

Carola Boehm
Manchester Metropolitan University, UK

Abstract

This presentation explores the potential of applying helix partnership models to the creative sector. The Triple Helix was published by Etzkowitz in 2008 providing a conceptual framework for “managing interactions among universities, business and government on common projects” (2008). Etzkowitz’s model was expanded in 2012 by Carayannis to include the third sector, and with it universities’ own civic engagements. Watson (2009, 2011 and 2014) has foregrounded this latter role; his concept of the “engaged university” (2011) advocates social enterprise and the not-for-profit sector to be considered within the helix models. The paper explores this development in relation to the role that universities play for the cultural and creative sector and how universities will need to consider new knowledge production models that allow a greater interaction between universities on the one hand, and both the public and industry on the other, e.g. for universities to become (even?) more engaged.

(148 words)

Outline

The conceptual model within Etzkowitz’ The Triple Helix was specifically designed to drive innovation. Applying this to the arts sector, the presentation will provide case studies relevant for driving innovation in the arts, the music sector and arts related digital innovations. Relevant for both the for-profit sector as well as social enterprise, it emphasizes these models importance of place and community for maximizing sustainability when devising partnership projects using helix system models.

This presentation will provide an introduction to these models, examples from the art & technology sector, and a discursive exploration of its significance for arts institutions in higher education. Although all examples are derived from within the creative sector, the exploration presented is relevant for the whole HE sector. One could even safely suggest that the last REF might be seen as a collection of quality assessment methods that, collectively, have an inbuilt tension between, on the one hand, a more traditional, linear knowledge production culture (mode 1 knowledge production model), and on the other, an impact driven, non-linear mode that values socially-distributed knowledge more than discovery (mode 2 knowledge production model).

At the basis of this tension stand different models for producing knowledge and with it comes the need, certainly for countries that engage in research assessment exercises, to consider how to assess the value of this produced knowledge. ‘Mode 1’ and ‘Mode 2’ are knowledge production models put forward by Gibbons back in 1994, and several authors of the past decade have picked up and further developed his concepts with relevance for the current impact agendas, including Etzkowitz, Watson, and Carayannis. Even Bror Samelin, a DG of the European Commission, emphasised the need for the European Research Community to embrace Open Innovation 2.0 models, including Quadruple Helix thinking. Thus for the UK research assessment exercise to include impact affords universities to shift their behaviour towards a Mode 2 or 3 knowledge production, and it can be expected that this shift might in turn afford new models of assessing the value of research in which the individual scholarly contributions are less important than the distributed knowledge (significance & reach) that has thus been created.

Originally Gibbons conjectured that Mode 1 knowledge production was a more ‘elderly linear concept of innovation’, in which there is more focus on basic research ‘discoveries’ within a discipline and less on problem solving for society. Quality is controlled through disciplinary peers or peer reviews. Success in this model is defined as quality of research, or ‘research excellence’ and both Watson (2014) and Carayannis (2012) suggest that our western academic cultures still predominantly support the Mode 1 knowledge production model.

Characteristically more inter-, trans-, multi-disciplinary, Mode 2 often demands social accountability and reflexivity. The exploitation of knowledge in this model demands participation of the knowledge production process and the different phases of research are non-linear, e.g. discovery, application, & fabrication overlap. In this model, knowledge production becomes diffused throughout society and within this, tacit knowledge is as valid/relevant as codified knowledge (Gibbons 1994:3). Quality control is exercised by a community of practitioners 'that do not follow the structure of an institutional logic of academic disciplines' (Gibbons 1994:33) and success is defined in terms of efficiency/usefulness, and contribution to overall solution of problems (Carayannis 2012:37).

In 2012 Carayannis expanded the Mode1/2 concept to include a Mode 3 Knowledge Production Model, defined as working simultaneously across mode 1 and 2. Adaptive to current problem contexts, it allows the co-evolution of different knowledge and innovation modes. It values individual scholarly contributions less, but rather emphasises the value of clusters and networks which often stand in "co-opetition", defined as a balance of both cooperation and competition. Partnership models for thus producing new knowledge have been covered by Etzkowitz in 2008. His book *The Triple Helix* provided a conceptual framework for "managing interactions among universities, business and government on common projects" (2008). And it is this model that Carayannis expanded in 2012, now to include the third sector, and with it universities' own civic engagements.

With Mode 3 knowledge production cultures innovation happens in a non-linear, collaborative manner with overlapping processes of basic research, application and development. In this model research is not the sole concern of universities, and technology exploitation might not be the sole concern of industry. This creates what he called it a "Mode 3 Innovation Ecosystem" which allows "GloCal" (local meaning but global reach) multilevel knowledge and innovation systems with "socially distributed knowledge" (Gibbons 1994).

Providing example projects from the presenters, covering areas such as community arts, participatory arts, digital arts, music and well being, and arts education, the presenters will debate whether triple and quadruple partnerships (e.g. helix models) between universities, industry, government and the civic sector (not-for-profit and voluntary sector) are the way forward for universities to allow innovation to happen in a non-linear, collaborative manner with overlapping processes of basic research, application and development. In this model, knowledge production (e.g. research) is not the sole concern of universities, and technology exploitation might not be the sole concern of industry, creating "socially distributed knowledge" (Gibbons 1994) or a (Mode 3) "Innovation Ecosystem" (Carayannis 2012).

Addressing its impact potential on the socio-economic aspects, the late Watson suggested that in this new era:

"(...) in universities around the world, something extraordinary is underway. Mobilizing their human and intellectual resources, institutions of higher education are directly tackling community problems - combating poverty, improving public health, and restoring environmental quality. Brick by brick around the world, the engaged university is replacing the ivory tower." (Watson, 2011)

The session will present an overview of these models, provide example case studies, and give the opportunity to debate the significance of these concepts to the role universities play in society today, focusing on communities involved in or interacting with arts practices.

(961 words)

References

- Carayannis, E. G. (2012) Sustainable policy applications for social ecology and development. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- Carayannis, E. G. and Campbell, D. F. J. (2012) Mode 3 knowledge production in quadruple helix innovation systems : 21st-century democracy, innovation, and entrepreneurship for development. New York; London: Springer.
- Curley, M., Salmelin, B. (2015) Open Innovation 2.0: A New Paradigm.

- Etzkowitz, H. (2008) *The triple helix : university-industry-government innovation in action*. New York: Routledge.
- 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.
- Watson, D. (2011) *The engaged university : international perspectives on civic engagement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Watson, D. (2014) *The question of conscience : higher education and personal responsibility*. London: Institute of Education Press.