CHALLENGING THE "APARTHEIDS" OF KNOWLEDGE

in Higher Education through Social Innovation

Joana Bezerra, Craig Paterson & Sharli Paphitis (Eds)

Introduction

Sharli Paphitis, Joana Bezerra
and Craig Paterson

RHODES UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT DIVISION

**s.paphitis@ru.ac.za; j.bezerra@ru.ac.za;
craig.j.paterson@gmail.com**

The apartheids of knowledge in *HE*

In their seminal paper 'An Apartheid of Knowledge in Academia: The Struggle Over the "Legitimate" knowledge of Faculty of Color' (2002), Bernal and Villalpando critically raise and discuss the issues of epistemic justice internal to academe, interrogating what they call the '*de facto*'-, gender- and, more importantly, race-based segregation of knowledges in academe.

Their paper was one of the first to highlight the statistics showing the slow speed of HE transformation in terms of racial demographics in academia, but more importantly showed distinct patterns of the segregation of knowledges across the academy along gender and race lines. Despite the grand assertions that HE is "objective, meritocratic, color-blind, race-neutral, and provides equal opportunities for all" (Bernal and Villalpando, 2002: 171), their study showed that these assertions serve to mask epistemic divisions, a literal apartheid of knowledge within the academy between those from dominant groups and those who have traditionally been marginalised within the knowledge economy. According to Bernal and Villalpando (2002:171), this is largely due to a global, and local, dominant European epistemological paradigm governing HE, which they claim leads to dominance of an epistemic perspective in HE that "can subtly – and not so subtly – ignore and discredit the ways of knowing and understanding the world that [black scholars and academics] often bring to academia."

Bernal and Villalpando set the scene and highlighted the problem in the global arena some 15 years ago, but little can be said to have changed in the modern academy, most notably perhaps in South Africa. Post-apartheid transformational work within institutions of HE has, until only recently, tended to focus on making universities more demographically inclusive and diverse, both in terms of students and staff (Soudien, 2010), and through the 'Africanisation' of university spaces (Metz, 2014).

At a national level, demographic transformation of the HE sector in terms of student enrolments in HE has shown the most progress: in 2013, 68% of honours student enrolments were black students, and in 2013, 52% of masters and doctoral student enrolments were black students. The enrolment of black students in HE overall increased from 64% to 70% between 2007 and 2013 (Council on Higher Education, 2013). Demographic transformation on the academic staff level, while slower, has also shown progress: in 2011 the ratio of white to black academics was almost 2:1 (9162:5077), and by 2013, the sector had 51% white academics (9205) and 34% black academics (5756), with similar increases in ratios of Indian and coloured academics (Council on Higher Education, 2013). These macro-level demographic transformations are largely, but not always, mirrored at the micro level of the individual disciplines themselves.

But overall, this transformation has been slow. Recent student-led activism – particularly in the form of the #FeesMustFall protests and the #RhodesMustFall movements – has demonstrated the growing discomfort with both the speed at which transformational efforts of these kinds occur and the lack of deeper transformation of epistemic norms governing academe.

In continuing to follow a Eurocentric, positivist paradigm, the South African HE sector has implicitly endorsed and perpetuated a number of important epistemic injustices beyond those discussed by Bernal and Villalpando. Epistemic injustices of this kind prevent the democratisation of the knowledge production process. They furthermore stunt the research potential of universities by delegitimising sources of knowledge deemed valid in mainstream research communities and limit access to HE in the face of already notorious economic barriers.

Continued positivist dominance in *HE*

The features of positivism dominating research and HE are views which held sway in the philosophy of science in the early twentieth century. In these views, the scientific enterprise was seen as predicated on the pursuit of value-free inquiries which transcended cultural and historical viewpoints, with the aim of

producing objective, factual and dispassionate research (Fondacaro & Weinberg 2002; Karnilowicz *et al.*, 2014). The underlying assumption behind positivism is that objective methodology will give researchers access to the single, absolute 'truth' describing things as they 'really' are – thus, positivist research tends to emphasise generalisable outcomes while ignoring or marginalising the perceptions, lived experiences and realities and socio-cultural and political conditions experienced both subjectively and collectively by those being researched. Consequently, interactions between academics or researchers and subjects within this paradigm are typically impersonal (Potts & Brown, 2005; Karnilowicz *et al.*, 2014). Following this, in positivist research, academics or researchers are viewed as the credentialed, expert and only legitimate producers of knowledge, who are set in a hierarchical relationship of power and privilege above and detached from the objects of study or those being studied – who are seen merely as sources of data rather than bearers or creators of knowledge itself (Potts & Brown, 2005; Newman & Glass, 2015). Moreover, while academics and researchers are seen as primarily responsible for the outcomes of the knowledge production process, having the power and legitimacy to act on the knowledge produced, they are also seen as the primary beneficiaries of this process, lacking in epistemic agency and credibility from the perspective of academe (Potts & Brown, 2005).

The dominance of the positivist paradigm in research and within the HE sector is reflected in the governing norms and standards of the academy, which "privilege theoretical over practical knowledge" (Newman & Glass, 2015:226) – measuring impactful and meaningful research in peer-reviewed outputs, where editors, reviewers and audiences reinforce the paradigm with their overarching focus on objectivity and methodological validity, reliability, and, more recently, check-box exercises in ethical compliance still rooted in biomedical frameworks (Pizarro, 1998; Fine & Torre, 2008). Beyond the realm of research, positivism, as a dominant epistemic framework governing HE, is reflected in the norms and standards governing much of the teaching and learning at universities where students are predominantly invited to engage with the "official knowledge" (Brandt, 2004:95) constructed by academic and research experts. But the dominance of positivism has not only been in response to pressures internal to the academic community itself. It can also be seen as a response to pressures from research funders, programme evaluators and policy makers who tend to presume that academics have the necessary and sole expertise required for building and sustaining the knowledge economy (Karnilowicz *et al.*, 2014; Newman & Glass, 2015).

In the realm of policy making, the concept of 'epistemic communities' – first introduced by Peter Haas (1990; 1992) in the context of environmental policy debates, but now much more broadly used in reference to knowledge creation policy contexts – has taken prominence. Within this literature, and in practice, the original definition of an epistemic community, put forward by Haas as "a network of professionals with recognised expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue area" (Haas, 1992:3) still primarily underpins debates in the field. The legitimacy and credibility of the advice and information aimed at influencing policy decisions provided by any epistemic community, within this framework, are derived primarily from the shared knowledge base within the community and the recognition of the expertise of the community of professionals (Sugden, 2006). While many groups of professionals (doctors, lawyers, accountants, etc.) can reasonably claim to constitute epistemic communities, researchers and academics comprise some of the most prominent epistemic communities which *in fact* impact on knowledge creation in policy contexts – providing reports, analysis, theories and frameworks from studies with scientific gravitas – where the expertise and power of credentialed researchers and academics play a large role in the politics of knowledge generation and knowledge application (Sohng, 1996; Sugden, 2006).

Predicated on an epistemologically positivist foundation, the concentration of 'knowledge' in epistemic communities comprising experts (predominantly communities of academic or scientific experts) resulted in a number of hierarchies dominating the modern knowledge economy, whereby: truth claims are generated through the discourses of credentialed academic experts rather than 'ordinary people'; individuals' understandings of their lived experiences are deferred to and become the province of expert academic analyses; academic experts colonise debates on development issues because technical, 'scientised' and jargon-laden discourses are either made inaccessible or assumed to be inaccessible to the broader public; and "practice principles and methods are developed by 'experts', often under controlled conditions, then imported into daily practice and tested against clients and the policy context" (Sohng, 1996: 82).

The developmental university

Debates on development are 'colonised' by 'experts' in the positivist paradigms and are thereby rendered inaccessible. This effectively prevents the 'knowledge' from having a significant impact on development at grassroots level and from being intelligible without the direct translation by members of the epistemic

community that produced it. The academy as epistemic community is still expected to engage in these debates – assisting with knowledge production aimed towards so-called development is increasingly at the core of the 'post-apartheid' university. As the South African Department of Education White Paper 3 ("A Programme for Higher Education Transformation" (Department of Education, 1997)) directly states: university spaces are required to "promote and develop social responsibility and awareness amongst students of the role of higher education in social and economic development through community service programmes. (p. 14)" In other words, the universities, by policy, are not only required to engage with solving the social and economic development issues of the day, but also need to inculcate this approach into the teaching process. In theory – in theory! – this would mean a shift in the institutional culture of the university away from the positivist paradigm towards the paradigm of a socially valued 'developmental university.'

As noted above, this has failed to translate from theory into practice. And the important question to ask is: *why?* After all, the problem was diagnosed many years ago. Bernal and Villalpando wrote in 2002 and the White Paper 3 was published in 1997. And yet, rather than engaging in the two central roles of a university academic – teaching and research – to include these new 'developmental university' objectives, a 'third prong' emerged: community engagement (CE). While a number of ideas (and myriad acronyms) emerged within the teaching ('service learning') and research ('community-based research') spaces to accommodate these changes, their uptake has been slow. Rather, CE is regarded as a third, separate activity alongside the other two functions of the university. As Akpan, Minkley and Thakar pointed out in 2012, "while universities often present CE as a strategic and operational priority [including, for example, tying promotion to CE activities], in certain cases this recognition is more symbolism than reality." (Akpan *et al.*, 2012:2).

CE has been established "from above," as a "third branch" of the academic project, and has not become integrated into academic practice as was envisioned. While a handful of individual academics apply the methods and practices of CE in their work (through either research or teaching), it has not, as was mandated, changed the focus of academic practice to the creation of the 'developmental university'. Rather, each component of the academic project has formed into a niche body with CE divisions – deployed (sometimes reluctantly in order to secure promotion) as a component of the 'normal work' academics are required to do. Service-learning, for example, is seen as a CE component of teaching; community-based research methods are seen as a CE component of research;

and participatory methods are relegated to the margins. In other words, CE remains a third branch of the public university. Where it was envisioned that CE practices would become a central part of the academic project, these practices have remained separate from the core activities of teaching and research. At the present moment, academics who engage in CE-related activities are seen as doing just that. Community-based and service-learning work is seen as academics *coming to* CE, rather than CE practices entering the disciplines in which these academics work.

But why has this occurred? Or, put differently, why, when few would disagree that 'the university' should be conceived as a public good that contributes its expertise to the betterment of society as a whole, has the academic community been so reluctant to put CE-derived practices in a central position, and rather retained it as peripheral to standard academic practice? The reason for this failure is not simply hubris on the part of the positivist academic community, but also falls into the contemporary university structure. Envisioned as a community of practice, an epistemic community, safeguarded in its quasi-democratic autonomy by vague notions of 'academic freedom', the university-as-community carries out its task with a sometimes vicious collegiality. But the university is not only a community – it is also an institution that is increasingly managerial, bureaucratic and financially stretched. The public university is a state institution, following state directives; it is increasingly market-driven, a brand seeking endowments and capital while 'tightening the belt' to stay afloat during rough economic seas. In other words, two universities exist in one: the university is a community of scholars **and** the university is a legal person and a brand.

This gives rise to two competing logics of operation in universities. On one side you find a managerial, state-bureaucratic logic; on the other, a self-governing community of scholars striving for independent practice. These logics are mutually unintelligible and exist in constant tension with each other in the university. The objectives of the developmental university – specifically, the directives given to transform the public university into a developmental one – have on the one hand been established 'from above' through that managerial logic. When coming not 'from within' the academic community logics, it should be no surprise that increasingly strained, overworked, underpaid academics resist what is positioned as an addition and which seemingly falls outside of their already established mandates of teaching and research. On the other hand, much of the work to transform the university has been born from the work of individuals and collectives of academics who have embraced new ways of thinking about their own roles as researchers and teachers. While making strides

in theorising CE or developing practice within their own discipline, they have seldom championed the institutionalisation of CE in an effort to radically transform HE establishments themselves. These academics have often been seen as the champions of CE in their disciplines or department, taking the role of CE on as others do with committee or administrative duties. Both of these developments, separately or together, have led to CE being forced into establishment as a 'third branch', rather than being embedded into teaching and research.

The mutual unintelligibility of the competing logics of universities may seem overstated, possibly exaggerated. Members of the academic community often feed from one space of predominating logic into another within the same institution through promotion from a teaching and research post into a managerial one: from Professor to Dean of Faculty, for example. Similarly, members of the academic community may effortlessly, and unconsciously, 'jump' between these logics, depending on the environment in the institution at a given time. Within an administrative committee meeting – perhaps as a representative on a university budget or infrastructure committee – the managerial logic is intelligible. To a university manager, a similar intelligibility of academic community logics may emerge in a curriculum discussion, for example. But a directive presented in a managerial or state-bureaucratic logic which impacts on the realm of teaching and research, governed by its competing logic, is unintelligible within that realm.

To understand just how unintelligible these competing logics might appear to each other, consider Felicity Wood's (2018) *Universities and the Occult Rituals of the Corporate World: Higher Education and Metaphorical Parallels with Myth and Magic* wherein she applies her experience as an anthropologist on myth and magic to the contemporary state of HE. In that work, Wood attempts an experiment in intelligibility through metaphor and analogy. Her approach is one that attempts to demystify the logics of HE's corporatisation through deliberately mystifying it; Wood takes the 'familiar' – day-to-day life inside a university – and makes it appear unfamiliar to the insider by way of metaphor. By 'defamiliarising', the problems and absurdities faced in that familiar thing (in this case, managerial and state-bureaucratic logics of universities) become more clear. In doing so, Wood, in a sense, 'translates' the managerial, state-bureaucratic logics for those operating in an academic logic, thereby clarifying it. That the analogy of myth, magic and the occult is so effective in this 'translation' indicates the degree to which mutual unintelligibility exists between the two logics of the university.

As individual teachers and researchers increasingly draw on CE-derived practices, however, a space is opening in which these practices can become embedded as envisioned. And an encouragement of this process – of kicking

the leg out of CE as a separate activity of the academy – is what lies at the centre of this book. It is intended partly as an invitation to members of the academic community to embrace CE-derived practices in their daily business through the use of case studies that illustrate how some have done so. It is also partly an act of translation – from the managerial logics of the university-as-institution, to the logics of university-as-community – through which members of the academic community might draw CE-derived practices towards their core work instead of seeing CE practices as a separate branch of the academic project which draws the member away from their teaching and research practices.

In order to do so, a number of concepts require at least some elaboration. What is meant by, and what is the relevance of, 'social innovation'? What is 'epistemic injustice' and 'identity prejudice'? Why are these concepts important? How do they affect the 'knowledge' we, as members of the academic community, are expected (and determined) to produce? Below we will address these issues.

Undoing the logics of the apartheids of knowledge

The twenty-first century has seen a marked increase in diversity in the HE sector, both in terms of students and academic staff as well as disciplines and methodologies. This increased diversity has undoubtedly led to an increased awareness and appreciation of the complex interplay between the knowledges brought into the knowledge economy by those from different positionalities. But are all positions, and is all knowledge, equal when it comes down to it? Whose knowledge counts? The disproportionate valuation of knowledge generated in the 'hard' sciences in contrast to the so-called 'soft' social sciences has long been a topic of debate. More recently, debates about the delegitimisation of contributions made by members of groups who are underrepresented in academe suggest that there is a segregation of knowledge (in terms of its value and legitimacy) such that it has been called an apartheid of knowledge.

As CE (encompassing volunteerism, service-learning and engaged research activities) has gained traction in the HE sector, two further apartheids of knowledge have been highlighted. The first is between the knowledges internal to the academy and those beyond, while the second is between academic learning and the learning involved in developing so-called 'soft-skills', such as social awareness, critical citizenship, personal growth, etc. most commonly seen in engaged student learning. These apartheids of knowledge reveal a deep tension currently at the core of the HE sector, particularly in South Africa, between the commitment to preserving and furthering the traditional modes of knowledge

generation and dissemination on the one hand, and the social and humanistic purposes of the academy (embodied in CE efforts) on the other.

The call for HE institutions to serve the public good – if seen as a call for these institutions to fulfil the political and moral imperative to actively contribute to social and epistemic justice and equality – can only be achieved if HE institutions themselves begin to shift from their traditional role as 'ivory tower' gatekeepers of knowledge to socially responsive and democratic institutions.

Given the post-apartheid calls for the transformation of the South African HE sector, it is surprising to find that higher education transformation "has not shown as much progress as might be expected" (Erasmus, 2014:105). While the call for HEIs to be more responsive to local communities and the challenges of local constituencies to serve the public good through CE has been widely accepted at policy levels throughout the higher education sector, community engagement has yet to become institutionalised in South Africa. The service-learning movement in particular has gained little traction since the release of the White Paper on Higher Education in 1997, and while 'graduate attributes' have been touted at institutions of higher learning as buzz words of the past two decades, academics struggle to integrate these learning outcomes into what they see as the 'core business' of their academic programmes. Most problematically, the question of the development of civically-minded graduates has been critically under-addressed in HE policy making at institutional, programmatic and curricular levels. As a result, the purposes of activities (such as CE) aimed at developing graduate attributes are often misunderstood, leading to "limited unequivocal support" (Erasmus, 2014:105) and remain relegated to the margins of academic activity. Similarly, engaged research, while gaining significant momentum in the sector (particularly in disciplines which already include extensive fieldwork components within their research methodologies and practice) is still subject to significant scepticism by those who continue to raise debates about "the specific forms of knowledge and understanding authorized by universities" (Glass & Newman, 2015:33).

CE activities (particularly in the form of service-learning and engaged research) have been purported as mechanisms of transforming the sector by breaking down the division between the academy and the communities in which they exist, as well as giving epistemic agency to both students and community partners in the knowledge production process. However, little research has been done on how effective such activities have been in promoting epistemic justice in both the academy and in broader society. There is also little evidence to suggest that these CE practices have been institutionalised in a manner which

fundamentally alters institutional cultures in ways that would shift the governing epistemic paradigm of the sector more broadly.

CE activities have been purported to have transformative potential for students, staff and community partners who are involved in these activities. A vast body of literature on service-learning and (a smaller body of literature on) volunteerism suggests that students who are involved in these activities are epistemically transformed through having their beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions challenged, problematised and changed (where appropriate). In doing so, the epistemic transformation purportedly achieved through CE activities serves a moral and political transformation imperative in the struggle against race, gender and class oppression. Moreover, through involvement in CE activities, students are purported to become graduates who are more socially aware and who, on the basis of this awareness, become socially responsible, active citizens. Little research, however, shows how these transformations occur at an epistemic level, particularly in a South African context. Although it is also true that CE activities aim to achieve similar epistemic transformations in staff and community partners who are similarly involved, there is very little research that confirms that CE achieves the desired epistemic transformations in these target groups, particularly in a South African context.

The renewed calls for the transformation of the HE sector by student-led activism (in the form of the #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall movements) provide a springboard for South African HE institutions to begin to engage more readily with the transformation project outlined in HE policy. Much of the scepticism about the transformative role of CE activities hinges on a reluctance to make appropriate shifts in the epistemic paradigm governing HE institutions. These epistemic shifts are both required and purported to be made possible through CE activities. Further debate and critical inquiry into these topics is important if the goals of epistemic justice are to be advanced. Central to this discussion is the willingness on the part of academics and researchers themselves to enter into a mode of critical reflexivity about the epistemic paradigms under which they operate, both explicitly and implicitly. Moreover, we suggest, this will require willingness on the part of academics and researchers to recognise their own biases and prejudices in the project of reimagining their own and other's roles in the knowledge production process – given that epistemic value is undoubtedly found not only within academic or dominant communities – and scholars have cautioned that within these debates “some local academics have come to the conclusion that what lies beyond the ivory tower is an ... ‘intellectual wasteland.’” (Erasmus, 2014:107)

Social innovation

The notion of 'social innovation' has become somewhat of a buzzword both within the academy and, more broadly, the society. Social innovation projects are transformative and have the ability to make profound and sustainable changes. Social innovation projects aim to meet social challenges and are for the benefit of all people. To this extent, many CE efforts undertaken in HE are social innovation projects, working to reorient the sector as a whole towards the public good. But to what extent can, and in what ways do, the engagement efforts – which bring together those within academe and those from broader society – introduce new ways of building and maintaining the knowledge economy, and thus serve to challenge the 'apartheids of knowledge' in HE?

In part, the answer to this can be found in recognising the often political, narrative, partnership-orientated and transdisciplinary nature of social innovation work. With social change and justice at the core of social innovation, new ways of knowledge production and dissemination are foregrounded in these projects. It is precisely the reimagining of the role players and rules of exchange in the knowledge economy inherent in social innovation which makes it instrumental in breaking down the apartheids of knowledge in HE. Social innovation is *social*, because it is often created by multiple forces and leads to systemic change (Moore *et al.*, 2012), change that enhances collective power resources (Pol & Ville, 2009). It is *innovation*, because it deliberately seeks new ideas and ways of thinking that may affect more than one social dimension (*Ibid.*), recognising an unmet need and finding new ways to address that need. Mulgan (2006:150) highlights an important point regarding social innovation: "Some of the most effective methods for cultivating social innovation start from the presumption that people are competent interpreters of their own lives and competent solvers of their own problems." Social innovation is thus underpinned by networks of community (Hazelkorn, 2009), and in order to be effective, there needs to be a recognition of the skills and capabilities of all concerned.

The practical – or grounded – nature of social innovation has two implications: (1) people from outside academia are necessarily part of knowledge creation; and (2) social and personal change to some degree will happen. Social innovation projects promote social inclusion and deep listening, stimulating and giving a space for knowledges from outside academia to flourish within the knowledge economy. CE as social innovation, as envisaged in this collection, thus continuously chips away at the apartheids of knowledge.

Epistemic justice and identity prejudice

Recently, epistemologists have paid some attention to the ethical implications of our epistemic practices. Most famously, philosopher Miranda Fricker (2007) has discussed issues of epistemic injustice in her work, which has received considerable attention since its publication in 2007. Much of the attention garnered by this work in relation to epistemic justice within the HE sector has focused on issues of inclusivity and exclusivity (particularly along race, class and gender lines) within the academy itself, but epistemic practices regarding research conducted with communities, and its ability to address the issue of epistemic justice in the knowledge production process, are not often discussed (Glass & Newman, 2015:25). Similarly, the relationship between the hegemony of Eurocentric positivism and epistemic injustice, perpetuated by researchers and academics while involved in the knowledge production process, remains largely underexplored in the social epistemology and HE literature. Recent discussions in the emerging discipline of the scholarship of engagement, by Glass and Newman (2015) and Leblanc and Kinsella (2016), have, to some extent, grappled with these issues. Glass and Newman, perhaps most strongly, suggest that HE institutions and academics are guilty of perpetuating both testimonial and hermeneutical injustices when they exclude from inclusion in the 'formal' knowledge production processes 'outside of the sphere of propositional knowledge' traditionally sanctioned by the academy. This is, at least in part, a by-product of operating under the dominant ideological paradigm of Eurocentric positivism as described above.

On Fricker's (2007) framework, an epistemic injustice is a kind of harm or injustice in which individuals or groups are wronged in their capacity as bearers of knowledge, or 'knowers'. Epistemic injustices are those which dehumanise both groups and individuals by delegitimising them as knowers – either in the eyes of society or the academy or in their own eyes. Our everyday epistemic practices, such as interpreting our social environment and experiences and reporting them to one another through knowledge claims, are compromised by the systematic prejudices and social inequalities which govern our societies (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2012; Davies, 2016). Even as South African institutions and researchers become more inclusive of members of previously marginalised or structurally excluded groups in the academy, what Fricker calls persistent "identity prejudices" will remain in the institutions and those who work there through systems of social power in which epistemic trust are mirrored (Fricker 2007).

Negative identity prejudices undermine the credibility of testimonies given by members of marginalised or excluded groups by distorting the credibility

judgements of hearers. In the wake of identity prejudice, knowledge claims, which should otherwise have been recognised by hearers, are lost (Leblanc & Kinsella, 2016). Epistemic encounters in which testimonial claims are devalued through identity prejudice serve to further oppress and marginalise members of groups who are already in epistemically less privileged positions, thereby excluding them from properly taking part in the knowledge economy (Leblanc & Kinsella, 2016). The systemic and structural testimonial injustice which arises from identity prejudice is, according to Fricker, a bias which operates at an individual level and is operational at a preconscious level in our everyday social interactions with one another, unless a conscious and deliberate disruption or intervention is made (Glass & Newman, 2015). While identity prejudices remain within the epistemic communities in HE itself – and important and significant work must still be done to disrupt the systemic and structural testimonial injustices which occur within academic institutions themselves – the epistemic relations between the epistemic communities within the academy and broader society are also significantly weakened not only by the social injustices pervasive in society, but by the overarching paradigm governing the HE sector. Here, too, important epistemic injustices occur.

Since academic and research epistemic communities enjoy privileged epistemic positions in society, they already and necessarily operate from a position of power and privilege when they engage with broader society, particularly in research settings, where, under the positivist framework, research participants are seen as lacking the epistemic credibility of their 'epistemically privileged counterparts' (Medina, 2012; Leblanc & Kinsella, 2016). Most problematically in the HE sector, such biases serve to further marginalise the voices and testimony of individuals and groups whose "knowledge claims enter the marketplace of ideas at a very substantial disadvantage" (Glass & Newman, 2015:27) when they are being received, evaluated and assessed by and assimilated into frameworks and paradigms determined by (for the most part) hearers from dominant groups. Testimonial injustices are committed when, because of identity prejudices stemming directly from the overarching positivist paradigm, "people's claims are dismissed as 'mere intuitions, vague feelings, or the like'" (Glass & Newman, 2015:29).

Similarly, both Fricker and Medina point to two further kinds of testimonial injustices – pre-emptive testimonial injustices and epistemic objectification – both of which seem to be perpetuated by the overarching paradigm. On the one hand, in cases of pre-emptive testimonial injustices, the opinions, views and knowledge claims of individuals and groups who are subjected to identity prejudice are not solicited because it is presumed that they will have little to

contribute or that they do not possess the required knowledge, and consequently these individuals or groups are effectively silenced as their testimony is barred from consideration in formal knowledge production processes (Glass & Newman, 2015; Leblanc & Kinsella, 2016). When researchers and academics, often unwittingly, commit pre-emptive testimonial injustices, members of epistemically (and often not accidentally socio-economically) marginalised or oppressed groups have their research questions, interests and understandings systematically ignored and overlooked – which in turn has important ramifications for broader development and policy decisions (Glass & Newman, 2015). In cases of epistemic objectification, on the other hand, where the tenets of the positivist paradigm are perhaps most obviously operational, the epistemic harm committed does not accrue from being barred from having one's testimony enter the marketplace of ideas, but rather the harm that comes from relegating an "active epistemic agent (or subject) to that of passive object, to be studied, observed, and in many cases, exploited" (Leblanc & Kinsella, 2016:66).

Such exclusionary epistemic practices not only further the perception of the public that the academe is an elitist 'ivory tower', but serves to further separate the public from academics who are perceived to be detached 'experts'. A barrier is thus created between the public's access to knowledge in HE intuitions and, at the same time, a barrier is created between the academics who need to work with the public in non-exclusionary ways in order to further research and teaching goals.

Actors and actions challenging the apartheid of knowledge

In order to understand the relationship between social innovation and the reimagining of the knowledge economy necessary to reorientate HE most fully towards the public good, we must draw from the experiences of those working on the front lines of change. In May 2018, Rhodes University held their fourth annual Community Engaged Learning Symposium, with a specific focus on social innovation and bringing together academics, students and community partners from across South Africa to reflect critically and collectively on each other's work. This collection stems from the reflections in this setting. It does so as both a translation and illustration of translated practices; case studies through which examples of better – and broader – engagements may be made from within the academe by academics or from community partners with academe. This collection is aimed at the individual academic or practitioner and is intended to provide examples of how CE-derived practices might be incorporated into the

core mandates of teaching and research. To this end, the chapters have been structured to guide the reader deeper into the realm of embedded CE-derived practices in that context.

An attempt has been made to draw together submissions which highlight, either tacitly or explicitly, ways to move beyond the issues of epistemic injustice, identity prejudice and positivist dominance in knowledge production. In selecting each submission, we deliberately sought to provide examples of the diversity of voices made available to us, and, as a collection of texts, provide examples of each of the themes and ideas discussed in this introduction. Our aim is to provide illustration of a collection which expands on the definition of 'expert', moving it away from the realm of (what Haas speaks of as) 'epistemic communities' and out of the positivist academic mode to include students', teachers', and community practitioners' voices alongside those of 'academics' and to include their voices *from that position*. In offering a diverse collection of knowledges perspectives in this way, the collection presents as kind of a hall of mirrors, showing the challenges and issues from a myriad angles and views, to raise important questions for the reader about where distortions or blind-spots in their own thinking may arise. As a result, the reader will find contained diversity, not just in the material or the position of the author, but also in the ways of writing and constructing writing which diverges from the formulaic model of academic publications. It includes work at proposal stage, reflections by those inside and outside the academy on their practices, explanations of research and research methods applied in an attempt to move the practices of disciplines. It brings questions, and intends to assist, not to necessarily provide answers, in encouraging readers to ask yet more questions and initiate discussions more widely in the academy, so that we might move to answer some questions collectively and, in doing so, transform HEIs into that envisioned in discussions on 'the developmental university'.

We have, in our selection, attempted to move beyond CE as a 'third branch' of the developmental university. In doing so, while we do take some of the work that has been done in CE into this collection, we deliberately selected work that does not. We also include submissions on work involving CE practitioners *outside* of CE, and practices that might not involve CE in higher education at all, but are programmes or reflections from which people in higher education might gain insight. In these instances, our goal is to ask how a developmental university might expand its practice beyond its epistemic community and engage with the community around it more broadly. Our goal is squarely to undo the logics of the apartheids of knowledge – it is also one reason for working with a broad

understanding of social innovation: only by doing so can a multiplicity of voices be drawn into the project of expanding and diversifying the epistemic community of the academy. We focused on the principles outlined in this introduction – social inclusion, deep listening and creating spaces for knowledge outside of academia – in how we selected diverse voices, views, approaches and positions to highlight in this collection. Each chapter addresses these issues in its own way. Each chapter was selected because it was read as an invitation to find new ways of conducting teaching and research which breaks the epistemic mould of the academe, or, at the very least, adds another crack to, or chips away at, the manner that academics engage with the society in which they work.

In reading this collection, then, one should hold up a willingness to recognise the biases and prejudices of knowledge production processes in the academy; to give a generous reading to the myriad ways of knowing, writing and engaging with the world from inside the academy; and to avoid the common pitfall of evaluating and assessing according to frameworks and paradigms that are determined by the epistemic community of 'academic experts'. How to select and work with the texts that follow has been a challenge for the editors, and will necessarily be a challenge for the reader, but only through that challenge being accepted by the editors, and subsequently accepted by the reader, can we work towards challenging the apartheids of knowledge in higher education.

To facilitate this challenge, the collection is arranged into a number of parts. The first part comprises four chapters which illustrate the nexus of groups working in the Makhanda (formerly Grahamstown) education sector using CE-derived and social innovation orientated practices. We introduce six actors in these first four chapters. The first three are: Ashley Westaway, manager at GADRA Education, where educational programmes are conducted in the town; Nicola Hayes, former principal of Nombulelo High School, a Makhanda/Grahamstown public school; and, Benita Bobo, who runs the Engaged Citizen Programme for Rhodes University students through the university's CE Office. The position of each of these actors gives unique insights into the theoretical and practical problems and successes associated with education and volunteer programmes conducted by Rhodes University in the Makhanda/Grahamstown area.

Beginning with Bobo's discussion of the Engaged Citizen Programme (ECP) run by the Rhodes University Community Engagement Office, the chapter asks vital questions which highlight the importance, and justification, of CE and volunteerism by students in HE institutions. Bobo posits a number of pertinent questions which are vital for acquiring academic buy-in in social innovation projects: How do students at universities understand CE? What do students gain

from such engagement? How do students change through CE activities? Bobo draws from the experience of working in ECP when asking these questions and illustrates how these questions have prompted the proposal for further research. This chapter highlights how we might take questions raised by our experiences of working in CE, identify what research needs to be done and produce a proposal from them.

How such 'engaged citizens' might collaborate through their organisations and institutions towards the formation of a 'coalition' aimed at positive change and social innovation is dealt with in Chapter 2. In this chapter, Westaway discusses some of the ways in which political power plays out in the public schooling sector of Makhanda/Grahamstown, and he reviews the efforts and effectiveness of varied collaborating actors to revitalise the sector. The chapter presents a robust theoretical scaffolding underlying the social innovation described, and highlights the wealth of expertise available beyond the ivory tower which can be harnessed for the knowledge generation project.

Chapter 3 is an autoethnographic reflection by Hayes, a school principal in Makhanda/Grahamstown's public schooling sector, and presents an important counter-narrative about power and the knowledge generation process to those seen in the pieces written from the perspective of academic practitioners. Hayes' reflections, covering the power dynamics of the school principals' position in relation to CE and volunteer programmes in the town, highlights the apartheid of knowledge through exploring "the reality of high power distance in the secondary education milieu and the perceived gap between those with 'valued knowledge' (in particular those within the academy) and those without." Hayes' chapter provides an important piece when read alongside Chapter 1, allowing the reader to think through the multiple layers of power and privilege which must be negotiated when facilitating spaces for co-development and co-reflection in community-based projects.

Three further actors in the town lead us deeper into the research arena in Makhanda/Grahamstown. Thandiswa Nqowana, a PhD candidate in the Rhodes University Pharmacy Department, along with Dr Roman Tandlich of that same department and Dr Sharli Paphitis of the Community Engagement Division, discuss their work in the field of public health and citizen science. Their case study of a community-based participatory research project at a Makhanda/Grahamstown public school emphasises the value of such interactions to researchers and community alike. They provide an outline of the community-based water quality monitoring programme in Makhanda/Grahamstown. Grade 9 learners from three high schools participated in this programme, which

provided home testing kits to assess microbial counts in water, the results of which were used to pin-point water quality areas according the learners' water quality results. Here, research, education and citizen science converge in a public health programme in a town with notoriously poor water quality, introducing new technologies and ways of involving community members in the knowledge generation and dissemination process.

But these illustrations of some intersections and workings of CE and mutual benefits of participatory research are introductions, provocations and insinuations towards a different way in which HE can encounter the society it works within. Further exploration of certain aspects of these 'ways' are required. So we return to our point of departure and ask new questions in Part Two of the collection. From one high school programme to another, we turn to Diepsloot in Johannesburg where a participatory action research approach is used by Lourenço to find a way to empower learners through simultaneously focusing on English language – the medium of instruction in public schools – and mathematical proficiency in an online bilingual mathematics programme. Lourenço's chapter introduces Part Two, which focuses on education and the benefits which can come from service-learning and engaged research approaches in the education space. Continuing this line of thought, Bezerra and Paphitis, like Bobo in Chapter 1, provide an analysis of the effects of CE and volunteerism on university students. They argue that the discrepancies between reported personal growth and evidence of personal growth through engagements with the honours level service-learning programme hint towards a barrier to change in what is perceived as 'legitimate' or 'academic' knowledge. They then discuss some of the challenges posed to the widespread institutionalisation of service-learning programmes in HE.

Akhurst addresses another problem which emerges in the drive for new, more just, pedagogies and curricula in the course of changing the modes of knowledge production towards the public good. Akhurst effectively demonstrates how a service-learning component in community psychology training might also contribute towards new teaching methods and, importantly, curriculum transformation. In doing so, Akhurst addresses a key aspect of transformation in HE – how to move beyond the hard positivist paradigm in teaching and curricula and towards achieving the role envisioned of a developmental university, which trains students in addressing the needs of society – and provides concrete suggestions for how to do so through case study.

How, then, would one combine the *methodologies* of the academy towards social innovation? This question lies at the heart of Part Three, where authors

suggest that effective social innovation must support local communities and contribute to capacity building of that community and its stakeholders. In Chapter 8 Ryan and Todd demonstrate such a process using the, now common, approach of systems theory in the opening chapter of Part Three of the collection. "What is clear," they say, "is that there is a clear reliance on reliable information regarding the system itself. Access to such information is often difficult for South African researchers due to socio-political/cultural boundaries." Thus, they propose that the key to the effective application of systems theory is the development of trust through "stakeholder engaged research", using a case study of sports science research in a local soccer community to illustrate their point. This "stakeholder engaged research" acknowledges that trust comes through collaboration. Collaborative engagement, which was introduced by Bobo and Hayes in Part One, is expanded on in Chapter 9 by Haese *et al.*, who move away from a 'charity/deficit' approach to community engaged work through collaboration and developing along the grain of community members' strengths. They do so through a case study of visual literacy and a "wordless picturebook" project established in Mamelodi near Pretoria.

Such innovative 'new literacies' projects are becoming increasingly popular in social innovation work and engaged research practices, as their use has shown itself to be effective in bringing out vital stories and connections through which participants can be empowered by personal reflection, as well as circumventing problems of low literacy levels (as understood by conventional metrics) in South Africa. But with these new literacies and methods of data collection come new ethical considerations. Gachago and Scheepers address these new considerations head-on in their case study of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology's digital storytelling programmes. In Chapter 10 they provide us with an analytical framework through which ethical considerations of digital storytelling in research projects may be managed by using Tronto and Fisher's "ethics of care."

Themes of collaboration, active citizenship and addressing socio-economic challenges are drawn together in Part Four. Shabalala and Bezerra's case study in Chapter 11 illustrates how various government departments can collaborate with volunteer organisations in the Kruger National Park to improve the socio-economic conditions of surrounding communities through ecotourism and eco-education, while Davy *et al.*, address a more specific problem in Chapter 12: that of everyday resilience amongst cardboard collectors in Durban's informal economy. In a collaboration between Rhodes University's Department of Human Kinetics and Ergonomics, Asiye e'Tafuleni (who works with informal traders at

Warwick Junction in Durban) and Women in Informal Employment: Globalising and Organising (WIEGO), Davy *et al.*, reflect on their experiences of working together to design and produce an innovative trolley design which might solve some of the problems encountered by informal cardboard collectors in the course of their daily work. Nel and Govender, in Chapter 13, offer an evaluation process of such programmes, which might enhance societal inclusion through the adoption of socially innovative systems. They do so by offering insights into Employee Assistance Programmes in South Africa. This study looks at another vital element of the kinds of work covered in Chapters 11 and 12, that is, how might a researcher assess the efficacy of a project in terms which relate to the broader goals of community-based, participatory and social innovation orientated research.

To conclude the volume, Van Rooyen and Venter offer an explicit framing of the academic process aligned to the goals outlined here. In Chapter 14, they argue that the central processes of scholarly work already contain the elements with which to reach the goals of a developmental university. A clear commitment to a radical interpretation of the processes of "discovery, integration, knowledge sharing and application" leads scholars to a participatory and engaged research. In effect, a commitment to the academic process in itself, rather than baseline expectations of the academy, brings scholars directly into the research space outlined in this book. They argue this through a discussion of their experiences with the Common Good First programme at the University of the Free State, but leave us with a call to action in doing so: we needn't change the foundation of our endeavour, but we must make a clear commitment to our research process. In doing so, we can alter the way in which knowledge is produced, assist in breaking the apartheids of knowledge, and move towards the realisation of a higher education sector which works directly for the betterment of society and consequently acts as a positive and effective force in bringing about social justice.

References

- Akpan, W., Minkley, G. & Thakrar, J. 2012. In search of a developmental university: Community engagement in theory and practice. *South African Review of Sociology*, 43:1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21528586.2012.694239>.
- Bernal, D.D. & Villalpando, O. 2002. An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35:169-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713845282>.
- Brandt, C. 2004. A thirst for justice in the Arid Southwest: The role of epistemology and place in higher education. *Educational Studies*, 36. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3601_8.
- Council on Higher Education. 2013. Council on Higher Education. *Higher Education Data*.
- Davies, C.J. 2016. Whose knowledge counts? Exploring cognitive justice in community-university collaborations. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Brighton.
- Department of Education. 1997. *Education White paper 3. A programme for the transformation of higher education*. Pretoria.
- Erasmus, M. 2014. The political unconscious of higher education community engagement in South Africa. In: M. Erasmus & R. Albertyn (eds). *Knowledge as enablement: Engagement between higher education and the third sector in South Africa*, 100-118. Bloemfontein: Sun Press.
- Fine, M. & Torre, M. 2008. Theorizing audience, products and provocation. In: P. Reason & H. Bradbury (eds). *The SAGE handbook of action research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fondacaro, M.R. & Weinberg, D. 2002. Concepts of social justice in community psychology: Toward a social-ecological epistemology. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30:473-492. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015803817117>.
- Fricker, M. 2007. *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online. <http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>.
- Glass, R.D. & Newman, A. 2015. Ethical and epistemic dilemmas in knowledge production: Addressing their intersection in collaborative, community-based research. *Theory and Research in Education*, 13:23-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878515571178>.
- Haas, P.M. 1990. Obtaining international environmental protection through epistemic consensus. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*. 19:347-363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298900190030401>.

- Haas, P.M. 1992. Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 46:1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300001442>.
- Hazelkorn, E. 2009. Community engagement as social innovation. In L. Weber & J. Duderstadt (eds). *The Role of the Research University in an innovation-Driven Global Society*, 63-76. London: Economica.
- Karnilowicz, W., Ali, L & Phillimore, J. 2014. Community research within a social constructionist epistemology: implications for "Scientific Rigor." *Community Development*, 45. Routledge: 353-367.<https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2014.936479>.
- Leblanc, S. & Kinsella, E.A. 2016. Toward epistemic justice: A critically reflexive examination of "sanism" and implications for knowledge generation. *Studies in Social Justice*, 10:59-78.<https://doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v10i1.1324>.
- Medina, J. 2012. Hermeneutical injustice and polyphonic contextualism: Social silences and shared hermeneutical responsibilities. *Social Epistemology: A Journal on Knowledge, Culture and Policy*, 26:201-220.
- Metz, T. 2014. Africanising institutional culture: What is possible and plausible. In S. Mathews and P. Tabensky (eds). *Being at "home": Race, institutional culture and transformation at South African higher education institutions*, 242-272. Durban: UKZN Press.
- Moore, M.L., Westley, F.R. & Nicholls, A. 2012. The social finance and social innovation nexus 1. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 3:115-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2012.725824>.
- Mulgan, G. 2006. The process of social innovation. *Innovations: technology, governance, globalization*, 1:145-162.<https://doi.org/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.2.145>.
- Newman, A. & Glass, R.D. 2015. Ethical and epistemic dilemmas in empirically-engaged philosophy of education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 34:217-228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-014-9418-3>.
- Pizarro, M. 1998. "Chicana/o Power!"1 Epistemology and methodology for social justice and empowerment in Chicana/o communities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11:57-80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236890>.
- Pol, E. & Ville, S. 2009. Social innovation : Buzz word or enduring term? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38:878-885. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soc.2009.02.011>.
- Potts, K. & Brown, L. 2005. Becoming an anti-oppressive researcher. In L. Brown & S. Strega (eds). *Research as Resistance: Critical, Indigenous, & Anti-Oppressive Approaches*, 255-286. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Sohng, S. 1996. Participatory research and community organizing. *Strategic Perspectives on Planning Practice*, 23:123-137.

Soudien, C. 2010. Some issues in affirmative action in higher education in South Africa. *The South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24:224-237.

Sugden, J. 2006. Security sector reform: The role of epistemic communities in the UK. *Journal of security sector management*, 4:1-20.

Wood, F. 2018. *Universities and the occult rituals of the corporate world: Higher education and metaphorical parallels with myth and magic*. 1st edition. New York: Routledge.