

**Campbell, D. F. J. and Carayannis, E. G. (2013). *Epistemic Governance in Higher Education: Quality Enhancement of Universities for Development*. New York, NY: Springer. Pages: 79. \$39.95 US (paper). ISBN 978-1-4614-4417-6.**

**Reviewed by Michael L. Skolnik, Professor Emeritus, University of Toronto**

A major question in the study of governance in higher education is how narrowly or broadly to define the term “governance.” Most of those who have addressed this question would agree that defining governance only in terms of the activities of the formally constituted bodies with statutory decision-making authority, such as governing boards and academic senates, is too limiting. However, at the other extreme, definitions that include all interactions among all members and stakeholders of an institution may be unmanageably broad. Besides deciding which parties and processes to include in the definition, there is also a question of whether to include some aspects of the context of governance in the definition, for example, the legal and cultural framework in which governance takes place, and the shared assumptions and values that underlie governance in particular places.

David Campbell, of the University of Klagenfurt in Austria, and Elias Carayannis, of George Washington University, argue that the knowledge paradigms and understandings pertaining to the structure of knowledge are so important to having “good, effective, and sustainable” governance that they should be included in the definition of governance. The resulting definition, which the authors term “epistemic governance” is said to refer to “the epistemic structure and knowledge paradigms that underlie higher education.” Campbell and Carayannis assert that approaching governance in this broadened perspective is particularly important when dealing with quality management, which they regard as one of the most crucial responsibilities for higher education governance.

In explaining what they mean by epistemic governance, the authors employ what I would describe as a somewhat circumscribed conception of “the epistemic structure and knowledge paradigms that underlie higher education.” Their focus is on the relationship between research and innovation, and more particularly the concept of modes of production of knowledge as originally formulated by Gibbons et al. (1994). In this framework, Mode 1 refers to knowledge production that is investigator-driven and grows out of interest in a discipline, while Mode 2 knowledge production is application-focused, context-driven, and interdisciplinary. Mode 1 knowledge production tends to consist of the ongoing work of basic research, but Mode 2 may involve shorter term associations of researchers and practitioners who come together to solve a specific problem. Build-

ing on the literature on Modes 1 and 2, the authors add a Mode 3, which is a blend of the other two modes. Mode 3 involves the “combining in a creative and sustainable format the different knowledge productions” of the other two modes (pp. 64–66). In their Mode 3, which the authors have described in more detail in other publications (e.g., Carayannis & Campbell, 2012), there is an “inclination for basic research in context of application.”

The different modes of knowledge production have different implications for such facets of the academy as the organization of faculty work, the relationship between the university and society, and quality assurance. The authors are particularly concerned with the implications of the latter area, and they offer valuable insights in that regard. For example, they note that while placing primary reliance on peer review by disciplinary experts may be appropriate for Mode 1 knowledge production, this approach is inappropriate for evaluation of Mode 2 knowledge production. The authors argue that proper quality assurance procedures for Mode 2 should include users as well as producers of knowledge, and should give considerable weight to the outcomes and impacts of research. Employing an approach to quality assurance that gives disciplinary-based, peer review “a gate-keeping function” would penalize those involved in Mode 2 and Mode 3 knowledge production and consequently inhibit potential contributions of higher education to innovation. Although they warn about systemic bias against Mode 2 knowledge production in the academy, the authors are nevertheless respectful of the importance of Mode 1 knowledge production, expressing concern about the implications of reductions in the number of full-time faculty for maintenance of the core functions of academe.

In its sixty-nine pages of text, this book presents some novel and intellectually stimulating ideas in a lucid and provocative manner, and it is well worth reading because of that. For example, as someone who has written critically about the limitations of conventional approaches to quality assurance in higher education for professional and applied programs (Skolnik, 2010), I was awestruck by the brilliant simplicity of the book’s use of the concept of modes of knowledge production to elucidate this issue.

Much as I enjoyed this book, I also found some shortcomings—not all of which can be attributed to its brevity. Even if it was beyond the scope of the book to develop its conceptual framework in greater detail, it would have been helpful to provide a more complete map of that framework. I will conclude my comments by mentioning a few examples of where that map might have been extended.

The discussion of modes of knowledge production provides a nice *example* of what might be connoted by the phrase “epistemic structure and paradigms of knowledge that underlie higher education,” but this discussion only scratched the surface of that subject. The book could have done more to suggest the outlines and dimensions of such a central aspect of epistemic governance, and made clear that the concept of modes of knowledge production was intended to illustrate rather than exhaust the subject (assuming that this was the intent). Moreover, the concept of modes of knowledge production was presented in a limited, descriptive manner that failed to take account of the criticisms that have been made of the concept.

Except for a few pages in the first chapter that provide a broad comparison of higher education finance in Europe and the United States, the book focuses exclusively on research. To a point, the emphasis on research in a book about higher education governance is welcome, since the traditional conception of governance is so heavily focused on the

teaching function—just look at the legislative acts of most Canadian universities. Still, the reader is left wondering if epistemic governance has any implications for teaching and learning. While some implications for faculty relations are hinted at in the book, the only aspect of higher education governance that is addressed substantively is quality assurance. Again, one can't help but wonder if any other realms of institutional governance would be affected by epistemic governance.

In summary, the concept of epistemic governance, as briefly outlined in this book, is intriguing, and based on the single example that is discussed in any detail, this is a concept that looks like it might have many interesting and constructive implications. However, the book leaves it largely to the reader to figure out what those implications might be. 🍁

### References

Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. J. (2012). *Mode 3 knowledge production in quadruple helix innovation systems: 21<sup>st</sup> century democracy, innovation, and entrepreneurship for development*. *SpringerBriefs in Business* 7. New York, NY: Springer.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

Skolnik, M. L. (2010). Quality assurance in higher education as a political process. *Higher Education Management and Policy* 22(1), 1–20.