (Escrigas [2008], in Escrigas et al. 2014: xxxiii)

This volume examines questions about the relations between university and society increasingly familiar in many central academic locations, and sets them in scenes and places in which new sets of participants are actively engaged. In this way, its authors take widely accepted theories and practices, placing them under new light.

What role can the university play in the broader community or society in which it is embedded? Is it embedded at all? Or must it remain segregated into the halls of science and knowledge which tower above the community? This book explores multifarious relations, connections, and mutual influences and exchanges between university and society from different perspectives, giving different understandings to the role of universities, and the variety of approaches undertaken with its support.

Distinct perspectives typify the expectations and claims that confront the university from the viewpoint of the wider society, and from that of the narrower community, which both create a range of different mandates. And of course university faculty members and administrators hold their own views, expectations and claims toward the community. Whether these viewpoints are compatible and, if not, how they might be reconciled within our increasingly competitive and complex world are surely questions worth addressing.

The contributors to this book are engaged with different universities from all over the world – though limited mostly to the Northern Hemisphere and Australia; and concomitantly they reveal different experiences. Nevertheless, our set of entirely white, middle-class authors do not work and write from bases in elite universities, but rather provide critical reflections and reports on efforts, sometimes successful and sometimes not, to bring about change in the canonic discourse or power-biased attitudes in their countries or localities. Central and Eastern as well as Southern European universities and their academics regularly seek legitimacy and

1

value-driven ways of challenging and fighting the neoliberalism and neo-conservativism so dominant in our time. American and Australian universities and academics more typically attempt to understand the rules and mechanisms of the process of engaging with community and try to provide intelligible and constructive interpretations of their experience and findings. Critical and self-critical approaches assist us to reveal institutional entanglements, communicational deficiencies, and obscured or hidden power relations underlying what are presented as benevolent projects.

However, one common feature can be identified in these writings: we all agree that the university is an institution which should move beyond the production of elite knowledge for power elites by also serving its students and society, by creating new forms and democratic ways of knowledge production and transmission. We ask: How might universities take greater responsibility for the situations and persons we deal with in our research and teaching? How should we not only teach knowledge but also illuminate the processes by which knowledge and power interact, and find ways to take advantage of this understanding on behalf of powerless persons? How can we not only teach about social and political processes but also critically understand them as impacting individual human persons, themselves more than mere objects of study or research?

The virtual discourse conducted in this volume is contextualized in the frame of the university 'third mission' discussion, which has been receiving increasing attention in Europe in recent years. However, this volume's interpretation of 'third mission' diverges from the mainstream talk, which tends to see it mostly in the context of economy, employability and entrepreneurship. In these introductory thoughts, three questions are clarified, and we intend to take a stand on these concerns as the authors of this volume did tacitly or explicitly in their chapters:

1. The first question is about *knowledge*. What do we consider to be knowledge? In what process do we think knowledge is produced, and by whom?
2. The second question is about the *university* as knowledge producer (researcher) and knowledge transmitter (educational) institution. How has the university changed, and under what conditions has it adapted to flux within the economic, social and scientific environment? How have multifarious interpretations of our current world (social and economic processes) – such as reflexive/second modernity (Beck 1992; Beck et al. 1994), the information/knowledge society (Castells 1996) and the post-colonial/'neo-colonized post-colonial world' (Spivak 1990: 160, 166) – become mirrored in the transmuting features, operation and system requirements of the university?

3.   Finally, the third question is about the *community* and society where the university is not only embedded passively but – as we think – an active builder of relations and societal ethos: day-by-day constructor of democracy or reproducer of knowledge-feudalism and neocolonialism. This question and the answers involved all flow in a variety of ways from the resolutions and the stands we take in the previous two matters. This third field of concerns foreshadows the extended context of knowledge and university, this volume's authors contend, which encapsulates the university's responsibility beyond knowledge production (research) and knowledge transmission (teaching and learning) to the application of knowledge (community interaction) for the public good.

The chapters of this volume explicitly or tacitly reflect these questions and outline answers through case studies which permit the reader to find her/his answers to the contested issues.

KNOWLEDGE IN CHANGING MODE

Many are the interpretations and views that have attempted to reflect the transitions that have taken place since the end of the last century in the world's societies. One attempt to structure and interpret was made by Gibbons et al. in 1994 when they delivered a seminal idea of the new modes of knowledge production, labeling the previous one as Mode 1 and the current one as Mode 2. Mode 1 is the traditional knowledge, generated in disciplinary, primarily cognitive context; Mode 2 knowledge is created in broader, transdisciplinary social and economic contexts (Gibbons et al. 2005). Different types of knowledge regimes generate different types of institutions, different policies and cross-institutional relations. Obviously the social role of the university significantly changes in Mode 2, and the way knowledge is produced receives greater weight. Gibbons et al. present their thesis contrasting Mode 1 and Mode 2:

● There is a shift from 'knowledge production for its own sake' to 'knowledge production for application'.
● A transdisciplinary and collective way of work replaces disciplinary and individualistic practices in Mode 2.
● Heterogeneity and diversity feature in Mode 2: the university loses its privileged status as the primary and stable institution of knowledge production; instead, the number of sites where knowledge is produced proliferates; sites are interconnected, and the university

moves increasingly away from traditional disciplinary activity into new social contexts.

- There is a shift towards social accountability and reflexivity – to bring closer the side of social demand and the side of university supply.
- The quality control mechanisms start to include new considerations, elements and actors which were absent in the traditional peer review process.
- Finally, knowledge being produced is no longer distributed and accumulated solely inside the academic community; rather, it is disseminated to a wider range of realms and into a broader society.

Many scholars accepted the structure developed by Gibbons et al.; others contested it, but it is certain that this interpretation of reality well reflects the growing spread and permeation of information and knowledge in social and economic operations. Some question the distinction between Mode 1 and Mode 2 (e.g. Pestre 2000), and some state that the difference between the two shows up in discourse rather than in the actual structural transformation of universities (Krücken 2002). One of the reasons why demands for change remained unsuccessful is the presence of another discourse among the academicians: the Humboldtian idea of the university (Krücken 2003). This latter thesis is discussed in detail in Chapter 1 of this volume by Maria José Casa-Nova.

Most experts agree that the concept of a *knowledge society* provides one of the most appropriate scenarios of society concerning the challenges and opportunities of future higher education. Teichler distinguishes two consequences of a knowledge society: one emphasizes the role of the intellectual elite which will determine developments and rule the society; the other is more egalitarian, assuming large numbers of individuals with in-depth knowledge and understanding, able to take decentralized decisions (Teichler 2004). The authors of this volume clearly take their stand on the side of the second option, namely the more egalitarian view of a knowledge society. However, we go beyond this thesis when we raise the issue and move towards *knowledge democracy*.

But what do we consider to be knowledge at all? Do we consider knowledge as only what has been canonized? Michel Foucault (2003 [1975]: 7) spoke of different types of knowledges as those 'that have been disqualified as non-conceptual knowledges, as insufficiently elaborated knowledges: naïve knowledges, hierarchically inferior knowledges, knowledges that are below the required level of erudition or scientificity.' Scientific knowledge is produced and recognized as such in an 'independent' scientific process. However, scientific knowledge is rarely neutral; nor are the conditions

of its production. But it is contested and negotiated knowledge that is increasingly influenced by economic factors (Hall 2014) and for which the economic and organizational resources are unequally distributed in society. Usually *experiential knowledge* is considered as subaltern in an academia which does not highly value social experience. Indeed, interpretation of experience and its linkage to theories and concepts were barely covered in the classical university.

On the other hand, *markets* increasingly intertwined with *knowledge policies* are part of the business of developing and disseminating knowledge. Perhaps markets give unambiguous feedback to universities about the preferred types of knowledge, as is central in the cases of traditional arts and humanities-based knowledge.

Especially in the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries, natural and technical sciences are becoming increasingly valued by higher education policies to the detriment of arts and humanities, even as these disciplines remain attractive to young people. The prestige of diplomas comes to accord with the social and financial recognition of the jobs which are available to their graduates. However, owing to the general phenomenon of underpaying intellectuals in these countries, any prestige of knowledge could be questionable. The market value of social and human sciences is relatively low, and the sometimes noisy and critical 'change agents' are undesirable for the political elite. Therefore certain types of knowledge become highly fragile and sensitive under the gaze of power (both political and economic) inasmuch as these actors price knowledge in accordance with their own interests, and often disregard considerations of the benefit to the wider complex society.

Knowledge, so assert the authors of this book, should not be seen as a mere valet to cognitive capitalism. Nor do we think that the university's major role is to serve a knowledge-intensive labor market (Roggero 2014). Rather, it is our intent to go beyond the politics of knowledge production located within the cognitive capitalist paradigm.

In the context of *knowledge democracy*, multiple knowledges and epistemologies are recognized, without building hierarchies among disciplines and pricing them by economic values. And not just disciplines. As Budd Hall summarizes,[1] the world is infinitely diverse, and knowledge is represented in manifold ways. It is represented in theater – illustrated in Chapter 17 of this volume by Arthur Feinsod – in ceremonies, poems, songs and dance. It is also represented in academic articles and books, however small a part this is of the way in which knowledge is represented in the world they represent. The world is infinitely diverse in every sense, and we have been limited in the Western canon by the narrower lens it offers for our understanding. Democratic knowledge has strategic value with its

broader understanding of reality and the many strategies for social change it urgently suggests. The knowledge democracy movement centered upon the lives, opinions and reflections of those who experienced injustice and exclusion (Tremblay et al. 2014).

Knowledge is produced in diverse places and locations, in social movements, community organizations, business, local government, Indigenous political organizations and thousands of places in addition to institutions of higher education. Locally created and owned knowledge is a powerful tool of community and social movement organizing. Knowledge generated in communities or as a result of community–university research partnerships must be made available free of charge and in an open access format, as Hall et al. (2015) assert.

THE TRANSFORMING UNIVERSITY

In the light of changing knowledge, the university's functions and social roles have been transformed, not just because the university has a central role in the knowledge economy but also, as Gibbons et al. (2005) noted, because a strong connection exists between the mode of knowledge production and the function of universities in it. Globalization and concomitant internationalization shape the university's identity from another direction, triggering different conceptions about 'multiversity' (Kerr 1963; Krücken et al. 2006) and/or the McDonaldization (Altbach 2004) of higher education. The 'knowledge production for application' principle in Mode 2 places the evergreen issues of 'theory and practice' and 'university–outer society' relations into new light and new working modes. Permeable boundaries among economic enterprises, community institutions, and universities make them increasingly equal co-producers and users of Mode 2 knowledge, as well as equally responsible agents of social change. Finally, as one of the globalized knowledge-based societies' consequences, massification/democratization of higher education has evolved, setting new challenges and opportunities for universities.

Transformations take place at all levels of university existence: in the institutional and administrative structure; in the roles of academics; in relations with economy, society, civil society and politics; toward governmental policies; and in teaching and researching methodologies and the distribution of knowledge.

These changes can be seen in very different contexts. This section unpacks some core processes which brought about significant changes and challenges in the higher education system on the level of social functions, mission and institutional operations. The social processes which turned

the university from elite institution to one of mass education can be seen as democratization or massification. The challenges and impacts of globalization, information technology and the high level of interconnectedness in the world can be seen as internationalization/multiversification or McDonaldization. The challenges of increasingly reflective modernity can be seen as uncertainties and ambiguities under the pressure of market claims (Vlăsceanu 2010) or social needs and can be reflected by the university generating the certainties of community engagement, the third mission and social responsibility.

Democratization and/or Massification

The expansion of the university beyond its old core of elite universities embodied in a continuously growing number of students can be seen as a manifestation of knowledge claims. Such demand permeated societies fueled by the increasingly knowledge-based economy and job market demand. Universities became accessible to people with multiple social backgrounds, providing the chance and opportunity for social groups previously excluded from higher education. From this perspective the growing number of students can be interpreted as *democratization* of the university. From different perspectives the same phenomenon can be seen as *massification*, which attributes a negative connotation to the same experience. According to Scott (2006), massification resulted in the degradation of the academic profession, a burgeoning academic proletariat, and fueling of the emergence of a new class of knowledge. He summarizes this process in three main points: 'levelling-down', because new institutions have been able to challenge the hegemony of elite universities – and with some success; 'managerialism', because academic communities have been superseded by bureaucratic hierarchies which have organizational cultures; and, of course, the intensification of the academic labor process (in teaching, because of worsening staff–student ratios and, in research, because of the pressure to increase scientific and scholarly productivity) (Scott 2006: 20).

Scott identifies two types of discourses that reflect these changes in higher education. One is the 'decline and fall' and the other is the 'knowledge workers' discourse. The first draws mostly negative consequences from the massification of the university, especially in the context of the role of academics and the academic profession; the second reflects changes stemming from the 'output of four decades of "academic production"', which in a symbolic sense is embodied in the 'graduate culture' that is a marked characteristic of advanced (and some less advanced) societies. 'Their dominance is such that they tend to overshadow older and more

traditional elites and to marginalize other social groups, both the Weberian salariat and the Marxian proletariat' (Scott 2006: 19).

A positive account of mass higher education emphasizes diversity, pluralism and complexity elements. In this positive light, the university is opened up to new kinds of students, to new kinds of institution (which may be more responsive to 'market' demands and social and cultural needs) and to new kinds of knowledge. From a very optimistic perspective the older distinctions between academic (or scientific) knowledge and vocational (or professional) knowledge, between 'pure' and 'applied' research, are lost in the creative vortex of the knowledge society (Scott 2006: 20). The authors of this volume tend to emphasize the democratization elements of these changes and see massification (e.g. the worsening staff–students ratio in teaching and research) as deficiency needs to be redressed and managerialism as a contradictory if not adverse element.

However, democratization of the university does not imply mechanically the recession of the inner institutional hierarchy or the ranking hierarchy among higher educational institutions. Academia is still highly stratified, stretching across the range of research universities and applied science colleges. A hierarchy of disciplines has emerged, created more on the basis of economic usefulness than of social benefits. Thus are produced second-class sciences and a sort of social/human blindness in non-social/-human disciplines.

Nonetheless, the university as an institution consists of teachers, professors, researchers, students and supporting administration. All these people enter from the 'outside world', thereby imbuing the university with their culture, views and values, which form its inner 'life-world'.[2] However, this process works in the other direction as well; institutional and system forces increasingly colonize the life-worlds of human beings, alienating human and commodifying academic values. Such an environment as the inner ethos of a higher education institution provides less supportive, if not adverse, conditions for innovative programs and human creativity, which are indispensable for both knowledge production and transmission.

Mass higher education as a result of the number of people involved increasingly fell into the focus of political approaches and public policies. At times, these public policies are less public but more political: their elite-drivenness may endanger the institutional autonomy and academic independence of the university. The increasing gaze of power on university practice is embodied often in financial and administrative control; at times, however, it appears as direct constraint (masked by economic reasons) or in covert (or overt) claims to the loyal elite. Unfortunately, international standards serve more to standardize (institutional isomorphism, as Chapter 2 in this volume by Meyer and Sporn refers to it) than to diversify

universities in the international arena, raising multiple expectations and demands which often provide good reasons for intrusive governmental policies. Eventually these international and national policies intensify unequal relations among disciplines and universities, and enhance the commodifying effects of the system.

In higher education the conditions of political control and management have changed radically as higher education budgets have become an increasingly considerable percentage of national budgets. This makes higher education much more visible and for that reason politically salient. Also, higher education today directly affects many voters – as students, consumers of research, or employers. Thus is created a powerful political motive for controlling costs and performance (Bleiklie and Byrkjeflot 2002). All these elements strongly shaped the conditions of managerial control and academic autonomy.

The Idea of Multiversity or McDonaldization of Higher Education

Not only have research and teaching become the essential functions of the university, but its roles and functions have multiplied, which led to the introduction of the term 'multiversity' by Clark Kerr in 1963. Kerr tried to reflect the huge variety of activities carried out by a university and argued that its outstanding feature was its diversity. In this context, the 'multiversity' came to challenge the 'idea of the university' as classically developed by Humboldt and Newman in the nineteenth century (Kerr 1963; Krücken et al. 2006). Multiversity in the global context is increasingly being shaped by globalizing trends in higher education that are transforming national systems and individual university organizations alike. 'The 'new multiversity' emerges because universities all over the world devise diverse solutions in the face of global trends that may appear standard, but that are never standardized in their effects, as they are adapted, incorporated or resisted by universities that are ultimately rooted in particular times and places' (Krücken et al. 2006: 8).

More critical views see globalization as both a worldwide source of inequality and the McDonaldization of the university (Altbach 2004). The realities of globalization and internationalization in higher education were 'unpacked' by Altbach, who highlighted some adverse ways in which globalization affects the university. As he noted (2004: 6), the world of globalized higher education is highly unequal in terms of academic systems and disciplines, and cleaved into central and peripheral institutions. The term 'McDonaldization' coined by Ritzer (1996) refers to the standardization of university processes, products including quality assurance in the frame of efficiency, predictability, calculability and control. In this context

McDonaldization is contrasted by humanization, democratization and more importantly knowledge democracy, and highly resonates with the neoliberal construction of knowledge and university. In this sense, neoliberalism aims to 'create an entirely new society and new social form where markets and minds would be increasingly aligned' (Ward 2012: 10).

The standardized Western university, through internationalization, re-colonializes the world through market-driven knowledge production, knowledge elitism and last but not least language (Altbach 2004). In Spivak's words we live in a 'neo-colonized post-colonial world' (Spivak 1990). Multinational corporations, media conglomerates and even a few leading universities can be seen as the new neo-colonists – seeking to dominate for commercial gain as they, with governmental largesse, seek to assist companies in their countries and secure a residual interest in maintaining influence as well (Altbach 2004).

In this volume these phenomena are reflected on multiple levels in chapters presented by Maria José Casa-Nova (Chapter 1), Michael Meyer and Barbara Sporn (Chapter 2) and Nichole Georgeou and Benjamin Haas (Chapter 3).

Since the present volume does not involve authors from the Global South, we need to voice our respect for and recognition of the seminal work of academics and activists who endeavor to decolonize the Global South's university. In 2011 a conference was held on the topic of 'Decolonizing Universities' in Malaysia, which brought together academics, activists, journalists and students from the Global South to address the problem of Eurocentrism in university curricula and to develop alternatives and pathways of resistance. The conference went beyond critique, with many participants sharing their experiences in decolonizing higher education by reporting on local initiatives from throughout Asia, Africa and the Mideast (Escrigas et al. 2014; Openjuru et al. 2015).

The University and the 'Outer World'

Knowledge, out of the context of knowledge democracy, does not mask itself: knowledge is power and a means of gaining power. Today's university is trapped by the power claimed for elite reproduction and challenged by new categories of democratization, marketization and universalization of knowledge.

It is clear that the currently ongoing process of university re-organization is part of a re-tailoring of the university in the frame of cognitive capitalism. In the first decade of the 2000s the emphasis was on hierarchical management rather than democratic governance principles, on stronger university–industry (or business) relations rather

than university–community relations, and on more practical (business) oriented education programs rather than on a broader societal approach to science.[3] This process has continued in the second decade with some twists – social engagement got included in the model as the third element of a new helix.

The triple helix[4] (TH) model (Lowe 1982; Etzkowitz 1993; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 1995, 2000) was coined in the 1990s and aims to replace the formerly dominating industry–government dyad of the Industrial Society with a growing triadic relationship between university, industry and government featuring the 'knowledge society'. The triple helix model is a sort of knowledge management model, where the three contributors – university, government, economic sector – are able to create a living knowledge and an effective model of knowledge transfer contributing to a successful economy and the community's enrichment. However, Fisher and Rubenson (1998: 92), in a book chapter which alerts us to the doubtful process of making Canadian universities entrepreneurial, noted that the increasingly permeable boundary between academic and corporate interests and operations was intertwined with (quasi masked by) the rhetoric of universities' 'community responsibility'.

In recent decades, the TH model was reinvented, and the quadruple helix (QH) model was coined which 'contextualizes the Triple-Helix by adding as the fourth helix "civil society" and the "media- and culture-based public"' (Cavallini et al. 2016: 14[5]). Therefore 'the absence of sensitivity to "*democratic additionality*"[6] [and] improved innovation approaches are introduced which widen the TH concept with a societal perspective' (Cavallini et al. 2016: 1). As the authors explained, this perspective allows those related to non-technological improvements, service creation and creativity exploitation to follow non-traditional innovation paths. The model also allows 'open innovation', which becomes a process inclusive of 'all stakeholders as active players in jointly creating and experimenting in the new ways of doing things and creating new services and products (EC, 2015)' (Cavallini et al. 2016: 14).

The QH model assigns novel roles to universities, and sees them as 'key actors of economic and cultural growth', expecting them to transform themselves into engaged institutions with industry and society at large.[7] The TH and QH models equally typify the university as an entrepreneurial institution, and the 'democratic additionalities' are scarcely addressed at all in these policy papers and articles. Social or public engagement is mentioned, though in a limited way, placed in third place (TM3) among the fields,[8] and civil society receives some attention: the university is expected 'to be achieved with the direct involvement of civil society representatives in the design of projects' (Cavallini et al. 2016: 83). However, only those

organizational elements that make the university entrepreneurial are specified in detail.[9] Eventually the authors acknowledged that 'Social (or public) Engagement (TM3) is probably the *most challenging*[10] activity for universities and is far from the entrepreneurial idea' (Cavallini et al. 2016: 91).

The authors of this volume do not see social and community engagement being the most challenging activity for the university, though indisputably it is far from the entrepreneurial idea. This position of the authors flows from a fundamentally different view and conceptualization of the university, and not incidentally from that fact they predominantly represent humanities and social sciences, as well as art, business and the legal sciences.

Comparing the TH and QH models unwittingly evoked Mandell et al.'s (2013) report, which warns that community-based, participatory methods are increasingly being co-opted to serve the interests of states and corporations (Bourke 2015).

Concurrently, on the basis of a different interpretation of the knowledge society and the university, the democratization of knowledge and living knowledge movements have taken form. The triple helix model uses the university as a means of market economy production; the democratic knowledge movement sees the university as an organic part of community and knowledge, as a tool for serving the common good. In the latter case knowledge is responsible, and not just for the privileged elites; it becomes seen as a way to empower the powerless. Knowledge democracy (Hall 2011) aims to foster public engagement with, and participation in, all levels of the research, innovation and learning process. This is a sort of knowledge which works in practice and increases itself by the feedback it receives from reality.

UNIFICATION OF THEORY AND PRACTICE IN UNIVERSITY–COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The word 'community' in this book will be used with different meaning than in the triple helix model. Community in some cases means labor market, not corporations but first of all those institutions which absorb young diploma holders from the field of humanities, social sciences and legal studies. Moreover, community means the surrounding society with its contradictions, social tensions and injustices. Central to this view are oppressed and powerless social groups who have little chance of accessing the world of knowledge and who are not considered as sources of knowledge production, although they have their own precious experiential

knowledge. Therefore, when we are speaking about university–community relations we mean mostly the democratization of knowledge and the democratic processes of knowledge production.

The mission of the university is to produce, collect and distribute knowledge. This knowledge is recognized by independent scientific process, and the university also aims to provide for the production and distribution of this knowledge. It is obvious that the discourses embedded in changing societies impact their universities, which stand among their central institutions. And one of the necessary agendas in knowledge production is how to reflect on the difficulties of putting theory into practice. Dealing with this problem, it is inevitable to encounter experiential knowledge which reshapes the university's boundaries towards the pragmatic world of its community (Williamson 1988).

By these activities, the minds and tasks of participants are shaped. The circle is closed when students, who start acting as graduated practitioners armed with the latest science, flow back into the community and put this knowledge into action. Often this practice is challenged, as part of reality 'fires back' and does not behave like the learned theory.

University–community engagement programs can be embodied in different community-based participatory methodologies such as community service/service learning, community-based research and so on. Such programs often successfully bridge most of the 'theory–practice' questions through learning by doing or embodying experiential internalization. However, these programs problematize additional issues which were not at the forefront of education previously and open new contexts as well. On the other hand, it is exactly these new issues and contexts engendered by university–community cooperation that are at the heart of experiential learning, confronting learned theory with its pragmatic implementation – lifting constraints and opportunities at the same time.

Holland (2005) subsumes community engagement under the general idea of 'engaged scholarship'. This definition exclusively incorporates the university's perspective: engaged scholarship is a specific conception of faculty work that connects the intellectual assets of the institution (i.e. faculty expertise) to public issues such as community, social, cultural, human and economic development. Through engaged forms of teaching and research, faculty apply their academic expertise to public purposes, as a way of contributing to the fulfilment of the core mission of the institution (Holland 2005). This approach has little to say about the engaged activities' impact on the community and the students, or about the importance of reflecting these impacts. Nevertheless, community-based education programs often build on the basis of social-sector needs, and university endeavors to promote cooperation and co-knowledge production with

community and civic organizations, as Chapter 7 in this volume by Nicolae Bibu and Mihai Lisetchi reflects.

So much depends upon relationship building and commitment at the very local level between faculty, students and community members or grassroots organizations. When Wallerstein and Duran (2003) give an insightful overview of the historical and conceptual roots of community-based participatory methodologies, they suggest that the above-mentioned quality of relationship may make the scaling-up of community-based programs problematic. The importance of the quality of the university–community relationship is nicely elaborated by Margot Rawsthorne and Alison de Pree in Chapter 8 of this volume. They ask 'Are we welcome here?' and expound how to build trust through community-based research.

In particular, a major challenge lies in the potential limits of community-based research 'given the realities of globalization, the imposition of Western cultural and economic hegemony on the rest of the world, and the difficulties for local communities in making meaningful change' (Wallerstein and Duran 2003: 44). These sorts of difficulties were indicated in Chapter 3 by Nichole Georgeou and Benjamin Haas, where a critical approach is taken on 'university student volunteering for development'. The chapter identifies the dangers and challenges of 'social mission', which eventually makes the university a co-constructor of a new colonialization. The authors highlight how voluntarism can be transformed into 'voluntourism', undermining the community-based participatory programs' integrity. The chapter takes a highly critical stand on the questions and interpretation of 'development' and consequently employs the theories of reciprocity and exchange to assess existing Australian university practice with respect to students volunteering for development (SV4D) in Asia Pacific. They claim that 'many students perceive this opportunity as an entrée to the development industry, and a future career option' (McGloin and Georgeou 2016).

Chapter 4 by Gaby Franger sees community-based participatory programs from the perspective of social work education, providing real ethnomethodology and a description of value-driven service learning in a globalized context. The author emphasizes the significance of no 'help' position, since 'help' reinforces the differences between 'us' and 'them', reconstructing the cleavage between the 'provider' and 'receiver' and concomitantly the power relations between them. The chapter provides a good example of ways in which the members of the local community of the Global South are able to generate and transmit knowledge to European students and faculty. The chapter concludes with some elements of how to approach community-based learning in a 'sentipensante' way. The theory

basis of the chapter can be traced back to Jane Addams and Orlando Fals Borda, providing a comprehensive picture of community-based social research and action. The chapter illuminates how students were able to use the knowledge given by the Global South in working in German refugee centers.

Most of the volume is a collection of case studies on different university–community participatory learning and serving programs. Multifarious ways and forms of partnerships are unfolded chapter by chapter.

Gábor Hegyesi and Katalin Talyigás in Chapter 12 introduce a new face of the university, which takes responsibility for an aging population, providing them meaningful learning and teaching opportunities. This Budapest-based program aimed at persons in their 'third age' (seniors) brings a new set of 'students' into university classrooms, and opens many exciting prospects for enriching the educational process. Service, it becomes clear, can enhance core university missions of teaching and research.

Service may become more prevalent if the representatives of the university, students and faculty, go to the community. In Chapter 10, Renate Buber and her colleagues describe and analyze a program which provides services to refugee and socially disadvantaged children and youth in Vienna. The program is carefully monitored and evaluated, and the chapter illustrates the ways in which the community-based participatory service learning model was reshaped, extended and even improved as part of an engaged business school.

In some cases the university may appear as an 'intruder' to the surrounding communities, taking their spaces and reshaping their places. The university–community collaboration aims to develop empowering democratic processes such as public deliberation and participative planning and decision making to share visions and involve residents. In Chapter 13 by Curt Winkle and David Perry, the university and the surrounding communities are active constructors of a democratic social environment. The chapter illuminates the 'memory traces' of the processes by which university campuses such as the authors' in Chicago have been built on ground formerly occupied by vibrant urban neighborhoods and communities. In such a milieu, the challenge is addressed of respecting the past, understanding the present and planning for the future. In each case, collaborative programs are vital to the health of both university and surrounding community.

Each chapter emphasizes different strengths and challenges of the community–university partnership. Some programs developed their own measures and processes to manage the quality of the cooperation itself. The chapters in this volume intend neither to summarize systematically the traits of a good community–university partnership nor to enlist the

difficulties and challenges.[11] Rather, the case studies seek to unravel and then interrelate these characteristics in a judicious and elaborated way.

The long and difficult path from universities providing 'outreach' to communities to the realization of a fuller level of engagement is traced by David Campbell and Dennis Pendleton in Chapter 15. The California-based relationship they describe rests on goals of reciprocity, humility and justice. The authors' efforts to build research and planning collaboration which exhaust these demands are given sensitive consideration in this chapter. The chapter introduces two cases where university contributors encounter strong community partners who (in different ways) tend to dominate the partnership programs.

In other cases the battle line does not lie between the community and university, but the university's institutional rigidity generates conflicts. Ágnes Kövér in Chapter 9 recounts the story of an innovative legal clinic program in Hungary, which not only provided valuable service to persons in need of legal assistance but also invigorated the traditional law school curriculum by establishing the field of clinical legal education. Her chapter not only details the service contributions of the program; it also indicates the administrative roadblocks that are to be expected when one engages in academic innovation. Kövér's chapter provides an example of viewing university third mission and community engagement as 'ways in which engagement enhances teaching (learning and education) and research (knowledge production, mobilization and dissemination)' (Escrigas et al. 2014: xxxi). These ways are seen as contrary to connotations of 'service' which tend to assume that the knowledge and expertise available at university should be transferred to communities, helping them to address their problems. Clinical legal programs open two-way channels of learning and serving to the benefit of all participants.

Chapter 5 by Roger A. Lohmann illuminates further inner institutional adversities and power policies in the university, tracing factors which led a successful community oriented service program into demise. The author examines the rise and fall of an innovative sustained dialogue program within an American land grant university. He describes the creation of a number of successful initiatives by applied social scientists at the university, but concludes with the observation that 'anyone engaged in pursuit of university–community partnerships should not underestimate the power of disciplinary, organizational and individual interests and cleavages.'

These last two chapters pose the general question of whether the mission is best addressed relatively haphazardly by individual faculty members (as they see fit) or more coherently (at some institutional level). To what degree, it might be asked, should the university–community partnership program be considered a sort of 'private business' of the individual

faculty members? Further questions emerge if we dive into the structural conditions of community engagement programs, such as: How should we arrange faculty roles, rewards and incentives to assist community engagement? How should we assess faculty performance of community work/public service? How should we include such programs in the university's 'academic plan' or statements of 'excellence' in ways that might connect with its learning objectives?

University–community relations appear in different but equally effective and powerful forms in Chapter 6 by György Csepeli, Chapter 11 by John Murray and Chapter 17 by Arthur Feinsod.

In Chapter 6, György Csepeli describes a university program which traces the aspirations and accomplishments of a Hungarian effort to empower members of the Roma community, and those wishing to assist in their social development, by learning important tools of conflict resolution. In the interventions he describes, direct efforts are aimed at the advance of justice by means of direct reductions in levels of prejudice, violence and xenophobia.

In Chapter 11, John Murray describes the effort to establish an ongoing program at a Midwestern American university designed to deepen and enhance town–gown relations. This chapter provides a step-by-step summary of the processes involved in establishing such 'community semester' programs.

Arthur Feinsod in Chapter 17 describes the work of the innovative university-based theater company he directed for many years, whose main focus is to reach out to the surrounding community and discuss relevant human and community issues related to the performances. In this case, a core university function (drama education) finds its community partner (its audience), and creates opportunities for expanding participation and dialogue among both sets of partners.

In Chapter 14, Juan Blanco López and colleagues present a Spanish case that seeks to address the complementary needs of both university (to accommodate the housing needs of its students) and community (to benefit from access to university resources). The story they detail about the University Residence Flora Tristán is rich and instructive, and indicates the need for sensitivity among all parties to such collaborative development.

Nowhere have greater challenges to university–community relations been posed than throughout the long history of the Jewish University of Budapest. Not only has the university sought to advance its ties to its own religious community, but it was subject to the brutal 1944 visit by Eichmann, which sent its faculty and students to Nazi death camps. But the university now thrives, and in Chapter 16 Zoltán Háberman recounts its distinguished history and anticipates its vital future.

Returning to the contested notion of the university's 'third mission', the authors of this volume understand it as *social and community engagement*; however, the relevant literature attributes a much wider meaning to it. Pausits (2015) overviews the perspectives taken on the 'third mission' in the international literature and points out that it includes an economic dimension, inasmuch as beyond finding answers to social issues it involves market orientation policies. Michael Meyer and Barbara Sporn in Chapter 2 define a 'third mission' that contemporary universities are challenged to accept as they abandon their ivory towers. In their view this mission values commitment and service to public affairs and business development in society. Their case study presented in the chapter shows how an Austrian university has adopted sustainability, accountability and a third mission into its organizational plans and strategies.

Meyer and Sporn in Chapter 2 provide a business school perspective on society–university connections and view altering missions and strategies with concern. In their description the pressure on universities became stronger; higher education and its third mission became the focus of public policies, international associations and universities themselves beside other priorities such as sustainability and accountability. The chapter describes the levels of pressures through the example of WU Vienna, giving a 'thick narrative' of business universities in a changing environment. The chapter illuminates the impacts of internationalization and globalization on the university, and introduces the concept of multiple institutional isomorphism, reflecting the process of standardization in this context. The authors provide remarkable observation on the nature and generation of the university third mission or social embeddedness when they notice that the claim for social engagement came from the bottom up in US higher education, while in Europe the state exerted pressure (from top to bottom) to generate this mission, which consequently overshadows the European experience.

Concerning types of universities covered by this book, at one end of the range are the land grant universities in the United States, which were founded by the state with very clear community developing purposes. At the other end may be found the Western European state universities, traditionally very academic and with not very much direct connection to their communities, pursuing few or no community purposes. The changes clearly indicated in this volume represent the transition these universities have been subject to in recent decades.

The experiences of several Central Eastern European state universities represent an experience of re-identification after a longer period of state dependence. A new phenomenon in the region, a community-church-based university, also introduces itself as a servant to its community (see Chapter 16).

Finally, some words have to be said about the language of the book: The message and the substance of this book, which brought together university experiences from multiple parts of the world and represent multiple traditions, claimed a common language, which ultimately is English.[12] The editors – non-native English speakers – confronted salient challenges in translating Spanish/Portuguese or Hungarian English into a sort of native English. The most stubborn language difficulties were bridged by Professor Emeritus Jon Van Til. We express our appreciation and deep gratitude for this work.

To reconcile the different and contradicting approaches of contributors and to explicate a common theoretical basis for this book we initiated a dialogic process in which we received the helpful support of ELTE University Faculty of Social Science and its dean, Professor Gábor Juhász, to whom we would like to express our thanks.

Finally, the authors of this book address the needs and rights of communities to access and participate in the production of knowledge. We see the responsibility of universities to be places of knowledge production and academic reflection and analysis of social processes with different approaches.

Knowledge is crucial but has to be democratically oriented in public interest perspectives to face the challenges our societies confront. Our knowledge society should be a shared distributed knowledge society, characterized by a process of permanent and disseminated innovation, contributing to the advancement of society toward productive creativity.

Our central message in this book is that the strengthening of direct relations between universities and communities is vital to the construction of social capital and to the opening of universities to society. These are processes to be advanced on both local and international levels, as they involve:

- *Democratizing* rather than corporatizing. More effective and productive cooperation can be developed on the basis of a service model.
- *Extending* the reach of our educational process. Participatory approaches to learning can become a more central part of our teaching and research processes.
- *Sharing* knowledge, resources and expertise. Productive relations between universities and organizations in the community enrich research, teaching methods and curricula in universities.
- *Reinforcing* community decision-making and problem-solving capacity. The quality of students' education and employability is increased when diverse opportunities to build their knowledge, expertise and

work skills through hands-on research and related experiences link them to local and global communities.

How these processes of change develop and unfold within a number of universities in a wide range of countries is the story told in the book that follows.

NOTES

1. Partly in an interview made by the Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community–University Engagement in 2014. See https://vimeo.com/101560531 (retrieved March 20, 2018).
2. Habermas (1987), when theorizing about modernity, stated that capitalist societies have created two distinct worlds: the systems world of highly differentiated legal, economic and political systems; and the life-world, the resource in which individuals form their identity and reproduce their culture. As the life-world has increasingly become colonized by the systems world, people have begun to define themselves by their role within systems. They become objects – clients and consumers – rather than subjects or democratic members of civil society who reproduce themselves as social and cultural beings. The manifestation of this colonization is seen in anomie, powerlessness, dysfunctional behaviors, increases in mental and physical disease, and the overall decline of civil society.
3. 3rd Living Knowledge Conference, 2007, Paris, www.livingknowledge.org/events/lk-conferences (retrieved September 12, 2016).
4. Triple Helix model of university–industry–government relationships initiated in the 1990s which describes the ideal relations between institutions with knowledge-intensive innovations initiatives, and which blueprints the path to knowledge-based economy. The Triple Helix model is a sort of knowledge management model, where the three contributors – university, government, economic sector – are able to create a living knowledge and an effective model of knowledge transfer contributing in a successful economy and the community's enrichment.
5. The paper was published under the auspices of the European Union.
6. Emphasis added. This expression is recurrently used in Cavallini et al. (2016: 1, 14).
7. European Indicators and Ranking Methodology for University Third Mission, http://www.e3mproject.eu/ (retrieved November 5, 2017).
8. The three main fields of the QH model are: a) technology transfer and innovation; b) continuing education; and c) social or public engagement.
9. 1) A strengthened steering core focusing on managerial values; 2) an expanded developmental periphery formalizing, beyond the traditional functions, structural interactions with external stakeholders (i.e. offices for knowledge transfer, industrial contacts, intellectual property management, and fundraising); 3) a diversified funding base relying on, apart from the institutional governmental support, other funds such as those from: competitive research contracts and grants; consultancy services for industrial firms, local governments and non-profit organizations; royalties from intellectual property; student fees; or alumni fundraising; 4) a stimulated academic heartland based on the initiative of faculties, departments and researchers which become entrepreneurial units; 5) an integrated entrepreneurial culture blending existing traditions with new values in order to create a specific identity and distinctive reputation.
10. Emphasis added.
11. There are valuable articles and volumes with this aim, such as Pasque et al. (2005).
12. In the line of inequalities among universities, language is one of the most significant

contributors to chances of success. This side of globalization is considered as a new way of colonization which even threatens small languages – consider how Dutch universities almost made the decision to transform their entire academic language into English (Altbach 2004: 11).

REFERENCES

Altbach, P.G. (2004), 'Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world', *Tertiary Education and Management*, **10**, 3–25.

Beck, U. (1992), *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, London: Sage.

Beck, U., A. Giddens and S. Lash (1994), *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bleiklie, I. and H. Byrkjeflot (2002), 'Changing knowledge regimes: Universities in a new research environment', *Higher Education*, **44**, 519–32.

Bourke, A. (2015), 'Universities, community engagement, and democratic social science', doctoral dissertation, York University, Toronto, Ontario, https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10315/30084/Bourke_Alan_G_2015_PhD.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y (retrieved February 3, 2017).

Castells, M. (1996), *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, Vol. I: *The Rise of the Network Society*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Cavallini, S., R. Soldi, J. Friedl and J. Volpe (2016), *Using the Quadruple Helix Approach to Accelerate the Transfer of Research and Innovation Results to Regional Growth*, Brussels: European Union, Committee of the Regions, https://cor.europa.eu/en/documentation/studies/Documents/quadruple-helix.pdf (retrieved November 22, 2017).

Escrigas, C., J.G. Sánchez, B. Hall and R. Tandon (2014), 'Editors' introduction: Knowledge, engagement and higher education contributing to social change', in C. Escrigas, J.G. Sánchez, B. Hall and R. Tandon (eds.), *Higher Education in the World 5*, http://www.guninetwork.org/report/higher-education-world-5/documents (retrieved December 20, 2016).

Etzkowitz, H. (1993), 'Technology transfer: The second academic revolution', *Technology Access Report*, **6**(6), 7–9.

Etzkowitz, H. and L. Leydesdorff (1995), 'The triple helix – university–industry–government relations: A laboratory for knowledge-based economic development', *EASST Review*, **14**, 14–19.

Etzkowitz, H. and L. Leydesdorff (2000), 'The dynamics of innovation: From national systems and "Mode 2" to a triple helix of university–industry–government relations', *Research Policy*, **29**(2), 109–23.

Fisher, D. and K. Rubenson (1998), 'The changing political economy: The public and private lives in Canadian universities', in J. Currie and J. Newson (eds.), *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 77–98.

Foucault, M. (2003 [1975]), *'Society Must Be Defended': Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*, New York: Picador.

Gibbons, M., C. Limoges, H. Nowotny, S. Schwartzman, P. Scott and M. Trow (2005), *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*, London: Sage.

Habermas, J. (1987), *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol. 2: *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hall, B. (2011), 'Towards a knowledge democracy movement: Contemporary trends in community–university research partnerships', *Rizoma freireano* (Instituto Paulo Freire de España), **9**.

Hall, B. (2014), 'Knowledge democracy, higher education and engagement', in M. Kariwo, T. Gounko and N. Nungu (eds.), *A Comparative Analysis of Higher Education Systems*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 141–52.

Hall, B., R. Tandon and C. Tremblay (2015), *Strengthening Community University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives*, Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.

Holland, B. (2005), 'New views of research for the 21st century: The role of engaged scholarship', in L. Silka (ed.), *Scholarship in Action: Applied Research and Community Change*, https://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/report-silka.pdf#page=11 (retrieved December 4, 2015).

Kerr, C. (1963), 'The idea of a multiversity', in *The Uses of the University*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1–45.

Krücken, G. (2002), 'Panta Rei – Re-thinking science, re-thinking society', *Science as Culture*, **11**(1), 125–30.

Krücken, G. (2003), 'Learning the "new, new thing": On the role of path dependency in university structures', *Higher Education*, **46**(3), 315–39.

Krücken, G., A. Kosmützky and M. Torka (2006), 'Towards a multiversity? Universities between global trends and national traditions', http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.502.8400&rep=rep1&type=pdf (retrieved December 21, 2016).

Lowe, C.U. (1982), 'The triple helix – NIH, industry, and the academic world', *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine*, **55**(3–4), 239–46.

Mandell, N., K. King, N. Weiser, V. Preston, A. Kim, M. Luxton, N. Din and A. Silver (2013), 'Community–academic research partnerships: Practical, ethical and strategic approaches to fostering engaged scholarship', http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/ca/ (retrieved December 11, 2017).

McGloin, C. and N. Georgeou (2016), '"Looks good on your CV": The sociology of voluntourism recruitment in higher education', *Journal of Sociology*, **52**(2), 403–17.

Openjuru, G.L., N. Jaitli, R. Tandon and B. Hall (2015), 'Despite knowledge democracy and community-based participatory action research: Voices from the global south and excluded north still missing', *Action Research*, **13**(3), 219–29.

Pasque, P.A., R.E. Smerek, B. Dwyer, N. Bowman and B.L. Mallory (eds.) (2005), *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement*, Ann Arbor, MI: National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good.

Pausits, A. (2015), 'The knowledge society and diversification of higher education: From the social contract to the mission of universities', in A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi and P. Scott (eds.), *The European Higher Education Area*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 267–84.

Pestre, D. (2000), 'The production of knowledge between academies and markets: A historical reading of the book *The New Production of Knowledge*', *Science, Technology and Society*, **5**(2), 169–81.

Ritzer, G. (1996), *The McDonaldization of Society*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Roggero, G. (2014), 'The general illumination which bathes all the colours: Class composition and cognitive capitalism for dummies', in Johan Fornäs (ed.), *Culture Unbound: Journal of Current Cultural Research*, Thematic Section: *Capitalism: Current Crisis and Cultural Critique*, Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press, pp. 125–36.

Scott, P. (2006), 'The academic profession in a knowledge society', in Ulrich Teichler (ed.), *The Formative Years of Scholars*, London: Portland Press, pp. 19–30.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1990), *The Post-colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, ed. S. Harasym, New York: Routledge.

Teichler, U. (2004), 'Changing structures of the higher education systems: The increasing complexity of underlying forces', in *Diversification of Higher Education and the Changing Role of Knowledge and Research*, UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series Paper No. 6, Paris: UNESCO Forum Regional Scientific Committee for Europe and North America, pp. 3–15.

Tremblay, C., B. Hall and R. Tandon (2014), 'Global trends in support structures for community university research partnerships', UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education, https://dspace.library.uvic.ca/bitstream/handle/1828/6654/Tremblay_Crystal_GlobalTrendsSurveyResults_2014.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y (retrieved May 14, 2017).

Vlăsceanu, L. (2010), *Universities and Reflexive Modernity*, Budapest: CEU Press.

Wallerstein, N. and B. Duran (2003), 'The conceptual, historical and practical roots of community based participatory research and related participatory traditions', in M. Minkler and N. Wallerstein (eds.), *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*, 2nd edn., San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 25–46.

Ward, S.C. (2012), *Neoliberalism and the Global Restructuring of Knowledge and Education*, New York: Routledge.

Williamson, Arthur P. (1988), *University–State Relations in Northern Ireland*, Dublin: Trinity College.