

SHARE

Handbook for Artistic Research Education

Edited by Mick Wilson
and Schelte van Ruiten

Contributors:

Henk Borgdorff

Anna Daučíková

Scott deLahunta

ELIA

James Elkins

Bojan Gorenec

Johan A Haarberg

Efva Lilja

Steven Henry Madoff

Leandro Madrazo

Nina Malterud

Ruth Mateus-Berr

Alen Ožbolt

John Rajchman

Schelte van Ruiten

Matthias Tarasiewicz

Andris Teikmanis

Johan Verbeke

Mick Wilson

General Introduction:

How to Use this Handbook

Living with contradictions is difficult, and, especially for intellectuals and artists employed in academic institutions, the inability to speak honestly and openly about contradictory consciousness can lead to a destructive desire for ‘pure’ political positions, to militant posturing and internecine battles with one another that ultimately have more to do with individual subjectivities and self-images than with disciplined collective struggle for resources and power. – George Lipsitz, 2000¹

This handbook for artistic research education is the outcome of three years of work by the SHARE network. It is a poly-vocal document, designed as a contribution to the field of artistic research education from an organisational, procedural and practical standpoint. For some, this organisational and procedural focus is anathema to artistic research; for others, this approach ‘goes (uncritically) without saying’. For most of the members of the SHARE network, attending to questions of research form and process while being primarily invested in questions of artistic practice might be read as one more of the many contradictory impulses that we must negotiate. Contradiction seems intrinsic to the role of the professional artist-educator, working to secure a position within different public institutional landscapes for the elaboration of art, pedagogy and research that is both transformative and challenging. This role involves maintaining and extending a space for a range of practices that have not been exhaustively predetermined and co-opted by the current fashions of art, intellect and policy while negotiating a language and accountancy of outcomes, outputs and metrics. Artist-educators have proposed that the creation of a research milieu within higher artistic education can potentially enact a radical openness, within the day-to-day operation of the institution, to the not-yet-known, not-yet-understood, not-yet-realised and not-yet-imagined.

1. G. Lipsitz, ‘Academic Politics and Social Change’ in Jodi Dean (ed.), *Cultural Studies and Political Theory*. (Cornell University Press, 2000). p. 80.

But, artist-educators have also expressed a concern about the difficulty of maintaining this openness and these values within regimes of increasingly reductionist academic accountability.

Inevitably, then, this is a book that is neither final nor comprehensive, but rather a provisional disclosure of the state of the art within a specific constituency at a particular moment. It does, however, seek to be serviceable to many different agendas and projects, and it attempts to do this by demonstrating the lived contradictions of what is simultaneously both an emerging and fully formed domain of research education. In another of its many paradoxes, this book is both hopefully and hopelessly instrumental. The modest claim to critical saliency this volume makes is that it seeks to disclose the contradictions and tensions that criss-cross the domain of artistic research education, while also providing intellectual and practical models that enable divergent re-negotiations, re-constructions and re-orderings. Our ambition, in presenting this book, is that, in rehearsing our contradictions, we may provide some assistance to colleagues and research students mobilising and re-negotiating their own contradictory impulses, desires, research horizons and operating contexts.

The book is divided into five parts:

- The Contexts of Artistic Research Education
- Examples and Case Studies of Artistic Research
- Values and Debates
- The Next Generation of Artistic Research Education
- Toolbox: Curriculum Resources

In turn, these parts are divided into chapters, and each chapter typically includes several sections. Within each part, chapter and section, members of the SHARE network have provided short introductions and conclusions. These connective texts serve as a way of navigating a wide variety of texts that speak in a wide variety of voices, ranging from the meta-theoretical to the bureaucratic, from the descriptive to the speculative, and ranging in tone from the pragmatic-discursive to the polemical; the book is, therefore, unashamedly heteroclit.

The book (and its structure) is relatively self-explanatory. It begins with a series of texts that map the contexts of artistic research education and identify some of the discursive and pragmatic discourses for current work. This is then followed by a set of short descriptions of doctoral-level projects in the arts and a series of positions and provocations on the question of artistic research education in general and the doctorate in

the arts in particular. The fourth part of the book is a relatively concise, but nonetheless, hopefully, helpful and challenging, speculation on future scenarios pertaining to artistic research education and the doctorate in the arts. Finally, some resources are provided as the closing contribution of the book, which may be of use in constructing a curriculum for doctoral-level education in artistic research. We present these tentatively, bearing in mind the widely contested nature of the field, while recognising the need, expressed by members of the network, for knowledge of alternative models that might function as examples rather than paradigms.

A key priority for the SHARE network has been to move arguments away from an exclusive focus on questions of first principle, in favour of the discussion of concrete examples of doctoral work and artistic practices that have an explicit engagement with ideas of research, knowledge and enquiry (e.g. What does this art practice do in this particular case? What knowledge is happening in this situation within art? What kind of knowledge work does this particular artwork or performance 'do'?). Through SHARE's workshops and expert meetings, we had access to the ways in which questions around the doctorate for artists were framed by the educators and students directly involved in third-cycle work in the arts. **The goal of SHARE was not, then, to establish a single fixed model that was intended to work for all art forms, cultural contexts, institutions and national situations but rather to map what was already happening and to share local knowledge about what has been done in different parts of the world.** What worked for some? What did not work for others? Who has been and who is now active, and where?

Finally, a note of caution to the reader on the nature of a publication that is authored in the name of a network. The viewpoints expressed throughout this book do not cohere into the SHARE network's singular account of artistic research and doctoral education for the arts. The book comprises positions that have appeared at different times within the network. They are presented not as positions to be adopted as an orthodoxy, but as positions worth attending to, if only to disagree with, qualify or otherwise amend. Part of our principle in selecting material has been to complement that which has already been given wide exposure within the debate so far. With respect to the members of the SHARE network, the perspectives expressed here may prove conducive for some, and disagreeable to others, but the editors' hope is that, for all readers of the book, they may prove a provocation to further work in building a diverse and energetic ecology of critical artistic research.

The SHARE network

SHARE is an international network, working to enhance the ‘third cycle’ of arts research and education (i.e. doctoral-level studies) in Europe. SHARE is an acronym for ‘**Step-Change for Higher Arts Research and Education**’ (a ‘step-change’ being a major jump forward, a key moment of progress). The network brings together a wide array of graduate schools, research centres, educators, supervisors, researchers and cultural practitioners, across all the arts disciplines.

Over the period 2010–2013, this network was (co)funded through the ERASMUS Lifelong Learning Programme. Jointly coordinated by the Graduate School of Creative Arts and Media (GradCAM), the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT) and the European League of Institute of the Arts (ELIA), the funding bid was comprised of 35 partners from 28 European countries.

This publications caps off this three-year period, but ELIA will continue SHARE network activities, pushing the agenda for artistic research and further developing this research community, together with global partners and collaborative networks for research within the arts.

Contents

Part One

6 The Contexts of Artistic Research Education

Chapter 1 The Third Cycle in Arts Education: A Contested Construct

Chapter 2 Organisational Strategies and Platforms for Artistic Research Education

Part Two

72 Examples and Case Studies of Artistic Research

Chapter 3 Artistic Research Projects: Some Examples

Chapter 4 Case Studies

Part Three

118 Contested Values and Critical Debates

Chapter 5 Interventions: Position Papers and Dialogues

Chapter 6 Advocacy Strategies

Chapter 7 Judgments: The Questions of Quality and Evaluation

Part Four

238 The Next Generation of Artistic Research Education

Chapter 8 Networking and Communities of Practice

Chapter 9 Think about the Future

Part Five

272 Toolbox: Curriculum Resources

Chapter 10 Questions of Methods

Chapter 11 What is a Discipline?

Chapter 12 Art as a Context for Research

Detailed contents

Part One

The Contexts of Artistic Research Education

8	Chapter 1	<u>The Third Cycle in Arts Education: A Contested Construct</u>
10	1	A. 'Six Cultures of the PhD' (James Elkins)
15	1	B. The Development of the Third-Cycle Debate
23	1	C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate
34	Chapter 2	<u>Organisational Strategies and Platforms for Artistic Research Education</u>
35	2	A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'
49	2	B. National Platforms
54	2	C. The Summer School as Instrument and Situation
60	2	D. 'Supervisors' Support – Some Specific Challenges' (Nina Malterud)
65	2	E. 'Developing Third-Cycle Artistic Research Education' (Anna Daučíková)

Part Two

Examples and Case Studies of Artistic Research

74	Chapter 3	<u>Artistic Research Projects: Some Examples</u>
76	3	A. Trygve Allister Diesen, Being the Director – Maintaining Your Vision While Swimming with Sharks.
78	3	B. Ana Hoffner, Queer Memory – Historicity, Neglect and the Embodiment of Trauma
80	3	C. Fredrik Nyberg, What is the Sound of the Poem? Becoming Firewood II
82	3	D. Katie Gaudion, Design and Autism
84	3	E. Lars Wallsten, Notes on Traces: Photography, Evidence, Image
86	3	F. Simon Dennehy, Perch/RAY School Furniture Design
88	3	G. Georgina Jackson, The Exhibition and the Political
91	3	H. Jo De Baerdemaeker, Mongolian Script: From Metal Type to Digital Font
94	3	I. Textiles Environment Design (TED), The TEN: A Tool for Narrative Prototypes
97	3	J. Bertha Bermudez, Labo21- Emio Greco and Pieter C.Scholten's Pre-choreographic Elements
100	3	K. [MusicExperiment21], Experimentation versus Interpretation: Exploring New Paths in Music Performance in the 21st Century

104 Chapter 4 Case Studies

- 106** 4 A. Valetta, Malta, June 2012
110 4 B. Budapest, Hungary, June 2012
111 4 C. Lisbon, Portugal, July 2012
114 4 D. Vienna, Austria, March, 2013

Part Three

Contested Values and Critical Debates**121** Chapter 5 Interventions: Position Papers and Dialogues

- 122** 5 A. The Basic Questions: ‘Why artistic research?’ and ‘Why the doctorate?’
123 5. A. 1 ‘The Intrinsic Value of Artistic Research’ (Johan Verbeke)
125 5. A. 2 ‘London SHARE Conference: A Critical Response’ (John Rajchman)
132 5. A. 3 ‘Knowledge-Making in the Age of Abstraction’ (Steven Henry Madoff)
140 5. A. 4 ‘Notes From a Debate in Ljubljana’ (Bojan Gorenec and Alen Ožbolt)
146 5 B. To Define or to Demur
146 5. B. 1 ‘A Brief Survey of Current Debates on the Concepts and Practices of Research in the Arts’ (Henk Borgdorff)
152 5. B. 2 ‘Habits within Arts- and Design-Based Research’ (Ruth Mateus-Berr)
162 5. B. 3 ‘Typologies of Research’ (Andris Teikmanis)
169 5 C. Some Discipline Perspectives
170 5. C. 1 ‘Publishing Choreographic Ideas: Discourse from Practice’ (Scott deLahunta)
178 5. C. 2 ‘The Opening of the Mouth’ (Efva Lilja)
187 5. C. 3 ‘Artistic Technology Research’ (Matthias Tarasiewicz)
193 5. C. 4 ‘Knowledge, Representation, Architecture’ (Leandro Madrazo)
203 5. C. 5 ‘Discipline Problems and the Ethos of Research’ (Mick Wilson)

218 Chapter 6 Advocacy Strategies

- 218** 6 A. Analysing the Broad Advocacy Challenges
223 6 B. Advocacy: Of what? By whom? To whom?

228 Chapter 7 Judgments: The Questions of Quality and Evaluation

- 230** 7 A. Research Assessment and Qualification Frameworks (Henk Borgdorff and Johan A Haarberg)

Part Four

The Next Generation of Artistic Research Education

240 Chapter 8 Networking and Communities of Practice**243** 8 A. Longer-Term Networks**252** 8 B. Project-Specific Networks**262** Chapter 9 Think about the Future**266** 9 A. Some Responses**269** 9 B. Some Scenarios

Part Five

Toolbox: Curriculum Resources

274 Chapter 10 Questions of Methods**275** 10 A. Pedagogical Model for Method Disclosure**281** 10 B. Rhetorics of Method**290** 10 C. Serendipity and the Happy Accidentalist**292** Chapter 11 What is a Discipline?**293** 11 A. Who can ask ‘What is a discipline?’**301** 11 B. Reproductions**313** 11 C. Disciplinarity, Complexity and Knowledge Management**320** Chapter 12 Art as a Context for Research**328** Appendix Bibliography**334** Biographies**342** The European League of Institutes of the Arts**346** The SHARE network 2010-2013



Part One

The Contexts of Artistic Research Education

The opening part of this book consists of two chapters. The first of these attempts to outline the multiple genealogies and contexts of artistic research education in a way that seeks (I) to understand why the notion of artistic research is contested and (II) to identify some of the different factors underpinning the energetic contest of meanings and values which characterises contemporary artistic research education. The second chapter turns to the organisational bases of contemporary research education in the arts. In doing so, it deliberately juxtaposes the contested genealogy of artistic research, given in the preceding chapter, with a discussion of some of the practical strategies already prevalent in doctoral education in the arts. This is done in a bid to renegotiate the arguments from first principles ('Is research through art practice possible?'), paving the way for a consideration of actually existing practices and organisational strategies. In summary form, the proposal is that the debate on artistic research should be pursued, in substantial part, through attending to actually existing practices and production. This can best be done by attending to the forms and contents of already operative doctoral educations in the arts, and not predominantly through exchanges of meta-theoretical propositions on the nature of art or research by commentators.

1

The Third Cycle in Arts Education: A Contested Construct

The applicability of doctoral study to different artistic practices is one of the key areas of debate and practical experimentation in contemporary arts education. This debate has a long history, arguably going back to the 1960s and earlier. However, in the past two decades, there has been an intensification of these debates and a wide expansion in the variety of third-cycle – doctoral-level – platforms available to artists in different disciplines and domains, including performing arts, film and audio-visual media and contemporary fine art. This may be seen as consistent with the broader pattern of *massification* in doctoral education during the last decade, which has entailed a very large expansion of the number of students pursuing doctoral-level studies across most disciplines, akin to the earlier massification of bachelor-level studies in Europe in the 1970s and 1980s. At this point, three basic observations need to be made:

- The wider debates on artistic research have most often taken an abstracted epistemological (“What does knowing mean in art?”) and/or ontological (“What is knowledge?” “What is art?”) and/or politico-critical form (“What is valorised in artistic research?” “What form of labour is being proposed?”);
- In practical terms, the doctoral level of studies provides a fundamental site of contestation in relation to the nature of research within artistic practices and the nature of institutional arrangements appropriate to the research cultures of different arts practices;²

- A variety of doctoral-level educations already exist, catering to artists employing a wide range of models, practices and organisational modes. Within these programmes, there is an accumulated experience that has been under-represented in the wider debates.

This first chapter of this handbook seeks to provide a broad overview of this context. It seeks to establish the contours of these debates, as a prelude to later sections that give specific examples of, and describe tools for developing, doctoral-level studies for artists and for the arts.

This chapter begins with a specially invited contribution by Prof. James Elkins, who has been conducting a global mapping of the doctorate for studio artists. This text presents a concise summary of one arena – contemporary fine art. The importance of this survey is that it establishes the global currency of the debate and points to divergences that will become apparent in other arts disciplines. This is followed by a description of the development of the third-cycle debate in the arts that further complicates Elkins's typology. The chapter concludes with a short genealogy of the wider debate on artistic research, which establishes that the impetus for developing a research culture within the arts is not solely a consequence of educational policy and institutional change. The chapter is thus divided into three sections:

1. A. 'Six Cultures of the PhD' (James Elkins)
1. B. The Development of the Third-Cycle Debate
1. C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate

1. If one considers a relatively recent discipline, such as computer science, which emerges in the orbits of mathematics, engineering and related disciplines, one does not find the same level of abstracted debate in terms of the specificity of the knowledge/practice of computer programming, systems development, theoretical work on computability, etc. The development of a research culture has proceeded from some other basis than the epistemological ('What does knowing mean in computer programming?') or ontological ('What is computer science?'). These questions have been raised, of course, and rightly so; however, there is no sense in which they have been given an overarching significance so as to constitute the framework of debate and the basis on which to launch a research culture.

2. The term 'fundamentally contested' is used here by way of indicating the presence of some who question the viability of research and/or doctoral-level studies through arts practices, and others, who while accepting artistic research as a potentiality of artistic practice, wish to place artistic research largely outside the institutional arrangements of higher education. SHARE was constituted as a project by those who broadly endorsed, and indeed embraced, the potentials of artistic research and the critical potential of higher arts education as providing one milieu (among others) for the exploration of these potentials. However, SHARE also critically revisits these questions of foundation from the premise that there is already an accumulation of practical experience which allows the discussion to attend to the abstractions of epistemic systems and to the polemical rhetorics of observers, as well as to the concrete experience and achievement of specific researchers, research groups and research platforms.

1. A. ‘Six Cultures of the PhD’ (James Elkins)

Approximately 280 institutions around the world offer the arts-based PhD. The administrative structures of the institutions that grant research degrees in visual art vary widely in different parts of the world, and the names of the degrees they offer also differ (DCA, DPhil, PhD, DFA). These institutions have special strengths and weaknesses, differences in assessment, funding, levels of international students and, of course, faculty and staff. All these parameters can make it seem as though the studio-art PhD is widely different from one institution to the next. But that may obscure a deeper question: Aside from these many differences, is the PhD for artists fundamentally the same worldwide? Is it developing as part of a single conversation? Does it share a set of common concerns, a bibliography, a history? Or does the PhD have different cultures, styles, concepts and purposes in different parts of the world?

Each institution offering the PhD has its own administrative literature; there are now at least 15 books on the subject and in the order of 300 to 400 articles, alongside an indeterminate number of blogs and listservs. Viewed in retrospect, 2011 stands out as the first year in which it became impossible for any single person to read all the literature on the PhD. The fact that the literature is no longer available to any researcher means that the studio-art PhD is no longer a single subject. In addition, no one has visited more than a fraction of the 280 institutions, and as a result, there is no way of being sure about whether the studio-art PhD is a coherent phenomenon worldwide. In the past few years, I have been travelling widely, collecting information on studio-art PhDs around the world; in 2013, I visited China, Ghana, Japan, Portugal, Singapore (where a PhD is being planned), South Africa and Uganda. In this essay, I want to risk some generalisations and simplifications, to propose that divergent PhD cultures exist around the world. I'd also like to suggest that these sometimes subtle and elusive differences are important, and that, as conversations become more global, we need to be careful not to inadvertently homogenise different practices.

In the most provisional manner, let me outline six cultures of the PhD.

The Continental Model

The Continental Model is found in continental Europe, especially Scandinavia, along with some institutions in the UK, Central and South America and Southeast Asia. North-western Europe, if I can use such an expression, is where most of the publishing about PhDs is taking place. It is also the centre of a certain type of research. In literature like Henk Slager's *The Pleasure of Research*, the concept of

1. A. 'Six Cultures of the PhD' (James Elkins)

research is aligned with a post-structuralist critique of institutions; it becomes partly a matter of mobile, oppositional spaces and of intellectual freedom. Research is less the institutionalised, science-based practice of hypothesis, deduction, experimentation and falsification and more a set of strategies for reconceptualising art in relation to existing academic structures. (Exceptions include design academies and art universities, because design has its own tradition of PhDs, and its own more quantitative sense of research based on the social sciences.)

The Nordic Model

The Nordic Model emphasises what Henk Borgdorff calls a '*sui generis perspective*'; it stresses 'artistic values when it comes to assessing research in the arts'.³ Programmes in Norway and Sweden follow this model, which is based on the idea that what counts as 'research' in the arts should proceed according to the properties of visual art; in that sense, this engages Christopher Frayling's original concept of 'research for art', which he described as being not about 'communicable knowledge in the sense of verbal communication, but in the sense of visual or iconic or imagistic communication'.

The UK Model

The UK Model is practised in the UK, Australia, South Africa, Uganda, Canada and other Anglophone centres including Malaysia and Singapore. There are many overlaps with the Continental Model, but there are also significant differences. The UK was one of two places in the world (along with Japan) to develop the studio-art PhD in the 1970s. The UK Model involves sizable bureaucratic and administrative oversight, sometimes including elaborate structures for the specification, assessment and quantification of learning outcomes. It remains closer to the scientific model of research than the Continental Model. Because of Herbert Read and Christopher Frayling, the UK is also the origin of the discussions about how research might be conducted 'in', 'for', 'as' and 'through' art. (These terms are all discussed in the book *What Do Artists Know?*, co-edited with Frances Whitehead.⁴)

3. See: chapter 5.B.1 of this book: 'A Brief Survey of Current Debates on the Concepts and Practices of Research in the Arts', Henk Borgdorff, 2013.

4. James Elkins and Frances Whitehead (eds.), *What Do Artists Know?* (Penn State University Press, 2012).

The Japanese Model

One of the main surprises of this research was the discovery that, by 2010, Japan had 26 universities granting the PhD. Few European and North American scholars are aware that, in terms of the length of their tradition and their independence (if not in terms of international influence or number of students), Japan and the UK are the co-founders of the studio-art PhD. As a corrective to the more familiar North Atlantic conversations, here is a list of all the Japanese PhD programmes:

- University of Tsukuba
- Joshi University of Art and Design
- Tama Art University
- Nihon University College of Art
- Tokyo Polytechnic University
- Musashino Art University
- Tokyo Kasei University Graduate School
- Bunka Gakuen University
- Bunsei University of Art
- Sojo University
- Kyusyu University
- Kyusyu Sangyo University
- Kyoto City University of Arts
- Kyoto University of Art and Design
- Kyoto Seika University
- Osaka University of Arts Graduate School
- Kobe Design University
- Takarazuka University
- Kurashiki University of Science and the Arts
- Hisorhima City University
- University of East Asia
- Nagaoka Institute of Design
- Kanazawa Bijutsu Kogei Daigaku
- Tohoku Institute of Technology
- Tohoku University of Art and Design
- Aichi Prefectural University of Fine Arts and Music

Most Japanese institutions take their cues from Tokyo University of the Arts, but no history of Japanese academic institutions exists. Japanese dissertations are based on studies of natural, technological, scientific and artistic precedents that are then applied to the students' practices. In this sense, the Japanese system is not yet participating in the debates about research 'in', 'for', 'as' and 'through' art.

1. A. 'Six Cultures of the PhD' (James Elkins)

The Chinese Model

China has a much shorter, more modest, tradition of PhDs. There are only three PhD-granting programmes: Central Academy of Art (CAFA); Beijing China Academy of Arts (CAA), Hangzhou; and Tsinghua University (THU), Beijing. Part of the reason for the PhD not expanding is administrative; the degree is awarded under an administrative research heading, which does not exist in academies such as Chongqing and Nanjing. This means that a change will be required at the Department of Education in order for other academies to offer the degree.

If this goes ahead, it will be interesting to see which models China will use for its studio-art PhD. Because the degree began in a university (Tsinghua), it was based on the concept of the university PhD in general rather than international studio-art programmes. In spring 2013, delegations from CAFA and CAA toured Europe and North America, gathering information, presumably as a prelude to Chinese institutions choosing the collaborative partners they prefer.

The Lack of a North American Model

Rather than a model, this last entry represents a lack, because there is no consensus in North America about how the PhD should look.

There are currently seven institutions in the US that grant the PhD:

- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York
- University of California San Diego, California
- Institute for Doctoral Studies in the Visual Arts (IDSVA)
- Santa Cruz, California, Center for Film and Digital Media
- University of California Davis: Performance Studies
- University of Washington, DXArts
- Texas Tech, Lubbock

Canada has five programmes:

- York University, Toronto
- University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario
- Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM): doctorat en études et pratiques des arts
- Concordia, Montréal: the Art Department doesn't have a PhD, but there are three 'research creation' PhDs
- University of Calgary: one student completed (2009)

Of the seven US programmes, several have distinct flavours. IDSVA has no rivals for what it does; it has a fixed curriculum of theoretical and philosophical texts that are intended to inform any artist's practice. Because the director, George Smith, has a background in

literary criticism, the IDSVA has had a roster of prominent guest lecturers from beyond the visual art world. Santa Cruz has a strong programme in North American-style visual studies, which also involves gender theory, postcolonial studies and anthropology. Rensselaer Polytechnic is one of the US's leading technical universities (alongside Georgia Tech Institute), and the nearby State University of New York at Albany houses one of the world's largest nanotechnology laboratories; this means that students at Rensselaer receive a unique combination of political theory, activism and science. The University of California San Diego is the base of Helen Mayer and Newton Harrison, who have been actively engaged in developing a new, environmentally focused PhD. Because of the unique cultural configuration in Canada, there is little communication between the Francophone and Anglophone institutions, to the point at which Canadian correspondents have been surprised to discover the existence of other institutions that already grant, or are contemplating, the PhD.

North America is the least formed of the PhD 'cultures' around the world. That is also my source of interest in this subject; I am sceptical about a number of the concepts and administrative structures in existing institutions, so I think that North America has an opportunity to rethink the fundamental conditions of the PhD. In some other parts of the world, particular administrative structures and particular understandings of terms such as 'research' and 'knowledge' have become naturalised and therefore inaccessible to foundational critique.

By Way of Conclusion

One effect of the proliferation of PhD-granting institutions and the literature is that many institutions are proposing changes that have already been implemented in other places. Another consequence is that younger traditions, like China's, are susceptible to influence by the more developed traditions, the latter of which take on the appearance of international norms. It can be very tempting, for example, to ask whether a dissertation at Tokyo Geidai might be made more reflective by engaging with Christopher Frayling's idea of 'research through art'; but that would risk overwriting the less theorised Japanese sense of what a dissertation might do for a student's work.

I hope that, as SHARE expands, it can make the field more interesting by highlighting similarities and differences and allowing regional

1. A. 'Six Cultures of the PhD' (James Elkins)

and national practices to develop their autonomy. The alternative would be the spread of one of the predominant models of the PhD. A way to guard against this is to increase awareness that words like 'research', 'assessment' and 'knowledge' are not unproblematic or universal but bound to particular cultural and historical settings.

1. B. The Development of the Debate

Introduction

Over the past decade, there has been a lot of debate on the question of the doctorate across all disciplines. This attention to research education is partly a consequence of the Bologna Process of coordinating higher education across Europe and due to the significance attached to 'knowledge production', intellectual property', 'cognitive capital' and a skilled work force in economic planning and development policy.⁵ It is also partly to do with 'human capital formation' being the key policy framework within which education is typically conceptualised by governments – an emerging global norm heavily influenced by the role of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the increasing hegemony of neoliberalism.⁶

All this attention being paid to doctoral education, particularly within the dominant rhetoric of human capital formation, has given rise to a range of debates and issues.⁷ Among these are:

- the employability of doctoral graduates and career pathways for researchers;
- the economic and social relevance of the research being undertaken by graduate students;

5. This interpretation of the impetus towards the development of artistic research and doctoral studies in the arts needs to be balanced by considering the internal dynamics of different arts fields. See Section C. Terms such as 'knowledge production' and 'cognitive capital' are cited here without necessarily endorsing the conceptual frameworks that have mobilised these terms. It is simply a matter of noting different ways of naming and interpreting the changing dynamics of research in terms of broader socio-cultural and political-economic analyses.

6. Human capital theory comes from the Chicago School of Economics and has become a dominant way of thinking about education planning and policy because of the adoption of these ideas by bodies such as the OECD. Human capital theory places the emphasis on the generation, through education, of people who can add value to the economy by virtue of their ability to generate new knowledge, apply that knowledge in new ways, and so forth. It is a controversial model – even though it is the dominant policy language. Part of the controversy lies in the way in which education within human capital models becomes an instrument of economic wealth formation; and emphasises individual life projects (career building) rather than social, communal or citizenry based life projects (society building, public good, social justice, equity, inclusion, cohesion etc.)

7. See for example the European University Association's work in this area: <http://www.eua.be/cde/Home.aspx>

- the role of doctoral education in promoting a combination of disciplinary expertise, interdisciplinary aptitude, generalisable skills, and the much contested construct of ‘flexibility’;
- the appropriate relationship between doctoral-level research work and the teaching and learning done at Master and Bachelor levels;
- the commercialisation of research and the ability of doctoral researchers to recognise potential applications and knowledge transfer opportunities;
- the building of team-working competence and collaborative practices in research and education;
- the capacity to work with and develop new technologies;
- the impact of doctoral-level study on international mobility and second language competence;

Within perspectives that self-consciously critique the dominant human capital formation model, the kinds of issues that arise are:

- the necessity of space for critical intellectual work that questions the dominant systems of value construction;
- the ‘flexibilisation’ and ‘casualisation’ of knowledge work both within the private and public sector (including such themes as: loss of job security; the ‘precaritisation’ of intellectual and cultural labour; expansion of workloads/working hours; loss of status by researchers and academics in management of education and research under ‘new public management’ models);
- the public good served by advanced education and research;
- the reduction of education to the simplified model of training for employment;
- the transfer of public wealth into private ownership (including such themes as: the state meeting the costs of corporate training through public monies; the privatisation of shared social knowledges and of cultural and biological heritages);
- technological change and questions of sustainability beyond the projection of ‘permanent’ growth;
- the role of educated elites in broader society and the political culture engendered by bureaucratised systems of ‘expertise’ construction.

1. B. 1. **Platforms of the Debate**

In turn, these discussions have provided the backdrop for specific debates on doctoral-level research within the arts. There are many platforms for these debates, ranging from the internal dialogues of teaching teams within higher education institutions to the discussions by higher education authorities and ministries of education in different countries. These platforms also include the

1. B. The Development of the Debate

production of specific argumentation within individual doctoral projects and the very different style of argumentation that emerges in broader debates on international policy forums (e.g. European Commission, OECD).

There has also been a significant level of debate within the creative arts outside the academies. An important example of this has been the series of debates that played out in the pages of *e-flux* journal, in which both the general terms of the Bologna Process and the particular question of the doctorate in the arts were intensely critiqued.⁸ Mapping the debate within both the academy and the wider frame of the art world(s), Prof. Chris Wainwright at University of the Arts London has established an initiative to catalogue the conferences and publications that have provided a platform for the development of the artistic research and doctorate debate. Networks such as the European Artistic Research Network (EARN), European Forum for Research Degrees in Art & Design (EUFRAD), docARTES,⁹ the Association Européenne des Conservatoires (AEC) (especially the Polifonia Third Cycle Working Group),¹⁰ Doctoral Curriculum in Musical Arts (DoCuMa)¹¹ and the Society for Artistic Research (SAR) have all been important enablers of the debate. In the UK, the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) has also been an important contributor to the debate with publications such as the 2007 *AHRC Research Review: Practice-Led Research in Art, Design and Architecture*¹² and the 2008 *Report on the 'state of play' in practice-led research in Art, Design and Architecture* (an AHRC/ Council for Higher Education in Art and Design (CHEAD) joint initiative).¹³ At the same time, journals such as *Art & Research, the Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)*, *maHKUzine*¹⁴ and *ARTMonitor* have opened out the debate in a number of different directions.

8. See www.e-flux.com/journal

9. The docARTES programme is run at Orpheus Institute in Ghent, together with Flemish and Dutch partner institutes since January 2004. See <http://www.docartes.be>

10. <http://www.polifonia-tn.org/Content.aspx?id=179>

11. Eight major higher education institutions in three European countries, together forming the DoCuMa alliance, this group of institutions developed the first joint European doctoral curriculum in musical arts, see: <http://www.orpheusinstituut.be/documa/en/home>.

12. C. Rust et al., *AHRC Research Review Practice-Led Research in Art, Design and Architecture*, 2007. http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0018/43065/Practice-Led_Review_Nov07.pdf

13. For the executive summary, see: http://artsresearch.brighton.ac.uk/links/practice-led/Practice-led-Research_2008.pdf

14. From the summer of 2006 onwards, the Utrecht Graduate School of Visual Art and Design (MaHKU) has published the biannual MaHKUzine, Journal of Artistic Research, see: http://www.mahku.nl/activities/publications_index.html

The debate on the doctorate in the creative arts may sometimes appear to be permanently caught up in an argument about basic legitimacy. The question ‘Can or should a doctoral research process be applied to the creative arts?’ has surfaced repeatedly. This discussion slowly began to appear in the second half of the 20th century, and it intensified to become especially prominent in the first decade of the 21st century. Some countries and disciplines now have almost two decades of experience of doctoral-level study through arts practices, and some countries and disciplines are only now having debates about whether there is a need or a desire to develop the third-cycle award. This means that the discussion has often returned to such first principles as: ‘What is a doctorate in the arts?’ ‘Can there be such a thing?’ ‘What does research mean in the arts?’ ‘Should it be “taught” within an academic institution?’ ‘How is “art” different from “science”?’ In addition to this, the debate has also been shaped by concrete experience as countries such as Australia, Belgium, England, Finland, Hungary, Portugal, Scotland and Spain have implemented (widely different) models for doctoral-level studies across such disciplines as Architecture, Contemporary Art, Dance, Design, Music and Theatre, leading to the development of new questions in the debate.

As indicated above, the discussion has proceeded along two broad lines. On the one hand, it has been built upon questions of first principle, and, on the other, it has been built upon practical and concrete experience. With reference to questions of first principle and epistemology, the treatment of these can tend to operate with highly problematic ahistorical constructions of ‘art’ and ‘the aesthetic’, whereas, with actually existing projects and programmes, the approach becomes both more anecdotal and more empirical. In a sense, the question of ‘What is a doctorate in the arts?’ has moved from being theoretical to practical as the debate has been enriched through the development of practical experiments in doctoral education for artists that provide a counterpoint to more abstract debates.

1. B. 2. **Ideological Stakes of the Debate**

As the debate on the doctoral level of studies for the arts has intensified over the past decade, there has been a move towards identifying the ideological stakes of the discussion so as to question the broader changes taking place in educational policy and practice. A recurring theme in such debates has been the impact of ideological and economic arguments about the nature and function of higher

1. B. The Development of the Debate

education. Ideological approaches to education are perceived as having a dual impact/effect. On the one hand, higher arts education has been subject to a wide range of interventions such as: institutional mergers; new and revised university laws; the introduction of new public management models; new financing models, including student loan systems; performance metrics and the re-calibration of education as content delivery and service provision. On the other hand, state subsidies for the arts have diminished; proxy markets have been created, advocating competitive, market-like behaviours for cultural 'providers'; private sector organisational models have been implemented as normative; and cultural policy rhetoric has been colonised with terms such as 'cultural industries', 'creative economy', 'creativity', 'clients' and 'prosumers'.

At times, it appears that older claims for the liberating effects of art, education and creativity have been co-opted into a discourse of inescapable economic necessity: creativity is good, it liberates and capitalises individual entrepreneurial agency and engenders greater autonomy. However, these newer rhetorics of the creative economy must be contrasted with the historical traditions that preceded them. In some European countries, the idea of 'autonomous' art has been a foundational principle for both arts education and state support. The theme of autonomy is a complex one, linking the terms of Kantian and post-Kantian aesthetics with the broader themes of liberalism and individualism. Different institutional arrangements have historically been elaborated to manage the proposition of autonomous art. This has given rise to highly specific models of educational practice, ranging from the sovereign-like independence of the professoriate to the radically regimented, time-intensive practices of virtuoso training. It is clear that the 'autonomous art' paradigm has historically served (implicitly and explicitly instrumentalised by) state and commercial interests in contradictory ways. In those European states that emerged from the collapsing Soviet empire after 1989, different traditions have been at play. In former times, the artistic role often carried within it great social and institutional prestige, whether as advocate or critic of the regime. The social and political salience of the artistic role has been radically undermined in the new arrangements for state support of culture. These different circumstances serve to indicate that the neoliberal conception of education and culture has not been installed in a completely uniform and equivalent manner across the different traditions of arts education and state policies within Europe. Nonetheless, certain commonalities can be discerned, not least the

tendency to subsume art and education under an economic evaluative logic, advocating return-on-investment and market-like competition for resources in the public sector.

The ways in which these sea changes in state approaches to higher education and culture interact creates a further level of complexity. The overall impact of the resourcing and leadership of public education and culture requires a move from any simple 'us' (the good guys – the artists) and 'them' (the bad guys – the bureaucrats) conflict towards recognition of a more complicated world of multiple and co-existing professional identities and contexts. As artists (which, for the purpose of this discussion, includes dancers, actors, writers, film-makers, animators, designers, visual artists, architects, composers, musicians and curators) and as professional educators, often funded by public monies through the state, the sector is already working within systems of power, knowledge, competition and politics that make such simple 'us and them' rhetoric too simple to capture the complexities of our working lives in cultural practice and education. As Tom Holert has argued:

The problem is, once you enter the academic power-knowledge system of accountability checks and evaluative supervision, you have either explicitly or implicitly accepted the parameters of this system. Though acceptance does not necessarily imply submission or surrender to these parameters, a fundamental acknowledgment of the ideological principles inscribed in them remains a prerequisite for any form of access, even if one copes with them, contests them, negotiates them, and revises them. Admittedly, it is somewhat contradictory to claim a critical stance with regard to the transformation of art education through an artistic research paradigm while simultaneously operating at the heart of that same system.¹⁵

The picture presented by Holert must be further complicated by recognising that the academic power-knowledge systems being reconstructed in contemporary Europe are founded upon the contradictory moments of their historical formation. It is helpful to recall that there is no single history of 'the university'. It is also important to note that reception of the new managerialist and neoliberal frameworks is mediated by different local and national histories, so that a Swedish academy or a Hungarian academy, for

15. <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/view/40>

1. B. The Development of the Debate

example, experience these changes in very different ways – one through the partial demise of social democracy and the other through the emphatic rise of ethnic nationalism.

The reordering of higher arts education has multiple conjunctions folded into it – the development of the doctoral level is but one of these – and, as such, it touches upon both the emancipatory and instrumentalising tendencies within the contemporary state's approaches to contemporary art and education. The question, for arts educators and researchers, then becomes: 'How do we work with these contradictions rather than pretend that we are completely free of them?' This is difficult, especially if these contradictions are to be kept 'live' and actively avowed in our dialogue. Indeed, it would seem important to acknowledge that there is a considerable emotional charge to the debates about the doctoral level of studies in the creative arts. This should not be seen as a weakness within the debate, but rather an indication of the importance of the issues at play. The Belgian critic, Dieter Lesage, captures this sense of passion when he writes:

At art academies in many of the forty-six European countries participating today in the Bologna Process, the doctorate in the arts has become the subject of heated discussions. First of all, there is the existential question many people ask: Why should there be a doctorate in the arts, rather than nothing? Weren't we happy without it? It is no secret that many people see neither the socio-economic necessity nor the artistic relevance of a doctorate in the arts. There is fierce opposition to it from people within higher arts education, universities, and the arts field – at least in so far as it still makes sense to draw a clear-cut distinction between higher arts education, universities, and the arts. [...] voices are heard opposing the doctorate in the arts. Against these voices – whether coming from the grumpy old folks who prefer to continue to live in a world that no longer exists and cling to the character of institutions as they once knew them, or from the jumpy young ones who already live in a world yet to come and fly at the character of institutions which they believe they know are no longer useful – I would like to fiercely defend the doctorate in the arts.¹⁶

Whether one is for or against, or whether one is unsure what to think, it is clear that, in some way, the discussion of the doctoral level of

studies in the creative arts touches upon key issues facing us in arts education more generally, within the academy and the university, and within the world of arts practice beyond the academy.

Clearly, those of us who worked for the past three years within SHARE – a network that investigates the future of the doctoral level of studies in the creative arts in Europe – are more likely to consider doctoral-level studies as desirable. But we also want to maintain our right to contradiction, our right to go back to these fundamental questions: ‘Is it appropriate/legitimate to elaborate a conception of research and research education within the arts?’ ‘What should, could or will the doctorate level of studies be used for?’ ‘Who will it serve?’ ‘What interests will it represent?’ ‘How should it connect with a world of culture that is not institutionalised in the art academies and universities but which lives and thrives in other institutional and non-institutional contexts?’ ‘What kind of cultural workers and practices are we trying to facilitate?’

1. B. 3. **Terms of the Debate**

When we turn to the specific content of the debate on the third cycle or doctoral format in higher arts education, we see that there have been common themes over the past two decades. These themes move across many registers – from practical questions at the core institutional arrangements to speculative questions on the future of the discipline. The latter category includes reference to: the role of writing, of artefacts, of performance and of original cultural works within doctoral research; the relationship of doctoral works to the mainstream art world and professional practice outside the academy; the impact of the doctoral level on the future autonomy of art academies, architecture schools, conservatories and specialist arts institutions; the colonisation of creative practices by the explanatory or discursive priorities of the humanities and/or social sciences and/or natural sciences; the open or closed nature of learning outcomes in specifying educational attainment; the epistemic particularity of the arts, variously as forms of ‘not-knowing’ or knowing ‘otherwise’ or as another knowledge type alongside the broad spectrum of knowledges typically referred to under the humanities and the sciences; the impact of the doctorate on qualification requirements for teaching. There has also been a specific discussion around the general reform processes driving educational change and whether these will undermine the resource needs and specialist environments required by the arts. It seems likely that we will continue to encounter these debates in our work. This has provided the stimulus

1. B. The Development of the Debate

for practical experimentation and concrete intervention, and the discussion needs to attend closely to specific examples of work by artist-researchers and educators, not just to abstracted debates on epistemology or policy. Before attempting an examination of specific cases, it will help to provide an overview of the wider debates.

As seen above, the debate on the doctorate in the creative arts has been framed within larger debates on the doctorate. There is also a specificity regarding the question of artistic research as it has emerged within the practices of the arts and not simply within the institutional logic of educational policies, universities and academies.

1. C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate

Introduction

As mentioned at the outset, the question of research by artists has been prominent in international academic debate and within certain areas of the mainstream art system. It has become especially intense during the 2000s, a development often attributed to the effects of the Bologna Process on debate within arts education in Europe in general. However, this should not be accepted at face value, as an engagement with the doctoral debate was a relatively late development within the Bologna Process. It would seem more appropriate to regard the question of artistic research as emerging from several strands of development, and from different aspects of the various artistic disciplines (including audio-visual media, design, film, fine art, literature, music, and so forth). So, for example, within the visual arts, the emergence of conceptualism in the 1960s had a decisive impact, making the question of art as a form of cognitive activity central to practices within both certain art academies and different institutional sites of the international art world. Indicative of this development are initiatives such as Experiments in Art and Technology (EAT, 1965–1981) and the Artist Placement Group (APG, 1966–1979).

Other developments, in ethnomusicology for example, contributed to a debate on performance practice as a research action, again bringing together the consideration of artistic practices, research and the generation of new knowledge. A key area of enquiry here was the topic of improvisation, the study of which requires performance as an integral activity within the research process, and so the turn to improvisation engendered a context in which the role of the performer-researcher emerged very clearly.

Within literature, the emergence of the novel in the 17th and 18th centuries, and the rise of various realisms and naturalisms in the 19th century, generated a very different context for addressing writing as a form of knowledge practice. This was complemented by the question of historical writing and the recognition that the greatest historical scholarship had often produced historical knowledge as a work of literature. In the 20th century, the emergence of the study of literature as a separate university discipline, and the co-evolution of new critical and theoretical paradigms (such as Russian 'Formalism', Anglophone 'New Criticism', Francophone 'Écriture Feminine' and Postcolonial 'Subaltern Studies'), further complicated the ways in which the writing of literature and the conduct of research were differentiated.

In theatre, the engagement with anthropology and concepts such as liminality in the 1960s and 1970s had a decisive effect in generating a context in which artistic practice and a concrete and widely shared research problem became intertwined. Within the field of film practice, both the increased emphasis on psychoanalytic models in criticism and theory in the 1960s and 1970s and the emergence of various politicised documentary practices contributed to a renewal of film as a self-conscious knowledge-making practice. The salient point here is that different arts disciplines have given rise to research agendas and desires for art-as-research and art-making-as-an-act-of-enquiry. We should not, therefore, assume that the research cultures these disciplines have developed are undifferentiated. At the same time, we should not suppose that they require radical separation. It is in the nature of research activities (as with artistic practices in general) that the close encounter and exchange with other knowledge traditions provides openings for mutual enrichment.

The general rise in the 1970s and 1980s of what was termed 'theory', as a key dimension of cultural practices, must also be seen as contributory stream into the development of a debate on the role of artists and artworks in the making of knowledge about how the world is constituted, encountered, experienced, imagined or known. Although theory did not rise to prominence uniformly across the visual and performing arts and it manifested itself in various ways in different national contexts, the conceptual aspect of the artwork within the education of arts practitioners was often unhooked from traditional notions of authorship and authorial intention. It is notable, therefore, that, in an exploration of artistic research at

1. C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate

DOCUMENTA⁽¹³⁾ in 2012, Chus Martinez framed the debate with reference not primarily to the knowledge ambition or research project of the artist (a theme prominent in the doctorate debate) but rather to the knowledge content or knowing of the work of art itself.

These summary remarks on the emergence of the artistic research debate indicate that this genealogy needs to be considered not simply as a uniform development within the arts. It is also clear that we have strong grounds for not limiting the artistic research debate to its determination by institutional and policy imperatives emerging from governmental educational and cultural planning discourses. This serves to underline the importance of linking the academy/university to other sites beyond itself in the construction of an artistic research culture, recognising the academy as one locus rather than the exclusive site for research practices by artists. In turn, this will inform the different ways in which doctoral-level studies will be constructed in a space that bridges the academy/university and other institutional and 'public' sites.

Turning to the content and form of the debate on artistic research, it has already been noted that the overarching preoccupations of the past decade have been questions of a broadly procedural and epistemological nature, such as: 'What should research from the arts be?' 'How should the concept of research be translated into artistic practice?' 'Is it legitimate to deploy an array of research-related concepts (such as method, object, knowledge claim, evidence, reproducibility, originality) and research-related institutional structures (such as peer-review publishing, doctoral awards, research training, state of the art review, examination) with reference to artistic practices?' 'Who should validate artistic research, and in what institutional matrix should the research culture of artists be vetted?' We have already indicated that these questions have been accompanied by other debates that adopt the approach of ideology critique to ask: 'What is the relationship between the priority of artistic research as a contested category and those changes in socio-economic order that have prompted analysts and policy-makers to speak of the "knowledge economy", "information society" and "cognitive capital"?'

There have been many instances in which the question addressed has been more descriptive in nature, such as: 'What are artist-researchers actually doing right now?' 'What does this work look like?' 'How is it formatted?' 'How is it presented to audiences and publics?' When

pursuing this form of descriptive questioning, standard practice has been to invite artist-researchers to present work. In terms of the ways in which this content has been structured, there has been a relatively traditional use of exhibition, performance and publishing (including anthologies and singly authored 'statements of position') and a relative under-use of other instruments such as the state-of-the-art survey or review of the field. Conferences and anthologies have tended to be structured around presentations of work-in-progress or recently completed work or as assemblages of broad position papers on epistemological or institutional questions, or a combination of the two. There has been less use of a thematised approach, for example, positing a shared research problem or research object (beyond the generalised questions as to what research is for an artist, etc.). In part, this reluctance to gather artistic research under well-defined themes, problems or objects may be a consequence of claims for the radical specificity of both the artwork and artistic research, making it important not to gather this 'specificity' under a more general heading (which might be seen to undermine the *sui generis* claims of a given practice). However, more recently, we have seen the emergence of thematically coordinated presentations of artistic research, with conferences and publications beginning to adopt a more pronounced inter-relationship between papers and panels referring to objects of enquiry rather than simply presenting projects together as examples of artistic research.

1. C. 1. **The Emergence of Research Cultures and Infrastructure**

In terms of research infrastructure, it may be helpful to note some generalisations about the emergence of research cultures in the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and so forth. By the end of the 19th century, a model had emerged that seemed to provide a broadly applicable template for constructing disciplinary research communities, including such institutions as the PhD, the academic conference, the scientific journal, the scientific paper and various forms of peer review. Another aspect of the formation of disciplines and recognised expertise were the professional membership societies modelled on the older guild and academy systems.

In the German universities of the 19th century, as a consequence of reforms inaugurated in the Prussian system by Alexander Humboldt in the 1810s, the disciplines of history and chemistry emerged to become exemplary of the ways in which research cultures could be formatted. Within the German system, these subject areas were

1. C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate

pivotal in establishing the PhD system as a certification of proficiency in research, which has important consequences for the modern system. Chemistry substantiated the relationship between advanced research training and technological and economic development, while history established the seminar – as exemplified in Leopold von Ranke's famous research seminar and the training of his students in the rigours of source criticism – and the priority of the *Doktorvater* relationship. From the 17th century onwards, the Royal Society established a form of scientific communications – the famous letters – which gradually became codified into a system of formal reports on current research. Building on this precedent, the 18th century also witnessed the embryonic formulation of the scientific journal, while, in the 19th century, the communication of scientific research became increasingly standardised and the paradigm of scientific journals and yearbooks became generalised to a wide range of subjects. The late 19th century is generally recognised as the period within which the 'Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion' (IMRAD) formula for academic writing begins to emerge, a formula which, in the mid-20th century, became the norm for much of the social and natural sciences.¹⁷

If one considers the discipline of sociology as it emerged in the late 19th century (from a complex genealogy of historical, economic and political discourses from writers as varied as Vico, Smith, Ferguson, Carlyle and Condorcet), one finds an exemplary instance of the ways in which these elements (doctoral education as research training; the establishment of international conferences and professional associations; the emergence of research journals: and an increasingly standardised formulation of scientific communication) were combined to ground the new discipline and research enterprise of sociology. Emil Durkheim's work is exemplary in this regard – setting up the first European department of sociology at the University of Bordeaux in 1895, establishing the journal, *L'Année Sociologique*, in 1896 and constructing a standard work of reference for the new discipline in his work on *Suicide* in 1897. Durkheim's project was also dependent upon international associations in the field that emerged in the same decade, with René Worms establishing the *Institut International de Sociologie* in 1893 and the American Sociological Association in 1905. These infrastructural developments were not just a matter of institutional forms (departments, PhDs, conferences,

17. R. Day, *How To Write & Publish A Scientific Paper* (4th Ed.). (Phoenix, AR: Oryx., 1994). pp. 3-5 and W. Brock, 'Science' in J. Doncann and R.T. VanArsdel (eds.) *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), pp. 81-96.

associations, journals) but also of particular research orientations. The emergence of new disciplines also signalled the emergence of new constellations of objects and methods of study. In the case of sociology, for example, this included social regularities, behaviours and orderings as objects of enquiry; statistical variation as mode of enquiry; and extra-psychological concepts as explanatory principles. The development of sociology went through a specific step-change in the 1890s, so that previously disparate materials and problems began to be aggregated in a clear and systematised way, as manifested in the development of the new associations and publishing platforms cited above. Thereafter, the modern formation of sociological enquiry becomes clearly discernable. This step-change must be seen as a consequence of multiple determinants, including the dramatic emergence of particular forms of mass society in the industrialised world of the 19th century.

In thinking about this example of discipline formation, it is helpful to consider the contrast between Durkheim's project and that of an earlier German academic, Wilhelm Dilthey, who also sought to establish a broad methodological foundation for the systematic enquiry into human affairs. Dilthey's project eventually contributed to several important philosophical currents in the 20th century – including phenomenology, hermeneutics and critical theory – each of which developed a critique of scientific sociology. Through the work of Dilthey, and that of Max Weber, German social research took a distinct journey that gave rise to some key critical intellectual traditions. A significant distinction is the degree to which the professional formation of sociology as a discrete discipline (as opposed to a range of social philosophies and cultural critiques) was less accomplished in the German-speaking world, with the grounding discipline of philosophy arguably retaining a stronger influence on the development of social research in Germany during the late 19th and early 20th century. In terms of research infrastructures, it is arguable that the path taken in the development of an institutional matrix for social research in Germany enabled a different research project, contrasting with French sociology, which consistently problematised the naïve 'scientificity' and 'positivism' of increasingly quantitative studies of human systems.

This simplified summary of developments in chemistry, history and sociology is provided here in order to indicate that the development of a research infrastructure is key to discipline formation, and it may also have a strong bearing on the research content. If we apply this observation to an analysis of the development of a conferencing

1. C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate

and publishing infrastructure for artistic research, we should then be alert to the conditioning impact of these developments on the research content itself.

1. C. 2. **Overview Analysis of the Debate**

A cursory review of the published material in this field makes it clear that there are a number of national contexts in which regular engagement with the question of artistic research has been established. These include the Scandinavian countries – Sweden, Finland and Norway (especially Bergen) – Belgium (especially within music, and latterly within architecture) and the UK (all the arts disciplines). Other countries are conspicuous by their relative absence from this debate, particularly Germany (although the indications are that this may change slowly).

As indicated previously, the emphasis in the earlier stages of the debate has been on general positioning, with the primary question being posited as ‘What is artistic research?’ (or ‘What should artistic research be?’) It is clear that thematic development has largely taken place in those situations in which there is a regular occurrence of meetings and discussions, e.g. *Sensuous Knowledge*, *EARN*, *Practice As Research In Performance (PARIP)* and *Art of Research*. However, even here, development appears to be broadly at the ‘meta’ register of ‘What is artistic research?’ ‘How is it evaluated?’ ‘How is it disseminated?’ ‘How is it archived?’ ‘How does it collaborate with other fields?’

The publishing that has happened with regularity also manifests a strong identification with an institutional locus, such as: *ArtMonitor* at the University of Gothenburg; *MaHKUzine*, *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)* at the Utrecht School of Arts; and *Art & Research* at Glasgow School of Art. It is notable that these vehicles for discourses around artistic research have potential limitations in terms of distribution, which largely falls to the host institution. Interestingly, *JAR* – the most prominent attempt to generate an international and inter-institutional platform – has received significant institutional endorsement. *JAR*’s model of online distribution and peer-review appears very promising. The open-access research catalogue that underpins it is also very promising as a mechanism for providing greater visibility and promoting dissemination of artistic research work. However, the consistent attraction of relevant content appears to be a key challenge, but this is likely to reflect the relative youth of the project (at the time of writing, *JAR* is in its third issue).

In the mainstream art world, publication is a means of both disseminating content and affirming the identity of a given artist, cultural provider or agency and their reputational capital. Art publishing thus often has a strong promotional dimension, centred on publicity generation and reputation-building. Academic research publishing also has a publicity function; however, in some sense, this is secondary to the over-riding imperative that is (supposed to be) a contribution to the field, making new material available to colleagues engaged in enquiry in the same area. In artistic research communications, these two different publishing imperatives overlap. Of course, this is complicated by the imperative to publish for the purposes of job applications, tenure, and so forth. However, the point remains that academic publishing is rooted in the substantive merit of the knowledge contribution being made. In the culture of publishing around artistic research, there appears to be a tension between publicising the work and the communication of knowledge. This should not be overstated, but there is a potential friction between the desire to make artworks visible within the reputational economy of contemporary art and the desire to make knowledge claims subject to critical review and challenge by colleagues within the same area or field. In turn, this kind of tension becomes the content of the debate within some conference settings, and a certain self-referentiality is reinforced, not necessarily in an interesting way.

If one considers the challenge faced by the would-be surveyor of the current field of artistic research, the question arises: ‘How would you subdivide this material in terms of topical connections?’ Without being too reductive, it could be said that it is not possible to subdivide this material according to a criterion of what it is about – other than it being about ‘artistic research’. This creates a problem for the elaboration of a sustainable research culture, because research would seem to depend, in some fundamental way, on the possible accretion of new knowledge upon existing knowledge driven by some logic of interconnection such as shared research object, problem or theme.

1. C. 3. **Deficits, Gaps and Development Potentials**

It would seem that, within both the publishing and the conferencing landscape, the key deficit is a space in which research related by a shared object or a shared ‘about-ness’ (beyond the topic of artistic research itself) can come into critical relation.

1. C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate

Another key gap, correlating with this, is the absence of paradigmatic works within the space of artistic research. There is no Durkheim's *Suicide* or Weber's *Spirit of Capitalism* or Said's *Orientalism* or Habermas's *Public Sphere* or Van Gennep's *Rites of Passage* – that is, there appear to be no foundational works that serve as basic referents for the subsequent development of a field of debate. Indeed, for many protagonists within the debate on artistic research, it would seem that the institution of a paradigmatic or canonical work would be counter-productive and stand in opposition to the radical alterity of artistic research. This is based on an understanding of artistic research as undisciplined, adisciplinary, radically autonomous, and so forth. In that sense, what is defined here as a 'key gap' may be regarded as a key virtue. However, one thinks of certain artworks which function as key referents (perhaps even clichés) within their traditions. Consider examples such as Duchamp's *Fountain* or Cage's *4'33"* or Kelly's *Post-Partum Document* or Jarry's *Ubu Roi* or Mallarmé's *Un Coup de Dés* or Vertov's *Man with a Movie Camera* or Nijinsky's *L'après-midi d'un faune*, and the role they play as key reference points for subsequent artistic works within their respective traditions. Consider the way in which artistic developments are often orientated by a re-reading of something that becomes canonical, even when we are considering self-consciously avant-garde cultural practices. It may be useful to clarify that what is sought is not necessarily a defining masterpiece, but rather paradigmatic examples that can be established as shared referents, subject to both contestation and recognition as something worth attending to and contesting.

Among the tasks that could be set for developing a research infrastructure in publishing and conferencing, are the following:

- Creating a topically orientated publishing/conferencing enterprise that would seek to constitute itself as the leading organ for publication on a particular problem or closely related set of problems (defined from within actual research work, rather than from within the debate on research).
- Renewing an existing element of the infrastructure which has largely fulfilled its original mission or which might benefit from re-definition. For example, EARN had the original mission to establish a Europe-wide support system for debate on artistic research in fine art and to create opportunities to review and discuss actual artworks and artistic research projects. Arguably, this mission has been accomplished and so the EARN network can now evolve new tasks. Another example is that of the Swedish journal, *ArtMonitor*, the original institutional publishing function of which could be enhanced by creating a

specific topical agenda for it and linking it to a distribution agency. Yet another example is EUFRAD, a relatively new networking infrastructure with a remit for many art forms, which has demonstrated an increasing membership but which would seem to require a clearer formulation of its mission. One could also reflect on what might be possible if the online journal, *Art & Research*, was re-activated under a renewed mission and with a new structure of inter-institutional collaboration.

- Providing annual state-of-the-art surveys of research developments within different arts and subject areas, constituting a central reference point for what happened each year in the fields of artistic research, supporting the international community of researchers to become orientated by shared projects that exceed the individual work.
- Taking a specific ‘meta’ theme (so characteristic of the debates in the field) and using it to frame a specific contribution (e.g. *NATURE Methods*, a journal, established in 2004, centred on the question of method and not topical objects of research).
- Translating a model from the critical humanities publishing press, such as the University of Chicago’s *Critical Inquiry* or *Representations* or *Public Culture*, in which generalist interdisciplinary academic publishing across the humanities is realised and topical coherence achieved through a combination of broad thematic mission and specific focused themes in the construction of individual journal issues.
- Establishing a series of definitive works for the field, combining special close-study case study conferences of exemplary instances with publication of definitive critical editions (or the equivalent construct for the arts).
- Approaching the question of publication and conferencing infrastructure in terms of practices immanent to the field of the arts (e.g. curating and dramaturgy), as a survey overview from an engaged editorial/curatorial group or even individual editor.
- Identifying cultural agencies outside the academy/university as potential partners in the research-building task. For example, cultural providers or cultural planning and policy agencies might have an interest in partnership. How might a partnership approach change the content/structure of what we plan?

Conclusion

The emergence of a debate on artistic research has been integral to the arts themselves and not simply a response to educational policy change (although this has been an important contributory factor in recent years, as we saw in Sections A and B above). Within the elaboration of this debate, a particular pattern of publishing and conferencing has been identified and a key gap has

1. C. Genealogies of the Artistic Research Debate

been posited. This gap is identified as the absence of a general tendency to co-ordinate the presentation of artistic research with reference to shared objects of enquiry. Instead, the tendency has been to aggregate presentations of individual projects with reference to their shared identity as artistic research projects and/or formal- rather than content-specific issues (such as method or mode of dissemination). (It is worth noting that this might be seen as a virtue by some commentators inasmuch as it is consistent with the specificity of artworks as art.) The challenge presented by approaching artistic research in terms of traditional discipline models from the university system was also indicated. Again, there is a desire on the part of certain protagonists in the debate to position artistic research as counter-disciplinary, adisciplinary, anti-disciplinary and/or non-disciplinary. Finally, we have seen the desire of some participants to foreground the specificity not of the artistic or the arts in general but of individual arts traditions, e.g. Western art music or contemporary visual arts. This debate on artistic research has a complex relationship with the third cycle, which is often seen as, precisely, the finalisation of one's competence within a discipline. (See contributions to this discussion below in Chapters 5 and 11.)

2

Organisational Strategies and Platforms for Artistic Research Education

Contestation of the ways in which the doctoral level of studies should be interpreted for the arts has meant that a wide range of models, strategies and platforms has been used for the implementation of doctoral studies/third-cycle work in the arts. This chapter seeks to provide an overview of the organisational strategies adopted, and to describe some of the instruments that have been used to elaborate a doctoral-level education for the arts. In some ways, this chapter may be seen as a rejoinder to James Elkins's description of a 'Continental Model' of doctoral studies in the studio arts. The argument developed here is that a real diversity – rather than just a surface play of institutional contingencies – exists among the organisational strategies and platforms that have been developed for the third cycle in the arts.

This chapter begins with an overview of the key variables that exist among the organisational forms adopted for doctoral education before giving some examples. The next section considers the emergence of national platforms and the opportunities and challenges that these relatively new models represent. The chapter then turns to the question of the summer school, and variations thereof, as a key instrument in providing doctoral-level education to artists in the early stages of their development as researchers. The chapter then

moves on to the question of education and development supports for supervisors by looking at the model proposed by the Norwegian Fellowship Programme. The chapter concludes with a look at the way in which development of doctoral-level studies has been shaped in different parts of Europe, pointing again to the specificity of regional contexts first introduced in Chapter 1.

The chapter is divided into five sections:

2. A. Two paths: Graduate-school and master-apprentice
2. B. National Platforms
2. C. The Summer School as Instrument and Situation
2. D. 'Organising the co-education of supervisors'
(Nina Malterud)
2. E. 'Developing Third-Cycle Artistic Research Education'
(Anna Daučíková)

2. A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'

Introduction

Within the heightened attention paid to the organisation of doctoral-level studies, a long-standing tension has been evident between two basic models of third-cycle education: that of the doctoral school and the master-apprentice. While both models are discussed below, it is worth noting from the outset that the master-apprentice model is being de-prioritised in the turn to 'structured' doctorates and cohort-based models of doctoral programmes, which favours the establishment of graduate schools across most disciplines. With the development of new national and European university and research policies, there has been a further expansion of the graduate school model since the 1990s. Interestingly, at the same time as the increased prominence of the graduate school model, there has been a renewal of interest in the master-apprentice paradigm on the part of some of those active in building doctoral education for artists.

2. A.1 Graduate Schools

A graduate school is an organisational unit within higher education that awards 'higher degrees', usually masters and doctoral-level degrees. These are higher degrees in the sense that a student typically requires a first qualification from a university, academy or higher technical institute (a bachelor's degree, for example) before being permitted to study for a masters or doctorate. In some countries, the term 'graduate school' refers to a platform that deals only

with doctoral education – for example, the *Graduiertenkollegs*, set up in the early 1990s in some sciences and other disciplines in Germany, with funding from the Foundation Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG – German Research Foundation). These *Graduiertenkollegs* – around 285 of which had been established by 2001, about 10 percent of them based on international partnerships – might typically have only 20 to 30 doctoral researchers.

Graduate schools are often contained within a single institution of higher education, but they may be based on collaboration between several institutions. Sometimes, a graduate school refers to a physical location or building, but very often it refers simply to an organisational structure or institutional sub-division that might be dispersed across several different places. Some graduate schools are finite projects, with a fixed duration limited to five or ten years; some have been established as enduring institutions.

The graduate school model was developed in the US in the late 19th century as a response to German university models that placed an emphasis on research. In Germany in the 19th Century, the PhD did not always entail a major volume of research and was often a qualification used to enter a high-school education career or the civil service. The US model of educating advanced students gave particular importance to separating the postgraduate level of research education (masters and doctorate) from the undergraduate level (bachelor level). The PhD also became a different kind of qualification in the US, where it was primarily seen as a career gateway into university teaching and the professoriate.

Thus, the organisational form of the graduate school is generally seen as a North American innovation. Nonetheless, it remains closely associated with a particular model of seminar-based research training, which was first given prominence by German historians such as Ranke, who used this model to teach the ‘higher criticism’. The seminar format involved bringing advanced students and university teachers together to discuss their research work. In Germany in the early 19th century, the seminar was a semi-autonomous form (that is not fully contained within the university’s formal protocols and partly conditioned and shaped within the social orbit of the informal community of teachers and select students), sometimes happening in the professor’s home. However, in the new US model, it became a formal class of courses lasting one or two semesters.

There is some debate as to why the US model developed in the way it did, but the most important factor is that this model distinguished

2. A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'

itself from the original European 'master-apprentice' model. In the 'apprentice' model, a member of the faculty sponsors and supervises a candidate's doctoral work on an individual basis. The key difference in the US model was that education at doctoral level involved greater amounts of group work and structured learning and teaching, and it was organised through new platforms – the graduate schools – many of which became internationally renowned centres of learning and research in their own right. Thus, the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, established in 1908, became world famous as an institution in its own right.

The graduate school model centralises the idea of bringing communities of scholars together to provide the most advanced education. Graduate schools have become widespread in response to the rapid growth of doctoral education in recent decades. Graduate schools have also become important because governments are actively seeking to establish structures that promote the training of researchers and the development of knowledge specialists within the 'knowledge economy'. Some commentators also see, in the growth of graduate schools, an attempt to construct systems of control over the development of researchers and their research.

2. A.2 New German Graduate School Models

Building upon the *Graduiertenkolleg* experiment in doctoral education, a different type of graduate school was established in Germany in 2006, termed *Graduiertenschule*. These were established by the DFG as part of the German Universities Excellence Initiative. *Graduiertenschule* are much larger organisations and often have up to 200 doctoral students. These graduate platforms were NOT established in the creative arts but in other disciplines; however, both these models have been key referents for artistic doctoral programmes in other countries.

In the early 1990s, the German Rectors' Conference and the German Science Council began to speak about difficulties with the traditional model of master-apprentice doctoral education. The introduction of these new graduate schools took place in response to perceived problems with the old model of PhD studies. Writing in 2008, Barbara Khem, Professor of Higher Education Research at the University of Kassel, retrospectively described the situation as follows:

Insufficient structure, unclear status of doctoral students, increasing time to successful completion of the degree, high numbers of drop-outs, high degree of personal dependency on the supervisor, lack of interdisciplinary approaches, and insufficient orientation to labor markets

outside academia were just some of the problems which could be observed. The German Rectors' Conference suggested the introduction of graduate programmes that would incorporate the model of graduate colleges.¹

The Graduate School model is often seen, then, as the alternative to the master-apprentice model. However, the two models sometimes go together, and the problems that the German Rectors' Conference identified in the master-apprentice model can also be found in some graduate schools.

2. A.3 Criticisms of the US Graduate Schools

In the US, a debate about doctoral education took place throughout the 1990s, and many of the problems that the German Rectors identified in relation to the master-apprentice model were also prevalent in US graduate schools. In 2000, this gave rise to an important conference in Seattle, Washington, called 'Re-Envisioning the PhD' (as part of a larger project assessing the doctoral level and its future development potentials). The criticisms made by some commentators at this time have been translated into the claim that doctoral students in the US were:

- educated and trained too narrowly;
- lacking key professional skills, such as working in teams;
- lacking organisational and managerial skills;
- ill prepared to teach;
- taking too long to complete their doctoral studies and in some fields many not completing their degrees at all;
- ill-informed about employment outside the academies;
- having too long a transition period from PhD completion to stable employment.²

In response to these criticisms, many new initiatives were developed, such as 'Preparing Future Faculty' in the 1990s;³ the 'Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate';⁴ and the 'Responsive PhD' (established by the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation).⁵ It is interesting to note the goals of the latter:

1. B. Khem, in M. Nerad, M. Heggelund (eds.), *Toward a global PhD?: forces and forms in doctoral education worldwide*. (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008). p. 23.

2. Nerad, 2008, p. 288

3. <http://www.preparing-faculty.org/>

4. See <http://www.ams.org/notices/200305/comm-carnegie.pdf> and <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/previous-work/professional-graduate-education>

5. The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, September 2005 (See: http://www.woodrow.org/images/pdf/resphd/ResponsivePhD_overview.pdf)

2. A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'

- to improve diversity in graduate education and the professoriate;
- to ensure that academic knowledge is used to meet social challenges and to promote 'public scholarship';
- to understand the impact of globalisation on doctoral education;
- to prepare doctoral students for a range of careers.

2. A. 4 **European Graduate School Models: European University Institute and European Graduate School**

Having looked at the contemporary positions in Germany and the US, it is helpful to consider some specific examples of graduate schools in the wider European context. Describing itself as a 'world-class postgraduate and postdoctoral research institute for Economics, History, Law, Political and Social Sciences', the European University Institute (EUI)⁶ in Florence is an example of a graduate school that has gained a worldwide reputation. The institute was set up in 1972, by the six founding member states of the European Community (Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany), to promote research among, and provide advanced education to, doctoral researchers. Full-time teaching staff, fellows and researchers are recruited from all over Europe and beyond. The EUI also provides a special doctorate (a four-year PhD) and a one-year masters programme in law (LL.M.) as well as hosting and funding postdoctoral researchers.

Based in Switzerland, the European Graduate School (EGS)⁷ is a private institution that has gained a lot of visibility in recent years because of its innovative 'immersion' model of doctoral education. This entails bringing doctoral researchers together with leading philosophers and intellectuals during immersive three-week summer schools that involve seminars, presentations and lectures. EGS is divided into Arts, Health and Society, and Media and Communication. Among the subjects it lists as being addressed through its programmes are: architecture, art, contemporary philosophy, cultural studies, film, literary theory, literature, media studies, performance art, photography and video.

These two examples, combined with the discussion of the German models above, make clear that the graduate school model in Europe is already quite diverse and contains ample potential for further organisational innovation and experimentation.

6. <http://www.eui.eu/>

7. <http://www.egs.edu>

2. A.5 **‘New’ Doctoral Programmes: The Structured PhD and the ‘New Pathway’ Doctoral Programme**

Part of the experimentation with doctoral education that has occurred in recent decades has resulted in the development of new approaches to doctoral *programmes*. A doctoral programme usually implies taught elements and group work, especially during the initial phase of research. Sometimes, this new programme approach is based on building a combined masters and doctoral programme, so that researchers enter into doctoral work through a first phase of masters work.

The structured doctorate is described as an alternative to the thesis project model, in which the student initiates their doctoral pathway of studies with a reasonably well-formed and discrete project proposal. In the structured model, a candidate is integrated into a specific training programme in which they are grouped with other selected graduates whose projects typically emerge through participation in the programme and most often share a topic, field or subject area with the other doctoral projects in the same structured programme. Sometimes, but not always, this structured programme will include a mix of masters and doctoral students. For example, some UK models use the MRes (Masters of Research) as a phase in the progress of the research student toward becoming a full PhD student.⁸ A specified curriculum prepares candidates for their research projects. The formal curriculum and group sessions within the programme are supposed to ensure ongoing exchange among researchers. Such structures are designed to promote frequent contact, both on an institutional basis and informally, with a supervisory team, typically comprising at least two mentors. Thus, structured doctoral programmes tend to:

- Be cohort-based as opposed to single-candidate learning situations;
- Be confined to a specific standard length of studies (typically 3 to 4 years);
- Use the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS points) as part of the required study achievement of students – especially in the first phase of study;
- Use detailed research plans and study contracts, specifying the workload of the doctoral candidate;
- Develop a detailed research proposal as a staged phase of the programme of study.

The emphasis of new programmes on well-defined phases of learning has been especially significant in the sciences, technology, engineering and medical disciplines, where advanced training in specialist

8. <http://www.ukcge.ac.uk/links/resourcespginfo/discussionpapers/papers/fiveyearsofthemres2001>

2. A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'

techniques and technologies is often a feature of research. Another driver for these new programmes has been the need to construct new interdisciplinary frameworks enabling researchers to tackle large-scale problems – such as sustainable development, ecological, public health, societal change, urban renewal or new technology development – in a thematically focused way.

This is another important distinction from the master-apprentice model because it tries to break with the idea of reproducing a discipline. The emphasis is on producing new competencies and new types of 'knowledge workers', often destined to work not in academia but in industry, policy, the public sector or an NGO or other professional setting. These programmes are often based in the idea that graduates have a very different mix of competencies from any individual professor teaching them. An important feature of the move towards new structured programmes is the emphasis on what are called 'transferable skills', which are not just abilities confined to a single knowledge area but which apply to many different areas of professional life.

Demands for innovation in doctoral education, on the part of national governments and within European policy initiatives, have created pressure on universities to claim that they have developed new structured doctoral education. Sometimes, the programmes are new in name only, and the old established practice of master-apprentice remains the norm for doctoral work. Some supposedly innovative programmes entail the construction of new layers of administration and management, which seem to pile extra work onto the supervisors without a clear sense of why this work is relevant to an individual research project. Sometimes supervisors prefer the older model because they experienced it, because it leaves space for greater independence and because they are reluctant to get involved with more bureaucracy.

2. A. 6. **The Professional Doctorate**

The graduate school model has not only been developed for research education; it has also been used to support professional doctorates and education that is directed not towards careers in research but towards careers in the professions and in industry. US business, law and medical schools make professional relevance more important than academic research.

The professional doctorate is an increasingly common alternative to the PhD – examples include the Doctor of Fine Arts (D.F.A.), Doctor of Architecture (D.Arch.), Doctor of Education (D.Ed.), and so forth. Professional doctorates have their origins in North America. They were

initially developed in the field of education, with the purpose of enabling teachers and lecturers to pursue their professional education to the highest level. More recently, they have emerged in Australia and the UK, where they have been developed in areas including education, business, law, psychology, health sciences, humanities, design and architecture.

There is no single definition of the professional doctorate in the literature or in practice. The *UK Council for Graduate Education Report* (2002) suggests that it is ‘a further development of the taught Doctorate but the field of study is a professional discipline, rather than academic inquiry and scholarship [...] most Professional Doctorates are designed to meet a particular professional need [...] the research element of a Professional Doctorate is focused on professional practice [...] it is possible for the work to make an original contribution to the way in which theory is applied, or to the nature of practice within a profession’. Powell and Long describe the professional doctorate as an award in which ‘the field of study is a professional discipline and which is distinguished from the PhD by a title that refers to that profession’. The University of Ulster in Northern Ireland defines the professional doctorate as ‘a programme of advanced study and research which, whilst satisfying the University criteria for the award of doctorate, is designed to meet the specific research needs of a professional group, and which develops the capability of individuals to integrate research practice within a professional context’.⁹

The key features of the professional doctorate are generally:

- A focus on professional work;
- A focus on the development of the individual in relation to their professional work;
- A significant taught element;
- The specification of learning outcomes;
- Cohort-based pedagogies;¹⁰
- A shorter length of thesis than that for the PhD, but with the same requirement for originality;
- A close relationship to the development of practice within the profession concerned, possibly accredited by a professional body and resulting in a professional qualification;
- A reference to profession or professional usually being made in the title of the award.

9. University of Ulster, Regulations for Professional Doctorates (PD) and Associated Rules and Guidelines

10. The UKCGE survey 2004 reports that some programmes are not universally cohort-based.

2. A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'

The main area of distinction between the PhD and the professional doctorate appears to concern: (I) the overall degree of emphasis placed on research and (II) the nature of research. The award of PhD is most often conferred solely on the basis of a substantial written piece of work (the thesis), whereas the professional doctorate is usually awarded on the basis of a portfolio involving a broad range of assessed objects. A fundamental issue, then, is that, in the professional doctorate, the work is aggregated as a string of components rather than a single cohesive research project. This distinctiveness may be challenged by the recent changes in PhD programmes outlined above. The increase in structured programmes, which include substantial taught elements and measures to develop generic and transferable skills, are arguably, bringing PhDs more into line with core features of the professional doctorate.

2. A. 7. **Other Third-Cycle Models: The Fellowship Model**

The Fellowship model is used here to refer to other models of third-cycle education that move away from the PhD degree award and focus instead on the construction of a research milieu and educational platform in which advanced practitioners can embark together upon a programme of work within a higher education institution or network of institutions. The emphasis appears to be on the production of a new situation in which artists can conduct new experimental and often interdisciplinary work, rather than on achieving a particular examination award as such.

The Fellowship model is very different from the traditional master-apprentice model because of the already advanced level of achievement by the Fellows, who typically nationally or internationally recognised artists in their own right at the beginning of their Fellowship. In some cases, a community of Fellows becomes a key aspect in a given educational situation, making the organisational platform crucial because it must bring highly accomplished individuals, often from very different disciplines, into meaningful dialogue.

2. A. 8. **Relationships between Second- and Third-Cycle Awards**

One of the key issues in the broader discussion of the doctorate, as identified in chapter one, is the relationship between the doctoral level and the earlier stages of higher education (first and second cycles). In this section, attention turns to the specific question of the relationship between doctoral and masters levels, which has already been briefly referenced above. The second cycle, more typically called the masters level, is a very varied award type. There are taught masters, research masters, professional masters and award nomenclature

continues to expand, now including the MFA, MDes, MMus, MArch, and so on. For some, the masters award can be a transition point into doctoral studies, and, while the doctorate is typically seen as the terminal degree for most professions and disciplines, there are some situations in which the masters (for example the North American MFA) is seen as the terminal degree. Some masters degrees introduce students to research, and some give them advanced professional skills, job-related education or cutting-edge knowledge of a field. Some masters awards are 'first' awards, which means that students do not need a bachelor's degree but spend four, five or even six years to achieve an award at masters level (although this model may be becoming less common with the implementation of the Bologna Process). More typical now is the 'postgraduate' masters, for which the student must already have a bachelor's degree before starting masters study. These postgraduate masters are typically two years long, but they can be one or even three years in duration in some cases. As indicated above, some of these postgraduate masters can be converted at a certain point, so that a student registers to undertake a masters degree by research but, after a period of study, changes to a doctoral degree without acquiring the masters award, and advancing to the higher award of doctorate.

The Bologna Process and the 'Dublin descriptors'¹¹ have provided a system of describing the differences between bachelor's, masters and doctoral awards in very generic terms, through generalised outcomes. In this way, the meaning of a masters award is becoming fixed as 'an academic degree higher than a bachelor's but lower than a doctor's'. However, what is not apparent in these descriptors is the historical diversity of masters programmes:

A concerted effort is needed to focus on the master's degree – its academic strengths and weaknesses, its diffuse character, and its importance in the hierarchy of degrees. The master's degree is distinct from other graduate degrees and needs to be analyzed as a class of degrees rather than as one generic model. While its relationship to the [BA] and doctorate is important, it is increasingly sought as a credential on its own merits. By addressing the issues pervading this degree, we can modify and adapt various models that strengthen [post-BA] education and suggest future parameters for the master's degree.¹²

11. Shared descriptors for Short Cycle, First Cycle, Second Cycle and Third Cycle Awards, known as the 'Dublin Descriptors' after the meeting in which they were agreed, in Dublin, March 2004, see: <http://www.nqai.ie/documents/bolognasummary.pdf> (accessed on: 5-11.2013).

12. J. S. Glazer, *The Master's Degree. Tradition, Diversity, Innovation*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6, 1986.

2. A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'

Taught masters programmes typically involve one or two years of full-time study. They are often very intensive and demanding; they may concentrate on a very specialised area of knowledge or they may promote a very generalist type of enquiry. Some universities in the UK also offer a masters by 'learning contract' scheme, in which a candidate can specify his or her own learning objectives. These are submitted to supervising academics for approval, and are assessed by means of written reports, practical demonstrations and presentations. Taught masters degrees often entail the accumulation of ECTS through set courses and learning units, with a final research project counting for 20 to 60 percent of the overall award. Until recent decades in Ireland and the UK, masters degrees were awarded without grade or class. Nowadays, however, masters degrees – especially taught ones – are increasingly classified into the categories of 'pass', 'merit' and 'distinction' – commonly 50+, 60+, and 70+ percentage marks, respectively (although there is great variation).

Research masters can involve two to three years of full-time study. Research masters may entail the accumulation of a small number of ECTS through set courses and learning units but very often do not. The main assessment output is usually a final major research project counting for 80 to 100 percent of the overall award. While the distinction between the 'research' masters and the 'taught' or 'coursework' masters was historically one of the most familiar distinctions in this award level, this has been blurred in recent years as the pervasive emphasis on building research competence has taken hold in higher education policy.

The many types of 'professional' programmes, combined with repeated efforts to differentiate these 'professional' degrees from the dominant 'academic' models (both taught and research types), have resulted in an avalanche of new titles. The major 'professional' masters degrees range from business, engineering and public affairs to teacher training, nursing and library science, and they include many specialties within each degree designation. The overriding issue, in the literature on these degrees, is the balance between theory and practice. The major issues that repeatedly arise in discussion are: specialisation vs. multidisciplinary education; requirements for admission and convocation; access to professionals outside traditional full-time student models; relevant standards for both industry and academic perspectives; and modes of instruction and delivery appropriate to professional practice.

In the Anglophone context in the 1960s and early 1970s,¹³ changes in the nature of masters awards were a function of the growth of the university, the rapid expansion of graduate education, the vocationalism of graduate students¹⁴ and the introduction of public policies to strengthen access at all levels. In the 21st century, these factors continue to be paramount; however, the most important issues are arguably the development of research activities, competencies and the drive for maintaining and updating skills and knowledge.

The masters has also proven to be a very important award in terms of non-European participation in European higher education system with many masters programmes being increasingly designed to cater for this demand and extensively marketed through international development offices in universities. The graduate school can be a framework that integrates both masters and doctoral programmes, or it can be the basis of a stand-alone doctoral programme. (See Section A1 above.)

As noted above, a key concern in developing doctoral-level studies is the way in which the relationships between masters- and doctoral-level programmes are built. Four models can broadly be identified, according to which an institution provides masters degrees and doctorates in the same discipline:

- (I) **SEPARATE AND DISTINCT:** The doctorate and masters are almost completely separate awards, with the masters designed to ensure that a student has a high level of proficiency in a given area and the doctorate focused primarily on building research competencies. Within such systems, the doctoral programme is independent from other forms of postgraduate tuition and can, in many instances, be entered into by candidates with a good bachelor's degree. While masters and doctorates are provided in the same organisation, they operate as separate programmes with very little cross-integration. In some cases, certain topics can only be pursued at one of the two levels – masters or doctorate – but not both;
- (II) **SEPARATE BUT RELATED:** The masters is seen as a separate study programme but understood as potentially enabling a student to enter into doctoral-level work in the same subject area. The masters

13. It is important that we secure more discussion of the divergent pathways of other parts of Europe and other systems.

14. Of course there is some debate about whether we should be talking here of student-led 'vocationalism' or the re-orientation of educational policy in a technocratic model of education as 'training-for-employment'.

2. A. Two Paths: 'Graduate School' and 'Master-Apprentice'

will typically be closely related in terms of content to the doctoral area of study. In such systems, the masters may not be obligatory for entry to doctoral study. Some classes and workshops may be shared between levels, and doctoral candidates and masters students will interact through the formal programme elements;

- (III) **RELATED AND OVERLAPPING:** The masters degree is seen as a self-contained qualification, but there is a standard pathway which specifies that most or all doctoral students begin on the masters register and 'transfer' or 'convert' onto the doctoral register. The masters is thus seen as an 'earlier' exit point on the same track that will lead ultimately to the doctorate;
- (IV) **FULLY INTEGRATED:** In some doctoral programmes, there is an integral masters award that most or all doctoral students achieve, whereby the masters award is an element built into the pathway to the doctorate. There are variations on this, including a version of the Masters of Research (MRes) award, which is used by some institutions in the UK as a general qualification in research practice that has to be achieved by completing specified units of study. Another variation is the achievement of an MA, MSc or other masters award indicating proficiency in the subject field within which doctoral work will be located.

These four broad models are complicated by the wide variation in masters models described above. It is to be anticipated that the masters level will continue to manifest a wide variety of models and approaches, and that it will not be fully assimilated within doctoral pathways but also have an independent and self-sufficient existence as a discrete award level. However, it is notable that the masters level has proved very important as a site for innovation in arts pedagogies, and it is also to be anticipated that the diversity of the masters level will in turn enhance the range of models that will be developed in the future for the doctoral level. We have only just begun to explore the possibilities of interchange here.

2. A. 9 **Renewing the 'Apprentice' Model**

There is still a great deal of debate about the potential value of the older 'apprentice' model, and it should not be assumed that this model has been superseded by the 'structured' model. One of the important aspects of the apprentice model is the degree to which the supervisor has the potential to mentor the future career development of doctoral students. It must be recognised that part of the pressure being placed on the apprentice model comes from a change in working practices with the massification of the doctoral level of studies (as indicated at the start of Chapter 1 above).

There are also cultural and professional differences that need to be taken into account, as various traditions have diverse approaches to the fostering of peer community and to the development of the individual practitioner. Most importantly, different countries, cities and regions have widely varying scales of need, and so alternate models will often emerge to address these. Furthermore, the role of networks in providing linkages and integration across many countries may sometimes be more compatible with the apprentice model. The graduate school as an institutional form may tend to reinforce a distinction between the professoriate and the community of doctoral researchers because of the hierarchical logic of formal 'school' structures as against the informal dynamics of mentor/apprentice.

The significance of this debate about the apprentice model to the earlier discussion of the relationship between masters and doctoral programmes might be seen as follows:

- (I) the apprentice model may tend to isolate doctoral researcher from the broader community of both masters students and other doctoral students;
- (II) the attempt to bring masters and doctoral programmes into a closer relationship with each other could potentially create a greater hierarchical separation between the combined masters and doctoral student body, on one side, and the professoriate, on the other;
- (III) however, organisational strategies around the relationships between masters and doctoral programmes might pave the way for experimentation. The learning opportunities available when there are highly accomplished individuals working with each other, while operating at different points in their professional and academic formation, could provide a means to evolve new practices in mentorship and peer learning that shapes future doctoral supervisors' practices in new ways.

Clearly, there are many choices here, allowing a range of models and practices for developing new programmes and renewing existing programme models. The following sections of this chapter will look at some concrete examples as well as describing some of the finer grained aspects of doctoral level pedagogy in the arts.

2. B. National Platforms

One of the most notable developments in the field of artistic research education over the past decade has been the emergence of national platforms, or national-level multi-institutional partnerships, for doctoral-level education in the arts. Countries in which such platforms have emerged include Norway, Sweden, Finland and Ireland. Key to these national platforms has been the combination of a wide variety of arts disciplines within an overarching network of doctoral-level studies, characterised by strong interactions between the visual and performing arts. Typically, these partnerships are initiated on a short-term basis and subject to renewal on a three- to five-year cycle, often correlated with the duration of the doctoral study cycle itself. These platforms normally require that doctoral-level candidates are registered within one academy or university within the national network, while also actively participating in a common programme of research education, seminars, conferences, workshops and related events shared by all the academies within the network. Often these network activities are marked by periods of immersive encounter akin to the summer school model alluded to earlier and fleshed out in the next section. A programme of support for doctoral students usually exists, with places sometimes being funded at a national or institutional level, based on competitive application processes by individual researchers or by the institutions themselves. Often, the format of platform events resembles that of a conference or immersive symposium, involving several days of presentations, seminars, dialogues and moments of practical production or performance.

In the production of this programme of research education activities, there is usually a combination of central provision, by the team steering the network, and local offerings made to the network by individual academies and institutions within the platform. In terms of the research student's institutional home and identity, there is usually some degree of hybridity, often further extended by the researcher being identified with the national platform, the home institution and the departmental sub-unit within the home institution – such as music, dance, scenography, film, etc. Often the emergence of a national platform will overlap with the development of broad platforms with a combined portfolio of arts disciplines within individual institutions. In the early stages of the development of these consortium-based national platforms, potential exists for duplication of provision across different institutional levels. There is also the potential for confusion in the relative priority of demands created, for doctoral researchers and supervisors alike, by the different layers of institutional arrangements – the host department within an academy, the academy and the national platform.

Often, these platforms will seek to integrate supervisors into the platform process and provide opportunities for supervisors to meet and discuss their experiences in the building of research culture. As the paper by Nina Malterud (2.D below) indicates, this networking of supervisors can become a very important strand of national platform activity, ensuring a critical mass to enable important (and relatively underdeveloped) discussions of supervision, enhancing connectivity across different disciplines and enriching the environment for research education in many ways.

The significance of these national platforms is immediately apparent from the level of visibility that they command within international dialogues on artistic research and artistic research education. It is notable, for example, that national platforms have a strong presence within the orbits of networks such as the Society for Artistic Research (SAR) which is the formal body that underpins the *Journal of Artistic Research* (see Chapter 8 below for more on these). They imply an enhanced reputational standing, enabled by pooling institutional identities within a larger platform, and make it easier to embed their research students in wider international contexts by more readily attracting international engagement and partnership from prominent researchers, artists and cultural institutions. These national platforms can also do a lot of important advocacy work at the national and European level, by ensuring direct dialogue between the proponents of artistic research education and the ministerial level, thereby helping to inform national policy.

Whereas smaller arts academies may only be in a position to recruit one or two doctoral researchers at a time, participation in a national platform ensures that a critical mass is achieved, creating a rich research milieu for the individual research student and engendering a strong context for research dialogues. The national platforms can also operate as a way of differentiating research space between institutions, so that academies and universities can specialise in their research mission and avoid duplication. This also means that specialist competencies and resources can be shared between institutions. This is, perhaps, the greatest challenge faced by the national platforms – to both enable specialisation in the respective research partners and secure real collaboration at a very basic operational level.

National platforms, or indeed any multi-institutional partnership, within doctoral-level education can also provide a strong balancing of interests within the doctoral process, by opening up the process

2. B. National Platforms

of doctoral supervision to many observers, participants and discursive contexts. Within these platforms, there is a clear tendency for students and supervisors to comparatively analyse their working circumstances, the regulatory environment for doctoral work, resource levels, and so forth. This kind of multi-tiered dialogue across the national research space is then complemented by international dialogue – again, something that is facilitated by the concentration of resources and construction of a national point of contact.

Inevitably, as with any institutional process of partnership and exchange, there are some risks. One very important challenge for the national platforms is to avoid the splitting of ownership and separation of cultures, whereby the national platform becomes dis-embedded from the constituent academies and universities. Within the structural logic of higher education institutions, there is an unfortunate, but all too understandable, territorial impulse that makes shared initiatives challenging, and this can be exacerbated when a national platform is seen as external to the day-to-day operational realities of the member academies.

For the individual research student, if the terms of engagement are not well defined and clearly implemented, this potential tension between the home institution and the national platform with which the home institution is nominally aligned can create confusion, anxiety and even conflict. Ultimately, this is not simply a matter of organisational protocols; it is a matter of human relations between professional colleagues and the kinds of conditions within which these relations unfold.

There are several levels to the challenge here. The first level is that of institutional strategy and planning; the institutions aligning themselves in a shared platform require good internal communication, in order to establish collegial support and engagement, and a common understanding of the rationale for the collaboration; the different functional units of the institutions in partnership must be aware of the logic of that partnership, to create a basis for active future support and to ensure that the partnership would survive a change of institutional identity, such as a change in leadership. The second level is that of the personnel directly engaging in platform work, whether as students, researchers, educators, supervisors, leadership or boards of studies. It is an important requirement that each of these be afforded an opportunity to understand the logic of partnership and the significance of the relationships at play. Territorial

tensions at this level can prove fatal to the partnership, so it would appear key to the long-term sustainability of these ventures that there is explicit statement of purpose and identification of respective roles, as well as a clear mechanism for discussing divergent understandings. The third level here is the wider professional and public legibility of the partnership platform. Given the highly sensitive personal and institutional reputations at play, it is imperative that there is a clear communication plan around the platform and the nature of the constitutive relationships, ensuring that prestige is held in common across the partnership, rather than creating a tension between a central platform and a periphery of academies. Ultimately, art and research depend upon high levels of personal and professional autonomy, and the orchestration of partnerships at an institutional level will only succeed if vital human relations underpin the collaboration. This is a matter of building upon operational realities within each partner institution as well as surpassing the limits of a given collegial environment. It is important to recognise that the productive potential of a national platform is to be found in the degree to which existing institutional cultures and horizons of possibility can be re-negotiated within a new operational context.

It is often remarked upon that, within these national platforms, the sustained dialogue engendered between practitioners of different art forms is quite unique. When doctoral-level practitioners of performing and visual arts, of architecture and design, of film and dance, encounter each other within these frameworks, there is a qualitatively different intensity to the cross-disciplinary dialogue created (compared to that in other inter-arts educational collaborations) by virtue of the longevity and intensity of these relationships. Nurturing such dialogues is important for researchers, supervisors and the institutions themselves. They build new connectivity across the arts, at a time when higher arts education is vulnerable to a changing policy regime, which is increasingly econometrically focused and often operates within a very reduced conception of public culture and the public good. This new connectivity can provide a forum for shared enquiry that allows new narratives to be constructed which champion public culture and the public good of the arts, overcoming the political vulnerability inherent in the fragmentation and internal competitiveness of the sector.

A further consideration is the cultural impact of these national platforms beyond the educational sphere, by virtue of the ways in which they provide new frameworks for critical development of

2. B. National Platforms

experimental art practices. It is notable that many of the writers, filmmakers, designers and artists engaged in these national platforms are quite explicit about the respite from the imperatives of the market and/or industry these research platforms provide, affording the time and critical community within which to evolve practice without subordinating experimentation to the incessant demand for concretised production, effectively facilitating new project forms that can risk failures and mis-fires in a sustained process of enquiry. Some of these platforms can come to operate as a kind of counter art scene – a space for dialogue and practice that is not already captured by the operational logics of the existing art world(s). There is, however, the risk of engendering an artificial or incomplete art scene in which the informal peer-review processes characteristic of the mainstream art world(s) are suspended and a self-referential (and potentially narcissistic) institutional bubble is created. However, based on the performance of these national platforms to date, the evidence seems to suggest that they have, for the most part, avoided this pitfall and attracted practitioners of a very high level, generating artworks that operate within the art world(s) beyond the immediate orbit of the academies and conservatoires.

Attracting artists of national and international prominence can, in turn, generate other challenges. For example, in smaller countries, the relative size of the national art scene can create problems when supervisor and candidate are both competitors for relatively limited resources and for recognition within the same field. This is not a problem specific to the doctoral level of research education, but it is perhaps exacerbated at this level. For this and other reasons, national platforms usually place strong emphasis on international connectivity. International peer exchange provides a critical bulwark against any potential for the problems and rivalries of scale to assert themselves. The transdisciplinary nature of these platforms also proves very useful in this context, opening up the internal politics of an art form to a degree of critical accountability within a peer network.

In the future, it is to be anticipated that national platforms will provide the basis upon which research achievements within the arts can be interchanged with those of other disciplines and domains. It is to be expected that the second generation of national platforms will maintain a wide variety of artistic practices while beginning to articulate these within broader research questions. If, as seems likely, a broad consensus is built across higher education, along with the recognition that research within the arts will be a sustained,

long-term development, then we should also be anticipating greater integration of non-arts disciplines within the orbits of these national platforms. It will be a mark of the maturing research culture within the arts that these platforms become sufficiently robust that they can host non-arts researchers without any anxiety of undue influence or loss of identity. Of course, right now, as we are building this consensus, it seems imperative to construct dedicated artistic research education platforms, but even these already demonstrate a wide receptivity to transdisciplinary dialogues and encounters (as demonstrated by several of the contributions in Chapter 5 below).

2. C. The Summer School as Instrument and Situation

Introduction

In the development of doctoral-level studies for artists, there has been a recurring appeal to various models of summer school that bring a group together, in one place for a period of days or weeks, in a structured dialogue mixing early stage researchers with established professionals and experienced supervisors in a temporary peer community of practice and debate. This section provides an overview of this kind of pedagogical instrument and describes some concrete examples. It also suggests some reasons for the suitability of this instrument to the education of doctoral researchers in the arts and introduces the notion of curatorial practice as an organisational format for doctoral-level education in the arts.

2. C. 1. **Knowing what they did last summer**

A summer school is a form of educational event that is typically:

- short in duration (1 to 3 weeks on average);
- immersive (i.e. a lot of activity over a short period of time);
- structured (i.e. a clear programme of activity);
- discursive (i.e. an emphasis on dialogue and not just presentations or lectures);
- participative (i.e. participants are required to actively engage in, rather than passively receive, information and ideas).

The original idea of a ‘summer’ school was that it took place in the period of the year when educators were freer to undertake inventive and non-standard activities because their teaching-load was lighter during the summer months. The construct now includes short immersive programmes that are set up in winter, spring and autumn.

2. C. The Summer School as Instrument and Situation

Summer schools may be directed at the general public or they may be directed at world leaders in a field and will often bring together international mixes of advanced students, already well-established players within a given field of knowledge, and world-renowned figures.

Summer schools:

- Have proven important for higher-level studies because of the way they facilitate advanced students who may have professional and life commitments that make it difficult for them to attend programmes on a weekly basis;
- Allow the bringing-together of expertise from several institutions and countries at once. This means that an international spread of inputs can be achieved, which is necessary if one wishes to develop work at the cutting edge of a field – especially when that field has practitioners distributed around the globe;
- Have an experimental nature as they are usually organised as single self-contained events allowing risk-taking and invention in terms of modes of presentation and mixes of people, disciplines and educational models. This experimental aspect is, of course, suited to developing new work in a research frame;
- Provide stimulation, enrichment and opportunity for those involved in third-cycle education – for research students, supervisors, examiners and people involved in managing and leading third-cycle programmes. Everyone who attends – whether as a ‘teacher’ or a ‘student’ – has an opportunity to hear, see and learn new ideas and practices because of the interdisciplinary, inter-institutional and/or international aspects of the school;
- Can be organised so as to bring the work of third-cycle students into closer relationship with the field of practice they are pursuing. Summer schools are mobile, and can follow the centres or margins of the art world in ways that open up the academy to insights from beyond its ambit;
- Are key to networking researchers from across disciplines and across countries as they allow new social and professional bonds to be created. This kind of networking is clearly important for the development of research and for peer communities of knowledge and practice.

2. C. 2. ‘As the Academy Turns’, Murcia, Spain, (2010)

‘As the Academy Turns’ was a joint initiative between EARN and Manifesta 8 (the nomadic European biennale of contemporary art) and curated by Henk Slager, EARN and Manifesta 8.¹⁵ It was a unique experiment at the intersection of artistic research, contemporary art and the new art academy practices that

have emerged across Europe over the past decade. 'As the Academy Turns' was a multi-layered project exploring the potentials and tensions in the growth of artistic research. The project was framed by the adoption of a series of questions in response to the perceived 'academisation' of art education. The questions proposed for the School were:

- What do these challenges mean for the art academy as such?
- Will novel forms of academic elitism pop up or will research induce a novel form of intellectual conscience in the art academy?
- How will research and artistic practice be intertwined?
- Will they produce redefinitions in both domains or is research doomed to be a fringe phenomenon at the art academy?
- How will research be conducted within art academies?

These questions and themes were tackled in three different strands of activity: (I) a three day international symposium; (II) an artwork in the form of a soap opera set in an art academy; and (III) the profiling of a series of exemplary projects.

The participants included artists and researchers based in Utrecht Graduate School of Visual Art and Design (MaHKU), Finnish Academy of Fine Art (KUVA), Malmö Art Academy, Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts, Gothenburg, Centre for Practice-Led Research in the Arts, University of Leeds (CePRA), and the Graduate School of Creative Arts and Media (GradCAM). The presentations by student researchers were critically addressed by a number of invited respondents including Sarat Maharaj, Tom Holert, Hito Steyerl, Marquard Smith and Jan Kaila. In addition there was a special infolab presentation in Centro do Documentación Y Estudios Avanzados de Arte Contemporáneo (CENDEAC), which included research statements provided by the twelve researchers presenting and provided further information on their research trajectories and practices.

The presentation of the soap opera, *As the Academy Turns*, a specially commissioned art project developed and realised by artist Tiong Ang, also took place in CENDEAC. This parodic soap opera is set in a contemporary art academy, where the characters, the art academy population of teaching staff and students, act within a situation of transformation in which the current master-pupil oriented educational system moves towards a seminar-based form of education with artists as scholars and researchers in an academic community. The school itself was the occasion of a very lively debate between participants, with the soap opera and some of the representations sparking controversial interventions from the floor, the spirit of which is partly

indicated by the review of the event that appeared subsequently in *e-flux* magazine. It is noteworthy that this research education event was also an art world event, indicating the hybridised space engendered by the project.

2. C 3. **‘First International Finnish Summer Academy for Artistic Researchers’, Helsinki and Seili, Finland, (2011)**

The First International Finnish Summer School for Artistic Researchers held in Helsinki and on the island of Seili in August 2011¹⁶ was co-organised by a series of academies (Aalto University School of Art and Design, Finland; Faculty of Fine Arts, University of Regina, Canada; Faculty of the Arts, Tel Aviv University, Israel; Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, Finland; Graduate School of Creative Arts and Media, Ireland; Theatre Academy Helsinki, Finland; University of Dance and Circus, Sweden; and Utrecht Graduate School of Visual Art and Design, the Netherlands.)

The school invited graduate students pursuing practice-based research to submit applications and proposals to the school and a short list of candidates then that took part in the event that took place during the last ten days of August 2011. The aim of the summer academy was to clarify and develop issues arising out of the individual projects of the participants, identifying and responding to the potential thematics emerging from the interaction of the different project formats, disciplines and subject matter. The summer academy provided a supportive setting in which artist-researchers from all fields could collaborate, present their ongoing artistic work and research and receive feedback from experienced tutors and peers from leading academic institutions. The tutors for the academy included: Prof. Annette Arlander, Theatre Academy Helsinki, Finland; Prof. Kathleen Irwin, Faculty of Fine Arts, University of Regina, Canada; and Prof. Dorita Hannah, College of Creative Arts, Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand. The academy aimed to reflect the international diversity and scope of artistic research and to provide a stimulating intellectual environment. It consisted of a broad range of activities including individual presentations by all the participants, discussions on material sent beforehand, individual tutoring and collective work.

The academy began with a two-day stay in Helsinki during which participants visited art universities and cultural institutions and

16. <http://www.konstnarligaforskarskolan.se/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/summeracademy2011call.pdf>

attended guest lectures by researchers who had previously completed their doctoral studies. The remaining seven days were spent in a study centre in Seili, a remarkable island in the South Western archipelago. There were 16 participants coming from a number of countries (including Mexico, Germany/Turkey, Belgium/Tunisia, Netherlands, Finland, Israel, Canada, Ireland), and from a range of disciplines (including theatre, dance, architecture, fine art, audio-design, scenography and photography). The working language was English. European applicants were required to be enrolled as doctoral students, while MA/MFA students from other continents were eligible to apply. This summer academy built upon an earlier summer school process that was developed by the Theatre Academy in Helsinki, and this new model was based on a lot of earlier experience and experiments. It also brought a new disciplinary mix and degree of internationalisation into the model.

The combination of an immersive environment (the relative isolation of the island, Seili) and the requirement on participants to generate practical work, much of this performative in nature, created an intense atmosphere that was marked by several moments of critical confrontation between participants. It was very notable that the discussion of individual research projects became much more challenging and productive once some initial points of contestation and dispute were established within the group. Dissensus was a powerful force in orchestrating a fuller critical discussion of each project.

2. C. 4. **‘The Question of Culture’, Dublin, Ireland (2009)**¹⁷

This was a one-week intensive summer school that introduced participants to the principles, methods and purposes of creative research across many different art forms. It was delivered as a collaboration between GradCAM, the School of Architecture in University College Dublin, and the Irish Museum of Modern Art, Dublin. This series of lectures, workshops and seminars focused on how artists, musicians, designers and architects are currently pursuing research through their different art forms and practices. The summer school was open to anyone interested in developing a better understanding of creative cultural practice as a means of enquiry. It was therefore not restricted to doctoral candidates, but targeted at a much wider community of practitioners in an effort to promote a wider understanding of the potential of artistic research paradigms for developing critical artistic practices. The following table gives an outline of the structure, themes and questions:

17. http://www.gradcam.ie/summer_school.php and http://www.gradcam.ie/autumn_schools.php#question

2. C. The Summer School as Instrument and Situation

day	mon	tues	weds	thurs	fri
theme	on first principles	on not knowing	on motives	on methods	on public-ness
question	what is the question of culture?	what do you want to find out?	why is it worth knowing?	how do you go about finding out?	who is this work for?
special guest	Pauline Byrne Simon Sheikh	Luke Clancy Barbara Holub	Sarah Tuck	Siun Hanrahan Dominic Campbell	Brian Hand

Participants included doctoral researchers, independent practitioners and masters students and brought urbanists, musicians, artists, designers and cultural historians together in one structure. Each day entailed lectures, seminars and workshops around the key theme of the day, enabling participants to begin formulating an answer to the key question adapted for each day. At the end of the week, participants presented their ideas to each other in small working groups.

One of the consequences of this programme was that a number of independent practitioners attached themselves as associate researchers to the GradCAM and there was a longer-term broadening of the research community based there. The model used in this summer school was further developed in a transfer into the domain of cultural history, indicating the potential of artistic research initiatives to energise dialogue within neighbouring disciplines.

2. C. 5. **‘Re-Visions and Re-Drafts’, NIDA, Lithuania, (2012)**

This ten-day summer school on ‘visual thinking’ and on ‘writing as artistic research’ was organised in partnership between the SHARE network, the NIDA Art Colony and Vilnius Academy of Arts. It took place at the NIDA Art Colony, on the Curonian Spit, a peninsula dividing the Curonian Lagoon and the Baltic Sea. The school was curated by Alvydas Lukys (Vilnius Academy of Arts) and Schelte van Ruiten (ELIA, Deputy Director) with the motive force, animating spirit and hospitality of Rasa Antanavičiūtė the Executive Director of NIDA Art Colony, as a key driver of the event. The focus was primarily on visual arts, and teachers included Aušra Trakšelytė (Vilnius); Giedrė Mickūnaitė (Vilnius); Prof. Klaus Jung (Cologne); Mick Wilson (Gothenburg); and Prof. Jan Kaila (Helsinki). The project was funded by EU structural assistance to Lithuania and this has enabled the Summer School to offer eight scholarships whereby all accommodation costs and a subsidy for travel costs were provided to successful applicants, who came from several European countries including Lithuania, Germany, France, Italy, Finland and the UK.

The scholarships were allocated based on the following criteria:

1. Relevance of the programme to the applicant's area and level of studies/practice (including potential benefit to the student from participating in the programme);
2. Potential contribution of the applicant to the dialogue in the Summer School;
3. Quality of existing art and/or design practice as demonstrated in the sample of recent work;
4. Quality of research ideas shown in the material submitted.

The content of the programme was divided between two units: the first four day unit concentrating on the question of visual thinking, and the second looking at the ways in which the practice of writing can constitute both a thinking and a research activity that can operate across genres and disciplines in a challenging and productively disruptive way. Participants were required to present their work with reference to these themes and there was also a robust programme of one-to-one tutorials. Among the key protagonists in the pedagogical setting were the physical location itself, an artists' studio colony, and the cultural milieu of NIDA and the Curonian Spit, a unique site criss-crossed by Europe's unresolved historical narratives.

2. D 'Supervisors' Support – Some Specific Challenges'

(Nina Malterud)¹⁸

Introduction

This paper was contributed by Nina Malterud from the Norwegian Artistic Research Fellowship Programme and is based on a workshop that was held at the second SHARE conference in London in 2012. This section helps to identify the organisational challenges presented by the project of developing supervisors' capacities as doctoral-level educators and project advisors. While based on the specifics of the Norwegian operational context – marked by a high level of public investment in artistic research – the paper provides ideas and reflections that will be helpful in many other contexts as well.

2. D. 1. Background

In the Norwegian Law for Higher Education, artistic research has been considered equivalent to scientific research since 1995. This made it possible for Norwegian institutions of higher art education to establish the Artistic Research

18. Norwegian Artistic Research Fellowship Programme. <http://artistic-research.no/>

Fellowship Programme, which was developed as an artistic alternative to the scientific PhD programmes with a dedicated support from the Ministry of Education and Research in 2003. The programme was one of the first in Europe to offer a three-year research education explicitly based on artistic goals and methods.

The fellowship programme was established for the ten main higher art education institutions in Norway, covering the fields of design, film, music, performative arts and visual art. In an international perspective, all these institutions are rather small, and one of the reasons for establishing a common programme was to ensure a critical mass for the fellows. Relations between the institutions and the programme are regulated through various documents and, subsequently, through years of practice.

In the first year, the Ministry granted a few three-year fellowships which were continued for other candidates in subsequent years. PhD projects in Norway are normally funded like this, so the economic framework consolidated the equality that had been inscribed into law. Institutions may also fund additional fellows from their own budgets, and all applicants go through the same procedure in having the quality of their project description assessed before being accepted into the programme.

In order to pass the final assessment, a fellow needs to present one work or a body of works of art of a high international quality and to deliver a critical reflection upon the work. Within the Norwegian Qualification Framework from 2011, the fellowship programme is defined within the third cycle, corresponding to the PhD level, but it does not yet give the official PhD title to fellows who have passed. The programme qualifies fellows for employment at the level of associate professors in the Norwegian system of higher education.

Six research fellows started in 2003. In 2012, about 80 research fellows have been attached to the programme over the years of its operation to date. About 30 have passed the final assessment, and a few have failed. The research fellow is considered to be an employee at one of the institutions, and is based in the local environment to accomplish her or his project. Fellows also take part in seminars and courses arranged by the programme, focusing on themes such as the understanding of artistic research, methodologies, critical reflection, ethics, etc. During the period of study, each fellow must have one main supervisor with competence based on artistic merits (the supervisor

doesn't have to hold a PhD title), and one or more co-supervisors, whose main field may also be theoretical. One of the supervisors should be closely connected to the fellow's home institution. All supervisors must be professors or associate professors or have unquestionable competence on one of those levels.

To date, more than 140 people have been involved as supervisors – a few of them for several fellows, but many related only to one. About 60 percent of supervisors are employees in Norwegian institutions of art education (but not all are Norwegian nationals); the rest are recruited from abroad, mainly Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States, Denmark, France and Italy. Most of these are professors within higher education, but some are also freelance artists, curators, producers or researchers.

2. D. 2. **Challenges**

When establishing the programme, there was a clear intention that the art education institutions involved should take responsibility for developing a third cycle relevant to the arts. The insistence on the primary supervisor having an artistic background has been crucial in this context. However, few of these supervisors were familiar with the PhD level from their own educational background, as the artistic PhD is a rather new phenomenon. The programme framework raised a lot of questions among the supervisors involved. Many supervisors' experience of teaching at BA and MA level had to be expanded in order to construct a new role for the third cycle. This could not be done only individually, but needed a community, and it could not be done in a day, but required a lot of endurance on the part of participants.

Because Norwegian art education environments are small, it was considered necessary to closely connect the programme and its projects to international discourses. The programme board recommended that one of the two supervisors should be non-Norwegian, and it is a formal demand in the regulations that assessment committees should have at least one member from abroad. Over the years, many resourceful experts with a foreign background have made valuable contributions to the development of the programme, both as supervisors and as assessment committee members. However, this huge diversity also represents a continuing challenge in the sense that supervisors and assessors may find it difficult to adjust their own preconceptions to the specific conditions. Some of them undertake this task only once and cannot draw on a longer experience, and some of them are not otherwise involved in educational affairs.

2. D. 'Supervisors' Support – Some Specific Challenges' (Nina Malterud)

These two main challenges – the potential difficulty of adjusting to the programme framework and supervisors' lack of previous experience of the third cycle – presented an obvious need to bring supervisors together to establish a common understanding. Given the busy schedules of the people involved, it was not considered feasible to demand participation in a mandatory foundation course of 'supervisors' school – the occasions for meeting between the stakeholders in the Programme should be compact and build on attraction, not obligation.

Two regular spaces for developing a culture and building competence have been established:

- The Artistic Research Forum, twice a year since 2003 (19 gatherings to date);
- The Supervisors' Seminar, once a year since 2011 (two so far).

2. D. 3. **The Artistic Research Forum**

This is a two-day gathering of all active fellows, supervisors and institutional representatives 'to focus on the understanding of artistic research from a national and international perspective, on the interdisciplinary dimensions in the programme, on the fellows' competence to present their project in an interdisciplinary setting, on relevant ways of communicating and discussing the projects' main aspects'. (Statement for the Artistic Research Forum autumn 2012) During the first years, keynote speakers were invited to address specific themes, but the content of the forum has more recently been largely based upon the actual fellowship projects and the people present as supervisors and fellows, with a focus on the professional exchange. Expanding over the years from a gathering of 20-30 to 80-90 people, care had to be taken to enhance active participation, by arranging more group discussions than plenary sessions. As a means of facilitating social interaction, the forum was held in a conference hotel just outside Oslo, and, in order to get closer to the art environment, every autumn forum now takes place at one of the art education premises around the country.

The forum has been the main meeting place for everybody involved in the programme, and it serves as a landmark. It continues to be a challenge to engage all participants from different fields of art and to find fruitful ways of stimulating productive discussions, but the forum soon proved to offer great academic potential and a stimulating experience that far exceeded the practical level. Within the forum, we have witnessed new networks being built up and an unexpected exchange of resources.

2. D. 4. **The Supervisors' Seminar**

From the outset, supervisors' meetings were included as a small part of the Artistic Research Forum. In 2011, it became necessary to establish a separate and more focused meeting place. Each time, there have been about 40 participants, including a large contingent of active supervisors.

For the first seminar, the following issues were elaborated, to be discussed in small groups:

- Ownership of the fellow's project – the degree to which the supervisor is involved.
- Supervision in connection with the reflective process. Artist as supervisor – a challenge when it comes to the demand for critical reflection?
- Relationship between supervisor and fellow. Maintain a critical distance – a challenge?
- Project failures – supervisor's failure as well?

All the issues generated strong engagement, and were followed up in the next seminar with these two points on the agenda:

- Focus on the supervisor's own experience of the relationship between artistic practice, theory and reflection – exemplified by two of the supervisors who described their own reflection related to practice;
- Focus on clarification of the supervisor's individual, often unspoken, attitudes to supervising, regarding essential artistic/research questions as well as practical conditions, and how these positions may be communicated to the fellow.

None of these questions have found final answers, but they have been opened up to an ongoing discourse. Feedback from participants has been very positive and generated demand for additional activities. By building this up as a regular meeting place, the seminar may also serve as a socialising community for new supervisors. The third seminar took place in March 2013 and focused more closely on the issues of critical reflection, both format and content.

2. D. 5. **Further Perspectives**

Most of the pertinent questions concerning the supervisor's role are, at their core, both artistic and academic, and, therefore, of great interest to the art education environment as a whole. When supervisors are invited to share aspects of their role, some basic principles emerge as crucial:

2. D. 'Supervisors' Support – Some Specific Challenges' (Nina Malterud)

- Create an environment for sharing by setting up small groups and focused agendas;
- Make the exchange relevant to the supervisor's own professional development;
- Respect the supervisor's competencies; meet as specialists, not as beginners;
- Concentrate on core challenges, not general discussions on programme profile and regulations;
- Separate practical problems from principal academic issues.

The positive energies among supervisors are generated by their professional interest in a demanding task and by the positive experience of breaking new ground together. By putting the above issues on the agenda in an open environment and by making specialists from very different corners of the art fields talk to each other about these questions, the supervisors' meetings may, in the longer run, become an important factor in developing new discourses within the arts.

2. E. 'Developing Third-Cycle Artistic Research Education'

(Anna Daučíková)

Introduction

This section draws on the experience of a key workgroup within the SHARE network to provide a short overview of the issues faced in building new third-cycle arts education.¹⁹ Workgroup two was focused on development of the third cycle at institutions where doctoral study had either not yet been established or was going through the early stages of development. The members of the group sought to support each other in identifying strategies that would enable new initiatives in this area to succeed. The working meetings created a good ground for cooperation, by mapping typical approaches to building the third cycle, recognising common difficulties in the participating countries; identifying similarities and differences in the practice of doctoral studies;

19. This section is based on a report made by SHARE Workgroup 2 at the closing conference in Brussels (22/05/2013). Work package 2 is the group of 11 countries represented by art education institution experts from: Art Academy of Latvia (Andris Teikmanis); Academy of Fine Arts and Design Bratislava (Anna Daučíková); University of Arts in Poznań (Andrzej Syska); European University Cyprus (Sophia Hadjipapa-Gee); Hacettepe University (Pelin Yildiz); MOME Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design Budapest (Márton Szentpéteri); National University Of Arts Bucharest (Roxana Trestioreanu); University of Ljubljana, Academy of Fine Arts and Design (Alen Ožbolt, Bojan Gorenc); University of Malta (Raphael Vella); Brno University of Technology (Tomáš Lahoda); and Vilnius Academy of Arts (Agne Narusyte). In the course of the project the partner institutions organised three WP2 meetings at: Academy of Fine Arts and Design in Bratislava, Slovakia, 14-15 January 2011; University of Technology in Brno, Czech Republic, 20-21 January 2012; and The European University Cyprus, Nicosia, 11-12 January 2013.

and defining the need for further development and quality enhancement. Very early on in this process, the group acknowledged that there were common patterns in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia due to a common geopolitical experience. A different picture was presented by colleagues from Turkey, Cyprus and Malta, with some work already underway at the third-cycle level in Turkey and a much earlier stage of development in Malta and Cyprus (where the second cycle is the focus of much energy at present). This divergence also allowed for these patterns within the former group of institutions to emerge more clearly. Through intensive networking within the group and across the whole SHARE network, the exchange of documents and comparison of models was very important, taking account of national regulations on artistic research outputs in Latvia and the Central Evidence Register of Artistic Activities (CREUC) in Slovakia and the Research Excellence Framework (REF) in UK. While the examination of procedural documents and regulatory frameworks was a key activity for this group, the question ‘what is artistic research?’ dominated the entire discussion. This gave rise to a workshop by Andris Teikmanis and Márton Szentpéteri, dedicated to the issue of models and methodologies within artistic research, as seen from a non-Western European perspective. (See chapter 5 section B.4 below.)

2. E. 1. **Changing Legal Frameworks and Recognition of the Doctoral Degree in Art**

National legal frameworks are a key element in the process of initiating the third cycle within higher arts education institutions. Legal recognition of the doctoral degree in the arts already exists in Lithuania, Romania, the Czech Republic, Turkey, Poland and Slovakia. These arrangements differ slightly in their structure; for example, in Poland there are two forms of postgraduate study within the arts, so that, along with the standard doctoral study model (conferring the title of PhD), some higher arts education institutions have the right to offer third-cycle study through ‘special procedures’ (*Przewód doktorski*), which provide a flexible model of doctoral-level award.

In Latvia, third-cycle degrees in the field of fine art are not yet established. Higher education legislation acknowledges the ‘doctoral degree in science’ but does not currently recognise the ‘doctoral degree in art’. Proposals, submitted by the Association of Art Academies, to implement a doctoral degree in Art and Design that would be different from the degree in Art Science was not accepted by the Education, Culture and Science Committee of the Latvian Parliament. However, third-cycle education in art has been practised and accredited since 2001 through international collaboration. The academic titles conferred in Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia and Hungary are variations on the title ‘Doctor of Art’ with abbreviations: Dr.art.,

2. E. 'Developing Third-Cycle Artistic Research Education' (Anna Daucíková)

Dr.A., Art.D., DLA. In the Turkish example discussed, the title conferred at the third-cycle level is (loosely translated as) 'Proficiency in Arts', while in Poland, Romania and the Czech Republic, it is 'Doctor of Philosophy' or PhD.

One interesting example is the specific case of Slovenia, where the third cycle in the arts has not yet been established. Historically, the idea of postgraduate study in the arts was discussed quite early, and was introduced as a two-year programme of study 'specialisation' in the 1970s. Paradoxically, with the implementation of the Bologna Process (and the transformation of studies into a three-year bachelor and two-year masters system), art academies in Slovenia lost this advanced postgraduate level and so an earlier development within advanced studies in the arts was interrupted. The potential for reconnecting with these earlier models was seen as an important consideration in developing the doctoral level.

Today, the National Programme for Higher Education in the Republic of Slovenia 2011–2020 reads: 'The University enables the formation and the mediation of new scientific and artistic knowledge in the framework of different scientific disciplines and artistic areas'. It also asserts that the 'teaching staff on these programs will have to have proven scientific and research competences, in case of artistic programs and also pedagogical competences'. It further states that the third cycle will be 'scientific and investigative, including art, and it will assure the competences for independent scientific and research work or artistic research work and academic activity'. And finally, it establishes demand for 'a contribution to the international treasury of science or art and an original research work. Universities will include the doctoral students into active research programs and projects'. The PhD in the field of art in Ljubljana is 'under construction'. The Academy of Fine Arts, as a part of the University of Ljubljana, has made a proposal to the senate of the university to establish an autonomous Commission for the Third Cycle in Art. (For more on this development see chapter 5 section A4 below.)

2. E. 2. **Challenges of Policy Volatility**

In analysing difficulties in the different national experiences of developing doctoral-level studies in the arts, several common features can be identified. One key difficulty is the volatility of the political-juridical contexts of higher education, as demonstrated by major national law reforms and policy changes observed in most participant countries – especially in the former Eastern bloc countries. The general pattern here was one of inconsistency and short-termism

in relation to policy changes, making long-term strategic development in higher arts education difficult as successive governmental elites came to power generating turbulence and imposing further changes of attitude and priority within national legislation. Accompanying this political instability, there was also a consistent pattern of gradually diminishing state support for higher arts education. It is notable that, in Romania, all the members of the national research council resigned in response to the radical divergence between the demands of the sector and the retroactive removal of funds.

2. E. 3. **Changing Status for Artists and Artist-teachers**

It is important to note that the status of higher arts education in these countries is that of a 'public or state higher education institution' financially supported from within the state budget. Unlike the private higher education institutions that have become increasingly common in other parts of Europe, study at these core art institutions is free of charge to citizens. As a new development in higher arts education, the doctoral degree in art is typically financed by ministries, and students often receive some form of state doctoral stipend. With the number of these positions being relatively limited and unstable and typically diminishing from year to year, it is hard for an institution to build a strategic development plan and consistent policy. Institutions are often placed on a reactive footing responding to abrupt changes in policy and funding. In many cases, while teaching at doctoral level is prestigious, supervisors are not adequately remunerated for this work, which appears as an added demand in their workload. In this situation, the attempt to build quality assurance processes and to promote quality enhancement (e.g. training for supervisors), while often understood as a positive development and not seen exclusively as a managerialist imposition upon teachers, is not amenable to long term planning.

An important context for these developments is the change in social status of the artist within many countries of the former Eastern bloc, as identified above in Chapter One. Within the regimes following broadly neoliberal patterns, the societal role of art and artists have shifted from the political-public (or crypto-public) sphere into the zones of the free market, increasingly orientated towards the aspirations of the newly consolidated upper middle classes, the new oligarchies and expanded leisure and entertainment industries.

2. E. 4. **The Perceived Tension between Artistic and Academic Judgement**

Another recurring theme in the development of new programmes is the question of criteria for evaluating quality, and, most importantly, a perceived tension between the judgement of academic achievement (at doctoral level) and the

quality of artistic work pursued with reference to criteria coming from outside of the academy and/or in some way inherent to the different art forms themselves. This problem was often cast in terms of a tension between theory and practice within the requirements of a programme of doctoral study. In turn, this overlapped with the fundamental question of how one might choose to define artistic research and how this definition constructed an understanding of the specificity of artistic research education. The other issues that arose as requiring clear clarification within any attempt to build a research education programme for the arts were: entry qualification profile(s) of the third-cycle student; qualification profile(s) of the third-cycle supervisor; criteria for third-cycle quality assurance and quality enhancement at project, programme and institutional level. While these questions must be answered clearly in order to initiate a new programme, they must be subject to renewal and should remain an abiding concern for the institutions developing third-cycle programmes.

2. E. 5. **The Working Group's Conclusions**

The working group concluded that the following developmental needs required careful consideration by those proposing or supporting the development of new doctoral-level programmes within the arts:

- Advocacy is needed to win full recognition of artistic practices as research processes in their own right, gaining equal treatment for artistic research as other areas of humanistic and scientific research;
- Advocacy is needed to campaign for the emergent national systems to correspond more effectively with the solutions implemented within the European Higher Education Area as a whole. The members of this working group saw the European-wide protocols in this area as desirable inasmuch as that they provided a corrective to the instabilities within their national contexts and seemed to allow for better long-term developmental coherence;
- A procedural need to work in a regulatory environment in which the national systems have adjusted to the Dublin Descriptors, especially with respect to the question of research in arts. The working group proposed that the Dublin Descriptors were broadly serviceable to the requirements of the arts, and that they actually had a positive potential in enabling the legitimization of doctoral-level education for artistic research;
- A need to build general supports and specific collaborators in a diverse international context, in order to develop broad acceptance for the doctoral award in arts practices within different academic contexts and national legislations;
- A need for joint cooperative models where possible, enabling the exchange of expertise, of students and of teachers. It was seen as


important that, in developing a new initiative, educators should begin to consider consortium-based approaches and alliances that could help in preparing a financial base for internationalisation and exchange of practices;

- A need to build and clearly describe the support for doctoral-level teachers, establishing education to increase competencies and to promote the development of the artist-research-educator, while also addressing issues of adequate remuneration and recognised status for artist-teachers;
- A need to use internationalisation and networking within third-cycle programmes as a means of enhancing quality assurance processes (diversified personnel and external contributions) and increasing the capacity to disseminate knowledge.


While identifying key needs to address in building new programmes, the working group also proposed some key actions that would facilitate new programmes. They recommended that colleagues wishing to build new doctoral education platforms should:

- Focus on the ERASMUS Programme for mobility as a route for building third-cycle experts' mobility (supervisors, examiners and teachers). Other colleagues in established doctoral-level programmes are also seeking to internationalise their student base, research connectivity and dissemination opportunities, so different kinds of partnerships can be built in which partners meet their different local needs through exchange. In building these exchanges, it is important to reflect upon key differences, taking account of the historical, cultural and linguistic contexts at the core of the differentiation of study programmes within the European higher education arena. The goal is not simply to displace these differences through a bland internationalism, but rather to build a heterogeneous and broadly interconnected landscape of research and research education;
- Foster understanding of the third cycle as a highly visible space of artistic practice, research and education that has relevance not just for the internal protocols of higher education but also has the potential to become a space that, while open, is a source of challenge to the presumed autonomies and undisclosed orthodoxies of the market and other non-academic contexts. This means building not just in dialogue with other higher arts educators but also with other kinds of educational and cultural agencies as well as with the informal networks and arts 'scenes' not necessarily anchored in either the academy or the market;

- Develop the research milieu, building upon specific local (albeit 'globalised-local') resources, traditions and issues rather than presuming that there is an international norm or ready-made ideal model of research milieu to which we can all adhere. Consciously consider the challenge of maintaining an openness to new insights and the radical unpredictability of research practices, while also trying to avoid a simple and unthinking embrace of generic research environments (laboratory, studio, performance hall, gallery or seminar room);
- While it is somewhat demanding – and potentially exposes us to criticisms in respect of coherence – there should be a constant revisiting of questions of first principle. These questions – as to 'What is research for the arts? Why might it be appropriate? In what ways might it not be appropriate? – must be kept open and subject to renewal through ongoing debate. These are questions that should not be put aside once answered within a process of third-cycle development; they must be maintained as themes to be renegotiated in light of the insights gained from the development process itself.



Examples and Case Studies of Artistic Research



This part of the book consists of two chapters, and has the function of providing outlines of specific situations in which third-cycle arts education is currently being enacted or developed. In chapter three, examples are provided of both individual doctoral projects and larger project frameworks that accommodate and shape doctoral education in the arts. In chapter four, a set of short case study reports indicates how development of the third cycle has been elaborated at four sites, using this to identify some of the tangible contributions made by doctoral education in the arts. These two chapters have been conceived as a counterpoint to chapters one and two, which provided general overviews and broad thematics. Here, the intention is to provide actual cases, as a means of giving specificity to the more abstract kinds of argument rehearsed in the opening section. These concrete examples then pave the way for the position papers, advocacy arguments and questions of quality and judgment that will be considered in part three of the book. It is hoped that, by moving between registers in this way – from the general to the particular and back – the questions that drive the volume as a whole are deepened and broadened.

3

Third-Cycle Projects: Some Examples

This chapter provides a portfolio of (post) doctoral-level projects and research practices, drawn from a variety of institutional frameworks, disciplines and national contexts. Within these examples, the fields of film, fine art, poetry, architecture, photography, design, typeface design, textile design, dance, music and curating are showcased. This sample includes both current research projects and completed doctorates.

The first seven examples (A–G) describe research undertaken within doctoral settings, with three of the projects being conducted under the auspices of national platforms (the Norwegian Artistic Research Programme and GradCAM, Ireland). These range from a successful television and film director conducting highly personal and auto-ethnographic research into his own practice – ultimately changing his perception on the director’s role and leading to him becoming the first person in Norway to support his practice-based research project with a thesis in the form of a video essay – to a design researcher examining approaches to ergonomic school furniture, in a project that began as a two-year research masters, leading to a patented design, later being transformed into a PhD project that ultimately contributed to a successful FP7 bid with a consortium of industry partners.¹

As themes and methods vary across the examples presented, so too do the ways in which the research has been funded. The Mongolian Typeface research (3.H.) was a postdoctoral project, funded through a private foundation in collaboration with a university. Textiles Environment Design (TED) is a (UK) university research lab,

18. European 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, <http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/>

participating in an international research consortium funded by the Swedish government. By contrast, the Labo21 project (3.J.) is an example of research centred in professional practice, through a partnership of esteemed performing arts companies which successfully applied for funding for a research project within the EU Culture Framework. The chapter concludes with the case of [MusicExperiment21], which was the first artistic research project to secure a ‘starting grant’ from the European Research Council (ERC), enabling the establishment of a sound multi-annual research structure. Overall, the projects considered in this chapter are as follows:

- 3. A. Trygve Allister Diesen
Maintaining Your Vision While Swimming with Sharks
- 3. B. Ana Hoffner
Queer Memory – Historicity, Neglect and the Embodiment of Trauma
- 3. C. Fredrik Nyberg
What is the Sound of the Poem? Becoming Firewood II
- 3. D. Katie Gaudion
Design and Autism
- 3. E. Lars Wallsten
Notes on Traces. Photography. Evidence. Image
- 3. F. Simon Dennehy
Perch/RAY School Furniture Design
- 3. G. Georgina Jackson
The Exhibition and the Political
- 3. H. Jo De Baerdemaeker
Mongolian Script: From Metal Type to Digital Font
- 3. I. Textiles Environment Design (TED)
The TEN: A Tool for Narrative Prototypes
- 3. J. Bertha Bermudez
Labo21: Emio Greco and Pieter C.Scholten’s Pre-choreographic Elements
- 3. K. [MusicExperiment21]
Music Performance in the 21st Century



3. A. Being the Director – Maintaining Your Vision While Swimming with Sharks²

Trygve Allister Diesen

A highly personal and auto-ethnographic dive into the world of film and TV directing.

The Norwegian Artistic Research Programme

Completed 2010

Disciplines: Film and TV Directing

Degree: The Norwegian Programme awards a degree which is officially refers to being 'at the doctoral level, representing the highest level of formal education in artistic research in Norway'. Presently it is not called a PhD.

Being the Director – Maintaining Your Vision While Swimming with Sharks is a doctoral artistic research project and video essay in which film/television director and former artistic research fellow, Trygve Allister Diesen, quite literally interviews himself, scrutinising his own work and process in a bid to understand the role of the film and TV director. Starting with the core question 'Is it possible to maintain a personal, artistic vision in an art form as collaborative and commercial as film and television?', he soon realises that he has no clear definition of what the 'director's vision' really is.

2. Excerpts available online:
<http://filmtvdirector.wordpress.com>
<https://vimeo.com/channels/swimmingwithsharks>

3. A. Trygve Allister Diesen, Maintaining Your Vision While Swimming with Sharks

Swimming with Sharks deals with Diesen's work and process as director/creator on the hard-boiled mini series, *Torpedo* (Norway, optioned for US remake), and the American feature film, *Red* (Sundance, Edinburgh festivals, etc.). The research project juxtaposes his video diary with footage from the set and interviews with key staff and collaborators, who often see things rather differently from the director. Diesen also interviews international collaborators, such as Danish director, Per Fly, and character actor for *Red*, Brian Cox, using their input as a sounding board for his own, ongoing reflection.

After major, well-documented clashes on *Torpedo*, in which Diesen used a 'bulldozer' directorial approach, he opted for a smoother, more collaborative approach for *Red*. He also found himself working on a different continent, with different rules and more than one ruler; Cox had his own, strong vision for the film and they had to find common ground. The video essay closely follows the editing process and shows how producers have the power to challenge, and occasionally overturn, the director's artistic choices.

With the video essay, *Swimming with Sharks*, Diesen uses his own artistic language and challenges his own medium to reflect upon, and develop, his own practice. This was made as the main reflective part of Diesen's doctoral work; it was intended as the audio-visual cousin of the more traditional, written dissertation. It was the first time that a research fellow had used the form of the video essay as a means of artistic reflection under the auspices of the Norwegian Artistic Research Programme, and, in the end, he was asked to supplement it with a brief essay. Every year since completion, Diesen's video essay has been used as example for all new artistic research fellows, in all disciplines, of what artistic research can be and how it can be presented.

The research project and video essay has been presented in six parts on the website of the main Norwegian professional film/TV magazine, *Rushprint*, and has been screened and lectured on at home and abroad for film, media and art scholars.





3. B. Queer Memory – Historicity, Neglect and the Embodiment of Trauma

Ana Hoffner

On the politics of memory as a selective framing technique for the perception of precariousness and vulnerability in social, political, economic and cultural transformations within European space after 1989.

Academy of Fine Arts Vienna

Intended for completion in October 2014

Disciplines: Fine Art

Degree: PhD in Practice


For a long time in the framework of post-war politics, memory was employed in the historicisation of singular events, especially the Holocaust. In this process, the proliferation of temporalities and knowledge formations shape contemporary subjectivities in a significant way, demanding an understanding of memory as a practice that challenges those national, hetero-normative and linear historicisations which force histories into competition. Taking these temporalities into account enables an understanding of memory as open to ephemerality, practices and knowledge formations, including the embodiment of traumatic experiences in queer times and queer histories. However, contemporary discussions do not tend to consider memory as having queer potentialities.

The concept of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*³ – dealing with the past – was strongly contested by post-war representations of the Cold War and, later, especially by the wars in former Yugoslavia.

If memory is a normative framework, selecting what is to be remembered and what is to be left aside, this framework can be exposed and questioned. This begs such questions as: How can we challenge contemporary frames of memory in the field of affection, trauma and the drive to get close to a traumatic experience? How can we move in time and reconnect post-war politics and representations in order to reframe the transformations of European space after 1989?

The inseparability of memory from the body requires a reflection upon its entanglement with precariousness and vulnerability, but memory's queerness needs a consideration of neglect, eradication, effacement and drive. This project focuses on two case studies: the representation of the Bosnian camp, Omarska, and Ingmar Bergman's film, *Persona*. The theoretical framework for the project consists of Visual Cultural Studies, Trauma Theory, Affect Theory and Queer Theory.

The project outcome will consist of a series of video and photo installations showing several performative practices dealing with historical narration and the fragmentation of imagery developed around the central notion of 'Queer Memory'. *After the Transformation*, one of the videos in this series, is an experimental video about the coaching of a transgendered voice after hormonal treatment. The transformation of the body also refers to social, political, economic and cultural transformations of European space after 1989. The role of memory for the construction of history between individual and collective narratives is brought into question.⁴




Die Geschichte hatte die Transformation durch das
Konstruieren einer Erinnerung zur Vergangenheit erklärt.

3. *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is a composite German word that describes processes of dealing with the past (*Vergangenheit* = past; *Bewältigung* = coming to terms with, mastering, wrestling into submission), which is perhaps best rendered in English as a 'struggle to come to terms with the past'.

4. A preview of the video can be seen on: <http://vimeo.com/66062644>

FREDRIK NYBERG

Hur låter dikten? Att bli ved II



3. C. What is the Sound of the Poem? Becoming Firewood II

Fredrik Nyberg

A historical and theoretical investigation of the culture of poetry reading and how it has established itself in modern times as well as what characterises this practice

Valand Academy at the University of Gothenburg

Completed May 2013

Disciplines: Literature

Degree: PhD in Literary Composition

Hur låter dikten? Att bli ved II [What is the Sound of the Poem? Becoming Firewood II] is centred on, and reflects upon, the question raised by its title. The dissertation consists of three chapters which are relatively diverse in character, and the different writing practices used in the dissertation become integral elements of the research project itself.

3. C. Fredrik Nyberg, What is the Sound of the Poem? Becoming Firewood II

This research is conducted by the established Swedish poet, Fredrik Nyberg. The first part of the dissertation is centred on a number of poetry readings given by the Nyberg some years ago. The chapter concludes with the concept of poetry reading being defined as something essentially different from other types of sonic poetic practices, which goes under the name of 'poetry performance'. In the second chapter of the dissertation, the focus shifts onto this kind of performative act, which became an important part of artistic and literary life during the second half of the 20th century. This chapter consists of three sections; the first discusses the terms 'text-sound composition' and 'sound poetry' from a historical and theoretical perspective. The second part of the chapter consists of an essay on the Swedish-Estonian avant-gardist and sound poet, Ilmar Laaban. The third section of the chapter deals with the sonic activities of the Swedish composer, performance artist, sound poet and conceptual artist, Sten Hanson.

A movement is identified, through which Hanson abandons conventional modes of literary expression in order to seek out and stage various sound poetry and performance activities. In the concluding chapter, two of Nyberg's own works are in focus.⁵ The first part is a discussion of the CD, *ADSR*. This essay is a text that, just like the CD, seeks to embrace a great many aspects. As it progresses, this heterogeneous essay also changes character and becomes more narrative in its mode. It is possible to regard this fragment of prose as yet another laboratory study of the significance of writing techniques in a practice aimed at producing knowledge.

The last section of the dissertation discusses the collection of poems, *Att bli ved* (by Nyberg), in which a number of key concepts – such as: sound similarities; loops, metre and rhythm; prose poetry; and a line of poetry – act as a point of departure. All these elements constitute important contributions in the different attempts to produce poems.

The dissertation blurs the lines between theorising the field and the practice-based aspects of research, to become a work of poetry in itself.

5. The CD *ADSR*, with poetry readings and the volume of poetry, *Att bli ved*, are an intrinsic part of the research.



3. D. Design and Autism

Katie Gaudion

Developing empathetic design approaches to improve everyday life for adults with autism.

The Royal College of Art

Intended for completion: October 2015

Disciplines: The Helen Hamlyn Centre for Design and Innovation Design Engineering

Degree: PhD by Practice

Autism spectrum disorder is a lifelong complex neurodevelopmental disorder that affects 1 in 100 people, determining the ways in which a person communicates and relates to other people and the world around them. People with autism may also develop sensitivities to sensory stimuli, complicating their ability to filter, interpret, perceive and adjust sensory information and effecting the way they experience their surroundings. Thanks to a handful of autism researchers and a continuous flow of first-hand accounts from people with autism, the design and composition of the 'physical' environment has begun to be considered a causal factor not in autism, per se, but in how a person with autism reacts to the world around them. Proof of this is found in the wave of sensory interventions developed to help people cope better with their surroundings, leading to the 2013 revision of the DSM-5 (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-Fifth Edition), in which sensory sensitivity was included as a core characteristic of autism.

As neuroscientists continue to look for a biological explanation for autism, this research takes an alternative perspective, exploring how design can complement existing research by focusing on the 'here and now' of everyday life for this growing population. It explores ways in which a designer's spatial/visual thinking, making skills and deep understanding of the sensory quality of materials can develop new modes of non-verbal communication and enhanced understanding of the everyday experiences of people with autism.

Instead of data, people are at the heart of this project. Important for this research is the development of empathetic design methods that engage and relate to the different cognitive styles of people with autism. In this, the design field can learn from designing with people with autism, whose unique sensory experience and perception of the physical world can enrich and inform better design practice. The research aims to expand the design a toolbox that will include design methods which move beyond written and spoken language to modes of non-verbal communication, which can be extrapolated into general design practice. The project will also examine how cause and effect reactions to the designed world can create tangible insights and clues to enable us to design and adapt the affordances of our physical environment, in which behavioural responses can be anticipated.

This PhD is supported by the autism charity, The Kingwood Trust, and brings together three distinctive and relevant forms of expertise: the people-centric design ethos of the Helen Hamlyn Centre for Design, the innovation and making orientation of Innovation Design Engineering and the autism expertise at the Centre for Research in Autism and Education (CRAE) at the Institute of Education. In collaboration with people supported by Kingwood, along with their family members and support staff, design ideas will be developed, explored and evaluated in different environmental contexts through a series of case studies. Design practice will also help to conceptualise, disseminate and communicate its ideas in a way that can be shared, amongst healthcare providers, family members, support staff, designers and the community as a whole.

This research aims to confront our conventional attitudes. It encourages us to reflect upon, and question, our perspectives to the point at which different ways of thinking, seeing, doing and behaving are embraced, accepted and celebrated.



3. E. Notes on Traces: Photography, Evidence, Image

Lars Wallsten

A treatise on the relationship between photography, representation and proof, in the criminological sense, in photographic practice.

Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts, University of Gothenburg

Completed in 2010

Discipline: photography

Title of award: Doctor of Photographic Composition

Lars Wallsten's *Anteckningar om Spår* [Notes on Traces] was a self-critical and self-reflective practice-based PhD project. It endeavoured to make visible the ways in which artistic practice could create its content and context in relation to experience, reinterpretation and progression.

The project was an enquiry into photography's capacity to prove evidence. It was structured around photographic representation and written text. The dissertation consisted of four photographic series, interleaved with an introduction, a list of contents and a main text

(presented as an essay with numbered passages). The research effort was guided by a broad, selective inquiry. Contextualisation and conceptualisation were orchestrated through a process of bricolage, in which creative use was made of different discourses, such as photography, film, art, philosophy, psychology, education, law, criminology, literature and cognitive science. Artistic strategies and practices that use forensic aesthetics were also discussed.

The method had the character of tracing a path that leads the project forward. This created a dialogue between the content and the form of the dissertation. Trace, condensation and pattern were presented as productive concepts; these concepts, which, in some respects, have their roots in photography not only provide others with the tools to understand a photograph as evidential proof but are also characterised by a suggestive quality, which is a recurring feature of the photographic projects.

Stylistically, Wallsten's thesis has been noted for its readability and departure from formal academic convention. As an artistic photographer and practitioner – with a background of many years as a crime scene investigator in Stockholm – Wallsten does not come from a traditional academic background and, as such, his study contributes to overcoming differences in the ways in which theoretical and practical knowledge are produced.





3. F. Perch/RAY School Furniture Design

Simon Dennehy

The design of new, ergonomic task furniture for students, resulting from research, qualitative and quantitative analysis and successful eventual commercialisation.

GradCAM, Dublin/National College of Art and Design (NCAD)

Intended for completion in 2015

Disciplines: Design

Degree: PhD

Sitting for prolonged periods of time on furniture that forces users to be static, uncomfortable and recumbent is unhealthy. Current thinking in relation to school furniture seems to be based on getting students to sit, for the majority of class time, on a reclining seat with a horizontal work surface. This research has invented a new way in which to experience task work, which aims to alleviate the negative consequences of sitting poorly all day. The resulting commercialised product, which resulted from this ongoing research, has sold many thousands of units around the world in its first year of production.

During a two-year research masters in 2008, the researcher created a new, patented seat system which encouraged upright and neutrally balanced sitting, as a result of a technological breakthrough with a flexible seat design. The final work consisted of a height-adjustable chair and sloping desk, with storage space for books and pencil cases. After launching these designs on his website, the researcher was contacted by hundreds of professional architects, teachers, designers, students and furniture producers.

3. F. Simon Dennehy, Perch/RAY School Furniture Design

An international consortium was formed, which successfully applied for European FP7 funding in 2009, for a project that was subsequently named Task Furniture in Education (TFE).⁶ This four-year IAPP⁷ research project aims to evaluate and propose future-focused concepts for furniture solutions in the educational environment, from a user-first design perspective. The researcher chose to pursue his research with commercial intent. He established a company called Perch. At the same time, he began his PhD study with GradCAM in Dublin. The primary research question was centred on quantifying the physiological and behavioural effects, on primary school students, of using the school furniture that had been developed.

After a short testing phase, it was decided that a long-term, qualitative research phase should be embarked upon, in which students could be analysed in their school environment without the use of any scientific equipment. For two months, sets of students were monitored from various angles as they engaged with both Perch and traditional furniture. Each morning, six high-definition cameras recorded an hour of footage from a multitude of angles. Capturing this footage enables the team to closely assess the behavioural and postural implications of old and new furniture – something which has rarely been done. This work is still being evaluated.

In 2010, Perch engaged with a Danish company, Labofa, which took a commercial interest in the research and findings. One year later, the partners signed a deal to commercialise the project as a Scandinavian-focused school furniture suite. After intense prototyping, testing and tooling, the RAY school furniture range was successfully launched at the international Orgatec fair in Cologne in November 2012 and at the Stockholm fair in February 2013.

The researcher is currently working closely with the producer to analyse and monitor the product range and assess its performance. It is expected that the testing phase will begin in early 2014 and the results will enable the conclusion of this PhD study.

The Principal Investigator is currently assisting with the rewriting of European standards for ergonomic school furniture (EN1729). His novel approach to task work is influencing this revision, which is due to be launched in summer 2014.

6. The partners in the TFE project include: the National College of Art and Design, Ireland; Escola Superior de Artes e Design, (ESAD), Portugal; Trinity College, Ireland; Vereinigte Spezialmöbelfabriken GmbH & Co. KG, Germany; Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft für Haltungs und Bewegungsförderung e.V. (BAG), Germany; Fielding Nair International, USA.

7. Industry-Academia Partnerships and Pathways (IAPP), Marie Curie Actions, EU Research and Innovation

Ferhat Ozgür *Tell Me Who Your Friends Are...* (2011)
Installation view *Neighbo(u)rhood*,
The Mattress Factory Art Museum,
Pittsburgh,
curated by Georgina Jackson



3. G. The Exhibition and the Political

Georgina Jackson

A study in the changing terms of contemporary art exhibition-making

GradCAM, Dublin / Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT)

Completed in 2012

Disciplines: Curating

Degree: PhD

This enquiry addressed the changing terms of the exhibition and *the political*,⁸ within the field of curating and contemporary art, with reference to the period since 1989. It responded to the proliferation of large-scale international group exhibitions that have referenced or engaged with politics, public-ness, the public sphere and *the political* over the preceding fifteen years. Indicative of the ways in which the exhibition is increasingly proposed as a space for the political are *documenta X* (1997), which focused on the social, economic and political issues of the present, and *Documenta11* (2001/2), which posited itself as a ‘constellation of public spheres’.⁹ At the same time, other exhibitions

8. The term *the political* (in italics) is employed to denote a broad conceptualisation of the potential for socio-political change (radical political reorganisation and social renewal). The term has increasingly been mobilised within contemporary art and curatorial discourses and is used propose a distinction between ‘politics’ (consensus orientated business as usual in the existing systems of liberal democracies) and the political (dissensus-based modes of contestation, leading to radical political reorganisation and social renewal). While this distinction originates from political theory, with reference to the work of Carl Schmitt in the early 20th century and, more recently, political theorists such as Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, the term has increasingly been used within contemporary art and curatorial discourses with the understanding outlined above. Italicisation of the term is used to differentiate from Mouffe’s specificity of ‘the political’.

9. O. Enwezor, C. Basualdo, U. Meta Bauer, S. Ghez, S. Maharaj, M. Nash and O. Zaya, (eds.) *Documenta 11 Platform5: The Exhibition. Catalogue*. (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2002). p. 54.

3. G. Georgina Jackson, The Exhibition and the Political

have directly engaged with contemporary political issues, such as *Fundamentalisms of the New Order*, Charlottenburg, Copenhagen (2002),¹⁰ and *Ausgeträumt... [All Dreamed Out... or Disenchanted...]* Secession, Vienna (2001),¹¹ which reflected upon the prevalence of political disillusionment.¹² This research explored the significance of the exhibition as a potential space in which to engage with politics. It entailed an extensive survey of curators' work and the production of exhibitions by the researcher.

While an interlinking of art and politics is not without precedent, this project contended that the intensification of exhibitions pertaining to this nexus of political terms marks a significant shift in exhibition-making and contemporary art. It was argued that the exhibition has shifted from a broadly implicit relationship with politics to an explicit citation of politics, and it has recently been



Declan Clarke / *Don't Ask That Much* (2009), Table, box, pamphlets, poster
Installation view Declan Clarke
Loneliness in West Germany (2009),
Goethe Institut, Dublin,
curated by Georgina Jackson

10. Co-curated by Cristina Ricupero and Lars Bang Larsen.

11. Curated by Kathrin Rhomberg.

12. Rhomberg details the initial optimism experienced post-1989 which quickly turned into political disillusionment in the mid- to late 1990s. This disillusionment with neoliberal democracy was exacerbated by 11 September 2001.

unambiguously mobilised as a space for the political. The aim of this research was to map this shift and explore its significance by examining the exhibition and the political through three distinct, yet interconnected, thematics: (I) the exhibition and politics; (II) the exhibition and the public sphere; and (III) the exhibition and the political. Each of these thematic conjunctions was examined through reflections on contemporary art, curatorial, philosophical, sociological and political discourses, and an analysis of examples of large-scale international exhibitions.

This research entailed the preliminary mapping of a field of changing exhibition practices and curatorial priorities, which attempts to lay a foundation upon which future research may be built. At key points within the thesis, the author's practice as a curator was brought into play, to counterbalance these discourses with the situated practice of actual exhibition making. In this way, a number of voices were combined in the act of thinking through the relationship between the exhibition and *the political* – those of art history, art criticism, art theory, political theory and philosophy – in combination with the actual practices of exhibition-making. This approach was adopted as consistent with the modalities of the expanded professional discourses in the 'field' of curating.

The written thesis arising from this research gives both a broad and detailed account of the changing terms of the exhibition and *the political* while interrogating underlying issues such as the public role of museums, art institutions and exhibitions, the question of public funding for the arts and the potential of exhibitions and contemporary art to play a critical role within society. Furthermore, this study contributes to an expansion of the ways in which exhibitions are considered, the specificity of their discursive production and the relationship of exhibitions to the question of publics, politics and the perennial challenge of thinking the world anew.

3. H. Jo De Baerdemaeker, Mongolian Script: From Metal Type to Digital Font



3. H. Mongolian Script: From Metal Type to Digital Font

Jo De Baerdemaeker

A new approach to designing and developing Mongolian fonts for contemporary use.

The Leverhulme Trust, University of Reading
(Department of Typography & Graphic Communication)

May 2011– April 2013

Disciplines: Typeface Design

Degree: Post-Doctoral Early Career Fellowship, The Leverhulme Trust

Looking at the vast array of fonts available for setting text on digital computers, a substantial difference emerges between the number of Latin typefaces and those created for non-Latin writing systems (not counting Greek, Hebrew and Cyrillic). Although, over the past 20 years, great projects have been developed for Arabic and Indian scripts, only a handful of digital fonts are available for minority languages such as Tibetan and Mongolian.¹³ In December 2005, a team of experts from the National University of Mongolia and the Mongolian University of Science and Technology proposed a UNESCO-supported project to promote the use of traditional Mongolian script by text processing and web publishing tools.¹⁴

13. Minority is here referred to in the context of being used by only a low percentage of the world population

14. http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=20774&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

Those few Mongolian fonts which presently exist are of poor typographic and technical quality, inadequate to represent the written Mongolian language over a range of text types and platforms. The need for high-quality fonts for typesetting texts in Mongolian script is clear; there is a great demand for them in contemporary Mongolian publishing, both in print and on screen, in the global cataloguing systems of libraries and universities (which, at the moment, use Cyrillic or Latin transliteration) and in several other typographical applications. In order to devise ideas for developing Mongolian typefaces for contemporary digital use, this research project deployed a methodology that was developed and tested in the Primary Investigator's PhD research into Tibetan type forms.¹⁵ This postdoctoral project sought solutions for the design of Mongolian digital fonts could be found by combining research into previous methods of typesetting and the evolution of the Mongolian script in print with an understanding of the latest font technologies. This methodology had already been adopted in relation to other non-Latin typefaces by Dr. Fiona Ross and, to some degree, by Bapurao Naik.¹⁶

Research was undertaken in the archives of international polyglot printing houses, specifically selected for their Mongolian material, and in the collections of international libraries, universities and museums. Different specimens of Mongolian typefaces and writing models were collected and analysed for comprehensive indicators of the shape, proportions and spacing of individual characters. Specialists in the Mongolian language were consulted, as were native speakers, writers and academics in Mongolia, and collaborations were established with a broad scale of academic institutions and libraries (in France, Germany, Italy, Mongolia, Russia and the UK).

All collected samples were examined at both the macro-level (looking at the size of character sets, the positioning of diacritical marks,¹⁷ etc.) and the micro-level, and dissected to analyse the visual quality of the individual Mongolian characters (designed as metal types or digital glyphs). A large comparative matrix of individual Mongolian type forms was compiled, comparing traditional and contemporary writing practices with respect to the outlines, proportions, counters, ductus, finials, positioning of the diacritical signs, alignment heights

15. J. De Baerdemaeker, *Tibetan typeforms: an historical and visual analysis of Tibetan typefaces from their inception in 1738 up to 2009*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Reading, 2009)

16. F. Ross, *The printed Bengali character and its evolution*. (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2005) and S. Bapurao Naik, *Typography of Devanagari*. vol 1 – 3. (Bombay: Directorate of Languages, 1971)

17. A diacritical mark is a mark or addition to some characters to denote a specific pronunciation (for instance: é).

and other elements of individual characters. This yielded a system for classifying all the typefaces that were examined.

The research and analysis for *Mongolian Script: From Metal Type to Digital Font* was undertaken from a typeface designer's perspective, and it shed light on the origins and development of Mongolian typeface design. The project provided a comprehensive historical account of the Mongolian typefaces that had been created throughout history and analysed their visual and technical characteristics as well as their quality of use. By investigating how the Mongolian script had been translated into moveable printing types and other type forms, the study offered practice-orientated guidance for the design and development of new digital fonts for the Mongolian script.

The research culminated in a study of the functionality of contemporary Mongolian fonts, and proposed methods of using current digital technologies to overcome the considerable complexities of Mongolian typesetting. At the same time, in collaboration with Mongolian linguists, a descriptive framework was developed that facilitated communication about the visual and technical analysis of Mongolian type forms. This framework focused on the anatomical elements of the Mongolian writing system.

A website, Mongoliantype.com, was created to function as the platform for this research project. It presents the research findings and guidance, supported by theoretical and practical analysis, as well as a database. The website also serves as an accessible network, and it gives references to collections and academic writings on the Mongolian script, as well as to all the collaborators on the project.

Finally, the project included scope to propose guidelines for designing new contemporary digital Mongolian fonts. This resulted in a practical consultancy with font software companies to improve the tools for creating digital Mongolian fonts, the online database of Mongolian typefaces and publication of a one-volume monograph.

This practice-based research project contributed to improving Mongolian typography, and it is hoped that it will become a good source of information for scholars of Mongolian language and culture, historians of print, professional (typeface) designers, software developers, librarians, linguists, academics and all those who have an interest in Mongolian or non-Latin typography and typeface design.



3. 1. The TEN: A Tool for Narrative Prototypes

Textiles Environment Design TED

The understanding and demonstration of how design can contribute to the future of sustainable textile products.

Textiles Futures Research Centre (TFRC)18 at the University of the Arts, London (UAL)
2010-ongoing

Disciplines: Textile Design

Project Leader: Prof. Rebecca Earley; Co-investigators: Prof. Kay Politowicz and Dr. Kate Goldsworthy

The Textiles Environment Design (TED) project at Camberwell, Chelsea and Wimbledon (CCW) is part of the Textile Futures Research Centre (TFRC) at the University of the Arts, London (UAL).¹⁹

Contemporary textile production employs systems for design creation and consumption that were established early in the early 20th Century, while being transformed by new technologies at almost every stage. However, in recent years, there has been a huge growth in worldwide demand for fast fashion, which has had an ecological, economic and social impact upon production. What, how, where and why things are made is gradually becoming central in the minds of designers, manufacturers and citizens, as images of pollution, waste, worker exploitation and landfill are widely available. If the dominance

18. www.tfrc.org.uk

19. www.tedresearch.net

3. I. Textiles Environment Design (TED), The TEN: A Tool for Narrative Prototypes

of consumerism and industrial profit is to be challenged, design innovation needs to be employed to overcome the ever-increasing imperatives.

Since '80% of the environmental impact of a product is determined at the design stage',²⁰ urgent practical action is needed to bring about systemic change, or to achieve even marginal gains. Practice-led research is confronting issues related to the whole lifecycle of textile products, including the non-traditional design areas of consumer use and disposal. The TED group of practice-based researchers has developed a set of TEN strategies for the design of more sustainable textiles, collectively known as The TEN: A Tool for Narrative Prototypes. These employ tactics that enable us to take on a dynamic design role, which includes facilitation, activism and social engagement.

The strategies act as a practical map for designers to act in collaboration with industry, to navigate obstacles to the sustainable production, consumption and regeneration of textiles. Strategies one to five propose radical design ideas for the reduction of materials, energy, water and chemicals in both the production and use phase of the product lifecycle. This requires a change in manufacturing processes, to enable cyclability without compromising the aesthetic value or functional sophistication of textile structures. Technological innovations, systems of distributed or additive manufacture, co-design and consumer engagement are explored for their sustainable credentials. Strategies six and seven take models from natural and historical systems in a bid to facilitate enterprise within social groups. Strategies eight to ten reduce consumption through a design approach to dematerialisation, through services and systems of sharing or leasing. Design activism



20. T.E. Graedel et al. et al., 'Green Product Design', *AT&T Technical Journal*, November/December, 1995, p. 17.

to promote sustainable thinking is central to the production of prototypes, which offer innovation and compelling narratives for energetic communication with industry. It is evident from our work with large and small commercial brands that they are most interested in strategies one to five, but it is in the tough eight to ten where the biggest shift will occur in future.

As a tool for action and reflection, the TEN cards provide a checklist for designers – a lens through which to view issues of concern, cut through the rhetoric and solve apparently intractable problems. In using this as a tool for analysis of conditions, prompts and enablers, the designer contributes to networks of innovation.²¹

In the creation of immersive workshops employing an empirical approach,²² the relevance of the TEN cards to industrial product development has been demonstrated, replicating and accelerating a proposed product supply chain with a design focus. An evaluative framework for the innovation that the workshops encourage is formulated using qualitative research methods in a ‘self-report instrument’, to map the effects of the cards on the design process. A retrospective assessment of workshop participation, observation and description is used to examine the experience and generate theories during the action research process for the evolution of workshop practice.

Innovation for sustainability is central to TED enterprise and research projects. TED is participating as one of eight research groups in a multidisciplinary international research consortium, MISTRA Future Fashion, funded by the Swedish Government. As designers, the TED team is collaborating with social, political and material scientists with the common goal of creating ‘systemic change in the Swedish fashion industry, leading to sustainable development of the industry and wider society, whilst remaining competitive’. The resulting intelligent design innovation could stimulate thoughtful, and even playful, solutions to the prevailing environmental, economic and social questions that are facing society today.

21. C. Bussracumpakorn and J. Wood, *Design Innovation Networks* (Lambert Academic Publishing, 2010).

22. J. Cassim, ‘Designing Effective User Interactions – examples from the Challenge Workshops’, in: *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference of the International Association for Universal Design IAUD* (Hamamatsu, Japan, 2010).



3. J. Labo21- Emio Greco and Pieter C. Scholten's Pre-choreographic Elements

Bertha Bermudez

new methods for the documentation, transmission and preservation of contemporary choreographic and dance knowledge.

International Choreographic Arts Centre (ICKAmsterdam)

2010-ongoing

Disciplines: Performing Arts

Funding: EU Culture programme (2012–2013)

For a few decades now, our society has been undergoing a process of transition from a literal society into a digital one. New modes of knowledge circulation are available, affecting our social relations as well as the established modes of education. Besides the massive use of the Internet for social media, there has been a growth in the use of Internet and other digital tools within primary, secondary and academic studies. After years of discussion around the value of the knowledge generated and transmitted through digital media, evidence of its positive use in knowledge acquisition is allowing interactive environments and online tools to be part of education. Being aware of such social developments has allowed a group of researchers and practitioners to engage with the search for new modes of dance transmission and educational strategies.

Within the dance field, few institutions are making use of digital tools, but the interest of artists, researchers, teachers and students is growing. A new generation of students and makers, embedded in the use of digital media in their daily life, is ready to be confronted with innovative proposals. The need to build bridges between the questions and findings of artist-led research projects, individual interests and praxis and the dance educational institutions is at the beginning of a fruitful relationship.

Labo21, or the laboratory of the 21st century, is a platform that encompasses various autonomous research projects on artistic methodologies in European countries. The project partners are: Coventry University (UK), Wayne McGregor Random Dance (UK), ICKamsterdam Emio Greco and Pieter C. Scholten (The Netherlands), BADco (Croatia) and Troubleyn Jan Fabre (Belgium). Each partner considers this research topic from a different perspective, but information is shared over the course of the two years

The interdisciplinary Pre-choreographic Elements is one of the projects within Labo21. Initiated by ICKamsterdam/Emio Greco | Pieter C. Scholten and coordinated by dance researcher, Bertha Bermudez, Pre-choreographic Elements is a continuation of two previous research projects around the documentation, notation and transmission of dance, entitled Capturing Intention and Inside Movement Knowledge. Focusing on one of the initial phases of the dance process – the creation and development of movement material, current research deals with the selection, definition and demonstration of movement concepts from the repertoire of Emio Greco | Pieter C. Scholten.

Making use of the frame theory from cognitive linguistics, interactive environments and design, Pre-choreographic Elements positions itself in the midst of questions around the digitalisation of dance, intangible heritage and e-learning, to ask: ‘How can we translate pre-choreographic moving concepts into other media?’ ‘What happens in the process of dis-embodiment?’ ‘How do digital media accompany such processes?’

Taking as its starting point the selection and definition of pre-choreographic concepts, a multimedia glossary will be built in order to establish relations between concepts, visual information, sounds and, later, interactive feedback. In collaboration with various partners, this glossary will be made interactive, online and, through the collaboration with new media artists and designer Chris Ziegler (Arizona State University), an installation. Looking at issues of

terminology and representation formats, the glossary is the core element of a user interface in which other media elements will accompany the textual and sound explanatory descriptions and definitions of the terms. Through this multimedia spectrum, the user will be provided with various sources of knowledge (cognitive and experiential) from which they will be able to generate their own movements and drawings. At this stage (2013), the development of the first prototype is on its way, and the research group is working toward the possible development of an interactive installation that will allow a more active and physical encounter of the Pre-choreographic Elements content.





3. K.

Experimentation versus Interpretation: Exploring New Paths in Music Performance in the 21st Century

MusicExperiment21

Transformations of concepts and practices in music performance.

Orpheus Research Centre in Music, Ghent, Belgium

2013-2018

Disciplines: Performing Arts

Funding: EU European Research Council Starting Grant (total funding: approx. €1.5 million)


Principal Investigator: Dr. Paulo de Assis

Co-investigators: Dr. Bob Gilmore, Dr. Darla Crispin, Dr. Michael Schwab, Juan Parra C and Paolo Giudici.

By clinging to an outmoded paradigm of interpretation, musical performance practices are becoming isolated from the wider fields of artistic research. By extension, musicians risk becoming less intellectually engaged within contemporary culture. Taking Gilles Deleuze's invitation not to interpret but to 'experiment' with the materials of our domain, this research project aims to develop a different and original model for musical performance – a model that takes into account older modes of performance (execution, *Vortrag*, interpretation, performance and others) but which is crucially based upon 'experimentation' (Fig. 1).

3. K. [MusicExperiment21], Music Performance in the 21st Century

Fig. 1: Execution – Interpretation – Experimentation



The main goal of MusicExperiment21 is to propose and generate new modes of performance and exposition of research. Integrating material that goes beyond the score (such as sketches, texts, concepts, images, videos) into performances, this project offers a broader contextualisation of the works within a transdisciplinary horizon. In order to achieve this, the project has a multidisciplinary structure, with specific research strands on artistic practice, musicology, philosophy and epistemology, generating a network of aesthetic-epistemic references, which emerge at different professional stages (including doctoral and postdoctoral researchers), as well as in the context of leading international projects and ensembles (in Austria, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Norway, Sweden, and the USA, among others).

Combining theoretical investigations with the concrete practice of music, this project presents a case for change in the field of musical performance, proposing alternatives to traditional understandings of 'interpretation'.

Whereas traditional models are based on static conceptions of the score, this project proposes a dynamic conception, in which innumerable layers of notational practices and editions of musical works throughout time generate an intricate multi-layered set of inscriptions. If the source text is seen as dynamic, rather than fixed, and if the performative moment is – in its essential nature – also dynamic and ever-changing, it follows that every performance is more of an 'event' than a reiteration of the given 'form' of a piece. In place of a heuristic approach, there is an exploration of potentialities contained within a given score. The performer wanders creatively through such a landscape, using and training the imagination with the goal of breaking free from the past and constructing new assemblages.

The research team is comprised of the Principal Investigator (a trained concert pianist and musicologist with strong interests in Philosophy, Aesthetics and Epistemology), two senior artist-researchers (one with expertise in Musicology, the other in Philosophy and Aesthetics), two postdoctoral students (focussing on artistic and technological enhancement of the projects) and two doctoral students (developing and giving continuity to the project's ideas). The docs and post-docs are hired through international open calls, contributing to the investigations while creating work.

The outcomes will include presentations, peer-reviewed journal articles, three monographs, as well as musical performances, recordings, CDs and DVDs. Moreover, the *Journal for Artistic Research* (JAR) will serve as a first-instance vehicle for peer-reviewed practical publications, supporting the development of a community and creating impact for the work. One International Conference on the topic of 'Experimentation in Music Performance' will be organised, and a Website (www.musicexperiment21.eu) will give continuous notice of the project's developments.

Hosted at the Orpheus Institute (specifically the Orpheus Research Centre in Music — ORCiM), this project will benefit from, and contribute to, the wider discourse on Artistic Experimentation, the Centre's current research focus. ORCiM's significant international links to music institutions devising advanced Artistic Research programmes will both contribute to the dissemination of findings and provide vital developmental material for these arts institutions; the centres include: the Sibelius Academy Helsinki (Finland), the Kunst Universität Graz (Austria), the University of York (UK), the Griffith University (Australia), the McGill University (Canada), the Royal Conservatory The Hague (Holland), and the Norwegian Academy of Music (Norway). Moreover, ORCiM's facilities, its musical lab and its community of artist-researchers offer an ideal and unique resource base for this project.

Example

Deleuzabelli Variations [On Beethoven's *Diabelli Variations* op. 120]

This artistic project involves Beethoven's *Diabelli Variations* op. 120 (1821–1824). Inspired by readings of the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze, William Kinderman's book *Beethoven's Diabelli Variations* (1987) and Michel Butor's *Dialogue avec 33 variations de Ludwig van Beethoven sur une valse de Diabelli* (1971), it aims to expose Beethoven's original piece to several musical 'encounters', letting other times and styles 'interfere' with Beethoven, and making 'unconnected connections' happen. In the timeframe of the original piece, and preserving the original sequence of the Variations, diverse techniques of elimination, suppression, substitution and replacement are used. A new score is written for every performance, including interruptions and interventions from others times and styles, not only including Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart and Cramer (which are implicit in Beethoven's original) but also Brahms, Webern, Berg, Feldman and others. This complex articulation of (unexpected) encounters allows for the emergence of new relations between its constitutive parts, thus contributing to a permanent 'non-closure' of artistic things and objects.

4

Case Studies

Over the ERASMUS-funded phase of the SHARE network, a series of site visits were made to several cities in Europe, where case studies were conducted for the purpose of (i) investigating the state of development of the debate on the third cycle and (ii) identifying the potentials present for developing the third cycle. These visits were conducted by the editors, Mick Wilson and Schelte van Ruiten, and typically entailed two days of discussion with institutions of higher arts education, in conjunction with visits to specific infrastructural and research education resources. This material is presented here by way of indicating the wide differences in the level of development of the third cycle across Europe and by way of demonstrating that there will not be a standard development pathway for the implementation of doctoral education in the arts. The cities selected were based on geographical spread (North, South, East, West) and an attempt to explore a wide range of scenarios (from situations where the second cycle in arts education was still in development to sites where there was an established history of doctoral education in the arts).

In each site, an agenda for the dialogue was configured, according to the specifics of the site and the relative level of development of third-cycle activity. There was a third purpose to these visits which was essentially (iii) to promote greater connectivity between doctoral educators in the arts across Europe and to provide advocacy support through informal information-sharing across the different case-study sites. Presented here is a series of short summaries from each case study, grouped according to the relative level of development of the third cycle in each case.

Informal, semi-structured interviews were conducted, in a bid to elicit full and frank disclosure of the operational realities, policy challenges and wider cultural politics of each context. This convivial *modus operandi* was selected in favour of a formal social scientific method in order to engender a more authentic approach to dialogue and in keeping with SHARE's remit as a developmental networking initiative. Each session began with an indication of our broad advocacy role and an assurance that dialogue partners would have editorial input into the final case-study write-ups, thereby attempting to place them at their ease. It was indicated that this way of working had been adopted with a view to releasing participants from any perceived obligation to downplay local challenges out of loyalty to colleagues and employers, by assuring them that the material made public as part of this process would not in any way present institutions or colleagues in a negative light. We reiterated that our purpose was advocacy for, and stimulus of, the building of doctoral-level studies, as part of a networking infrastructure rather than a formal research project as such. However, it was indicated that, within the informal knowledge exchange of the network, the information shared would be invaluable, enabling us to build a clear sense of what is really happening on the ground at the intersection between policy change, institutional strategy, actual teaching practices and individual researchers.

For each case-study visit, an agenda was proposed, and, wherever possible, an attempt was made to convene meetings on site (i.e. within the immediate research environment in which doctoral education took place or, in the absence of doctoral level activity, where masters education took place). In some instances, meetings were convened in such a way as to bring institutions based in one city together in the dialogue, so that our site visits could support local exchange and interaction and not simply service our own agenda. In all, eight case-study visits were conducted (see list below); provided here are four examples in the form of extracts from the case-study reports.

Florence	<u>no third-cycle activity in artistic education, but many opportunities identified</u>
Malta	<u>second-cycle and some very limited pre-third-cycle activity in artistic education underway (4.A)</u>
Copenhagen	<u>third-cycle activity in artistic education underway</u>
Bucharest	<u>third-cycle activity in artistic education underway</u>
Istanbul	<u>third-cycle activity in artistic education underway</u>
Lisbon	<u>third-cycle activity in artistic education in second or third generation (4.B)</u>
Vienna	<u>third-cycle activity in artistic education in second or third generation (4.C)</u>
Budapest	<u>third-cycle activity in artistic education in second or third generation (4.D)</u>

4. A. Valetta, Malta, June 2012

This case study entailed a site visit to the University of Malta and meetings with Dr. Raphael Vella, Dr. Vince Briffa and Prof. Jo Butterworth. The university currently provides for approximately 10,000 students, serving an island-wide population of approximately 400,000, occupying an exceptionally important role in the country's intellectual and cultural life. While the emphasis on creative arts education in the University of Malta is currently focused on the second cycle (masters level), as will be seen a critical issue that emerged from the site visit was the key role that graduates of third-cycle (doctoral level) programmes in creative practices (particularly Fine Art and Architecture) were playing as agents, leading the development of first- and second-cycle education in the arts.

There is a range of first- and second-cycle creative arts programmes provided by the University of Malta, which includes the disciplines of Dance, Art Education, Digital Arts, Music Studies, Theatre Studies and Architecture. While not all the disciplines are currently represented at both first and second cycle, there is a clear pattern of development, demonstrating the university's commitment to creative arts education. For example, in 2011, the Faculty of Media and Knowledge Sciences was established, building upon the 13-year existence of the Centre for Communications Technology, which was set up to address local opportunities arising from the opening up of the airwaves to independent operating licenses by educating a range of different creative professionals for the media. The conversion of the centre into a faculty signalled capacity for an intake of approximately 100 new students per annum.

In recent years, there has been considerable growth, with the development of new bachelor and masters programmes. Several faculties are actively involved in the delivery of creative arts education, including Education, Built Environment, Media and Knowledge Sciences, Arts and the Mediterranean Institute. There are also ongoing discussions about this School / Faculty tier of organisational division as the university grows. It seems likely that some form of closer inter-operation will emerge in the coming years, perhaps in the form of two key sub-clusters of performing arts programmes and of art, design and media programmes respectively.

The cohorts of most creative arts education programmes are small, ranging from four to 15. In part, this reflects the scale of Maltese society, but it is also determined by the numbers of qualified staff available to teach on the different programmes. Organisationally, the potential

for cross-departmental, cross-faculty and interdisciplinary collaboration has been very important in enabling new programmes, increasing the pool of available expertise to inform development. However, other limitations are less easily negotiated; for example, there is a limitation on art teacher education programmes, by virtue of the limited opportunities for trainee teacher placements, which are an essential feature of the pedagogical development of the student. There is an uneven pattern of capital and human resourcing in relation to different disciplines, which would seem to reflect a contingent history of development rather than a specific policy of prioritising one discipline over another, although, more recently, a clear strategic priority has emerged in favour of creative technologies and digital media that reflects internationally trends.

Another notable feature of the University of Malta's provision is its international aspect, which is particularly evident in the international masters programmes that it realises in conjunction with several US universities (according to one estimate, 10 percent of the university's student body is attached to these international programmes). While there is no clear timeframe for the development of third-cycle awards with a substantial body of creative practice, the logic of development trajectories to date would seem to indicate that this will become an explicitly framed strategic goal within the next few years. Two of the academic leaders consulted during the site visit explicitly identified third-cycle development as something that was under discussion, albeit primarily in an informal manner. One respondent indicated that he believed that the existing PhD framework in the Faculty of Education could be utilised to support a creative arts education doctoral project without anything new needing to be added to the regulations. All respondents placed great emphasis on a combination of theoretical and practical competences in artistic education across all three cycles, and projected the doctoral level of creative arts education as a logical development from the current trajectory of new programmes and initiatives.

An important issue that emerged during the course of the site visit was the importance of PhD bearers as agents of change and leaders of new programme initiatives. It was notable that those members of staff who had achieved a doctoral qualification were critically active in developing new first- and second-cycle initiatives. This raises issues that are often left unaddressed in discussions of the doctoral level of studies in the creative arts. On the one hand, the influence of the PhD bearers was pronounced, and it was suggested (at an anecdotal

level) that there was a strong correlation between research qualifications among educators and innovation in first- and second-cycle educational provision. On the other hand, the potential cultural hegemony of a particular educational model might also require consideration, as the majority of PhD bearers operative in the creative arts in this context had been formed in the British educational system. An important consideration in the future development of third-cycle awards through the creative arts in Malta is likely to be the specificity of a small country with a narrow population base and a modest number of research students in the arts. However, the rich internationalisation potentials – building upon existing relationships across the Mediterranean, Europe and the US – might indicate an alternative approach to building critical mass in the context of a small nation. Whichever development pathway is adopted, it seems likely that a key consideration will be that of addressing the particularities of the Maltese context rather than simply importing predefined ‘off-the-shelf’ strategies for artistic research degrees.

An important consideration for the development of the creative arts third cycle in Malta is the broader context and research relevance that doctoral-level studies in the creative arts might engage. In this respect, several themes recurred in dialogues with academic leaders. At the time of our visit, Valetta, the Maltese capital, was in a second-phase bid to become 2018 European City of Culture, and the University of Malta was a major stakeholder in the bid process. This created a context in which the question of the arts could be foregrounded in the strategic mission of both the university and the city. (It is worth noting here that the bid is supported by neighbouring municipal authorities, indicating a national level of coordination and the potential for high-level access and influence by arts educators and advocates.) Thus, the timeframe of 2013 to 2018 will be an interesting one in terms of the potential for developing a strategic vision for artistic research development. An important consideration could be the ways in which development of a public and political agenda around the arts might require concomitant growth in critical culture and debate within the arts. This, in turn, suggests a pathway for research development. All of the respondents made particular mention of recent cultural development within Maltese society, as manifested in new venues and initiatives for the performing and visual arts, as well as cultural events that invited the residents of Malta to enter into public spaces and increase participation in civic culture. A clear challenge to the arts and to arts education in Malta is the development of an appropriate physical infrastructure. This could itself be taken as a research agenda for the arts, using the arts in order to better understand and plan

the resource needs of the arts for the future.

During initial contact with educators based in Malta, some doubt was expressed as to the value of a case-study visit because of the absence of third-cycle activity. However, the experience of being on site and meeting people in their workaday environments was, in fact, very important. The key insight that emerged was the role of PhD bearers in leading innovation in first- and second-cycle teaching and learning. This also brought a new issue onto the agenda: the diffusion of educational models and artistic research paradigms from one country to another, through the agency of the PhD bearers themselves. Balancing this insight was the recognition that greater attention needed to be paid to the specificity of regional and national contexts, particularly when it came to questions of scale and critical mass. This is a theme that will be developed in subsequent case-study visits, in which the opposite extreme – very large scale cohorts and well established programmes – was experienced.

Coda

After circulating this draft report of the site visit made in summer 2012, the following updates were received. Prof. Jo Butterworth noted that, within one year, the situation described in the summer of 2012 was already well out of date. She noted that, in July 2012, the Senate of the University of Malta had approved the establishment of a new School of Performing Arts, comprising the departments of Dance Studies, Music Studies and Theatre Studies. This unit now offers a full range of programmes (BA, MA, MMus, PhD and DMus). According to Prof. Butterworth, staff in the school have an especial interest in developing Practice as Research courses as these methods ‘support the philosophy to synthesise theoretical and practical/performative aspects, a very important factor in the development of the performing arts cultures here in Malta’. This development is, in itself, indicative of the rate of change in the artistic research education landscape in Europe.

4. B. Budapest, Hungary, June 2012

This case study included a site visit to the Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design (MOME), Budapest, where discussions were held with Prof. István Ferencz, Head of the Doctoral School, Júlia Gáspár, Coordinator for the Doctoral School and Assoc. Prof. Márton Szentpéteri, who hosted the site visit. This visit was very important in challenging the assumed dominance of Northern European institutions (specifically the UK and Scandinavia) in the development of doctoral education in the arts. Budapest presented a highly structured doctoral model that had been developed independently by art and design educators working through successive iterations of doctoral education over a 15-year period. There are currently 50 doctoral researchers working on the three-year doctoral programme at MOME. The importance of international connectivity in creating a research milieu was emphasised by the research educators at MOME, who pointed to 114 partnerships with international universities and the contributions of 22 visiting professors over the previous academic year.

Distinctive features of the MOME model include an emphasis on sustained group contact and a structure of teaching inputs that covers all three years of the programme, while maintaining an emphasis on the major research required for the doctoral exam. The pattern of contact is roughly one day a week during semester time, meaning that there is a very strong community of doctoral students and a strong identity for the doctoral school as one of the main pillars of the university. The content of the weekly programme is very varied and includes cultural history, sustainability, literary studies and economics, thus ensuring a wider educational perspective beyond art and design practice. During discussions, recurring emphasis was placed on the wish to have both depth and breadth in the doctoral level of studies, so that graduates achieve mastery in their own discipline and a more general grounding in intellectual and visual culture.

Respondents made a strong connection between the success of the doctoral programme and the level of partnership and experimentation taking place at the masters level. Although there was a clear separation between the second and third cycles, an extremely rich milieu had been created within the small university (less than 1,000 students in total), engendered by a sustained partnership with Mercedes Benz, Miele and others. The small university environment was seen as flexible, by being responsive to partnership opportunities and establishing the personal and professional ties needed to

4. B. Budapest, Hungary, June 2012

secure partnership projects over many years. This, in turn, created a platform within which interesting and ambitious doctoral projects could be undertaken.

An issue that arose here, which is increasingly prominent across Europe, is that of measures of achievement. The problem of a single monolithic system of bibliometrics was identified by respondents, who noted the work that had been done in trying to build recognition for the kinds of outputs that are relevant in an art, design or architectural research context. They noted that this was an ongoing task, in Hungary as elsewhere, and cited several different attempts to develop models that they were following with interest.

One of the most striking things about the situation at MOME is the degree of internationalism maintained by educators and researchers within a relatively small organisation. This international connectivity has been built over many years, rooted in the modernist internationalism that is evident in the university's name. It is also noteworthy that the original foundations of the academy were in the higher arts education reforms of Victorian England, prompting a Hungarian experiment in higher arts education with the founding of the Hungarian Royal Institute of Arts and Crafts in 1880, the ancestor of today's MOME. Throughout all the case-study visits, international connectivity emerged as key to the local arts educational milieu, regardless of the level of development of the third cycle at any given site, especially a connectivity that was multidimensional (academic, industrial and societal). One respondent noted that, given the tensions emerging in the wider European project, because of the loss of belief in a merely 'economic' Europe, it would be worth re-asserting the intellectual and cultural resources of the arts and arts education as both bearers and beneficiaries of particularly rich traditions of internationalism.

4. C. Lisbon, Portugal, July 2012

The case study included a site visit to the Faculdade de Belas-Artes da Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal, and meetings with Vice Director, Prof. João Paulo Queiroz, President of the Scientific Board, Prof. Fernando António Baptista Pereira, and the Head of Academic Services, Mr. Nuno Cruz. Established in 1836, the faculty has offered doctoral level education since the early 1990s, with the first graduations taking place in the academic year 1998–9. The original model of doctoral education in the arts was based on individual study with a supervisor, entailing little or

no group work as part of the process. In this older model, there tended to be a degree of separation between written and practical components in the doctoral submission. The advent of the Bologna Process in 2000, combined with national university law reforms in 2005–6, prompted a review and renewal of doctoral education, giving rise to a restructured doctoral programme, based, in part, on work by Prof. Isabel Sabino. The first changes made to the doctoral programme, in the early 2000s, saw the creation of vertical pathways for BA, MA and PhD within each subject subdivision of the faculty (painting, sculpture, communication and design, multimedia, etc.), thus creating discrete PhD education in each subject. However, by the late 2000s, even as this new vertical system was in development, the value of cross-disciplinary doctoral-level education was recognised and a system of doctoral seminars was elaborated that provided cohesive third-cycle education across all seven subject areas.

Interestingly, this process was iterative, initially based on a response to Bologna at an institutional level, then shifting into a new strategy, based on national reforms several years later. This last point affirms the experience of elsewhere, which is that, in many discussions of Bologna, what is really at stake is the variant interpretations that have been adopted through national university laws and particular institutional dispensations, which differ in their reading of the detail of the Bologna Process. It seems that much confusion has been generated in international debate on this subject, because of the failure to make a clear distinction between what proceeds from Bologna (such as the Dublin Descriptors accords) and what proceeds from the idiosyncrasies of national reform agendas. In the concrete case of Lisbon, we see that the initial interpretation of Bologna was directed at clarifying an award progression pathway within each subject, followed by the adoption of distinct award levels and pedagogical or organisational strategies for each cycle, not determined by the highly generalised nature of the Dublin Descriptors, but by the particular operationalisation of these proposed in local legislative reforms.

One of the issues of importance in Lisbon, when differentiating between the older 1990s model and the newer 2000s model was the question of time to completion. In the older model, completion typically took between five and eight years, whereas, in the newer model, a commitment was made to achieving completion within three years. In the reform of doctoral education, the question of time to completion, and rates of student attrition, are key concerns. This can be an issue of controversy, with certain educators demanding that the time for art-making be understood as radically open, by contrast with the time for institutional procedures (such as doctoral

4. C. Lisbon, Portugal, July 2012

study and accreditation), which are increasingly subordinated to a calculus of efficiency. It is notable that most institutions negotiate some kind of settlement between these two positions, and, in the context of the faculty in Lisbon, the decision was taken to opt for a specific completion time on account of the arts-based doctoral award being considered not simply as a space for artistic development but also as a research qualification required for entry into a pedagogical career within the university. In order to achieve completion within the three-year timeframe, a basic structure has been adopted that entails a first year of structured curriculum and seminar work, while, in years two and three, the emphasis is heavily on completion of the research project.

There are currently more than 150 students enrolled in the doctoral programme, across all seven subject areas. While the bulk of the student body is comprised of Portuguese students, very strong networking activity is being led by the faculty, with a major Iberian–South American network creating an important international research milieu for doctoral candidates. The faculty is also developing a unique networking initiative across the Mediterranean, linking art educators from the European and North African hinterlands.

Perhaps the most striking thing about the Lisbon situation is the rapidity with which an innovation beginning in the early 1990s has, within two decades, become the accepted norm. The scale of the doctoral programme is striking, placing Lisbon on a par with some platforms in London in terms of numbers. The interesting question for the next five years will be the pathways that are open to these doctoral graduates. The faculty already has a postdoctoral programme, and the doctoral qualification is required for teaching at the third level; however, it is to be anticipated that, with these numbers, pathways will be much more diverse. It will be interesting to revisit the Lisbon context in the coming years, to see what impact the presence of such a large cohort of doctoral researchers is having on the independent, small-scale and self-organised scene in Lisbon and the wider national context.

4. D. **Vienna, Austria, March, 2013**

The case-study visit to Vienna brought together a wide range of experience and leadership in the development of an artistic research culture across the higher arts education landscape, and involved site visits to the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, the University of Applied Arts Vienna and to the Austrian Science Fund (FWF). This followed in the wake of ELIA's major international biennial conference, which had taken place in Vienna some months previously, meaning that there was already a well-established dialogue on research issues in the arts and design and the subject of the third cycle.

Furthermore, two of the institutions in Vienna are leading and highly proactive members of the SHARE network, enabling a well-developed and lively debate on artistic research education within the higher arts education community in Vienna. Finally, the activity of the national funding organisation for basic research – in establishing PEEK, an internationally celebrated and advanced programme of funding for artistic research – created an environment in Austria in which legitimacy anxieties within arts-based research were no longer an issue. This provided a specific context for doctoral education in the field and allowed the substantive content of the research to be the key pre-occupation among researchers, research educators and educational leaders. Participants in the discussion included:

Prof. Ruth Mateus-Berr (University of Applied Arts Vienna);

Vr. Dr. Andrea B. Braidt (Vice-Rector for Art | Research, Academy of Fine Arts Vienna);

Mag. Michaela Glanz (Head of Support Art and Research, Academy of Fine Arts Vienna);

Dr. Alexander Damianisch (Head of Support, Art and Research, University of Applied Arts Vienna);

Prof. Vitaliy Bodnar (University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna);

Prof. Annegret Huber (University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna);

Prof. Christine Hohenbuechler (Vienna University of Technology [TU]);

Dr. Paul Rajakovics (TU);

Barbara Holub (independent artist-researcher, associate researcher and educator, TU);

Dr. Eugen Banauch (Manager Programme for Arts-based Research, PEEK, FWF).

The discussion in Vienna was extremely wide-ranging, indicating that there was a clear relationship between the growth of a rich artistic research milieu within various institutions, the robust development

of doctoral education at the art universities and a proactive stance on the part of the national research funder. It was pointed out that a strong background for research activities in the field was vital for prosperous development, leading to applications and project support and also for third-cycle activities like the ones in place. The overall context was marked by the empowerment of a bottom-up approach, taking serious what is already in place within arts education at the first and second cycle. This was seen by the participants as a key factor for the success of Austrian artistic research space. Some participants noted that inter- and transdisciplinary institutional open settings are a key requirement, and pointed to examples at the University of Applied Arts Vienna (e.g. Art and Knowledge Transfer, Art & Science, TransArt, Social Design, Transmedia Arts) and to the doctoral contexts, like the PhD-in-practice programme at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna.

One of the most important issues discussed was the legal situation concerning doctoral programmes, which allows for 'scientific' research-based doctoral programmes, meaning that the possibility to create purely practice-based programmes is still absent in Austria. The art universities are thus introducing third-cycle programmes in arts-based research areas as scientific doctoral programmes.

Among the other issues that emerged was the significance of internationalisation in engendering the necessary milieu for successful artistic research education. In response to questions as to why Austria had taken a leading role in developing artistic research education, particularly in contrast with the other major German-speaking nation in Europe (which has manifested broad reserve, if not quite antipathy, on this question), the participants cited a number of factors. One general consideration proposed, but subject to some debate within the group, was the different geopolitical histories of the two countries. In particular, the different ways in which the interaction with former bloc countries had played out in Austria was posited as contributing to a different kind of internationalism within Austrian experimental arts and arts education, and that Austria, and especially Vienna, participated in a different geopolitical sphere of influence. However, all participants agreed that the enlightened approach of the national funders had been especially important, and they cited, in particular, the way in which the funding measures had an internationalising effect in themselves. The review progress of the PEEK programme invites reviewers from around the world (well over 600 reviewers since 2009, exclusively from outside Austria) and this creates both a robust

international peer-review culture for the sector and an international awareness of what is happening in Austria. Since 2009, close to 40 PhD students have been funded under the PEEK umbrella. It was noted that the Academy of Fine Arts' doctoral programme for artists had attracted 200 applications for 15 positions; these were drawn from a very wide international base, even though there was no automatic funding system in place (unlike the Nordic countries, for example, where all doctoral positions are funded).

Colleagues from the University of Music and Performing Arts noted that their first foray into doctoral education with a specifically artistic research dimension was within an inter-university doctoral system, begun in 2000, which brought together a very diverse mix of disciplines from across the performing arts, media and film arts. In this way, they pointed to the role of national-level networking in providing a basis for developing doctoral research education. Some challenges were noted in relation to the construction of a wide disciplinary mix within a national doctoral education network, as there was a sense that, at a certain level of generality, doctoral research education becomes less salient to the individual researcher. However, the value of interdisciplinarity across the arts was generally endorsed by the participants.

Speaking with respect to architectural education, the participants from TU noted that there was an important need to reorientate professional architects and architecture education to a research practice because of the over-production of cadres of 'professionals' with narrowly conceived professional identities ill-suited to the radically changed demands of the contemporary built environment, the challenge of sustainability and the demise of the 'perpetual unrestricted growth' paradigm. They emphasised the necessity of enhancing and promoting the role of independent artist-architecture collaborations in research, taking place in the orbit of architectural educations, crossing formal and informal education settings, as a means of stimulating and nourishing the research culture and challenging the common ground of the established institutions. This was seen as important as the established education formats historically understood professional practice to operate at a certain remove from research, construed as a historiographical or theoretical task. The argument proposed was that, precisely because of the engagement with a world of professional practice beyond the academy and the university, there was a need to integrate innovative research initiatives, and doctoral education, into the professional educational

4. D. Vienna, Austria, March, 2013

setting and transgress this setting. This was seen as especially important in terms of foregrounding practice within a research process and developing new tools based on artistic research and practice for addressing the current challenges of architecture and urbanism as societal issues. In this field, new artistic-urban practices can play an essential role in challenging the neoliberal governance paradigm of urban development in order to reintroduce social values.

One of the issues that emerged during the closing stages of the discussion was the potential for local networking across disciplines as a means of exchanging experience in developing doctoral education. This was not a matter of proposing interdisciplinarity as an end in itself, but rather a means of sharing knowledge of techniques and strategies in organising research and research education.

Conclusion

In pursuing the eight case studies on behalf of the SHARE network, the aims were to:

- (I) investigate the state of development of the debate on the third cycle
- (II) identify any potentials present for developing the third cycle
- (III) promote greater connectivity between doctoral educators in the arts across Europe, and provide advocacy support through informal information-sharing across the different case-study sites.

In summarising four of these case studies, an attempt was made to identify a key theme in each case. These are: the role of the teacher educated to doctoral level as an agent of change (Malta); the relative speed of acceptance of educational innovation at doctoral level (Lisbon); the importance of international connectivity as a driver of experimentation in artistic research education, enriching the research milieu (Budapest); and the enabling role that enlightened funding authorities can play (Vienna). In a later chapter in the book, there will be a discussion of networking initiatives and their role in artistic research education; however, at this point, the importance of both formal and informal dialogues across different institutional sites and national contexts needs to be underscored. Networking creates spaces of encounter that engender opportunities for critical self-reflection and for recognising that which may otherwise go undisclosed in the day-to-day operations of a given institutional setting.



Part Three

Contested Values and Critical Debates

As has already been indicated, the idea of artistic research and the question of the doctorate in arts practices have been sites of contestation. There continues to be an intense exchange of perspectives around the question of artists pursuing research in a way that is immanent to their practice(s). This part of the book seeks to give an overview of current debates across three chapters.

In chapter 5, under the heading of ‘Interventions’, different members and associates of the SHARE network contribute specific arguments on different points of contention or propose particular perspectives from a given arts domain. This chapter comprises extracts from position papers produced at different times during the network’s development over the period 2010–2013. These papers have been selected and edited on the basis of their contribution to mapping a divergent field.¹

In chapter 6, under the heading of ‘Advocacy Strategies’, examples of tactics used to advocate for the development and support of artistic research educations are presented. This chapter includes a position paper, presented to the European Commission at an early stage in the development of the network, by the working group on advocacy issues. This chapter also identifies the challenges and risks

1. Those readers wishing to access the full text are directed to the SHARE Network Reader – an online resource built up by members of the network over the lifespan of the project, which can be downloaded via www.sharenetwork.eu

associated with these attempts to translate our working practices into dominant policy terms while, at the same time, trying to argue for the specificity of different arts traditions. It asks how can we do this without blunting the challenge that experimental art often presents to established value systems. Finally, in chapter 7, under the broad heading of 'Judgements', the question of assessment and the construction of qualitative equivalence are considered. Drawing upon the activities of the SHARE working group on questions of quality assurance, we open the thorny issue of judgement and attempt to map the ways in which questions of quality are negotiated at this level of research education in the arts.

Structurally, these chapters are brought together through a three-step logic of development. This section begins by acknowledging a constitutive dissensus that grounds the broad domain of artistic research. Then is indicated how advocacy strategies may be built upon this, while acknowledging certain risks and ongoing challenges. The section concludes with a chapter exploring how questions of judgement and quality can be operationalised without obscuring the widely differentiated field of argumentation and practice that underpins the artistic research enterprise.

5

Interventions: Position Papers and Dialogues

This chapter provides a tour through some of the salient points that have arisen in the discussion around question of artistic research and the arts doctorate. Some of these contributions are made in a spirit of robust argument, and some are made in an attempt to think through issues without producing a final position. In some cases, writers are working through issues informed by the day-to-day experience of delivering doctoral education, while others seek to clarify certain principles in order to formulate new departures for artistic research education. From an editorial perspective, these sometimes-contrary interventions are presented in a spirit of ongoing pluralistic debate.

This chapter is divided into three sections:

- 5. A. The Basic Questions: ‘Why artistic research?’ and ‘Why the doctorate?’
- 5. B. To Define or to Demur
- 5. C. Some Disciplinary Perspectives

Section A presents diverse positions and critiques in relation to artistic research and the doctorate. It begins with an affirmation from a leading researcher who has been active in building research education for many years, creating multi-national research projects that have garnered major funding and international recognition. This is then contrasted with two positions from keynote speakers at SHARE conferences, in which critical questions or moments of doubt were introduced as to the need for a specialised doctorate programme of study for artists. This is followed by two texts that map a moment

of refusal in the European context, in which Slovenian arts educators make the case for the doctorate and describe the resistance they have encountered to this in their specific institutional setting. Section B looks at two broad approaches to the construction of artistic research – one that proposes specific definitions and a kind of ‘prescription’ for artistic research, and one that proposes a sceptical or ‘demurring’ approach which neither affirms nor negates a definition of artistic research. Lastly, section C looks at five different approaches to artistic research, grounded in specific disciplinary perspectives, while addressing the question of interdisciplinarity. This section includes contributions from researchers with backgrounds in choreography, architecture, design and the visual arts.

5. A The Basic Questions: ‘Why artistic research?’ and ‘Why the doctorate?’

Introduction

This section opens with an enthusiastic declaration of purpose from a leading artistic researcher, Johan Verbeke, who describes the basic rationale for the contribution of artists, designers and architects to the development of research in general. This is followed by a critical response to the second SHARE Conference (London, May 2012) made by the internationally acclaimed philosopher, John Rajchman. In this paper, the institutional horizon of the debate on artistic research doctorates is problematised and a declaration is made of the need for an expanded critical dialogue. Working from a different perspective, the internationally renowned educator, curator and poet, Steven Henry Madoff, provides a perspective based on decades of experience of the North American Master of Fine Art (MFA) system and his historical analysis of the development of artistic educational institutions since the Renaissance. The section then switches back to a resolutely European focus with two short texts identifying a different institutional horizon in the Slovenian context. The material presented in this section should be read in conjunction with the material provided in sections 1.A, 1.B and 1.C in the first part of this handbook.

5. A. 1. **'The Intrinsic Value of Artistic Research'**

(Johan Verbeke)

In recent years, artistic research and research by design has been on the rise in schools of art, design and architecture. Many of these research projects connect the arts, design and architecture to other disciplines, and can thus be situated at the crossroads between several fields of enquiry. On the one hand, artistic research and research by design frequently serve to open up positions, confront ideas and contribute through experiences and concepts. On the other hand, it will be clear that the disciplines of art, design and architecture can only do this from within their own body of experience and knowledge. At the same time, the specific core of these fields is very difficult to grasp, let alone describe.

The arts, design and architecture are not involved in an exact logical understanding of our world (as are the exact sciences), but they complement this with a knowledge field which builds on human experience and behaviour and is interwoven with cultural and societal development. As with any other discipline, the arts, design and architecture build on their own specific positions in relation to reality. Additionally, they contribute to projecting into the future and are an important part of culture.

Artistic research encompasses short-term outcomes and results (e.g. immediate financial benefits). It explores the borders of human experience and extends into unique positions. As such, it goes beyond its applied multi-disciplinary focus and builds on multi-sensory modes of communication. As explained by Søren Kjølrup, artistic research and research by design do not look for general laws; instead, they embrace the specific and the personal, the human and the experiential; they open perspectives.¹

As was stated nicely by Helga Nowotny, chair of the European Research Council:

Research is the curiosity-driven production of new knowledge. It is the process oriented toward the realm of possibilities that is to be explored, manipulated, controlled, given shape and form, and transformed. Research is inherently beset by uncertainties, since the results or outcomes are by definition unknown. But this inherent uncertainty proves to be equally seductive: it promises new discoveries, the opening of new pathways, and new ways of problem-solving and coming up with novel ways of 'doing things',

1. S. Kjølrup, 'Pleading for Plurality: Artistic and Other Kinds of Research' in Biggs and Karlsson (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. (London and New York: Routledge, 2010). pp. 24–43.

designing and transforming them. To put research (back) into the arts, to (again) make visible and explicit the function of research in the arts and in the act of 'creating knowledge' (Seggern et al. 2008) is a truly ambitious undertaking, because it takes up a vision and a project that originated in the Renaissance. After centuries of separation, it promises to close a loop.²

It will be clear that the field of the arts, design and architecture deserve their specific position in the field of university disciplines and need support to develop into a strong position to validate their unique enquiry.

Already in 1999, Ranulph Glanville gave consideration to the specific nature of research and design, to argue that all research requires design competences.³ While it is both useless and damaging to try to fit the arts to scientific criteria, it can be both innovative and challenging to apply the unique qualities of design to research.

With this in mind, it will be of the utmost importance to articulate ways of looking at reality that are specific to the arts, design and architecture. Through the making of art, design and architectural projects, the practitioner develops new understandings that are, at the moment, mostly hidden but should be brought to the forefront of the disciplines. It is especially here that artistic research and research by design has to play a crucial role in European research endeavours. When this deep insight has been discussed and validated, arts and design disciplines will be in a much stronger position to contribute to the interdisciplinary research in which they are already involved.

It has been claimed by Henk Borgdorff that, 'As a rule, an original contribution in artistic research will result in an original work of art, as the relevance of the artistic outcome is one test of the adequacy of the research'.⁴ Hence, the developing field of artistic research will, in the long term, impact on art activity within the art world as it is impacted upon by developments in the art world. More than in any other field, the interaction between art practice and research is

2. H. Nowotny, 'Foreword' in Biggs and Karlsson (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. pp. xvii-xxvi.

3. R. Glanville, 'Researching design and designing research' in *Design Issues*, vol. 15 no. 2 (Summer 1999). pp. 80-91.

4. H. Borgdorff, 'The Production of Knowledge in Artistic Research' in Biggs and Karlsson (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. pp. 44-63.

essential, and one cannot develop without the other. This is why it is so important for the art field that the discipline establishes itself with research processes which are appropriate and in line with the art field, which build on the experience and understanding developed while making and producing art and design.

5. A. 2. '**London SHARE Conference: A Critical Response**'
(John Rajchman)

At the second SHARE conference, which took place in London in May 2012, the internationally renowned philosopher, John Rajchman, was invited to be act as respondent, taking on the role of a 'friendly critic' who could give feedback on the content and nature of our dialogues around the doctorate in artistic research. He generously agreed to do this, and what proceeded from his engagement was a very important prompt to consider the alternative formulations of artistic thinking, and thinking through practice, that might be obscured within an institutionally framed, or overly abstracted, project of formal education.

In his talk, Prof. Rajchman introduced the important theme of institutional critique, and suggested something about the different rhetorical tools with which we can think about art's specific mode of enquiry. Particularly interesting was the way in which Prof. Rajchman re-activated an old, but key, debate between the philosopher, Jacques Rancière, and the 'sociologist king', Pierre Bourdieu, indicating a broader field of contestation and disciplinary (or 'dedisciplining') perspectives within which the question of artistic research practices might be placed. What follows is a transcript of the critical feedback provided by Prof. Rajchman. This retains the conversational tone of his presentation, which was delivered after two intense days of conferencing without missing a beat in its rehearsal of these critical themes.

Henk Slager: John Rajchman is a philosopher working in the areas of art history, contemporary art practice, architecture and Deleuzian philosophy. He has, among many other things, published *The Deleuzian Connections* and (together with Etienne Balibar) the volume *French Philosophy since 1945*. Rajchman is an adjunct professor and Director of Modern Art for the MFA programmes at Columbia University. He has previously taught at Princeton University, MIT, the Collège International de Philosophie in Paris and at Cooper Union. He was active in realising the Korean Pavilion in Venice (2011), and he is currently developing a project for the 2012 Sao Paulo Biennial.

John Rajchman: Thanks so much to Henk and Mick for the invitation and for this introduction. These are the people who introduced me to this larger problem of art research, or artistic research in Europe, having come to New York earlier in 2008 for the symposium 'Nameless Science'. I'm very happy to have the opportunity to sit in and listen to your discussions, to learn a little bit about the history of how this topic arose and was developed in the 1990s, how it was taken up in different places in Europe and Scandinavia and Eastern Europe, and, reluctantly perhaps, in Germany.

The larger focus of the discussions here is an institutional question: 'Is it possible and/or interesting to create a special institutional status for artistic research or art research?' This question is one that I'd like to respond to, having listened to everybody's discussions. The general problem of what I call 'thinking in art' or 'artistic thinking' is one that has interested me for a long time. As I've developed, I've had contact with many different areas, the visual arts, architectural design culture and now, more recently, curatorial culture. Of course, I'm housed (or 'based' as people say now) not only in a different country but in a different area of the university. I'm at Columbia, and I am in a humanities department where this issue – 'What is it to think?' 'What is it to think visually?' 'What is it to think in the arts?' 'What is it to think in design?' – translates into a question of how to re-adapt the traditional humanities curriculum (rather than trying to institute a special degree). In order to connect to the energies that are attached to this new kind of practice in thinking that you find in other areas, individual arts and exhibition practice and in design, the three areas of conference.

It comes at a time for us in New York of a kind of crisis, a sense of crisis for traditional humanities, traditional book culture, the tradition of literary culture. For example, we recently had a debate in New York around the question 'Are the degrees that you get at a university like Columbia, which cost such an incredible amount of money, worth it?' The answer is, if you look statistically, yes. It's not so bad except for three areas – art history, anthropology and philosophy.

I would like to focus on two fundamental issues that seem to have been discussed in many different ways over the course of your symposium. The first: 'What is visual thinking?' 'What is artistic research?' 'What is it for an artist to think?' 'Does that change?' 'What relationship do they have to knowledge?' 'What relationship do they have to politics?' 'What relationship do they have to larger

fields?' And so forth. This is a very traditional and interesting question in its own right. The second one is an institutional question: 'Should we, and can we, find an institutional role for this visual thinking, and what role should that be with respect to larger intellectual issues?'

I would just like to say a little bit about my own track record in the 1990s, during the period in which this debate about artistic research was emerging in Europe. In the 1990s, I had a lot of relations with architecture. I was part of an international symposium. We created magazines and journals and so forth, surrounding all of this, and, as a result, had quite a bit to do with the Architecture School at Columbia.

In the 1990s, this problem of theory in thinking entered into studio practice. Before, theory tended to be more in the history side of the architecture school, but then it started to be in the studios, in the crits, and so on – lots of theory, architects themselves bringing it into the situation, the people that were invited, and so forth. Bernard Tschumi, then the dean, encouraged this. It was also the moment of paperless studios, the introduction of computers, and so on. During this period of the '90s, I was trying to develop models for how to exchange with architects and, more generally I guess, with design culture, and I was very interested in the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze, as maybe one philosophical source for how to go about this.

It struck me that Deleuze, in his own work, in writing about painting and cinema, had come up with an interesting way of doing philosophy in relation to artistic or architectural practice. This avoided the two extremes of didacticism – either telling the artist what to think or which methods to use, or a romanticism in which you think, 'Ah, the artist is so creative that s/he can never have any relationship with thinking at all'. This was what was interesting about it: 'How could one go about doing this?'

Deleuze struck me as having been very much engaged with this question himself. He had earlier written a book on Proust, who also uses these words 'search' and 'research'. Proust's story, as you will know, is of somebody who is searching, who doesn't have a method, who's struck by certain sensations and goes through this incredibly long process. We have, then, a very interesting image of what it is to think – not through method, but when you're struck by sensations and you're prompted to go into this kind of process. That's the process that Deleuze developed, both in cinema and with respect to painting, in his book on Francis Bacon.

The book was published (after he died, for complicated reasons) with an introduction by Alain Badiou, in which Badiou says that what's great about this book is that Deleuze has shown us the violent form of thinking that is painting itself. First, you find a form of thinking in Bacon, and second that thinking is violent. It's violent because it breaks, among other things, with clichés. That's an interesting model.

In Deleuze's book, *Cinema*, this question is very much connected to the great 'new wave cinema' in Europe and the earlier neorealism in Italy. This book forms a dialogue on this problem 'What is it to think in cinema?'

These two books strike me as interesting for at least three reasons. Firstly, they suggest that the model of thinking is not one of prior method but a kind of search and research. Secondly, in order to think, there has to be something of a moment of illiteracy, of not reading, of not understanding, which gets you away from the incredibly cultivated kinds of discourses that form you. Thirdly, when you look at filmmakers or painters, you're not looking for them, or not asking them, or not interested in them writing books, because that's what you do. You are looking for how they think, themselves, with the means at their disposal – in the case of Bacon, painting. Of course, Bacon is a special case – that incredible studio of his, this incredible mess in which he created things.

There is such a thing as visual thinking, or spatial thinking. You think by drawing. You think by painting. It's that sense of thinking that's interesting for a philosopher. The role of the philosopher is not simply to pay attention to this invention on the part of an artist; but, having listened, to formulate the problems, the larger field in which the thinking takes place, the questions it poses and the political issues it involves. That general model of how theory could play a role within artistic thinking was what interested me in Deleuze.

In the 1990s, I wrote a book on Deleuze and also tried to put it into practice. I would very quickly like to mention two artists, not discussed by Deleuze, who interested me and with whom I had the opportunity to put this into practice.

That's a little bit about my own experience of trying to bring my philosophical background to bear on this issue of artistic thinking or artistic research. On the question of how it should be taught in or introduced into institutions – which seems to be the much more central concern here – I think I speak maybe for our situation at

Columbia when I say that it's not so much that we're in denial, or refusal, or that we're about to enthusiastically accept this idea. It's that we're indifferent, and we seem to think that our existing institutions can be adapted in such a way that this problem of thinking can be inserted into our existing curriculum, maybe transforming it a little bit. This would be a first remark in response to the conference discussions.

As far as theory is concerned, an experiment of this sort has long existed in New York. That's the Whitney Independent Study Program, in which a lot of the ideas that have been developed in philosophy and in art history and in the university were taught to artists and, increasingly, curators as part of an independent programme of studies. Incidentally, when I took over the masters program at Columbia, we had a curatorial component. I thought it was very interesting to have practitioners coming to speak to our students and participating in our debates. We created a consortium with the Whitney, MoMA, ICP and the Studio Museum. The Whitney Independent Study Program was very unhappy that a university or an institution would want to take over the zone that was theirs and should remain independent.

On the question of institution, I'm inclined, as was Deleuze, to pose the question of institution in relation to its outside. There's no institutionalisation of knowledge and thinking that doesn't, at the same time, create some outside space in which other kinds of discussions can take place. Vital ideas, creative ideas, are the ones that often come from this extra-university space.

Incidentally, I was also invited to participate in a conference here in London, sponsored by the Radical Philosophy group, but the dates didn't work out. It was on transdisciplinarity. The question was: Are there issues that are not interdisciplinary but are in all the disciplines and transcend them? Had I gone, I would've wanted to talk not simply on transdisciplinary problems but extradisciplinary spaces and de-disciplinising experiences. All of those are a bit connected to this notion of the vitality of something outside institutions.

I'm not saying it's not interesting in Europe, and in the art schools as they were described, to introduce programmes in which you have artistic research, provided that that introduction is not completely enclosed within the art academies themselves, but is a way of opening up those art academies to something like this outside. That's my general reaction to many of these interesting discussions.

One source, within French philosophical discussion, is the debate that took place between Rancière and Bourdieu around these problems. As you know, Bourdieu developed this incredible apparatus with which to study museums and exhibition culture more generally, indicating that taste, which we think of as universal, is, in fact, just a habitus, just a series of dispositions, and that's why only a certain class of people come to our museums. Many people in Paris never go to the museums, yet those museums claim to be universal and open to an enlightened public. Bourdieu proposes a fundamental problem. Rancière replies, calling him the 'sociologist king', as if a sociologist could fundamentally determine what this habitus is, what this field is, excluding from it those acts which challenge and open up the institution. Instead, he says that there's no institution that cannot be interrupted or disrupted by acts of emancipation which open those to this outside. It seems that these French intellectual debates are not central to the SHARE initiative. It's interesting because, as you know, the Louvre is the first public museum. It's a part of the French Revolution. It's part of this idea of a larger, enlightened public that should be the audience of art, and so on. To have this kind of internal debate about the institution is interesting.

I know I'm exceeding my time. Just two remarks about the SHARE initiative in general. The first has to do with geographies, the nature of Europe itself – whether, and in what way, Europe is itself changing and, within that change, the problem which was first posed by Kant in terms of cosmopolitanism and nationalism: how those larger problems will be reformulated in a larger and global area. I think it's an interesting question to include in the larger discussions of the SHARE initiative.

A second remark, maybe a plea, is to include some people like myself, who are engaged in this kind of critical theory debate and can be participating in discussions, who can help to open them up to these larger debates, even if those debates are not themselves settled. That would give the discussions this attention and also an energy that might be useful. These are my two recommendations. With that I'll stop.

Henk Slager: Thank you so much, John, for your thoughtful remarks. Before I open it to the floor, I would like to ask you one small question – just for, let's say, conceptual clarification. You talked a lot about 'thinking', but can you say something about the relationship between 'thinking' and 'researching' and 'knowledge'? This is a sort of triangle, but we talk a lot about 'research' in this conference, so how do you view the relationship between artistic thinking and artistic research?

John Rajchman: The notion of search and research, there are many different kinds of models. We evoke them in the course of discussion, of course. In the history of hard science and technology, it's the laboratory form that determines a new kind of relationship in research. This is referenced in one of Hans-Ulrich Obrist's project, this idea of laboratory – adopting the model of laboratory research within an artistic and, for him, curatorial context. I think there are many interesting ways in which research might figure in this.

A first remark is, of course, that I am in this very old and dying area called the humanities, but in that area we've developed incredible research techniques. When I go into this very fast world of biennials and everything, everybody seems very unable to do any research at all. They don't think about it at all. They think about money. They think of all kinds of other things. We have something, or are sitting on something, that would be useful to introduce into this context. We need to adapt, let's say, our earlier research techniques, and not simply abandon them. That's one remark.

Second, among the figures of this French group I wrote about is Michel Foucault. I recently gave a course about him at Columbia, trying to imagine new ways of using him or thinking about him. One aspect is what happened to him in this politicised period of the 1970s. Of course, he was elected to the College de France, and he had at the College de France open to a public, created by another of the French Revolution's 'big' 'public' kind of institution in Paris. As such, he helped to create the radical campus advance.

More interesting, for this question, he created a group for information on prisons, and that group was a research group. It was a research group that was outside the university and outside his teaching. It is a very interesting group and a very interesting kind of research. First, because they had very 'high-end' people, artists and people like that, ministers and very mixed high Parisian art scene kinds of people, with these surveys that they did of prisoners and the words of the prisoners themselves. It's the link between those two things – this high culture and this very specific problem – that created the research that led to his best and most famous book, called *Discipline and Punish*, in which these two things are combined.

I think outside groups, collectives, is one zone in which artistic research now takes place. All this outside stuff I still find very exciting. Now I'm old enough to want to try and integrate it into these earlier research paradigms. That's the paradoxical situation in which I find myself.

5. A. 3. **'Knowledge-Making in the Age of Abstraction'**

(Steven Henry Madoff)

It's an honour to be here and to address all of you,⁵ and let me begin by saying what a quandary this is. The US and Europe are at very different stages in the development and growth of doctoral programmes in arts practices. I'm currently serving on an advisory committee of the College Art Association (CAA) to determine its policy statement concerning the validity of a doctorate as the terminal degree in the visual arts, and particularly in relation to the MFA. The current policy statement, written in 2008, includes these words: 'The master of fine arts (MFA) degree in art and/or design is the recognised terminal degree in the visual arts. It is considered by the CAA, the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), and the vast majority of institutions of higher education in the United States to be equivalent to terminal degrees in other fields, such as the PhD or EdD'.⁶

Yet it seems you have already queried many times over all of the questions that my colleagues and I are now asking, such as the warrant for such a shift, and what Mick Wilson and others call 'first principles', such as epistemological enquiries into the nature of knowledge itself and the parity of forms of measurability, replicability and validation between research in the sciences and research-based arts practices within the university structure of bureaucratic approbation on which hiring, promotions and grants depend. Everything that I've read indicates that you've been addressing these questions for more than a decade, intensified by the Bologna Process. And, while such first principles remain grounds for contestation, this conference is witness to the movement beyond these fundamentals, from broad enquiry to broad execution.

For the moment, I'd like to put this in a different light. At Yale University's art school, I've taught a course I call 'What Do We Think About When We Think About Teaching?' I begin it with some thoughts about what I consider the cardinal activity of teaching, which is a specific form of care. No one knows what a particular artist needs to know to become the artist they need to become. But, in the act of caring, we find out. To care is to listen. The word 'teach' comes from the Indo-European root 'to show, to point out', and 'care' originates in the Indo-European root 'to cry out', which, in Old English, took on the specific sense of oversight and protection. 'Care' is a word, then, about concern and interest, and the teacher shows what needs

5. This is a revised version of the keynote address made at the third SHARE conference in Brussels, 24 May 2013.

6. See the CAA's MFA Standards at <http://www.collegeart.org/guidelines/mfa>.

to be shown out of oversight, out of care for what I'll call the health of knowledge in the other. Health is a term that will immediately call to mind, for many of you, Foucault's ideas about biopower, about the political and corporeal inscription of each of us within regimes of power, and I don't want in any way to put aside the political agendas that lie on the surface of the health of knowledge. It is hardly metaphorical to invoke both Foucault and Agamben⁸ in such notions as bare life, the political economy of health and the sovereign's decisions about death and life. The close relationship between the levying of power over the bodies of the polis and the uses of education is ever-present.

Nonetheless, I'm going to say that care in the educational frame is not something you don't have, given to someone who doesn't need it. Just the opposite is true, as the contract between teacher and student, between an educational institution and its faculty and students, between the state and its educational system may be riddled with politics – particularly, in our time, the devastating compromises wrought by the neoliberal project. Yet, no less present than the political is this other thing, still whole, which is the task of caring, of giving to the other from the inventory of what is known, and the potential to create new knowledge – though this creation is now automatically called knowledge production, without contestation of its implications regarding each of us as a commoditised subaltern. Production naturally implicates each of us in the systematic planning for the creation of things that are not things in themselves, the *ding an sich*, but things in their blatantly commodified form. Things, therefore, that are not autonomous and free as objects of knowing, but things already overdetermined, mapped in the scheme of another agenda, the trajectory of which is toward massification and control, and each student and each teacher is caught up in this systematic conversion. That is what the Bologna Process intends, though Dieter Lesage has accurately observed that it has done nothing but show the heterogeneity of national educational systems and the localisation of knowledge underlying them.

Against this overdetermination, or rather still lying within it, is the care I describe: the devotion to the activity of instilling in the other, the student, not simply the routinising of *techné* or the intellection of theory, but the internalisation of a sensitivity to this crying out, this oversight we must each take on, which is the act of caring for others, which is also, finally, at the base of what every artwork is.

8. G. Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

I've just come from Tel Aviv, where I've organised a series of exhibitions, workshops, interventions and discussions at the Tel Aviv Museum of Art under the title 'Host & Guest', based on Derrida's little book, *Of Hospitality*. No doubt, there's a connection, something in me, that goes to the same well in which caring and hospitality, generosity and support dwell. The Latin *curare*, from which we derive the verb 'to curate', is also a form of care; quite literally, it means 'to take care of', and, in fact, the signification in the Medieval church of the word *curatus* was the one who takes care of souls. Of course, here too we find the complexity of oversight, control, and dogma mixed with humane desire. And Derrida is quick to point out the complexities featured within hospitality – its own proto-Indo-European root giving rise to the words host, hostile, hostage, hospital, guest and ghost. What, then, is buried within the gesture of care, what true desire to listen to the one who needs as it is joined to the biopolitics of control, of segmentation, bureaucratisation and commodification, of an insidious taking away alongside a hospitable giving? Derrida begins his book in a typically Derridean interrogatory form, thinking of the guest who arrives, the one who seeks the care of the host. He asks: 'Isn't the question of the foreigner a foreigner's question? Coming from the foreigner, from abroad?' And I want to make this small copula between figures by asking: 'Isn't the maker of knowledge one who always comes to the foreign land of both knowledge and making, who asks for the hospitality of knowledge, to know and to make, to come to this place of knowledge's foreignness and be given welcome as the foreigner – a new maker in a strange land, for the maker is always on the outside of what is to be made?' The thing that is not yet but is yet an immanence of its made-ness is on the other side of this welcome.

This is an old story, even as I elide it, of foreigners who come to a new place, just as artists arrive at their own knowledges and making as they pass through a system in which their private *terra infirma* is submitted to the encounter of care in a school. In essence, a school is simply a place of gathering where those who give this form of care and those who take it meet; a space of care that is never without its structures of power that set out its claims for legitimacy. I want to remind you of the continuity of this story, not simply from the almost eroticised fetishisation of hierarchical order implicit in Raphael's painting, *The School of Athens*, but specifically as the ordering of art knowledges established as practices that offer, at the same time, this tradition of a teaching care and the archaeological strata, the slow layering and restructuring of economic, sociopolitical and

materialised orders up to the eventual condition of the present and what I'll call our 'evolved abstraction'. By this, I mean the etherised distribution of all things through digital means and the spectral sense of disembodiment that seems to pervade contemporary experience as an effect of this etherisation, including so many of our forms of production and consumption that have been summarised in such concepts of dematerialisation as post-Fordism, immaterial labour, hive thinking and the digital cloud.

In the images you see on the screen, I've laid out this continuity as a timeline of academies from the 17th century to the year 2000, from the reigns of aristocracies to the incomplete democratisation of the present, and, I admit, with a leaning toward American schools from the mid-19th century onward that reveals my parochial interests. Now, having looked at these schools, some of them formal and some of them rebellions against the bureaucratisation of the lesson, so to speak, we can see the arc of who is the host and who is the guest, of a questioning of this knowledge-making that interrogates how we, as teachers with our students, live within educational systems that mirror the endless will-to-power of economic regimes in which we're complicit and yet can still hold some form of agency for the private imagination. Simon Sheikh summed up the current moment brilliantly in a short essay, entitled 'Spaces for Thinking. Perspectives on the Art Academy', in which he claims: 'There is a direct corollary between the dematerialization of the art object, and thus its potential (if only partial) exodus from the commodity form and thus disappearance from the market system, and the institutional re-inscription and validation of such practices as artistic research and thus knowledge as economical commodity'.⁸ What this means is that the requirement for visual expression to meet the standards of scientism presses artists to represent themselves textually and discursively – and, consequently, to privilege predictability, which, by necessity, twists the ontology of making, with its mysteries not bound to rationality, toward different ends. What they do is make their work, to use a word borrowed from Foucault, 'mathematicisable', in thrall to positivism.

When I constructed my book, *Art School (Propositions for the 21st Century)*, I had no doubt of my intention to interrogate and attack the assumption that the nearly century-old Bauhaus was sacrosanct as the dominant model for the contemporary MFA and that the upheavals of 1968 were lost in time. My questions, and the questions I put to every one

8. S. Sheikh, 'Spaces for Thinking. Perspectives on the Art Academy' in *Texte zur Kunst*, nr. 62, June 2006. P. 195.

of the book's contributors, were: 'Is the MFA necessary in its current form?', 'Is the group crit as a form of social modelling in any way an accurate preparation for the slickly professionalised entrepreneurship of the artist as a form of corporate subaltern and de-patronised client in the hyper-accelerated late capitalist market?', 'Does the MFA need to be re-formed as a conceptually orientated education in a fundamentally Duchampian landscape?', 'How or should we transform this degree or will it reorganise itself differently as late capitalism holds its particular sway over the art market to the point at which the free space of the art school is transformed into something else?'

Radical or not, the critique of the art school as a place of care is under some form of transformation precisely because of the tension that Sheikh sees as an inversion of dematerialisation toward the re-inscription in a system of academic patronage that requires materialist validation. And so it is that I come to the consideration that the MFA has, in fact, begun to evolve into something else, something precisely organised by economies of power and reputation, and that this transformation is a simultaneous increase in contemporary abstraction that directly affects practices of art-making and their positivist representation as research. These coalesce not as a necessity, but as both a desire of imagination and a bureaucratised fulfilment of this supplementary expression: the doctorate in arts practices. This rendition of the evolution of art pedagogy at the graduate level turns on its head something that Rancière notes in his book, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*.⁹ The book concerns the work of the 19th-century educationalist, Joseph Jacotot, and his belief in teaching what he did not know in order to join his students in a de-hierarchicalised journey of learning. This was a practice, as Clémentine Deliss summarises, in which 'explanation was not only the brutal weapon of pedagogy, but also the very connection that created a social order. A social order, in turn, implied a distribution of rank. Rank led one back to explanation – a fiction that justified the unequal distribution of intellectual value with no reason beyond itself'.¹⁰ What we now have is a hierarchicalised order in which explanation is everything, in which the immaterialism of the artistic imagination is inscribed in the textuality of explanation, in fact a textuality that is forced to pretend that it is not even heuristic and hermeneutical, not even a product of subjectivity, but hews to the vaunted and far from pristine objectivity of the hard sciences and

9. J. Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*. trans. K. Ross. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991).

10. C. Deliss, 'Roaming, Prelusive, Permeable: Future Academy' in S. H. Madoff (ed.), *Art School (Propositions for the 21st Century)*. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009). p. 128.

social sciences or, if you like, to the standard, which is a very high standard indeed, of the materialist tradition within German art-historical scholarship.

This is my initial critique – that this newly engaged discursiveness of explanation, which is a flattening of expressive detail in a verticalising of authority, a reassertion of class, has forced artistic practice into the very strange position of forgetting the form of caring special to its own histories of knowing and making. But two things: first, after many years of thinking, writing, lecturing on, and teaching in art schools, I've realised that the art school, when it does not pretend that it is a sanctum of experiment free from the market, does more than incrementally adapt to new modalities, exactly because it is an apparatus of capitalism that allows every form of novelty to be explored. Second, the insertion of a fundamentally conceptualised art world, in this age of abstraction, into the mathematicisable rendering of the Real (which is what art research in the university finally must be for it to succeed) does still allow the immaterialism of the artist's imagination to exist, quite possibly to thrive. This imaginative benefit is a surplus production of neoliberalism. But artists have always had to find ways to support their habits of making, and the university is not only another venue for it but also a path to the expansion of what making and knowing are for the artist – albeit, and this is a crucial caveat, when it is relevant to his or her specific practice.

Now, I need to look at this again and share with you my view as an American in the throes of attempting to understand this for the very different educational economics of the US. There, the MFA is the terminal degree – rather than the PhD, DFA or other doctorate – for a reason of economics, of money. There is already great reason for ethical concern that an MFA for a visual artist or designer can cost \$80,000 in the US, and often without institutional financial support to significantly offset the postgraduate burden of debt. It is now standard within the curricula of MFA programmes to offer coursework proportional to disciplinary and interdisciplinary making in critical and cultural theory, art history and writing, as well as optional courses to augment a research-based practice. Currently, there are less than a dozen doctoral programmes in the visual arts or related to visual arts practices in the US, according to a recent count by one of my CAA committee colleagues. The economics are daunting for any student who takes on this debt in order to teach, as it is entirely obvious that the degree is of no ascertainable value in the

art world, while, in the web of art schools within and outside of the university system, the MFA, as I've said, remains the acknowledged terminal degree – indeed, specifically noted as the equivalent to a doctorate in order to gain academic employment. And this at a time when it is extraordinarily difficult for anyone to find a teaching job, let alone one on a tenure track. There are no financial incentives for such doctoral programmes in arts practices to be offered programmatically by the university system in the US, quite contrary to the European offerings.

In a blistering email, another of my colleagues wrote: 'I am uncertain at this point what the field feels is lacking in the MFA degree – is the art the MFA makers make not good enough? Is the degree holder uninformed or inarticulate about the practice and theory of their own discipline? Is the standard candidate ill-prepared in terms of other studio practices in fields outside of their own practice? Are they poorly prepared to do the three legs of most institutions' retention and promotion requirements of teaching, service, and scholarship? Are they not acculturated enough into the ways of the academy? Do they not know how to practice their discipline's pedagogy? Are they not deep enough in debt?'

And yet, against this scepticism, even cynicism, which seems to me a refraction of a neoliberal critique, as I've already suggested, and one with considerably more validity within the US context, I want to return to the explicit imaginary of abstraction, so environmentally pervasive in the conditions of contemporary life. We live within what, in the book I am currently writing, I call a network aesthetics. Its connections are asymmetrical in their power laws of distribution, with multiple topologies of knowledge arriving and departing along different flows of intensity and speed. To simply be in this world, to find in each of our bodies a locus of meaning and meaning-making – and, therefore, of reception and consumption in shifting communities of action, interpretation, enquiry, response, adaptation and renewal – the expanded mobility of the data of knowing confers an ethics of expansion upon those who teach and those who are in that concentrated stage of life focused on the activity of learning. It is difficult to encapsulate this other than to say that just such words as expansion, mobility, data, streaming, intersection, network, nodes and hubs now form an aesthetics unto themselves – a shape, if you will, of a new form of nomadic existence of the mind in which each of us, as actors, intuitively lives this life of immense and unresolved openness. And, in this life, it is impossible to not be infected by

the porousness of the once-stable typologies of the categorical, the classical age of the Enlightenment's Encyclopédie, dissolved into the ether of abstraction.

How can this be, in such a world as ours, in which the velocity of the data stream is a great, unending, and invisible wave of knowledges crashing on and through each other as nodes in continuously transformed networks of becoming, in which we are continually moving between familiarity and strangeness, of knowing how to make, how to think about making and watching around us new forms of knowing and making? How can it be that there would not be an expansion along the plane of this teaching-care? That the capaciousness of what is to be known would not feel the porousness of its own borders? Looking across the historical vista, haven't we seen that, from the monolithic authority of the great academies, there has been a subsequent occurrence of smaller, more fragmentary offshoots, transient outcroppings of gatherings taking different forms? The modularity of the Bologna Process, mirroring the US system, is at once a reflection of that neoliberal project that makes me and so many others deeply uncomfortable, of a viral capitalism in its rapaciousness, while it is also the structural expression of the need of knowing to know more, to break apart unwieldy edifices and apparatuses that splinter and reintegrate, to shift from the disciplinary to the multi- and inter- and trans- and supradisciplinary.

If the artist is a maker of worlds within worlds, a knower on the way to knowing, a datum-weaver in the weaving of networks, then the research for that knowing is increasingly an act of necessary assemblage, and it is no coincidence that, as abstraction grows, there has been a growing urge in recent years to encompass the thingness of things. We saw this in the last Documenta, staged in 2012, in which this thingness was the topos of the show and proposed that our inter-agency with the nonhuman was to be paid close attention, just as a school of philosophers called Speculative Realists, or simply Thing Theorists, has offered a conceptual basis for this re-understanding of the thingly world.

Sheikh's comment – that the dematerialisation of the art object has, in turn, brought about the re-inscription of this abstraction within the market economy as research to be validated (that is to say, made material for the purposes of financial materialism) – sits alongside the rematerialisation of every object for that revived phenomenological sensitivity to the *ding an sich*. This is a hunger for an untrammelled

thingness, and it rises from the roiling, immaterial plane of abstraction, so that the experiencing of life's every grain is centrifugal, moving outward from categorical stability to the terra incognita of the always inter-streaming unknown of knowingness. What we must understand in the wider impulse of human expansiveness, whether it is greed for capital or greed for knowledge, is that it does not end. The artisan in the studio of a more experienced artisan, the disciple and master, the baccalaureate, then the master's degree, now the PhD... each is a step in a procession that would seem to be at our core as acquisitive creatures. The logistics of this, the gaining of respect or prestige, the infiltration, in the best sense, of one form of knowing by another, the networking of nodal hungers for knowing, the imbrication of contested modalities of knowing into a wider web, the breakdown and rebuilding of the facilities and apparatuses of knowing – all of these move toward expansion. This is in keeping with the epistemological cadences of contemporary abstraction, indeed with abstraction itself. They are symptoms of expansion; and knowledge itself is that which cries out, with each of us as the *curatus* who watches for its safekeeping and growth. What kinds of artists and what kinds of scholars will be hybridised through the ongoing establishment of research as a medium of artistic production is yet to be seen. As well, there is still the troubling sense of the artist-researcher as a conscript in the broader scheme of funding, not only toward the work at hand but also toward the manufacture of prestige in and for itself. And there is the question that must be asked of the doctorate as it must be asked of the MFA, which harks back to what Ivan Illich wrote in 1971: 'Does this degree accomplish a form of democratisation that has an impact on the elitism of the art world – the world in which this work almost wholly exists – or is this simply tilting at windmills?' In the US today, we are stuck at a bypass, where precisely the structural limitations of capitalism are impinging on the incremental, fragmented, yet evidently pressing, desire to expand what making and knowing are in the fields of arts practices and their inter-relations with all fields of knowledge. Meanwhile, here in Europe, though many questions still remain, you are moving ahead.

5. A. 4. **'Notes from a Debate in Ljubljana'**

(Bojan Gorenec and Alen Ožbolt)

This section contains part of a submission by Bojan Gorenec to the Commission for the Third-Cycle Study in Art at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, outlining the basic rationale for doctoral-level studies. This is followed by a statement from Alen Ožbolt on the fate of this bid, which illustrates both the context for and the challenges faced by this initiative. We believe that this is an important

contribution, because it serves to anchor the theoretical debates on these issues in the institutional dynamics that frame such debates and often obscure reasoned arguments for legitimization under the operational constraints of established hierarchies within an institutional order.

The Third Cycle of Education in the Field of Art

(Bojan Gorenc)

- a. The third-cycle study programme in the field of art is a qualitative upgrading of the bachelor's and master's degrees in art as a result of the Bologna Process. This upgrading has already been implemented by several other art academies and colleges in the EU (e.g. Kuvataide-akademia [Finnish Academy of Fine Arts] Helsinki, Finland (www.kuva.fi); Akademie der bildenden Künste [Academy of Fine Arts] Vienna, Austria (www.akbild.at); Koninklijke Academie van Beeldende Kunsten [Royal Academy of Art] Den Haag, the Netherlands (www.kabk.nl); Magyar Képzőművészeti Egyetem [Hungarian Academy of Fine Arts] Budapest, Hungary (www.mke.hu) and in the USA, University of California, Division of Arts and Humanities, San Diego, USA (www.ucsd.edu)¹¹.
- b. In view of the above, the programme is analogous to a third-cycle/doctoral study in the field of science. The third-cycle programme in art is similar to the scientific one in its systematic organisation, complexity and creativity, and it differs in relation to its content, methodologies and educational and evaluative study aspects. The important 'common denominator' for both third-cycle levels is the necessity of research, as both programmes are designed and conducted as a research process.
- c. The research aspects of the third-cycle study in art are based on the requirements of the contemporary art systems and on the intense methodological development of artistic research, with which the students have already become familiar during earlier levels of study.¹²
- d. If artistic research is a conceptual means of achieving results, artistic practice is the core of all academic developments, as it is only through this practice that the effects of research and conceptual strategies can be accurately verified.
- e. Given that the artistic practices of all previous socio-historical formations have been interpolated between three basic 'existential' areas – beliefs and ideologies; already implemented cultural patterns,

11. See also *Handbook Guide to Third Cycle Studies in Higher Music Education*, available at: <http://goo.gl/tA3d3>.

12. e.g. L.S. Adams, *The Methodologies of Art. An Introduction*. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996); M. Alvesson and K. Sköglberg, *Reflexive Methodology. New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. (London: Sage, 2000); G. Sullivan, *Art Practice as Research. Inquiry in the Visual Art*. (London: Sage, 2005), bibliography. pp. 227-244; etc.

together with the corresponding morphological epistemology; and current socio-historical phenomena – it is logical that any third-cycle study in art is also supported by three types of epistemology: (I) productive or formational (empiricist enquiry; shape-generating theory, composition theory, semiotics of art, etc.); (II) interpretative (interpretative discourse); and (III) critical and representative (critical process, enactments). These types of epistemology provide the infrastructure for artistic research.¹³

- f. The third-cycle programme in art is not a theoretical but a practical study leading to practical results. This does not, however, mean that theory is unimportant; on the contrary, practical results are supported by theoretical findings and are discursively expressed. The theory and practice within an artistic creation are not two diverse or mutually exclusive entities, but two points of the same ellipse which become intertwined during the creative process.
- g. Third-cycle study in art is in permanent contact with developments in the field of contemporary art and the art market; however, its organisation, epistemology and realisation are emancipated from these events. The third-cycle programme also takes into account the values and socio-historical characteristics of the Slovenian cultural context.

The Shipwreck of the University and the PhD in Art in Slovenia (Alen Ožbolt)

A society that enthusiastically declares itself to be a society of knowledge in fact resembles more and more a society in which the market has become the measure of all things, knowledge a commercial commodity, and education a utopia. Thus, while education is increasingly understood, on the one hand, as being an indispensable means for the successful performance of both companies and national economies in the ever more competitive global marketplace, it is seen, on the other hand, as a commercial commodity, whose sale in the marketplace of educational services should, like any other commodity, be subject to the usual rules of commercial transactions. In this context, schools are viewed more and more as companies, while education and knowledge are no longer understood as public goods, but rather as private wares with a primarily economic value and are treated like any other commodity that is bought and sold in the marketplace. If this trend continues, schools will be increasingly subject to economics, and their main function will be the production of human capital. In such a school, two values will dominate: practicality and effectiveness – values that, in the opinion of critics of the neoliberal doctrine, are destructive for the traditional model of the public school, as the school becomes less and less an autonomous site for the spread of knowledge, social integration, moral

13. See G. Sullivan, *op. cit.* p. 190.

development, and the formation of the enlightened citizen, and more and more a place for training consumers.¹⁴

In the past year and a half, the intellectual and, more broadly, the critical public in Slovenia has risen up in defence of public education and, indeed, of public institutions in general. People have poured onto the streets to protest against austerity measures, teachers and other employees in public education have gone on strike and university students and professors have demonstrated against drastic cuts in funding for higher education. Newspapers have published numerous commentaries with such dramatic headlines as 'They are stealing our country', 'The destruction of the public university', 'Academics in a battle for survival', 'A free university must be fought for', 'A clearance sale of our public universities is coming', 'Structural changes are underway that will lead to the destruction of public education for the enrichment of the private sector', and so on. Over the past few years, books and studies, as well as translations, have been appearing – enough to fill an entire bookcase – on the topic of neoliberal changes to the university and their effect on academic and administrative processes.

What we are talking about here, of course, is not some local issue or a special problem that affects only Slovenia. We are talking about a 'global picture', which is bringing commercialisation and private, particular interests into the 'independent' or 'old' university. The decline of the 'old' university in Europe is symbolised by the Bologna Process, which, through 'homogenisation, standardisation and de-individualisation', has subordinated education to the dominant ideology of 'useful and practical knowledge'. In Slovenia, with the so-called Bologna Process, universities and faculties have, under the dictate of politics, either begun 'adapting' – that is to say, fragmenting and shrinking – their programmes and academic content (for the sake of so-called 'flexibility') or they are introducing new programmes subordinated to 'the needs of industry and the economy'.¹⁵ Under this logic, the university must 'service' society, the economy and the business sector. In recent years, as conditions have worsened, faculties have been forced to introduce a 'management style of directing and handling the workforce'. A crude 'administrative centralisation of leadership' is being carried out; bureaucratisation and the burdens

14. Z. Kodelja, *Izobraževanje: človekova pravica in javno dobro ali tržno blago?*. (Delavsko pankerska Univerza, Ljubljana 2010)

15. R. Močnik, 'Ob koncu univerze', accompanied text in: Micheal Freitag, *Brodolom univerze* (Publisher Sophia, 2010)

and obligations of professors have significantly increased, while, at the same time, the number of students is also rising (multiplicity and de-individualisation), which makes it impossible for professors to provide high-quality instruction of any depth or to pursue research work of any breadth. This is the first cycle of commercialisation, in which universities and faculties have had to (and still have to) adapt their programmes to the interests of industry – leading to the fragmentation and ‘specialisation’ of learning processes – or they have introduced ‘focused’ or ‘applicative’ programmes (e.g. a new private faculty of ‘applied social sciences’ in Slovenia). Here, we are no longer talking about providing independent, systematic, ‘academic knowledge’ that is broad and comprehensive, but rather about explicitly practical and narrowly focused ‘new programmes of study’ that are supposed to satisfy the current – and commercial – needs of society. At the same time, a negative atmosphere has been forming, and indeed, has already formed, toward the social sciences and humanities, which are seen as ‘not necessary’ or ‘not useful’. This leads to segregation and a lack of equality between different programmes of study and different kinds of knowledge, and even to the unequal standing of disciplines and knowledges within the university. The study of art is, perhaps, in an even more fragile position, as its specific nature and small ‘numerical’ size, its lesser ‘influence’, make it a weak opponent to neoliberal thinking, to which art and culture appear to be ‘nothing but an expense’.

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia, every citizen has the right to public, accessible and free schooling and education. There are no tuition fees in public schools and universities. The state is also obliged by the constitution to fund public universities, which are, in their programmes as well as in their research and artistic explorations, politically independent and financially autonomous institutions. However, the state has not prepared or commissioned any serious analysis in connection with the introduction and implementation of the Bologna Process, nor did it foresee the potential organisational, technical, spatial, material, staffing, etc. consequences of these changes. At the same time, it also failed to provide any additional funds whatsoever for the preparation or introduction of new programmes and academic content, all of which have had to be planned, implemented and carried out ‘ad hoc’, as it were. Meanwhile, since 2009, and especially under the new ‘austerity measures’ of the past two years (2011–2012), funding has dramatically diminished. Despite not being funded by the state, the reformed programmes have, nevertheless, already begun at the master’s level. In Slovenia,

the field is dominated by 'the political situation'; it is as if politics wishes to see the public university brought to its knees, to see it destroyed, so that the 'useful' parts of it can be privatised.

Several years ago, the Resolution of the Parliamentary Committee on Culture explicitly supported 'the development and proactive funding of the study of art' while also promoting collaborations between the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology for the sake of 'creating the best possible conditions and possibilities in the field of the study of art'. Because of funding cutbacks, however, today even our 'basic mission' – maintaining the existing programmes at the existing level of execution – is made extremely difficult and, as a result, the development and implementation of the third cycle of the PhD in the field of art becomes technically and financially impossible.

Unfortunately, at present, no one sees any possibility of the state supporting the implementation of new third-cycle programmes of study in the field of art. At the Academy of Fine Arts and Design, in the past three to four years, we have prepared an extensive content-focused and comparative study in relation to the introduction and maintenance of the third-cycle curriculum. But, this has not yet even begun the approval process. Consequently, the PhD in the field of art is still 'under construction'. As we are a part of the University of Ljubljana, this is the level at which we are obliged to organise, promote and implement the programme.

Conclusion

These different positions, and their animating experiences, evidence the many registers at which the question of artistic research education plays out. These range from the broad ideological field within which public institutions currently operate (variously signalled by such terms as 'the market', 'privatisation', 'public good' and 'neoliberalism') to the micro-politics of individual institutions and professional associations. One of the characteristics of this contestation is the way in which these registers can either be held in isolation from each other or entangle and even collapse into each other under the weight of a particular analysis. There is also clearly a tension between the rhetorical formulation of advocacy and that of contestation. In some instances, it appears that the simple acknowledgement that artistic research education is contested is already to forfeit legitimacy. In other cases, the fact that artistic research education is an enterprise characterised by dissensus and interwoven with fundamental questions of legitimacy, saliency and value is seen to be a virtue. It seems highly significant that the North American settlement on the MFA has begun to be reviewed, however tentatively. The next section will assess how this contestation continues to play out at the level of definition.

5. B. To Define or to Demur

Introduction

This section begins with a contribution by Henk Borgdorff – a paper originally developed as a contribution to an internal discussion within Swiss higher education on the question of artistic research – which maps a number of different conceptual bases for artistic research. Ruth Mateus-Berr provides a perspective on artistic research by mapping a pathway through the terminologies of discipline – inter-, trans-, multidisciplinarity – to compare contemporary science with art and design. Importantly, Mateus-Berr also gives us an introduction to one of the most important national funding programmes for artistic research, introducing the Austrian Program for Arts-based Research (PEEK) as an example to be viewed through her lexicon of interdisciplinarity. This is followed by a paper by Andris Teikmanis which draws upon a specifically North Eastern European semiotic tradition in order to make a contribution to the construction of a provisional artistic research typology. This paper is included here with the dual intention of indicating the many different intellectual currents that have been drawn into the artistic research debate and illustrating the divergent philosophical bases informing different programmes of artistic research education. This takes as its starting point the belief that this is an important issue, given the tendency of German, Italian and French philosophical discourses to be prioritised in much of the debate on artistic research in Northern and Western Europe.

5. B. 1. ‘A Brief Survey of Current Debates on the Concepts and Practices of Research in the Arts’

(Henk Borgdorff)¹⁶

The Concepts of Research

A variety of expressions exist to denote research in the arts, amongst which ‘artistic research’ is now widely used. In Francophone Canada, the term *recherche-cr ation* is in frequent use. In the world of architecture and product design, the expression ‘research by design’ is common. In Australia, Brad Haseman has proposed the use of ‘performative research’ to distinguish the new paradigm from other qualitative research paradigms.¹⁷ In the UK, the terms ‘practice-based’ or ‘art-based research’ and, increasingly, ‘practice-led research’ are often used, in particular by funding agencies like the Arts and Humanities Research Council. Sometimes, the term ‘practice as research’ is used to indicate the intertwining of practice and research.¹⁸

Sir Christopher Frayling famously made a distinction between ‘research into art and design’ (i.e. ‘traditional’ academic research as performed in the humanities or social sciences), ‘research through art and design’ (i.e. materials research or developmental work) and

'research for art and design'.¹⁹ He described the latter as 'research where the end product is an artefact – where the thinking is, so to speak, *embodied in the artefact*, where the goal is not primarily communicable knowledge in the sense of verbal communication, but in the sense of visual or iconic or imagistic communication'.²⁰ Others prefer to use the distinction between 'research on the arts' (mainly humanities research), 'research for the arts' (applied research in the service of art practice) and 'research in the arts', the latter being more or less synonymous with 'artistic research'.²¹



There are two characteristics of artistic research that make it distinctive within the whole of academic research. The first is its methodology – the research takes place in and through the creation of art. Artistic means and methods are employed in the research process. This is why some prefer the expression 'research in and through art practice'. The second distinguishing feature of artistic research is its outcomes, which are, in part, artworks, performances, installations and other artistic practices. I say 'in part' because most people agree that a form of discursive justification or contextualisation is needed (which needn't always be verbal).



16. Commissioned by the Schweizerischer Wissenschafts- und Technologierat, SWTR. July 2011.

17. B. Haseman, 'A Manifesto for Performative Research' in *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy* 118: Special issue 'Practice-Led Research', 2006. pp. 98–106.

18. What all these expressions have in common is the word *research*. Yet that does not go without saying. Research in the emphatic sense is an activity traditionally associated with what people do in universities and industrial laboratories, and not with what people do as they practise or teach art. In the Netherlands, the Dutch Advisory Council for Science and Technology Policy once recommended using 'design and development' (*ontwerp en ontwikkeling*) to denote those research-like activities that take place in professional schools, including the schools of the arts; within higher education, the term 'research' (*onderzoek*) was to be restricted to traditional universities. Reality has since overtaken this recommendation, however, and 'applied research' is now defined as one of the remits of higher professional education, or universities of applied sciences, in the Netherlands. This illustration of the reluctance to use the word research does not stand alone. In Norway, the Artistic Research Fellowships Programme has been operating since 2003. That is its English name, at least, but in their own language Norwegians avoid the term *forskning* and speak instead of *kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid* ('artistic development work'). And in Austria, the term *arts-based research* is used in English to denote the new funding programme, whereas the German name is *Entwicklung und Erschließung der Künste* ('advancement and accessibility of the arts'). To be sure, differences also exist in what words such as *research*, *recherche*, *Forschung* or *onderzoek* normally denote and connote in English, French, German or Dutch. By analogy, there are also considerable differences between what is meant by the English *science* and the German *Wissenschaft*, which also includes the *humanities* (*Geisteswissenschaften*). In the foundational struggle that is raging over artistic research, the uses and the meanings of words are of cardinal importance. As paradigms shift, not only do changes occur in the ways of looking at things, but also in the meanings of words.

19. C. Frayling, *Research in Art and Design*. Royal College of Art Research Papers series 1(1). (London: Royal College of Art, 1993).

20. Loc. cit.


21. H. Borgdorff, *The Debate on Research in the Arts*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2006).

The emergence of artistic research is consistent with what has been called ‘the practice turn in contemporary theory’,²² which suggests that knowledge is constituted (rather than found) in and through practices, be they scientific or artistic. Renewed interest in the contexts of discovery (e.g. in science and technology studies) parallels a broader understanding of academic research, which can also be witnessed in the open definitions of ‘research’ used by research funding agencies and research councils (in their research assessments), and as employed in the Dublin Descriptors for the learning outcomes for first-, second- and third-cycle education.

Within the growing community of people engaged in artistic research, disagreement exists about which criteria (if any) apply to this new paradigm. Some oppose what they call the ‘disciplinisation’ of art,²³ while others are less reluctant to relate to academic values and conventions.²⁴ This dispute on art and academia – which often partly turns on a limited understanding of academic research – is also reflected in the various takes on artistic research in Europe. **Roughly speaking, one might discern three points of view here: (I) the academic perspective, (II) the sui generis perspective and (III) the critical perspective.**

- I. **The academic perspective** – associated, by some, with the ways in which the new research paradigm has been institutionalised in the English-speaking world, notably the UK – puts value on traditional academic criteria when it comes to differentiating art practice as research from art practice in itself.
- II. **The sui generis perspective** – associated, by some, with the ways in which artistic research made its entry into academia in the Nordic countries – foregrounds artistic values when it comes to assessing research in the arts. In Sweden, a new ‘artistic doctorate’ was created in 2010, and in Norway an independent artistic research fellowship programme – equivalent to a PhD programme – has been operating since 2003.
- III. **The critical perspective** – associated, by some, with a struggle against the Bologna Process in the German-speaking countries – emphasises the critical, or even subversive, force that research in the arts might exercise, as against the neoliberal tendency to subsume deviance under a single umbrella.²⁵ An example is the new PhD in Practice programme at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna.

When the generic criteria for undertaking research – concerning research questions, references, methods and communication/ dissemination – are transposed onto the field of artistic research,

it is important to stress that the object of research, the context of the research, the method of research and the way in which the research results are presented are inextricably bound up with the practice of making and playing. **Art practice is the object, context, method and outcome of the research.** 

The standard subdivision between basic research, applied research and experimental development – as laid down in the *Frascati Manual* –²⁶ is no longer considered appropriate in light of the present diversity of academic fields, research strategies and knowledge forms. The emergence of **Mode 2 knowledge production** may be seen as a corrective to the conventional model of scientific research.²⁷ Mode 2 knowledge production involves interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary research, performed in the context where the research is applied (the 'context of application'). It also implies the substantive organisational involvement not just of academics but also of other 'stakeholders' who help to plan and perform the research and evaluate its societal relevance.

Because of its close ties with art practice and the central role that this practice plays in the research, artistic research sometimes seems to be a type of Mode 2 knowledge production. But sometimes – for instance, in research on historical performance practice in music or research in and through choreographic practices – artistic research might more readily be seen as **intradisciplinary research**, intended to contribute both materially and cognitively to the development of the art form in question.


Much artistic research simultaneously focuses on enriching our world by developing new products (like compositions, images, performances, installations) and on broadening our understanding of the world and

22. Schatzky et al. (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. (London: Routledge, 2001).

23. K. Busch, 'Generating Knowledge in the Arts – A Philosophical Daydream' in *Texte zur Kunst* (June 2011) 20/82 (issue: Artistic Research). p. 70-79.

24. M.A.R. Biggs and H. Karlsson (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. (London and New York: Routledge, 2010).

25. T. Holert, 'Art in the Knowledge-Based Polis' in *e-flux Journal*. 3 (February 2009). <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/view/40>

26. The Frascati Manual is a document ing forth the methodology for collecting statistics about research and development. The Manual was prepared and published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The manual gives definitions for: basic research, applied research, research and development, etc. It also organizes field of science into main and sub-categories.

27. M. Gibbons et al., *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. (London: Sage, 1994).

of ourselves – an understanding that is embodied in the products generated by the research. This dual research aim transcends the classic dichotomy of applied versus basic research. Stokes' quadrant model provides a conceptual framework for understanding this type of research.²⁸ In this analysis, much valuable research, today and in the past, embraces both these aims, achieving a fundamental understanding of what is being studied as well as developing products and services that benefit society.

The Artistic Research Community

Both the pressure of the art market and the strain of art production often leave artists little room to 'stop and contemplate' what they are doing. Many artists are compelled to operate as entrepreneurs in the 'creative industry' – a market that is not orientated towards reflection but which expects its suppliers to deliver a constant stream of new products and projects. Although there is still some scepticism towards the phenomenon of artistic research in the art world, and some people steadfastly oppose the alleged 'disciplinisation' of the arts within and by academia, there is also a growing interest among artists, art institutes (such as museums and galleries) and art events (such as major exhibitions) to partake in what they perceive as a free space for 'material thinking'.



Several organisations and networks have recently been created which foster research in the arts, inside and outside higher arts education. To name two of them:

- The **Society for Artistic Research** (SAR, founded in March 2010) serves as the backbone for the **Journal for Artistic Research** (JAR). JAR is an international, online, open-access, peer-reviewed journal for the identification, publication and dissemination of artistic research and its methodologies from all arts disciplines. In its aim of displaying research practice in a manner that respects artists' modes of presentation, JAR abandons the traditional journal article format and offers its contributors a dynamic online canvas in which text can be woven together with image, audio and video (www.jar-online.net)
- **European Platform for Artistic Research in Music** (EPARM, founded in April 2011) is a platform initiated by the Association Européenne des Conservatoires [European Association of Conservatories] (AEC), serving the community of European conservatoires as they each come to terms, in ways most appropriate to their unique context, with the phenomenon of artistic research in music.

28. D. E. Stokes, *Pasteur's Quadrant – Basic Science and Technological Innovation*. (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997).

Research in Higher Arts Education

SHARE not only provides an overview of publications and conferences but also of institutions and programmes engaged in research in the arts as well as of the situation in different European countries with regard to funding, regulations, degrees and integration into the academic infrastructure. This overview, which is still in progress, presently describes the situations in 14 countries. The following programmes from that overview could be highlighted here, as they are at the frontline of developments in the field:

- The Norwegian Artistic Research Fellowship Programme is a national programme offering a three-year post to candidates who have completed the highest level of art education in their subject area. The fellow is associated with one of the Norwegian institutions providing higher arts education. The programme enables high-level artistic research, resulting in expertise at the associate professor level. <http://www.kunststipendiat.no/en>
- The Swedish Konstnärliga Forskarskolan is a national research school in the arts. Its overall aim is to create a nationwide structure in Sweden for postgraduate education in the arts. Konstnärliga Forskarskolan fosters a stimulating, productive environment for artistic research, characterised by a plurality of genres, disciplines and approaches. <http://www.konstnarligaforskarskolan.se/>
- In Austria, the funding scheme known as Programm zur Entwicklung und Erschließung der Künste [Programme for Arts-Based Research] (PEEK) supports high quality, innovative arts-based research in which artistic practice is integral to the inquiry. <http://www.fwf.ac.at/de/projects/peek.html>

Research and Research Training

A distinction needs to be made between research and research training. Within arts academies, this translates into the difference between research by faculty and research by students during their training.

Faculty research in higher arts schools may take on various forms. In Europe, one sees both 'traditional' academic research (e.g. art historical research, technological/material research, social science research in art education) as well as artistic research. The Berlin University of the Arts, for instance, puts a strong focus on applied research (some of it contracted) and traditional academic research. There, artistic research is not acknowledged as an independent form of research at the doctoral or postdoctoral levels. At the Arts Faculty of the University of Gothenburg, the focus is on artistic research and development, and students there may obtain an 'artistic doctorate'.

Within research training, it is important to distinguish between the bachelor, masters and doctoral levels. Clearly, the bachelor's

curriculum teaches elementary research skills like argumentation, information, communication and presentation skills. The masters and doctoral programmes can then focus more directly on undertaking research.

Here, too, one encounters a wide variety of research practices, ranging from auto-ethnography to research by design. Increasingly, though, artistic research is acknowledged as typical for research within higher arts education.

In 2001, an informative report was published by the UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE), entitled *Research Training in the Creative and Performing Arts and Design*.²⁹ It makes lucid recommendations about building research training programmes at arts schools. Proposals take account of the research environment, research seminars, programme content, admission procedures, supervision of researchers and research projects and assessment of the research. This report could provide support and inspiration to those who are currently working to introduce research into arts education.

5. B. 2. 'Habits' within Arts- and Design-Based Research' (Ruth Mateus-Berr)

Inter/Trans/Multidisciplinary Arts and Design-Based Research

The term discipline, derived from the Latin word, *disciplina*, is associated with pedagogy and 'signifies the tools, methods, procedures, exempla, concepts and theories that account coherently for a set of objects or subjects',³⁰ bringing 'access and boundaries, with associations of profession, elitism, and exclusivity'.³¹ In discussion, disciplines are taken to refer to: territory, identity, belonging and status. A discipline is considered to be 'private property', a 'mother lode'.³² Specialists are locked in their 'bastions of medieval autonomy', nurturing 'academic nationalism', keeping 'departmental' turf jealousy guarded.³³ The concept of interdisciplinarity, and related controversies over its meaning, offers ground for interesting discussion; Two centuries ago, Immanuel Kant warned against interdisciplinarity: 'Es ist nicht Vermehrung, sondern Verunstaltung der Wissenschaften, wenn man ihre Grenzen ineinander

29. UKCGE, *Research Training in the Creative & Performing Arts & Design*. (UK Council for Graduate Education, 2001).

30. J. T. Klein, *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory and Practice*. (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1990). p. 104.

31. J. Dalrymple and W. Miller, 'Interdisciplinarity: a key for real-world learning' in *Planet No.* 17. 2006. p. 29.

32. J. T. Klein, op cit. p. 77.

33. Loc. cit.

laufen läßt' [Merging the spaces of the disciplines is not enhancing but defacing the sciences].³⁴ The father of cybernetics, Norbert Wiener, localised the 'fertile areas' of science in a 'no man's land' between established disciplines.³⁵ The US National Research Council (NRC) discovered 'that almost all significant growth in knowledge production in recent decades was occurring at the interdisciplinary borderlands between established fields'.³⁶

Julie Klein demystifies the interdisciplinarity that marks 20th-century scholarship by compiling the first comprehensive bibliography of relevant literature. In this, she defines interdisciplinarity as a synthesis of two or more disciplines, establishing a new method of discourse and need for disciplinary behaviour, which might seem to be a paradox. When interdisciplinarity is successful (e.g. electromagnetism, molecular biology, installation art), it becomes a new discipline. The Belgian philosopher and advocate of interdisciplinarity, Leo Apostel, asserts that, 'When two sciences really get together, then there is a point of fusion and the new science doesn't present itself anymore as an interdisciplinary effort'.³⁷ Maurice deWachter believes that disciplines may be reinforced in their autonomy through interdisciplinary processes, articulating a need for permanent translation; for him, the solution does not necessarily have to be interdisciplinary, but can result in monodisciplinarity.³⁸ In other words, 'Until there is willingness to change one's mind and translate conviction into a language the other will fully appreciate, no interdisciplinary communication has taken place'.³⁹ By contrast, multidisciplinarity signifies a juxtaposition of disciplines. It is essentially additive, rather than integrative, maintaining a separation of professional roles. Transdisciplinarity can be described as an interconnectedness of all aspects of reality, transcending the dynamic of a dialectical synthesis to grasp the total dynamics of reality as a whole.⁴⁰ In 1972, the Austrian astrophysicist, Erich Jantsch, introduced transdisciplinary science as an evolutionary challenge, presenting the term at the first conference on interdisciplinarity

34. I. Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1989). VIII-IX (translation by Ruth Mateus-Berr).

35. N. Wiener, *Kybernetik. Regelung und Nachrichtenübertragung in Lebewesen und Maschine*. (Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag, 1968). p. 21.

36. J.T. Klein, op. cit. p. 17.

37. L. Apostel, 'Conceptual Tools for Interdisciplinarity. An operational approach' in *Interdisciplinarity, Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities*. (Paris: OECD, 1972). 2. p. 141-80.

38. M. DeWachter, 'Interdisciplinary Team Work' in *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 2, 1976, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2495117/>

39. Loc. cit.

40. J.T. Klein, op. cit. pp. 66-67.

in Paris in 1970.⁴¹ Transdisciplinarity can be considered to occur when different academic disciplines work collectively on real-world problems. Transdisciplinary research is an additional type within the spectrum of research, coexisting with traditional monodisciplinary research.⁴³ Transdisciplinarity is a new approach to research and problem-solving; In this field, innovation might occur when continuity is broken and practice comes into question.⁴⁴

Arts-based research was first formally identified in the mid-1990s.⁴⁵

Arts-based research has various approaches. It posits knowledge as sensory knowing and a form of critical engagement, a socially engaged process of reflection and action that discloses new meanings and possibilities.⁴⁶ Barone and Eisner derive from an educational observing context as research and borrow the methodologies of the social sciences. Andrea Sabisch who derives as Kämpf-Jansen from educational background, reflects in 'Staging of research' on the empty map of Lewis Carroll ('Hunting of the Snark') and contradicts Kämpf-Jansen that a research has to start with an enquiry but with something undefined before.⁴⁷ If it were the case that all research starts with a question, a single answer might be expected, rather than the question remaining in discussion, which should be the objective.⁴⁸ Borgdorff believes that 'artistic research as a rule does not start off with clearly defined research questions, topics, or hypotheses whose relevance to the research context or to art practice has been established beforehand [...] it is not 'hypothesis-led' but 'discovery-led' research.'⁴⁹ Mullican writes 'you can't answer the question,

41. E. Jantsch, 'Towards Interdisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity in Education and Innovation' in OECD (ed.), *Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities*. (Paris, 1972). pp. 97-121.

42. J. Klein, 'What is Artistic Research?' in *Gegenworte 23, Wissenschaft trifft Kunst*. (Berlin: Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Akademie Verlag, 2010).

43. J. T. Klein et al. (eds.), *Transdisciplinarity: Joint Problem Solving among Science, Technology, and Society. An Effective Way for Managing Complexity*. (Basel, Boston, Berlin: Birkhäuser, 2001).

44. Compare: W. J. T. Mitchell, 'Interdisciplinarity and visual culture', *The Art Bulletin* in T. Winters, *Interdisciplinarity and Design Education*. Conference Cumulus 38, 1995. p. 77(4).

45. T. Barone and E. Eisner, 'Arts-based educational research' in R. Jager (ed.), *Contemporary methods for research in education* (2nd ed.). (Washington, DC: American Education Research Association, 1997). pp. 73-116.

46. T. Barone, 'How arts-based research can change minds' in M. Cahnmann-Taylor and R. Siegesmund (eds.), *Arts-based research in education: Foundations for practice*. (New York: Routledge, 2008). pp. 28-49.

47. A. Sabisch, *Inszenierung der Suche. Vom Sichtbarwerden ästhetischer Erfahrung im Tagebuch. Entwurf einer wissenschaftskritischen Grafieforschung*. (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2007). p. 18.

48. K-J. Pazzini, *Kunst existiert nicht, es sei denn als angewandte*. 2000. http://kunst.erzwiss.uni-hamburg.de/pdfs/kunst_existiert_nicht.pdf. p. 37.

49. H. Borgdorff, *The Conflict of the Faculties. Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. (Leiden: University Press, 2012). p. 80.

you can only demonstrate it'.⁵⁰ Damianisch asserts that 'the formulation of a question is crucial for any kind of research, often in conjunction with a concrete working hypothesis, whereupon follow-up questions unfold dynamically'.⁵¹ On the other hand, Frayling criticises the exceptional positioning of arts and design, which he considers institutional rather than conceptual. He distinguishes three categories from Herbert Read, who deals with art and design education and not with research:⁵²

- Research **into** art and design (art historical research)
(Historical research, aesthetic or perceptual research, social, political, critical, economic, iconographical, technical, material, structural research)
- Research **through** art and design (artefact and research)
(studio work and research report, research diary, practical experience, project in the studio, communication of results: material research, development work, action research)
- Research **for** art and design (artefact stands alone)
(research where the end product is an artefact, where the thinking is embodied in the artefact, where the goal is not primarily communicable knowledge in the sense of verbal communication but in the sense of visual or iconic or imagistic communication)⁵³

Rubidge further differentiates 'research for art and design' as follows:

- **Practice-based research**
Research that tests pre-formulated questions and/or hypotheses derived from artistic practice ('blue-sky-research', hypothesis-led); the artist is the researcher.⁵⁴ Bennet et al. believe that only someone other than the artist can conduct the research.⁵⁵ This research method is grounded in theory, developing theory out of practice.⁵⁶

50. M. Mullican, 'A Drawing Translates the Way of Thinking' in *Drawing Papers Number 82*. (New York: The Drawing Center, 2008). p. 7.

51. A. Damianisch, 'Artistic Research' in G. Elias et al. (eds.), *Springer Encyclopedia on Creativity, Invention, Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (CI2E), LLC. (New York: Springer, 2013). p. 124.

52. H. Read, *Education through art*. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1958).

53. C. Frayling, 'Research in Art and Design' in *Royal College of Art Research Papers*. 1/1 . Compare also: sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/.../chap1.pdf, 1993/1994. p. 5.

54. S. Rubidge, Artists in the Academy: *Reflections on Artistic Practice as Research*, <http://ausdance.org.au/articles/details/artists-in-the-academy-reflections-on-artistic-practice-as-research>, 2005.

55. D. Bennet, D. Wright and D.M. Blom, The Artistic practice-Research-Teaching (ART) Nexus: Translating the Information Flow, in: *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, Volume 7. Issue 2. <http://http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol7/iss2/3/>, 2010.

56. K. Friedman, 'Creating Design Knowledge: From Research into Practice' in E.W.L. Norman and P.H. Roberts (eds.), *Design and Technology Educational Research and Development: The Emerging International Research Agenda* (Loughborough University, 2001). pp. 31-69.

Practice-led research

Research using practice to research practice itself. Often without an initial clearly defined question or hypothesis, it may lead to a formal question or hypothesis; discovery-led; 'the artist uses his or her professional experience insights and skills'.⁵⁷

Practice as research

The term 'practice-based' is frequently used as an umbrella term for academic research which incorporates artistic practice as a 'research methodology', Friedman criticises this method because he believes that many designers confuse practice with research. He also refers to Polányi in *The Tacit Dimension*: 'Our stock of tacit knowledge enables us to practice. Putting tacit knowledge to use in theory construction requires rendering tacit knowledge explicit through the process of knowledge conversion'.⁵⁸ These possibilities need explicit knowledge rendered articulate for shared communication and reflection. Nigel Cross remarks that he also does not see any strong evidence of the output of this applied methodology.⁵⁹ Johnson observes, that 'making strong contrasts between scientific methods and arts practices ignores the central role of the qualitative aspects of any inquiry, whether in the arts or sciences'.⁶⁰ Damianisch argues that 'the number of possibilities of artistic practices is unlimited'.⁶¹

In agreement with Friedman, it would seem that original sources need to be read, trawled and critically rethought, but believes that a mixed method works and meets international recognition (research into/through/for art).

DOCUMENTA(13) was 'dedicated to artistic research and forms of imaginations [...] and to a holistic non-logocentric vision that is skeptical of the persisting belief in economic growth'. The goal of any enquiry is to be able to act upon the knowledge gained. As an outcome of research, understanding is as significant as explanation. The quest for understanding means individual and social transformation is a worthy human enterprise, because to know means to capable of thinking and acting and thereby changing things, evoking a cultural

57. S. Rubidge, op. cit.

58. K. Friedman, 'Research into, by and for design', *Journal of Visual Arts Practice*. Volume 7 Number 2 (Intellect Ltd Article, 2008). p. 154.

59. N. Cross, 'Subject: Re: Research into, for and through designs', *DRS Discussion List*, 13 December 1999, <http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/DRS>.

60. M. Johnson, 'Embodied Knowing through Art' in *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. (New York: Taylor and Francis Group, 2011). p. 161.

61. A. Damianisch, op. cit.

change for our future world. Artistic research should 'continue providing potential as a platform for knowledge [...] it serves as the innovation of basic research'.⁶²

Mersch and Ott describe the singular space of art, in which no objective theory or reliable 'cartography' can be situated; the 'area' has to be diversified.⁶³ For example, as an artist, Joseph Beuys researched his personal history and his construction of it, stressing the ambiguity of possible results and interpretations, in contrast to a historical research process within classical disciplines. Arts-based research is considered to be an undiscovered landscape with diverse paradigms. In 1989, Flusser argued that: 'die Wissenschaft [...] als eine intersubjektive Fiktion, die Kunst als intersubjektive Disziplin zwecks Erkenntnis-suche erscheinen (werde), also die Wissenschaft als eine Kunstart, und die Kunst als eine Variante der Wissenschaften' [science is considered to be an intersubjective fiction, art appears as an intersubjective discipline, a search for knowledge; therefore, science is a type of art, and art is a variant of science].⁶⁴ Artists have always been interested in various topics, which inspired them to find artistic concepts and solutions. Leonardo da Vinci's diaries on his personal artwork and science provide the archetype for the interdisciplinary approach of artists. Nonetheless, many theorists have attempted to analyse the artistic approach. In Vienna, for example, there were various symposia on artistic research in 2011, one of which invited artists as keynote speakers. The artist, Efva Lilja, asserts that, at those research conferences, it was primarily the application of 'scientific' perspective to artistic works, which counted.⁶⁵ This problem has been compounded by theoreticians' lack of practical art experience and artists' lack of language. Moreover, theorists are 'suspicious of artistic reconstructions, [...] they defy a unilateral semiotic reduction'.⁶⁶

Following a historical reconstruction of perspectives on arts-based research, Mersch and Ott advocate a need for self-reflection within the arts and sciences. In 1946, the art critic, Clement Greenberg, incited the arts to be self-critical and, since then, a shift has taken place; an

62. A. Damianisch, op.cit. p. 124.

63. D. Mersch and M. Ott (eds.), *Kunst und Wissenschaft*. (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2007). p. 30.

64. V. Flusser, *Gedächtnisse*, in *Philosophie der neuen Technologie*, Hrsg. Ars Electronica. (Berlin: Merve, 1989). p. 54 (translated by Ruth Mateus-Berr).

65. G. Bast, 'Can Artists Be Researchers? A Necessary Discussion of the Obvious' in J. Rittermann, G. Bast and J. Mittelstraß (eds.), *Kunst und Forschung/Art and research*. (New York, Wien: Springer Verlag, 2011). p. 169.

66. P. Carter, 'Interest: The Ethics of Invention' in E. Barrett, B. Bolt (eds.), *Practice as Research. Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry*. (London, New York: Tauris, 2009). p. 16.

approximation between the arts and sciences (research) can be observed, though many artists still observe the procedure critically and consider this development as colonialism. Mersch and Ott suggest that art should redeem philosophy. For them, both disciplines produce interactive spaces, and it seems that new relations have to be proportioned within reflexive research projects. In experimental and performative research, the arts react in an equivalent way to the sciences. Art uses its own irreducible terrain without art and research competing with each other, because art suggests different questions to science, to provide a locus at which contradictions and ruptures might occur.⁶⁷ But researchers and scientists remain sceptical, arguing that 'Arts-based research methodologies are still in conflict with conservative scholarly and political climates that emphasize traditional, scientific definitions of research'.⁶⁸ Feyerabend rightly argued that 'knowledge needs a plurality of ideas, [...] and that well established theories are never strong enough to terminate the existence of alternative approaches'.⁶⁹ He considered science to be a confused political process, a new experience, and argued 'against established methods' in science.

Much artistic research has focused on 'enriching our world by developing new products (like compositions images, performances, installations) and on broadening our understanding of reality and of ourselves'.⁷⁰ Florian Dombois suggests that, 'Because Science has explained the world successfully, but not exhaustively, an alternative is needed that returns to view the things that science has neglected'.⁷¹

In an excellent paper regarding contemporary designers, Tara Winters reflects on the concepts and situations that frame everyday design activities through a shared concern with ethics and responsibility.⁷² Design and art are no longer distinguishable; the disciplines have merged as painting did after the invention of photography. 'Design

67. D. Mersch, and M. Ott (eds), *Kunst und Wissenschaft*, (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2007).

68. M. Cahnmann-Taylor, R. Siegesmund, 'Arts-based research. Histories and new directions' in M. Cahnmann-Taylor, R. Siegesmund (Eds.), *Arts-Based Research in Education. Foundations for Practice*. (New York: Routledge, 2008). p. 7.

69. P. Feyerabend, *Against Method*. (Norton Verlag, 2010). p. 132.

70. H. Borgdorff, 'Where Are We Today? The State of the Art in Artistic Research' in J. Rottermann, G. Bast and J. Mittelstraß (eds.), *Art and research. Can artists be researchers?* (New York, Wien: Springer, 2011). p. 69.

71. F. Dombois, 'Kunst als Forschung' in G. Bast and B. Felderer (eds.), *Art and Now* (New York, Wien: Springer, 2007). p. 86.

72. T. Winters, *Interdisciplinarity and Design Education*, Conference Cumulus 38, Hemispheric Shifts across learning, teaching and research, The University of Auckland, Aotearoa, New Zealand, <http://ocs.sfu.ca/cumulus/index.php/cumulus09/swinrmit/paper/view/429/21>

is having its Marcel Duchamp moment'.⁷³ Winters believes that, as our conception of the disciplines can vary, our construction of interdisciplinarity will depend upon our ideas about its component disciplines. Squires' model suggests that 'disciplines can be viewed as multi-dimensional spaces which define, protect and enlarge themselves along any of those dimensions, and, in so doing, come into conflict or co-operation with other disciplines; these other disciplines are often adjacent, in the sense that they have a common boundary in terms of object, stance or mode'.⁷⁴ Designers, like contemporary artists, pose provocative questions about, for example, the cohabitation of electronics and men in which the design practice comes into question. This is real 'interdiscipline',⁷⁵ a challenge of 'breakage or rupture, when continuity is broken and the practice comes into question'.⁷⁶ As Newbury argues, 'The institutionalization of the division between reflection and action, theory and practice, has always been of dubious worth, and should be rejected in favour of a more interactive and interdisciplinary approach, which will be to the benefit of all'.⁷⁷

The Austrian Example of Fundamental Arts-Based Research Funding (PEEK)

In 1998, the Federal Law on the Organisation of the Universities of the Arts (KUOG), assigned arts universities the task of 'research' alongside the 'advancement and appreciation of the arts or arts-based research'.⁷⁸ In this, arts universities were given equal standing to scientific universities. However, amongst the universities, there is an acknowledgement that arts- or design-based research involves 'a systematic enquiry whose goal is communicable knowledge'.⁷⁹

In 2009, a funding programme was set up in Austria that aimed to promote and advance the arts (PEEK). President of the University of Applied Arts in Vienna, Gerald Bast, one of the main protagonists behind this programme, describes how 'It was set up on the initiative of

73. N. Currie, 'A Duchamp Moment', electronic version, *Frieze*, retrieved March 19, 2009, from http://blog.frieze.com/a_duchamp_moment

74. G. Squires, 'Interdisciplinarity in Higher Education in the United Kingdom' *European Journal of Education*, 27(3), In: *Interdisciplinarity and Design Education*, Conference Cumulus 38, 1992. p. 44.

75. W. J. T. Mitchell, 'Interdisciplinarity and visual culture', *The Art Bulletin* in T. Winters, *Interdisciplinarity and Design Education*. Conference Cumulus 38, 1995

76. Loc. cit.

77. D. Newbury, 'Knowledge and research in art and design' in *Design Studies* 17, (1996). p. 5. http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XX/II/I_01228/fname_140119.pdf

78. http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XX/II/I_01228/fname_140119.pdf

79. C. Frayling, 'Nourishing the academy' in *Drawing Fire*, vol. 1 no. 3. (Winter, 1996). pp. 16-22.

the universities of the arts, after long and determined negotiations'.⁸⁰ This new instrument for stimulating aesthetic innovation is organisationally based at the Austrian Science Fonds (FWF). Regarding official policies, Austria has to adhere to the classification of the *Frascati Manual* (OECD),⁸¹ which describes the fields of science and technology and the arts, albeit in limited form. In this, the artistic fields are assimilated into the humanities and defined as 'Arts (arts, history of arts, performing arts, music): Arts, Art history; Architectural design; Performing arts studies (Musicology, Theatre science, Dramaturgy); Folklore studies; Studies on Film, Radio and Television'. Certain artistic fields are missing, such as design in its entirety, and many index entries refer to theoretical art-related disciplines rather than practical art.

The PEEK funding programme disburses an annual average of about 1.5 million Euro and receives an average of 50 applications per year totalling around 12 million Euro. Artists and designers (alone or in collaboration with theoreticians) are entitled to apply. Since 2009, 20 projects have received funding,⁸² 38 art and related science fields, according to the index numbers of the OECD. It might be too early for predictions about the art fields in general, but the summary for 2010–2014 may be broken down as follows according the OECD index numbers: Arts-based research as research-in (artists and designers research their art/design work) and -through the arts⁸³ account for around 60 percent of all selected projects; about 40 percent belong to 'classical' scientific theoretical research disciplines. Twelve index numbers are used to refer to arts-based praxis (media arts, fine arts, computer-aided simulation, performance practice, music, singing, dramaturgy, applied arts, landscape design, rhetoric, audio-visual media, architecture), and 26 to 'classical' scientific disciplines. Five projects sit completely within the arts fields; six are regarded as more than 50 percent within the arts field; one project is totally identified as scientific, the rest are considered to have an arts component of between 20 percent to 40 percent.

80. G. Bast, op. cit.

81. OECD: Frascati Manual http://www.oecd.org/document/6/0,3746,en_2649_34451_33828550_1_1_1_1,00.html

82. PEEK: http://www.fwf.ac.at/asp/projekt_res.asp

83. C. Frayling, op. cit.

What Kind of Habits of Interdisciplinarity are Used within the Arts?

The 20 PEEK projects demonstrate the following interdisciplinarity:

Two projects were designed in just one discipline – music or fine arts.

Three projects combine two art disciplines – media art and dramaturgy, applied arts and landscape design, ethno-musicology and computer-aided simulation. Four combine three disciplines (media art, media research, communication; performance practice, music, singing; media art, art theory, interdisciplinary technical sciences; music, musicology, theory of music). The other nine combine four disciplines. Interdisciplinarity within the arts can be considered in the following projects: media art and dramaturgy; applied arts and landscape design; dramaturgy and fine arts; media art and fine arts and rhetoric; geometry and audio-visual media; architecture and computer-aided simulation. Nearly half of the projects are situated within 'classical' scientific disciplines such as media research, communication sciences, ethnomusicology, philosophy of history, cultural philosophy, cultural studies, art theory, interdisciplinary technical sciences, contemporary history, knowledge management, Jazz research, humanities/the arts interdisciplinary, theory of music, music education, architecture theory, space research, information society, geometry, experimental physics, ethnology, gender studies, nanotechnology, biomechanics, music sociology, musicology.

Closing Remarks

Arts- and design-based research seems to succeed in the 'breakage of continuity', in which practice comes into question. Durão and Vasconcelos conclude that a tradition in research culture is lacking in the arts and design.⁸⁴ Reasons for this were identified by several authors.^{85,86} Frayling observes that 'there is a lot of private territory' within disciplines; arts disciplines may have less 'academic nationalism' than the classical disciplines of science. In considering interdisciplinary practices, we find that arts disciplines more often merge with other theoretical disciplines than with each other because of scientific tradition and a considerable lack of self-confidence or question of the definition of how research within the arts should be done. They explore various possibilities by exceeding limits.

84. M.J. Durão and M.C. Vasconcelos, *Research in Art and Design: A common ground between science and creative practice*, http://www.sd.polyu.edu.hk/iasdr/proceeding/papers/Research%20in%20Art%20and%20Design_%20A%20common%20ground%20between%20science%20and%20creative%20practice.pdf, n.d.

85. B. Allison, 'Research in art & design in the United Kingdom' in *Higher Education Review*, vol. 26 No 2, (1994). pp. 49-64.

86. H. Karlsson, 'Managing Art Schools Today, Reflections from the OECD seminar' in *OECD Proceedings of the Seminar 'Managing Art Schools Today'*. (Paris 28-29 August 2003). pp. 3-16.

It will be interesting to define new research methods within the arts- and design-based research fields that exceed established definitions. PEEK is a very innovative fund in Austria that should continue to encourage other art and design disciplines to 'leave their territory', because art and design practices can be characterised by risk-taking that can bring about societal change.

5. B. 3. **'Typologies of Research'**⁸⁷ (Andris Teikmanis)

A version of this text was used as the basis of a workshop 'Typologies of Research – Design Research / Artistic Research' during the SHARE Conference in London in 2012. We include it here by way of indicating a different analytic and style of intellectual practice in the approach to questions of definition that **does not propose a differentiation between 'artistic research' and 'design research'.**

Basic Research

Research, in the broadest sense, is a part of our everyday practice and experience. We are undertaking research every time we realise that there are some questions that need to be answered through the gathering of information.⁸⁸ With this in mind, the basic model for any research could be drawn simply as: *question (problem) – research (solution)*. However, research carried out in our everyday practice is rarely identified as research proper, a notion we usually reserve for a narrower circle of activities which can be defined as academic, applied or scientific research. These vary according to several aspects: methods, subjective relations of researcher, research object, types of knowledge produced, etc. There is no doubt, therefore, that we could interpret almost any artistic practice as research given the breadth of these definitions. The only question that we need to answer is: 'What kind of research?'

Art Practice-Related Researches

Over the past twenty years, a new phenomenon has emerged across the globe in the field of art education: research-linked and -informed art studies. These studies constitute a new model of current art education that could be called a research art academy. **Considering four of the historical models of art academies, introduced by James Elkins – the French academy, German Romantic art academy, Bauhaus and post-war art schools⁸⁹ – the research art academy can be identified**

87. With contributions of Marton Szentpeteri

88. W. Booth, G. Colomb and J.M. Williams, *The Craft of Research*. (University of Chicago Press, 2008).

89. C. Sollfrank, *Art Education Is Radically Undertheorized*, An interview with James Elkins (2008), <http://thing-hamburg.de/index.php?id=796>

as a fifth hypothetical model that represents a wide variety of art- and design-related research practices carried out in contemporary art and design education. These practices are conducted under different legal frameworks; they are based on different models of relations between artistic practice and research, they make use of diverse research methods and they might be categorised using various typologies.

The first typology of art- and design-related modes of research were introduced by Sir Christopher Frayling in his seminal paper 'Research in Art and Design': Research into art and design, Research through art and design and Research for art and design. While the first category, Research into art and design, was easily attributed to the most common part of art related research activities and the second category, Research through art and design, was possible to identify inside every practice of art and design teaching, the most 'thorny' one was the third category - Research for art and design, that Frayling described as research 'where the goal is not primarily communicable knowledge in the sense of verbal communication, but in the sense of visual or iconic or imagistic communication'.⁹⁰

In 2009, Hazel Smith and Roger T. Dean introduced another, more elaborated, typology. They presented two main types of art-related modes of research: 'practice-led research and its affiliates (practice-based research, practice as research)' and research-led practice which they used 'to complement practice-led research' because it 'suggests more clearly than practice-led research that scholarly research can lead to creative work'.⁹¹ These two types of art-related research were coupled with a third type of research, designated, by authors, as academic research.

At the same time, these three proposed categories cover only part of the known kinds of art-practice-related research, leaving aside such concepts as 'art-based research'⁹² and 'artistic research', of which account should also be taken. Art-based research was defined by Patricia Leavy as 'a set of methodological tools used by qualitative researchers across the disciplines during all phases of social research' that appeared as 'the merging of cross-disciplinary social research with creative arts'.⁹³

90. C. Frayling, 'Research in Art and Design', *Royal College of Art Research Papers*, Volume 1 No. 1 (1993). pp. 1-5.

91. H. Smith and R. Dean, *Practice-led research, research-led practice in the creative arts*. (Edinburgh University Press, 2009).

92. P. Leavy, *Method Meets Art: Arts-Based Research Practice*. (Guilford Press, 2008).

93. Loc. cit.

And, while art-based research uses art as an instrument of research rather than research object or research aim, it also should be considered a legitimate part of practice-related research. In turn, Mika Hannula never used formal definitions but rather poetic metaphors to portray artistic research, such as: '1) Like Trying to Run in Waist-High New Snow [...] 2) crossing a River by Feeling Each Stone [...] 3) Moving like Smugglers' Boats, moving quietly in the night, with no lights, almost colliding with one another, but never quite making contact'.⁹⁴

A general model of these five types of art practice-related research could be drawn up, by outlining: relations between research and practice, subjective relations between researcher and author (producer) of artwork, type of research object, type of produced knowledge and expected research output.

Table 7.B.1 General model of relations between art practice and research

Research types	Relations between research and practice	Subjective relations	Research object or objects	Types of produced knowledge	Research output
Academic (Scientific) research	Research about practice	Researcher ≠ author of artwork	Artworks, processes, ideas produced by other persons	Ideas, theories, methods, new data (art history and theory)	Texts
Practice-led research	Research is based on practice	Author of artwork = researcher	Artwork (artworks) produced by researcher	Artwork (artworks) and documentation of its production	Artwork and text
Research-led practice	Practice is based on research	Researcher = author of artwork	Production of artwork and new knowledge	New technological solutions, methods and theory	Artwork and text
Art-based research	Practice as field research	Researcher is not necessarily author of artwork	Effect caused by artwork(s) on social environment	Ideas, theories, methods, new data (social sciences)	Text
Artistic research	Practice and research are inseparable	Author-researcher	Artistic practice	Artwork and ideas and theories	Artwork and text

Describing only relations between certain parts of the research process, objects and outputs, this model represents just part of the story. Questions about relations between research and artistic practice and concepts used to interpret artistic practice in contemporary society are not possible to address without establishing broader relations between art practice-related research and shifts of research paradigms in the academic world.

94. M. Hannula, *Catch Me If You Can: Chances and Challenges of Artistic Research*, volume 2. No. 2. Spring 2009. <http://www.artandresearch.org.uk/v2n2/hannula1.html>

Triangulation of Methods

Applying demarcation criteria proposed by Karl Popper – who stated that falsifiability of a system is to be taken as a criterion of demarcation between science and non-science⁹⁵ – art practice-related research usually falls outside the realm of science, but that does not mean that it is not part of an evolving research culture. In fact, the very opposite is true. The introduction of art practice-related research is not an isolated accident in the field of Western research culture. It had been anticipated by the shift of an entire scientific paradigm in human and social sciences during the second half of 20th century. This change of paradigm, which is comparable with the Copernican revolution, was marked by the emergence of semiotic, poststructuralist and deconstructionist reasoning across a wide range of the humanitarian and social sciences, including: Thomas Kuhn's choice of scientific paradigms over the efforts to define the fixed scientific method,⁹⁶ the replacement of objective scientific realism with socially motivated knowledge by Jerry Ravetz⁹⁷ and even epistemological anarchism proposed by Paul Feyerabend in the philosophy of science.⁹⁸ These transformations, which marked the end of 'normal science', determined the necessity to reconsider differences between evidences and explanations, to reassess the importance of contexts in humanitarian and social sciences, to critically reevaluate any concept of reality and to elaborate researchers' own methods as part of the dominant paradigm and, at the same time, be prepared for the next scientific revolution.

Acknowledging this new Copernican revolution, methodological frameworks that explore and classify art practice-related research methods might be constructed by linking their underlying concepts with their particular viewpoints. The acceptance of the notion of knowledge as a product of social construction makes these theoretical viewpoints an even more important part of methodological enquiry. The methodological framework that can facilitate an account of these subjective and objective viewpoints and their mapping onto network conceptual consequences can be built by applying the 'triangulation' of methods introduced by Jordan Zlatev. In developing a synthetic cognitive semiotic theory like The Semiotic Hierarchy, Zlatev proposed the 'triangulation' of methods from three perspectives, which are usually called 'subjective', 'intersubjective' and 'objective'.⁹⁹ This was used as

95. K. R. Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. (Basic Books, 1959).

96. T. S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. (University of Chicago Press, 1962).

97. J. R. Ravetz, *Scientific Knowledge and its Social Problems*. (Oxford University Press, 1971).

98. P. K. Feyerabend, *Against method: Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge*. (New Left Books, 1975).

99. J. Zlatev, The Semiotic Hierarchy: Life, Consciousness, Signs and Language, *Cognitive Semiotics*, No.4, (2009). pp. 169-200.

Interventions: Position Papers and Dialogues

a device with which to group methods ‘on the basis of the type or perspective adopted for the particular phenomenon under study’.¹⁰⁰ This application of the triangulation of methods can be extended to creative practice by addressing three main concepts within art: **art as a form of self reflection, art as a means of communication and art as a commodity that can be sold for profit.** In turn, these three concepts determine three types of modelling system that may be applied to the creation of art, giving rise to three related types of research modelling.

Table 7.B.2 Triangulation of concepts in relation to art research practices

Type of methods	Point of view	Concept of art	Modelling system	Research modelling	Relations between art and research
Subjective methods	First person	Art as self reflection	Art as an individual modelling system	Invention of individual models	Art practise is identical to research
Intersubjective methods	Second person	Art as communication	Art as the artificially constructed modelling system	Construction or exploration of communication models	Art as an tool of research
Objective methods	Third person	Art as commodity	Art as an collective modelling system not necessarily released as artificially constructed	Elaboration of general models	Art as an object of research

This triangulation of methods and related concepts could be used to ascribe not only relations between art and research but also proposed art research types.

Table 7.B.3 Mapping of both models: General model of relation between art practices and research and Triangulation of concepts in relation to art research practices

	Subjective methods	Intersubjective methods	Objective methods
Academic (Scientific) research	-	-	+
Practise led research	-/+	+	-
Research led practise	-	-/+	+
Art based research	-	+	-/+
Artistic research	+	-/+	-

100. J. Zlatev, op. cit

101. L.B. Archer, ‘A view of the nature of the design research’ in R. Jacques and J.A. Powell (eds.), *Design: Science: Method.* (Guildford: IPC Business Press, 1981). pp. 30-47.

Unanswered Questions Concerning Design Research

However, this mapping only throws light onto relations between art and research, leaving questions about relations between art and design research unanswered. While design research can be classified as being related to art practice-related research, bearing in mind that the design research goal is 'knowledge of, or in, the embodiment of configuration, composition, structure, purpose, value, and meaning in man-made things and systems',¹⁰¹ it should be distinct as a separate issue of research category constituting several questions: 'Do the same models that were used to outline relations between artistic practice and research remain valid when we try to map relations between practice and research inside design?' 'Is it possible to interpret relations between design research and practice, research object, types of produced knowledge and research output in the same way as we could interpret research-led practice (Table 4 and Table 6)?' 'Is it possible to translate design research into a framework created by applying this 'triangulation' of concepts?' 'Could we put forward three dominant concepts of design based on 'subjective', 'intersubjective' and 'objective' approaches: design as the artistic expression of an individual designer (artistic design), design as a service (social design) and design as a part of product production (industrial design) (Table 5)?'

Table 7.B.4 General model including design research

Research types	Relations between research and practice	Subjective relations	Research object or objects	Types of produced knowledge	Research output
Academic (Scientific) research	Research about practice	Researcher is not author of artwork	Artworks, processes, ideas produced by other persons	Ideas, theories, methods, new data (art history and theory)	Texts
Practise-led research	Research is based on practice	Author of artwork = researcher	Artwork(s) produced by researcher	Artwork(s) and documentation of its production	Artwork and text
Research-led practice	Practice is based on research	Researcher = author of artwork	Production of artwork and new knowledge	New technological solutions, methods and theories	Artwork and text
Design research	Practice is based on research	Researcher = author of design object	Production of design object and new knowledge	New technological solutions, methods and theory	Design object and text
Art-based research	Practice as field research	Researcher is not necessary author of artwork	Effect caused by artwork(s) on social environment	Ideas, theories, methods, new data (social sciences)	Text
Artistic research	Practice and research are inseparable	Author of artwork = researcher	Artistic practice	Artwork and ideas and theories	Artwork and text

Table 5 Triangulation of concepts of art and design and art and design research

Type of Type of methods	Point of view	Concept of art	Modelling system	Research modelling	Relations between art and research	Concept of design	Design research
Subjective methods	First person	Artwork as self reflection	Art as an individual modelling system	Invention of individual models	Artistic research	Design as an artistic expression of individual designer, artistic design	Methods of artistic practice and research
Intersubjective methods	Second person	Artwork as communication	Art as the artificially constructed modelling system	Construction or exploration of communication models	Art as an tool of research; Art-Based researches (in social sciences)	Design as service, social design	Methods of social sciences
Objective methods	Third person	Artwork as commodity	Art as an collective modelling system not necessarily released as artificially constructed	Elaboration of general models	Art as an object of research	Design as part of product production, industrial design	Methods of engineering sciences

Table 6 Mapping of both models: General model of relation between art practices and research and Triangulation of concepts in relation to art research practices taking into account design research

	Subjective methods	Intersubjective methods	Objective methods
Academic (Scientific) research	-	-	+
Practice-led research	-/+	+	-
Research led practice	-	-/+	+
Design research	-	-/+	+
Art-based research	-	+	-/+
Artistic research	+	-/+	-

Conclusion

It seems that any doctoral-level education specific to artistic practices must necessarily engage each doctoral candidate in careful consideration of the choice of foundations and principles upon which artistic research may be based. While acknowledging the desirability of a multiplicity of approaches here, it seems essential that we engage all doctoral-level researchers in a discussion of these various definitions. This is, of course, consistent with the way in which doctoral-level students are usually required to engage in some degree of epistemological reflection and critical positioning. However, as experienced within other disciplines and other research undertakings, the challenge is to encourage researchers in the arts to engage with these questions without simple recourse to an epistemic lexicon derived from philosophy, sociology or cultural studies. The exploration of these different intellectual traditions is important, but so, too, is the attempt to balance this with attention to the intellectual

5. C. Some Disciplinary Perspectives

and critical reflective traditions within the diverse field of arts. This question is explored further in the next section, which provides examples of some of the diverse ways in which different arts practices rhetorically frame their engagement with enquiry, discursivity and pedagogical renewal in the context of artistic research debates and third-cycle experiments.

5. C. Some Disciplinary Perspectives

Introduction

This section builds upon the two previous sections by providing a range of disciplinary perspectives on questions of artistic research. Importantly, in the framing of artistic research, we begin to see a wider spread of rhetorical styles, which is an important dimension of the debate here. This is a matter of different interpretations of actions which seek to counteract a broadly conceived threat of bureaucratisation and ‘flattening’ of affect in the oral and textual regimes elaborated around art education and artistic research.

Scott deLahunta’s text begins with a consideration of the specific challenges around the development of a research culture within the field of choreographic practice. This paper illustrates the kind of thinking that emerges from within an arts practice as it formulates its own perspective on the building of a research culture immanent to the field. This demonstrates something much more interesting than simply the superficial transfer of the rhetorics of research. Remaining within the field of choreography, Efva Lilja’s paper demonstrates another ‘bodily’ rhetoric, rehearsing the dynamic relationship – or co-identity – between the body that speaks and the body that moves. This seeks to impose a particular orientation onto the idea of ‘art’ which then subordinates appropriation of the term ‘research’. This paper complements that of Ruth Mateus-Berr from the previous section, by providing an introduction to the Swedish national funding programme, which specifically supports artistic research. Matthias Tarasiewicz makes a further contribution to this section by providing an account of an artistic technology research platform and demonstrating a different rhetorical framing that draws upon the broad critical lexicon of science and technology studies. Leandro Madrazo provides a perspective from architectural research, proposing that interdisciplinarity necessarily arises even in research grounded within one discipline. He explains this by foregrounding the role of representational frames in delimiting the choice of research object, the construction of research problems and the broader mediation of the research enterprise. The section

concludes with a perspective, developed by Mick Wilson for a multi-disciplinary platform in Ireland, which draws upon a tradition of critical art practice from the broad domain of contemporary visual art. The rhetorical mode here is one of uneasy compromise between the procedural language of a formal curriculum document and the rhetorical terms of critical arts practice.

5. C. 1. **'Publishing Choreographic Ideas: Discourse from Practice'**

(Scott deLahunta)

Let's start with the idea of a space for new knowledge, emerging from the embodied practice of dance and the process of dance creation. We quickly realise that this is a space with no literature, or at least there was no literature, as there now appears to be a growing collection of materials that is beginning to define the space from which new knowledge can emerge. These materials have been published in different formats, including books, various book–DVD combinations and websites.¹⁰² These publications are recognised as having been authored or co-authored by, and with, leading choreographers from the field of dance. These publications are not artworks, but they have been developed with the aim of furthering understanding of choreographic ideas and processes and bringing these into newly productive relations with general audiences and other specialist practices.

Each publication project has maintained a close connection with the motivating concerns of individual artists, drawing upon and amplifying elements of their 'signature practices'.¹⁰³ Collectively, these publications show evidence of a novel domain of context and reference – one that explores non-linguistic forms of description and collateral knowledge relations drawn together by dance. This does not mean that dance artists have not written and published about their practice before, and in inventive ways, but there are features of the current cultural context that are unique. It is this, and the surge of related projects,¹⁰⁴ which

102. A list of recent projects would include websites: Siobhan Davies Replay, Synchronous Objects for One Flat Thing, reproduced, *What's the Score?* Oral Site; book/DVD: BADco, *Whatever Dance Toolbox*; Steve Paxton, *Material for the Spine*; William Forsythe, *Improvisation Technologies*; Anne Teresa de Keersmaeker, *A Choreographer's Score*; Emio Greco/PC, *Capturing Intention*; books/scores: Jonathan Burrows, *A Choreographers Handbook*; Elizabeth Streb, *STREB: How to Become an Extreme Action Hero*; Deborah Hay, *My Body, the Buddhist and Lamb at the Altar*; Susan Rethorst, *A Choreographic Mind Are We Here Yet?*; Meg Stuart, *Hiking the Horizontal*; Liz Lerman, *Caught Falling*; Nancy Stark Smith, *Schreibstuck & FUNKTIONEN tool box*; Thomas Lehmen, *Everybody's Performance Scores*; Antonia Baehr, *Rire Laugh Lachen*.

103. The concept of 'signature practices' is taken from the writings of Susan Melrose. See: 'Confessions of an Uneasy Expert Spectator' nr. 13. <http://www.sfmelrose.org.uk/>

104. In addition to the list in footnote 102, new publication projects are under way, such as: Motion Bank online scores with Deborah Hay, Jonathan Burrows, Thomas Hauert, Bebe Miller; Transmedia Knowledge Base for Performing Arts with Rui Horta; Choreographic Thinking Tools with Wayne McGregor/Random Dance.

makes it possible to imagine that these are the beginnings of a new literature for a new knowledge space, signalling the emergence of an intrinsic discourse coming from dance practice.¹⁰⁵

This new literature presents the results in various media (text, diagrams, drawings, still and moving image, graphic visualisations, interactive software applications, etc.) of artists asking questions about dance's relationship to itself, to its audiences and to fields outside of dance. Certain authors are interested in communicating insights into their choreographic process, or into creative process more generally; others offer a self-determined analysis of selected artworks or lay open an enquiry into the 'body's mind'. Some work to expose the essentials of an improvisation technique or share scores (as information objects) or systems (devised for making and organising materials). Revealing that which may not be visible in the work itself and exploring new forms of documenting and transmitting dance are often cited as priorities. A dialogue or interview format is commonly used to draw out insights through questions, and other authors may be invited to provide context. In both cases, the individuals involved are clearly 'close to the work'.¹⁰⁶ The place and time of the daily work of creation is always at least implicitly present as source material. An important recent contribution features extensive research into, and documentation of, the accumulated experience embodied in the expert teacher of dance.¹⁰⁷ In terms of time, organisation and funding, the scale of each publication project varies greatly. Together, this content represents a plurality of contemporary approaches, techniques, languages, concepts and methodologies coming from dance practitioners for whom sensation and movement are often (although not always) associated with expert practice – derived from training in 'dance

105. The concept of a new form of dance literature has been introduced in: S. deLahunta, R. Groves, and N. Zuniga Shaw, 'Talking About Scores: William Forsythe's vision for a new form of dance "literature"', in Sabine Gehm, pirkko Husemann and Katharina von Wilcke (eds.) *Knowledge in Motion* (London and New Brunswick: Transaction, 2007), pp. 91-100. In addition to this, deLahunta and Zuniga Shaw published two background articles in the journal of Performance Research (2006 & 2008, which are available to download at: <http://www.sdel.a.dds.nl/choreoresourcespdf/>) on four projects using digital media to publish choreographic ideas; in 2008-2009, an interdisciplinary research network funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK *Choreographic Objects: traces and artefacts of physical intelligence*, brought these same four projects together for the first time in the same investigative context (<http://projects.beyondtext.ac.uk/choreographicobjects/index.php>).

106. Individuals working closely with the choreographers to publish their ideas include: Bertha Bermúdez, Nik Haffner, Bojana Cvejic and Jeroen Peeters. What distinguishes these individuals from others who have contributed significantly is a history of working inside, or close to, the creative process, for example as performers and/or dramaturges.

107. I. Diehl and F. Lampert, *Dance Techniques 2010 – Tanzplan Deutschland*. (Berlin and Leipzig: Henschel Verlag in der Seemann Henschel GmbH and Co. KG, 2011).

technique'. For these choreographers, there is a kind of 'raw material' in their own and/or their dancers' somatic history, practised intuition, skilled habits and trained or untrained movement patterns.¹⁰⁸

As a cumulative poetics,¹⁰⁹ this growing collection needs a context in order to be acknowledged as a coherent body of ideas that has value beyond the networks of cultural and academic production within which signature artistic practices are recognised as artwork. Outside of these networks, dance *normally* lacks legitimacy in the grand scheme of what we consider to be knowledge in 21st century society, which tends to be associated with verbal language, 'alphabeticism',¹¹⁰ logic and rational thought. But there are movements in three areas that may provide a reference space for the discourse emerging from dance practice.

The **first movement** is the development of artistic or practice-based research that can be described as debate, traceable in European contexts to developments in the early- to mid-1990s. This has largely played itself out in the context of higher education, both in the area of university-based humanities and in professional schools of the arts.¹¹¹ The key issue is of placing artistic research practices – as different from artistic practices – on an equal footing with other forms of academic research. This approach has been embraced and opposed in various measures. Some argue that artistic research practices engage in, and develop, an understanding of the world in culturally important ways and deserve the same status as other modes of engagement, with academic research agendas needing to adapt accordingly.¹¹² Others argue that, while exchanges between arts and academic disciplines are to be encouraged, the

108. The 'publication of choreographic ideas' described in this essay assumes choreography-dance-movement to be fundamentally connected, while acknowledging the importance of critical developments from within the dance field of the past decade as scholars, makers and curators have questioned assumptions and explored the implications of separating [choreography] from [dance] and [dance] from [movement].

109. This is in reference to Laurence Louppe's *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, recently translated to English by Sally Gardner (Alton: Dance Books, 2010). Louppe's book was first published in 1994, calling for a discourse that better addresses perceptions 'awakened' by dance.

110. Brian Rotman posits 'alphabeticism' as an 'entire logic of representation' that has contributed to a rift between language and the body. In *Becoming Beside Ourselves: The Alphabet, Ghosts and Distributed Human Being* (Durham and London: Duke University Press: 2008).

111. For an overview and in-depth analysis of these developments, see Henk Borgdorff's excellent book, *The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. (Leiden University Press, 2012).

112. Adaptation means, amongst other things, determining criteria for evaluating arts research. For an overview of how institutions across Europe are working through such issues, the SHARE network is a useful place to start: <http://www.sharenetwork.eu/>

arts are unique and should not be integrated into an academic research agenda.¹¹³

Within the framework of professional arts (dance) practice, the discussion is often found rubbing up against this edifice of education, where the struggle over what constitutes research is most directly manifested. The literature emerging from dance practice, addressed in this essay, is not artwork, but it has the aim of bringing choreographic ideas and processes into newly productive relations with other specialist practices. It is at this intersection that the debate about artistic research in the academy might be superimposed onto this emerging discourse from dance. What is unclear is what happens to artistic practice if and when artistic research achieves the acknowledgement it seeks.¹¹⁴ Could this result in a devaluation of artistic practice by placing too high an emphasis on legibility before the process of reading – as reception – itself changes? It is of crucial importance that this question continues to be posed, because, as with any discourse seeking legitimacy, qualifications and protocols for evaluating new modes of understanding begin to define and control those modes (see Footnote 110). Nevertheless, at this time, the debates about artistic- and practice-based research are interesting contexts in which to pursue critical questions about the general nature of these artist-led dance publication projects, offering an institutional framework which may be useful.

Second movement: Over more or less the same timeframe as the debate about artistic research practice in higher education has been taking place, advances in digital technology have been changing the material form of literature to include a wider range of media and media-related operations. This has given rise to an expanding definition of literacy that is also marked by debates in which the traditional notion of discourse as speech-related reading and writing comes up against a new discursive space facilitated by machine and software-based information processing.¹¹⁵ Importantly, these developments extend into the wider socio-cultural environment, and the concept of digital literacy goes well beyond the domain of art practice and artistic research.

113. For an 'exchange' model, see the Graduate School for the Arts and Sciences at Berlin University of the Arts: <http://gs.udk-berlin.de/en>

114. It is interesting to note that the thirteenth edition of *doCUMENTA* in 2012 was 'dedicated to artistic research and forms of imagination that explore commitment, matter, things, embodiment, and active living in connection with, yet not subordinated to, theory'. <http://d13.documenta.de/#welcome/>

115. See: N. K. Hayles, *Writing Machines and How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis*. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012); L. Manovich, *Language of New Media*. (London: MIT Press, 2001); M. Fuller (ed.), *Software Studies: a Lexicon*. (London: MIT Press, 2008).

However, expanding literature's material basis fits very well with the publishing of choreographic ideas using computer-based tools, as several choreographers have done so far.¹¹⁶ These digital tools are being used to document, analyse and notate the complex spatio-temporal-corporeal relationships involved in dance-making and performance such that they can be rendered visible, accessible and comprehensible to a reader – whose *activity* of reading is now changing to engage this new material form of literature.¹¹⁷

Embracing this wider range of inscription-like things, which digitally and uniquely render aspects of dance accessible (where it may not have been before), causes us to look again at non-digital dance drawing, scoring and notation as potential encodings of information that might be re-examined in this new research context, revealing hidden layers of practice and thinking.¹¹⁸ And beyond what digital technologies can materially co-produce as a new form of literature, interesting associations emerge with a digital media artistic community that embraces open processes and methods, tool-building, networking and data sharing and the variable-relational in artworks as a core part of creative practice.¹¹⁹ In the framework around the design of these digital dance renderings (scores or objects), the resistance dance has had to its own documentation has been transformed by a *transductive* transfer to 'data'. In the expert hands of the collaborating digital artist, dance data materialises a newly formed kinetic idea – one in which the unique patterns of a choreographic 'signature practice' may not only be studied by other researchers in the context of this emerging discourse but can also give rise to multiple variations as new digital objects or artworks.¹²⁰

116. See websites and book/DVD Footnote 102.1. A unique research documentation website by Nik Haffner and Bernd Lintermann can be included in this list: <http://www.timelapses.de/>

117. For reading and writing rethought as embodied experience, see Maaïke Bleeker on the concept of 'Corporeal Literacy' in 'Passages in Post-Modern Theory: Mapping the Apparatus', *Parallax*, 14:1. p. 65. 2008.

118. Choreographers' drawing-notating in practice is/are normally considered contextually constrained and fairly inscrutable (i.e. it works well in situ, but makes no sense outside of the studio) and notation systems, e.g. Laban, are not widely used (written or read). For very different, but related, accounts on these materials, see: L. Louppe (ed.), *Traces of Dance: Drawings and Notations of Choreographers*. (Paris: Editions Dis Voir, 1994); S. deLahunta, 'The Choreographic Resource: technologies for understanding dance', *Chapbook 1: newDANCEmedia. Contact Quarterly*, 35:2, Summer 2010. pp. 18-27.

119. 'variable-relational' here draws a link between the concepts of 'variable media' and 'relational aesthetics' both familiar discourses in the context of media arts practices.

120. See Mark Franko on the potential for the 'body to be its own medium' that connects to the concept of 'dance data' in 'Writing For The Body: Notation, Reconstruction, and Reinvention in Dance', *Common Knowledge*, 17:2, 2011.

Third movement: Popular imagination has the tendency to, either directly or indirectly, relegate physical practice, like dance or sport, to the territory of the purely intuitive and organic – a non-verbal and, therefore (according to aforementioned assumptions about knowledge), non-intellectual form of expression. A physical intelligence, even when acknowledged, is assumed to express itself most wholly when 'thinking' – as interference – is well out of the way, reinforcing the view that mind and body are somehow separate parts of *experience*.¹²¹ A similar reinforcement can be discovered in specialist scholarly-scientific practices. Humanities academics often work in analytic-critical traditions that fix bodies – dancing and others – into a matrix of histories, politics, identities and signs. This perspective tends to regard the body as culturally constructed and to leave out knowledge or understanding that is achieved through movement and sensation.¹²² And so, while many working in the biological, psychological and neurological sciences have fully embraced the idea of embodied intelligence, scholars of the humanities and social sciences often see the approaches of these fields as too reductive to enable meaningful intellectual collaboration. Perhaps this is not surprising as some philosophers still hold the view that consciousness might eventually be explained in neuronal terms.¹²³ As a focus of study, human experience seems to have the tendency to highlight disconnections across a wide range of disciplinary discourses.

This radically generalised summary of specialist scholarly-scientific perspectives on the relation between mind and body is set up as a backdrop against which the publication of choreographic ideas might find an interdisciplinary context for further study by specialists in other domains. As the most integrative of all practices, dance involves a complex set of cognitive, emotional and embodied sensory and sense-making modalities and expresses these in rich social and cultural

121. See Footnote 102 reference to Stephen Jay Gould's 'The Brain of Brawn', *New York Times*, 25 June 2000, in S. deLahunta, 'Traces of Physical Intelligence' in Annett Zinsmeister (ed.), *Gestalt der Bewegung*. (JOVIS verlag, 2011). pp. 94–113.

122. Attributed to the subtitle of, and drawing on, the introduction to Brian Massumi's seminal *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Sensation and Affect*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), which can be accessed here: <http://www.brianmassumi.com/textes/Introduction.pdf>

123. On embracing embodied intelligence, see: Shaun Gallagher, *How the Body Shapes the Mind*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005); David Kirsh, 'Thinking with the Body' in S. Ohlsson and R. Catrambone (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. (Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society, 2010). pp. 2864–2869.; P. Robbins and M. Aydede (eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). On lack of collaboration, see: Barbara Maria Stafford, *Echo Objects: The Cognitive Work of Images*. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007); Harvey Whitehouse, *The Debated Mind: Evolutionary Psychology versus Ethnography*. (Oxford: Berg, 2001); on persistent views still held, see: Alva Noë, *Action in Perception*. (MIT Press, 2004) and *Out of Our Heads*. (Hill and Wang & FSG, 2009).

settings. This presents an opportunity for anyone making a serious scientific or scholarly enquiry into the nature of human experience. For this reason, a number of interdisciplinary thinkers – from the fields of anthropology, philosophy, cognitive science and cultural studies – have directly engaged choreographers and dancers in collaborative studies. There is a need within these efforts to establish future protocols for research in which dance itself plays a greater constitutive role, and this process is already underway.¹²⁴ It is difficult to know whether popular assumptions regarding dance will change, but it is very possible that the discourse emerging from dance practice described in this essay may have a role to play within other specialist practices, providing a significant and useful body of literature for experience researchers who may, in turn, contribute to it.

This completes the ‘movements in three areas’ that may provide a reference space for the new discourse emerging from dance practice. What we can’t yet know is how the meta-structures of a coherent reference space of ideas – the standards and indices that enable connections and discoverable relationships within an emerging discourse community – will work with this new literature and its material forms. This is an issue for artistic research practices more generally – how to stabilise an emerging knowledge community (the artistic research community) through linkages and connections, enabling one set of ideas to encounter another.¹²⁵ Digitally mediated operations, codes and structures will increasingly play a role in these relationships; they are already enabling new forms of peer review and open access to ideas. The transmission of ideas through the skills, habits and patterns of (danced) movement always has connections to cultural and social contexts and are traceable as such.¹²⁶ But the current efforts by artists to publish movement ideas – to render what might otherwise remain invisible (structures, relationships, models), transferable, scalable and applicable to other contexts and under other conditions – offers new forms with which dance can engage, through new forms of engagement.¹²⁷

124. The Dance Engaging Science Interdisciplinary Research Workshops are a series of meetings, organised in the frame of Motion Bank, with the support of the Volkswagen Foundation, with the aim of laying 'the foundations for future interdisciplinary research in which dance itself plays a greater constitutive role'. <http://motionbank.org/en/research-2/>

125. For an example, see: *The Journal for Artistic Research*, an online peer-reviewed journal for the identification, publication and dissemination of artistic research from all arts disciplines: <http://jar-online.net/>

126. S. deLahunta and E. Hoerster, 'Rethinking Tools: based on interviews collected during MODE05' in *Reverse Engineering Education: in dance, choreography and the performing arts*. (Berlin: b_books verlag, 2007). pp. 88-95.

127. Recent and new publication projects include: *Siobhan Davies Replay* (<http://www.siobhandaviesreplay.com/>) *Synchronous Objects for One Flat Thing, reproduced* (<http://synchronousobjects.osu.edu/>); Oral Site, *What's the Score?* (<http://sarma.be/oralsite/pages/Index/>); BADco in collaboration with Daniel Turing, *Whatever Dance Toolbox* (Zagreb: BADco., 2011); Steve Paxton, *Material for the Spine: A Movement Study* (Brussels: Contredanse, 2008); William Forsythe, *Improvisation Technologies: a Tool for the Analytical Dance Eye* (ZKM, Karlsruhe & Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2012); Anne Teresa de Keersmaecker & Bojana Cvejic, *A Choreographer's Score* (Rosas, Brussels & Brussels: Mercatorfonds, 2012); *Capturing Intention: documentation, analysis and notation research based on the work of Emilio Greco* (PC. (Amsterdam: Emilio Greco | PC and Amsterdam School of the Arts, 2007); Jonathan Burrows, *A Choreographers Handbook* (London: Routledge, 2010); Elizabeth Streb, *STREB: How to Become an Extreme Action Hero* (New York: The Feminist Press, 2010); Deborah Hay, *Lamb at the Altar* (Duke University Press, 1994) and *My Body, the Buddhist* (Wesleyan University Press, 2000); Susan Rethorst, *A Choreographic Mind: Autobodygraphical Writings* (Theatre Academy Helsinki. Department of Dance, 2012); Meg Stuart, *Are We Here Yet?* (Dijon: Les presses du réel, 2010); Liz Lerman, *Hiking the Horizontal: Field Notes from a Choreographer* (Wesleyan University Press, 2011); Nancy Stark Smith and David Koteen, *Caught Falling: The confluence of Contact Improvisation, Nancy Stark Smith, and other moving ideas* (Northampton, MA: Contact Editions, 2008); Thomas Lehmen, *Schreibstuck & FUNKTIONEN tool box* (Berlin, 2002 & 2004) *Everybody's Performance Scores* (<http://www.everybodystoolbox.net/>, 2010); Antonia Baehr, *Rire Laugh Lachen* (Editions: Les Laboratoires d'Aubervilliers / L'OEil d'Or / make up productions, 2008); Deborah Hay, Jonathan Burrows, Thomas Hauert and Bebe Miller, *The Forsythe Company/ Motion Bank* (<http://www.theforsythecompany.com/> > motion bank); Rui Horta, *Transmedia Knowledge Base for Performing Arts* (<http://tkb.fcsh.unl.pt/knowledge-base/>); Wayne McGregor | Random Dance *Choreographic Thinking Tools* (http://www.randomdance.org/r_research/).

5. C. 2. **‘The Opening of the Mouth’**¹²⁸

(Efva Lilja)

Choreography authors itself in a void, in the space between public and private, but it cannot exempt itself from its political, social, cultural or personal context. Choreography may be interpreted as the art of, and about, the composition of movement in time and space. This movement articulates the self and puts the work within the framework of that which the viewer is able to interpret. In turn, this ability is dependent upon the position our culture affords humanity as a body.

Choreography offers, and explores, tools for movement production – for the process and analysis of the prerequisites for art, and the creation of art in many different contexts, as a proactive, artistic dimension within society. Yet choreography is still defined by the majority of people as the art of creating dance – a definition in use since the 18th century. Even if the idea of what constitutes dance has changed over time, the definition has remained constant. Or has it? Which voices have been heard? We must learn to both move and think politically.

History blinds you. We dress conventions up as traditional figures and hesitate before the innovative, before that which differs from that which we have hitherto experienced. It is as if we are encountering a foreign language. Choreography becomes textual, a way of *inscribing* movement into the contemporary.

Through choreography, new contexts are created. Why limit that activity to what we call dance? That seems stupid, given that choreography can visualise alternative forms and expressions – spatial, as well as conceptual – places in a dialogue that contains elements of both the traditional and the contemporary. Choreography is an open, inclusive concept that encompasses a wide array of activities. It operates cross-media-wise and cross-language-wise, inter-disciplinarily, dialectically and discursively; it changes, it manages and it transforms. Highlighting the bodily and activating the sensual develops our ability to feel, to move, to speak and to be.

We all speak with two voices – words and movement. Movement can be read as signs. Our common task is to redefine these and take a stand in creating a new awareness, giving movement a voice. In this, we stretch the limits of our communicative competence. This is how our

128. The Opening of the Mouth refers to an ancient Egyptian ritual, from about 1550-1070 BC, intended to open the mouth of the deceased and his statues and thus return to him the use of his faculties. The ritual was designed not only to enable the mouth to speak and eat again, but also the eyes, ears and nose to again carry out their functions.

ability to see and interpret grows and changes, not just in a work of art but also in the world. Now and then, a few detours are inevitable, along with making choices that establish boundaries, but that doesn't amount to shutting your mouth.

You can never avoid your context. One movement cannot be isolated from another. The task is to transcend the subjective, to venture so deep into the private that it becomes public and takes us from what has been, through the now into that which is to come. Time offers resistance, just like the cultural context in which we live and work.

Choreography conquers new territories beyond more conventional scenes and venues. In some European cultures, the past decade witnessed a general shift toward movement in relation to questions of identity, economy and the distribution of abstract values. Here, choreography is no longer thought of as a simple object. Choreography is no longer synonymous with dance. Choreography has broadened its territory and 'choreography as expanded practice' has gained currency.

Movement challenges stillness to a fight! Words lock in movements. That is why they must be swallowed and exchanged for listening, to give movements meaning. Choreography becomes a text that fades away and is blotted out by a new one. What's the worst thing that can happen? Do what you want, and you'll end up using clichés. There is no freedom without limitations. Okay, so what has all of this to do with research or research training?

What choreography is, and what it wants to be, can be experienced in certain works of art and their contexts, but it can also be discussed and researched – researched in, researched for and researched about.

Artistic Research, Arts-Based Research, Practice-Based Research, Research in the Arts, Artistic Development Work

Active artists, interested in the methodology of the in-depth process, develop definitions of what is meant by artistic research. What role should an artistic seat of learning assume in order to visualise and motivate art as art, the choreographer as a partner with art as a goal, artistic research paralleled with scientific research and the societal values represented by these creative products, this knowledge and this competence?

These questions warrant a discussion to clarify the needs of, and the motives for, a development of the conditions that will allow choreographers to engage further with artistic research. These needs

and motives will shape the evolution of training and research projects, which, in turn, will influence not only future choreographic representation but also the workplace and society beyond it. Universities and higher seats of learning must deploy modes that open up for new ways of thinking.

All countries have different laws, acts, cultures and conventions concerning artistic activity, the politics of art, the training of artists and the parameters of research. The Swedish Higher Education Act states that all education should be provided on either an artistic or a scientific foundation. In Sweden, we have a complete educational progression, encompassing arts-based BA, MA and PhD programmes. Upon being accepted as a PhD student, you are employed with a salary for four years. Your findings must be presented through a reflected and documented artwork. We offer free tuition to all citizens within the European Union, grants for doctoral studies and special financing for artistic research. We can accept students by audition, appoint teachers, professors, supervisors and examiners on artistic merit. Quite fantastic! It opens up possibilities for artists that go far beyond what is feasible in many other countries.

We need to spread knowledge about what it means to undergo research training and/or undertake arts-based research. It means, for instance, that artists are able to train in research or be invited as senior researchers to investigate their own choreographic practice, formulate methodologies based on different artistic processes and suggest art-specific methods of documentation and presentation. This is how both artistic research education and frontline choreographic research can develop, to give us highly qualified choreographers, interested in communicating, sharing their knowledge and thereby influencing, supervising and teaching. Choreographers interested in undertaking artistic research can do so without adapting to scientific theory or methodology.

Since 1977, artists have been able to carry out artistic research in Sweden. For the first 20 years, this happened mainly under the label of 'artistic development work'; since the 1990s, it has been thought of as artistic research. In 2001, the Swedish Research Council was charged with distributing funds for this purpose. This was followed by a 2010 research bill, which paved the way for the degree of doctorate to be awarded on the basis of artistic merit. At the same time, Konstnärliga forskarskolan (National Research School in the Arts), was instituted. As the sphere of artistic research has developed and gained strength, demand has increased for the artistic quality and knowledge formation that is the outcome of the research.

5. C. 2. 'The Opening of the Mouth' (Efva Lilja)

In Europe, what is generally labelled 'artistic research' tends to be research 'about' and 'for' art – not arts-based. In many countries, there is still a lack of faith in the knowledge production, methods and theory arising from within the arts. Most countries also demand a scientific context for the artist as researcher. Some demand a doctoral degree in order to qualify for the position of university teacher or to be eligible for a research grant. A doctoral degree is mainly thought of as a step in an academic career. This is one of the reasons why artists in many countries, not least choreographers, have met artistic research with suspicion. Such 'academicisation' of art makes artists shun research. It feeds the notion of a 'B-class' artist, unable to make their mark on the market, who is referred to the academic world... Shut your mouth!

Innovative choreographers have always worked by means of exploration, experimentally and inquisitively finding a way forward. The strong commercialisation of our markets compel more of us to seek alternatives for more in-depth work, both within our own practice and in relation to others. When we document processes and products in order to share our experiences with colleagues, new methods of working and new research methodologies develop. In turn, research training generates knowledge about different methodologies and practices and encourages critical reflection.

In mixed collegiums of scientists and artists jointly engaged in research, artists have often felt the demand for scientific method to be part of this 'arranged marriage'. In order for methodological development to be useful to the artistic process, it must take place on art-specific terms. The future of artistic research is, therefore, entirely dependent upon the dedication of choreographers who really want to engage in research, based on well-established artistic practice. We need a strong interaction between artistic process, production, research and education. Cooperation with others – in artistic as well as scientific fields of study – is nothing new in choreographic processes or productions. We do it all the time. My claim is that it makes a difference to artistic research whether the artist/choreographer is responsible for the research and it is arts-based with art as its goal.

Choreographers approach research in new ways, to generate knowledge as well as forms of production and presentation. The aim is to facilitate an integration of new forms of organisation and financing in the workplace. Innovation is also sought by 'market players', such as museums (e.g. Tate Modern in London, the Museum of Modern Art

Interventions: Position Papers and Dialogues

in Stockholm, MACBA¹²⁹ in Barcelona), galleries, theatres and others, which initiate and host research beyond the academic world. New artist-driven forums appear, with the aim of finding new forms for developing, sharing and presenting artistic research projects. These include: Performing Arts Forum St. Erme (PAF),¹³⁰ BUDA Art Center (Kortrijk),¹³¹ Pro-Arte (St. Petersburg),¹³² Weld (Stockholm),¹³³ Dancelab/The Cloud (Den Haag),¹³⁴ Society For Artistic Research (SAR), BADco (Zagreb),¹³⁵ ReScen (Middlesex University UK),¹³⁶ A-pass{Advanced Performance Training,¹³⁷ Research Academy for Dance and Choreography (RADC),¹³⁸ Advancing Performing Arts Projects (APAP)¹³⁹ or the work led by Mathilde Monnier for many years at Centre Chorégraphique National (CCN) in Montpellier. But this interest is also apparent in a number of artistic practices, for instance in that of the choreographers, Emio Greco, Jan Fabre and William Forsythe, who have started their own research labs, often in conjunction with other disciplines. Or Wim Vandekeybus, DV8 and Scott deLahunta, who run their own research projects. All of these are men. Women rarely build organisations or houses around their projects. Cristina Caprioli and Mette Ingvartsen are examples of female choreographers undertaking research into their artistic processes under the auspices of academia. Look at other innovative artists, look at younger choreographers, look at those who may interest you and visit their websites! Many of them now contain loud-mouthed advertising: We do research!

129. Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona

130. A place for the professional (and not-yet professional) practitioners and activists in the field of performing arts, visual art, literature, music, new media and internet, theory and cultural production, and scientists who seek to research and determine their own conditions of work, see: <http://www.pa-f.net>

131. See: <http://www.budakortrijk.be/>.

132. The PRO ARTE Foundation promotes contemporary arts and culture, see: <http://proarte.ru/en>.

133. An artist-run experimental platform in Stockholm, see: <http://www.weld.se/>.

134. An open group residing at Danslab Den Haag, facilitating performance and movement research and residencies, see: <http://www.danslab.nl/index.php?id=322>.

135. A collaborative performance collective based in Zagreb, Croatia, see: <http://badco.hr/>.


136. Centre for Research into Creation in the Performing Arts, a multi-disciplinary, artist-driven research centre, see: <http://www.rescen.net>.

137. A 12-month post-masters performance research programme, developed out of the individual projects of participants, see: <http://www.apass.be>.

138. A new international platform, based at Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK), see: <http://dancingopportunities.com>.

139. A European network, which was founded in 2000 and has since enabled more than 100 artistic projects.

Artistic research is research conducted by artists, who explore their field of study on the basis of tested experience and artistic practice.



Choreography as a Field of Study

Researching choreography is living with double vision, perpetually being the carrier of dual perspectives – on one hand, formalised research in an academic context; on the other, a process of exploring innovative choreographic practice. What happens when you juxtapose the two? Can they be read simultaneously or must they be kept apart? As a choreographer, you act as a translator between two linguistic worlds. It intrigues me to understand how other artists deepen their knowledge and enhance their competence, their ability to create and communicate. What do we seek in our process? Which challenges move us forward? Many of the research projects I have mentioned aim to develop tools for artistic production. Others focus on artistic practice. Artistic research embraces a multitude of voices.

As a field of study, choreography starts with bodily experience, but the definition includes a number of linguistic tools for action, thought, reflection, consciousness, literacy and experience. Thus, choreographic research contributes to an expanded understanding of the expressions and imprints of our present time. Artistic research generates faith in our ability to communicate beyond words. Research makes it possible to convey this in new forms of imagery. How so?

I know that, as a choreographer, I carry knowledge about and in my work. By also developing that work into research, I initiate a process from which both others and I gain knowledge. This process is documented and can, just like the result, be criticised and reflected upon by the outside world. Many leading choreographers are bearers of unique competence, as communicated through their work. If the road to the finished work is documented and the reflection upon this process is made available for others to follow, scrutinise and learn from, then more of us will learn, be inspired and provoked in our own practices.

It is important to make choreography visible, as a possible road to insight that is otherwise beyond our reach; to show how choreography works, contributes to our communicative abilities and offers a deeper consciousness of the importance of art in the development of our society; to make clear the simple fact that it is fun, as well as a bit frightening and absolutely essential, that choreography has a place in everyday life; to give voice to that which will otherwise never be heard.

Do you get what I'm not saying? Questioning the present is a prerequisite for development. Knowledge must be tested, retested and given new nourishment. The field of choreography is strong and progressive in many cultures and movements. But, if there are so many artists of interest who work with choreography, why so few in research? Where have you placed your voice?



Different Cultures, ‘Helter-skelter’

Contemporary dance and choreography have a short history as artistic educational programmes in the academic world. In most European countries, you can get artistic training in dance and choreography at the BA level; after that, masters training is available sporadically and artistic research training even more rarely. Many of the leading programmes began as private initiatives, later expanding with state subsidies (e.g. The Performing Arts Research and Training Studios,

P.A.R.T.S.) or as state-run diploma courses (e.g. Centre national de danse contemporaine, CNDC, in Angers). Few countries recognise artistic knowledge production at the academic level. Where will that lead artistic research in choreography?

It is important to safeguard different work-forms, organisational structures and leadership responsibilities for artistic research in choreography. One place should be within higher educational institutions. If we can agree on the quest for a broad – inclusive rather than exclusive – definition, in which artistic quality carries stronger weight than traditional academic quality, then it is for us to raise our voices and give meaning to the word 'quality', to clearly state which values we wish to promote.

Within the arts, there can never be a theoretical representation that defines qualitative values. A useful way to work is through different art forums, depending on the field of research in question, and submit works to peer reviewed publications, such as the *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)*, *Artistic Research Archive (ARA)*, *InFormation* (a Nordic journal of artistic research) and *Curating Artistic Research Output (CAIRO)*. These forums also work for choreography. Different genres of choreography demand different forums for their representation and alternative presentations. More are needed!

These are examples of relevant quality criteria for choreography (I quote from my article, 'What's Good in Art?', in *InFormation* no 1/2012):

Is there something original, a personal approach/expression in the work? Can I distinguish a purpose and direction behind the work? Is there a contextual discussion or positioning? Is there a development of time, space and form in the presentation? How are intra-medial effects used, such as music, light or imagery? Is the work relevant in a current discourse? How is the work related to other choreographic practice? Is there a development of established codes or other contextual spheres (social, political, cultural)?

To answer questions like these, you need knowledge in, and about, choreography, the artistic process and production, based both on experience and participation within the field of choreography. Knowledge in choreography is what I, as a choreographer, need to do, what I want to do – express my idea and communicate it to the outside world. But it is also what I get out of experiencing the artwork – an enhanced communicative ability, insight into the world from a

different perspective than everyday life, a conscious reflection and a visualisation of meaning through a subjective experience/interpretation. You can surely add more arguments, more criteria and opinions about what constitutes, for example, relevance.

When choreographers meet, discuss and critically reflect upon each other's ongoing and/or completed processes, it clearly promotes better art and a development of the relevance of choreography and its importance for the progress of society. It is of fundamental importance to the role of art in our culture that the power of many voices is heard through open mouths.

Drawings by Efva Lilja



5. C. 3. 'Artistic Technology Research'

(Matthias Tarasiewicz)

Critical media arts not only reflect upon new technologies and the ways in which they transform society; they also offer a crucial laboratory for the development of new techniques and forms of presenting, structuring and conveying knowledge. In the 21st century, New Media Arts work with distributed publics and identities, as new media artists present their processes 'coded' into the fragmentations of global networks.¹⁴⁰ Terms such as 'post-internet art' (Marisa Olson) and 'internet aware art' (Guthrie Lonergan) refer to contemporary artistic practice imbued with a concept of reality that emerged from virtual space, permeating real life and creating a fusion of both in giving rise to something new – the hyperlocal world as we know it today.¹⁴¹ Inke Arns writes about a 'post-medial condition'¹⁴² that can be succinctly summarised by the idea 'code is law'.¹⁴³

Actual project-structures, as well as the artistic output of non-product-based arts,¹⁴⁴ are hard to tackle, since their work is often very swift and ephemeral, not touching popular art discourse and art markets at all.¹⁴⁵ Critical New Media Arts, as 'artistic research and development'¹⁴⁶ between artistic, medial and techno-scientific discourses, is research-based and practice-led. It does not produce final products but processes artefacts. Creating taxonomies and systemically defining said cultures seems almost impossible.¹⁴⁷ The first world is on a path from the 'knowledge society' through the 'network society' to a possible 'Next Society' as outlined by Dirk Baecker.¹⁴⁸ The 'Next Cultures' can

140. See in this context: M. Tarasiewicz, 'Coded Cultures Between New Media Arts and Production Cultures' in *Coded Cultures – New Creative Practices Out Of Diversity*. (Vienna: Springer, 2011). pp. 202-219.

141. See A. Soojung-Kim and D. Pescovitz, 'Cyberspace is Dead', *Wired Magazine*, February 2006.

142. I. Arns, 'Über Zeitgenossenschaft – Die medialen Künste im Zeitalter ihrer postmedialen Kondition', *Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen* 131/IV (2010). p. 48. Arns further writes: 'Media arts dispose themselves of the conceptual exoneration through the novelty of the media and meets the challenge of being artistic. They have (finally) grown up' (translated by M. Tarasiewicz).

143. L. Lessig, 'Code is Law', *Harvard Magazine*, January 2000, <http://harvardmagazine.com/2000/01/code-is-law.html>.

144. Such as outlined by M. Bochner and S. LeWitt under the auspices of Conceptual Art, just to apprehend the statement from an art-historical perspective.

145. See G. Lovink, *Zero Comments* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2008). Lovink describes this as a 'crisis of new media arts', but I cannot share his pessimistic view, since this output could not be positioned into traditional/classical markets without transformation.

146. H. Borgdorff, 'The Production of Knowledge in Artistic Research' in *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. (London: Routledge, 2011).

147. Obviously it doesn't make sense to observe such heterogeneous systems as if they were static and homogeneous, since they are in a constant process of re-structuring and re-formatting, always in resonance to each other.

148. D. Baecker, '16 Thesen zur nächsten Gesellschaft', *Revue für postheroisches Management*, Heft 9 (2011). pp. 9-11.

be seen as form-building elements in regard to Luhmann's systems theory; borders emerge through self-referred operations which connect with each other (through cooperation, codex, language, aims, etc.). In considering the differences that emerge within such systems, constantly producing new components, attempts to structure such phenomena are only relevant to a limited extent, because the findings might only be commonplaces. It is more interesting to focus on the subsystems, which are continually altering – despite, or because of, their possibility to vanish (or transform) quickly.

Critical (new) media practices, which can be described as 'art with media' as well as 'art that reflects on media', are rapidly adapting to the fast-evolving media landscape.¹⁴⁹ In an age of real-time media and constantly revving media usage, concepts such as 'art' and 'science' (*Wissenschaften*) change 'their essential nature' in terms of 'movement and circulation'.¹⁵⁰

Looking at the discussions around 'When is research artistic?' – and the wrongness of that attempt, given that 'art without research is lacking an essential foundation, as this is the case for science'¹⁵¹ – I use the term 'artistic technology' as [*dispositif*].¹⁵² With this *dispositif*, we can transcend the gap between arts and sciences (*Wissenschaften*) without entering obvious minefields such as questions around whether artists are allowed to do research at all. I am postulating that the next artistic science will not only be transdisciplinary but another discipline entirely, which is artistic and scientific at the same time.¹⁵³

'Artistic Technology Research' is a project that observes possible transformations from artistic, technological, playful and 'critical engineering'¹⁵⁴ backgrounds to intertwine them, using methods (and developing methodologies) that systematically combine research methods from artistic and scientific realms, creating a field of proto-research: 'research about/for/through arts, arts about/for/through

149. H. Ulrich Reck, *Mythos Medienkunst*, (Köln: Kunstwissenschaftliche Bibliothek, 2002).

150. P. Virilio, 'Vitesse et politique' in *Geschwindigkeit und Politik: ein Essay zur Dromologie*. (Berlin: Merve, 1977).

151. See: J. Klein, 'What is Artistic Research?' in *Gegenworte* 23. (Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2010).

152. See J. Bussolini, 'What Is A Dispositive?', *Foucault Studies*, 2010. pp. 85-107 for the problems of translating the term *appareil/apparato* and *dispositif/dispositivo* which 'produce a false identity in English'. This use of the term relates to 'dispositiv' (German) as used by G. Agamben.

153. See H. J. Rheinberger, 'Experimentelle Virtuosität', 20 September 2011. <http://www.dgae.de/downloads/Rheinberger.pdf>

154. See 'Critical Engineering Manifesto', at: <http://criticalengineering.org>.

research'.¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, the project includes a practical approach to problem solving, so the understanding of 'artistic technology' is closely related to the Greek term of *technē*,^{156 157} which includes the critical arts as well as a critique as the 'culture of the modern society'.¹⁵⁸

'Artistic Technology Research' is comprised of 'practices, actions and interactions' that involves diverse audiences and is intended to measure and discuss contemporary (artistic) media practices as well as offering 'connections' to social and cultural sciences. Extending 'action research' to include 'documentation as method' (and as corrective),¹⁵⁹ the project is designed to connect to open research and discourses. The entire process applies an interdisciplinary approach to knowledge building and, at the same time, facilitates popular awareness of applied critical research.

Curating Networked Discourse

The core aim of the project 'Artistic Technology Research' is to stress critical discourses in (and about) new media, technology, society and their intersections with the domain of art. The term 'Artistic Technology Research' is seen as a vehicle for creating new actions, interactions and interventions that demonstrate critical views, visualising and re-structuring our *Lebenswelt*.¹⁶⁰ Critical discourse is accompanied by tools, formats and publications that are developed throughout the duration of the project.

155. F. Dombois, '0-1-1-2-3-5-8-'. Zur Forschung an der *Hochschule der Künste Bern* in Hochschule der Künste Bern. Jahrbuch Nr. 4/2009. (Bern: Hochschule der Künste, 2009).

156. Look at Heidegger and Platon's understanding of *technē* as knowledge. *Technē* resembles *epistēmē* in the implication of knowledge of principles, although *technē* differs in that its intent is making or doing, as opposed to 'disinterested understanding'.

157. See G. Raunig, 'Aussetzung und Neuzusammensetzung in textuellen und sozialen Maschinen', in: B. Mennel, S. Nowotny and G. Raunig (eds.), *Kunst der Kritik. Republicat 10* (Vienna and Berlin: Turia+Kant, 2004). Raunig argues that '[...] the term art is closely related to the Greek term *technē*, therefore in his lecture Foucault states criticism not only as art and virtue, but also as technique. This is not Foucault's quirk, in fact it is a tradition going back to the original uses of the term critique. In Platon's *Politicos*, the term at first appears as the combination *kritikē technē*, which means the art, the crafts of distinguishing (translated as '*ars iudicandi*' in Latin). The label critique as technique and as art can be observed in the course of the centuries and of the different European languages' (translated by M. Tarasiewicz).

158. 'critique' as the culture of the modern society, starting with book printing. 'Artistic Technology Research' includes parameters of 'networked critique'.

159. Borgdorff argues that 'research findings give immediate cause for changes and improvements'. Borgdorff, op. cit., p. 51

160. In my understanding, Media Arts should illustrate *Lebenswelten* (lifeworlds), which improve current social situations and critically reflect upon the current hypermedial reality. But Media Art is only able to do so if it is critically self-reflexive and if it is in stronger regard to past forms of critique. It can only meet economic requirements of the creative industries when it is reduced to a form and object discourse, so it has to be outlined as more than an 'economic force'.

Documentation as Method

Documentation is seen as an internal (self-observing) corrective (in terms of action research) as well as being the subject of research into aesthetic/qualitative parameters of experimental documentation.

Narrations for the Query Public

In the age of the 'query public',¹⁶¹ we have to radically rethink the concept of the public. A change of reception/perception of audiences can be observed through multiple, diverse channels of consumption and participation; the creation of attention and user engagement is crucial to any contemporary discourse or research. The opinion-led 'Next Society' values information as its main resource, in an 'alliance of news, advertising and entertainment'.¹⁶² The 'truth' of information is not important anymore; what counts is being told good stories.¹⁶³ As can be seen in the evolution of Wikipedia as a knowledge resource, mankind can write its history as a collective retrospective.¹⁶⁴ Cass Sunstein warns of 'Information Cocoons' and 'Echo Chamber' effects;¹⁶⁵ 'networked knowledge' (as outlined by Weinberger)¹⁶⁶ needs precise narratives and new concepts of conveying research results.

Addressing the methods of the media and information of the 'Next society', 'Artistic Technology Research' aims to develop new narratives and forms of publication, fed through documentation as method, networked data-driven science and an implementation of contemporary art and media practices that are produced in the wider network, such as by cooperation partners (festivals, researchers, labs, projects, artists and practitioners). Experiments in narratives for the query public include the dissemination of contents in artistic as well as scientific formats.

161. M. Seemann argues that 'The query public is the positive flip side of "loss of control". It is that piece of autonomy, the recipient of information gains, which was lost by the sender of that information through the "loss of control"' (translated by Matthias Tarasiewicz). Michael Seemann, 'Vom Kontrollverlust zur Filtersouveränität' in *Digitale Intimität, die Privatsphäre und das Netz - #public_life*, (Berlin: Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, 2011).

162. G. Franck, 'The Economy of Attention', *Merkur* no. 534/535, 1993. pp. 748-761

163. On the word 'Wikiality', S. Colbert argues that, 'If you claim something to be true and enough people agree with you, it becomes true'. 'Wikipedia - bringing democracy to knowledge' <http://j.mp/ODaVd>.

164. G. Lovink and N. Tkacz, 'Critical Point of View: A Wikipedia Reader', *INC Reader #7*, (Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2011).

165. C. Sunstein, *Republic.com 2.0*. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007).

166. D. Weinberger, *Too Big to Know*. (New York: Basic Books, 2012).

Laboratory for Process Artefacts

Through empowering cultural artefacts¹⁶⁷¹⁶⁸¹⁶⁹ and through enabling technologies, it becomes possible to integrate technological ideas into artistic practice without having to first think about feasibility. In this context, artistic practices have changed in recent years, yet not every cultural artefact necessarily becomes an artistic artefact. The artistic process is describable through the application of artistic knowledge; through transformation-intelligence¹⁷⁰ and contextualising intelligence,¹⁷¹ cultural artefacts are moved into the system of art. In this sense, artistic knowledge (or artistic intelligence) is the basis for creating artistic capital.¹⁷² The 'Laboratory for Process Artefacts' is an integral part of the project, which has been installed at the University of Applied Arts in 2013.

The cultural accomplishments of individuals, or differently organised forms of human being in an ever-changing (transforming) environment, bring manifold products and processes to the surface – 'distributed agencies', 'framed interactivity',¹⁷³ collective ideas. The concern of 'Artistic Technology Research' is neither popular culture nor technological invention but a focus on incidents based on a synergetic potential,¹⁷⁴ 'creative emergencies'¹⁷⁵ which can be brought up by

167. M. T. Schäfer, *Bastard Culture!* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011).

168. L. Lessig, *Free Culture*. (London: Penguin, 2005).

169. Examples of empowering cultural artefacts and enabling technologies are 'Open Hardware' projects such as the Arduino Micro-controller and other 'physical computing toolkits', but also the free (open source) operating system, Linux, can be seen as such. Critical theory is the basis for the development of cultural artefacts. Schäfer describes 'bastard cultures' which open up 'closed systems' (using the example of fan-made Nintendo DS cartridges, etc.); Lessig (*Ibid*) describes empowering systems coming from a mindset of 'free culture'.

170. Artistic transformation-intelligence describes the basic knowledge of new media artists about the 'arts' system as well as the underlying functionalities and operations of cultural and technological artefacts.

171. Artistic contextualising intelligence describes the flexibility of new media artists to positioning their output (processes, artefacts, discourses, etc.) in other contexts and public(s), e.g. digital public, open discourse, mass media, art audience, selling, etc.

172. See P. Bourdieu, 'Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction' in R. K. Brown (ed.) *Knowledge, Education, and Cultural Change: Papers in the Sociology of Education*. (London: 1973). pp. 71-84. I use the term 'artistic capital' as an extension to 'cultural capital'. In the 21st century, artistic knowledge is not only describable through embodied, objectified and institutionalised types of cultural capital. Through cultural evolutions 'Free Cultures' (Lessig, op. cit.), 'Bastard Cultures' (Schäfer, op. cit.) and 'Coded Cultures' among many other depictions appeared.

173. W. Rammert, *Where the Action is: Distributed Agency Between Humans, Machines, and Programs*. (Berlin: Technical University Technology Studies Working Papers, 2008).

174. Buckminster Fuller, *Operating Manual For Spaceship Earth*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969).

175. The 'Coded Cultures' Festival 2009, which was co-curated and co-organised by M. Tarasiewicz, had the subtitle 'exploring creative emergenc(i)es'. See: <http://codedcultures.net>.

inter-/trans-/metadisciplinary and open cultures of production. We need to understand the correlations between culture, technology, codes, art and media in order to systemically comprehend today how next cultures contextualise and state their ideas. Critical research is the basis for 'experimental systems' that can only be successful if they offer 'epistemic things enough room to evolve'.¹⁷⁶ Recently, successful 'experimental systems' have been described via phenomena such as 'critical engineering' and 'post-industrial design', to name but a few. The current discourse of 'research in the arts' makes art universities prototypical localities, in which new forms of research practice and knowledge production can take place. Said spaces are rare today; in this sense, artistic research works as an experimental system in which the freedom of sciences and arts is to be given space to evolve.

'Artistic Technology Research' aims to work at the discursive and practical level, both as a motor for innovation and as a tool with which it is possible to assess the social and artistic/scientific significance of new forms of expression and dissemination. It is important not only to integrate 'Artistic Technologies' into existing theoretical academic discourse but also to make the results of these studies, and the subsequent critical works, accessible to the public, extending into the realms of phenomena such as 'networked cultures', 'bastard cultures' and 'coded cultures'.

176. H. J. Rheinberger, *Experimentalsysteme und epistemische Dinge. Eine Geschichte der Proteinsynthese im Reagenzglas*. (Göttingen: Wallstein-Verlag, 2001).

5. C. 4. **'Knowledge, Representation and Architecture: PhD programme at the La Salle School of Architecture, Ramon Llull University, Barcelona'**¹⁷⁷

(Leandro Madrazo)

It is becoming more difficult to apprehend an increasingly complex world by relying solely on the methods and tools afforded by single disciplines, such as had been used by the classical sciences. In our time, the autonomy of reality from the conceptual models fostered by the scientific and artistic domains is being questioned. Today's interdisciplinary sciences (e.g. neurolinguistics, bioengineering) not only attempt to stand in for a complex reality; they also create reality using their own conceptual models. In parallel, a steady increase in levels of self-awareness about knowledge-acquisition processes, which characterises the evolution of Western culture, has transformed modes of thinking into objects of study (e.g. knowledge management, knowledge engineering). In our culture, as Gianni Vattimo has argued, methodology can no longer be seen as an instrument of thought but as a subject matter in its own right, as a central and substantial part of the discourse of human sciences.¹⁷⁸

In line with these reflections, the purpose of the doctoral programme 'Knowledge, Representation and Architecture' – which was operational during the period 2002–2009 at the La Salle School of Architecture at the Ramon Llull University in Barcelona – was to create a trans-disciplinary knowledge space out of the interaction between architecture and other disciplines.¹⁷⁹

The concept of representation played an instrumental role in this PhD programme, insofar it helped to bring together different areas of knowledge, such as art, philosophy, physical sciences, psychology, education and computing. Representation is a transversal, ubiquitous category which is not confined to a particular field of study. Multiple meanings of representation – visual, aesthetic, epistemological and methodological – are implied in the conception of form and space, the study of creative processes, the analysis and classification of precedents and, in general, in any attempt to systematise knowledge.

177. This text was written for the SHARE Workshop, 'Art and Architecture: Constructing Transdisciplinary Knowledge Spaces', held in London, 12 May 2012, details of which are available on the blog http://arc.housing.salle.url.edu/share_workshop_transdisciplinarity/.

178. G. Vattimo, *La società trasparente*. (Milan: Garzanti, 1989).

179. Programme content and representative examples of student work are available at <http://www.salleurl.edu/arc/doctorado/>.

Study Programme

The courses that made up the two-year programme were based on fundamental categories such as form, image, space, method and system (Figure 1). Each of these categories stands for a mode of thinking – that is, of representing the world and the way we think about it. Rather than dissolving architecture in a multidisciplinary debate, the goal of these courses was to extend its realm beyond the built object to encompass the conceptual structures that prefigure and explain it.

[illegible]

Figure 1. Poster for the PhD programme 'Knowledge, Representation and Architecture'.
La Salle School of Architecture, 2002-2009

Lectures on the courses were provided by architecture professors as well as by specialists in various disciplines, and students, working under the guidance of their tutors, explored the architectural implications of the ideas presented and discussed in the lectures. Student works were carried out by means of short essays, videos and photographs, drawings and collages, in combination with all kinds of digital media.

At the end of the programme, a tutored research work was carried out on a theme selected by the student. In undertaking this work, it was expected that students would apply some of the conceptual

frameworks, developed during the courses, to an architectural issue, while demonstrate possession of the research skills necessary to complete a PhD thesis.

The generic and specific competences that students were expected to have acquired by the end of the doctoral programme included the following:

- Capacity to undertake analytical and critical thinking and understanding.
- Capacity to apply a spirit of synthesis of ideas and forms.
- Capacity to creatively generate new ideas and forms.
- Ability to develop a transdisciplinary understanding.
- Personal and social skills in expression and communication through speaking, writing and sketching.
- Ability to abstract and present key elements and relationships
- Ability to communicate, appropriately to a variety of audiences, through oral, written and graphic forms
- Awareness of the issues and themes of present-day architectural debate
- Critical awareness of the relationship between current and previous developments in architecture
- Awareness of the need for continuous professional development.¹⁸⁰

In the following sections, the background of each of the four courses is summarised, stressing those issues which facilitated dialogue with other disciplines:

'Form': Interactions between Architecture and Philosophy

This course was dedicated to exploring interactions between architectural thinking and philosophical thought. Philosophical thinking permeates the history of architectural theory all the way from the Platonic dualism present in Vitruvius's treatise to the attempts by Peter Eisenman to transform Derridian deconstructivism into a design methodology. Architecture is as philosophical as philosophy is architectural.¹⁸¹ Like philosophy, architecture needs to understand the world in order to contribute to its construction; like architecture, philosophy builds systems of thought – e.g. Kant's *Architektonik* – that is to say, conceptual constructions which can be compared to those embedded in the buildings that the architect builds.

180. Adopted from C. Spiridonidis, *Towards a competences based architectural education. Tuning architectural education structures in Europe*, European Network of Heads of Schools of Architecture (ENHSA), 2007.

181. In recent years, the interest of architectural thinkers for philosophy has resulted in a series of publications which provide a reading of some relevant philosophical works from an architectural perspective. See, for example, the series *Thinkers for Architects*, published by Routledge.

This exchange between both systems of thinking – philosophical and architectural – which has been present throughout the history of ideas, was reproduced on the course. Accordingly, the course was structured as a network of relationships between authors representative of the realms of philosophy and architecture, such as: Martin Heidegger vs. Mies van der Rohe; Michel Foucault vs. Aldo Rossi; Ludwig Wittgenstein (as philosopher) vs. Wittgenstein (as architect); Richard Rorty vs. Rem Koolhaas, among others. Scholars representing each discipline presented the work of a particular philosopher or architect to the class. Using the ARKINET¹⁸² learning environment – a tool specifically developed for this course – students summarised the ideas debated in class into a series of concepts which were grouped into themes. The themes were then discussed in class using the digital environment as a presentation medium. Following the discussions, students created links between concepts that gave rise to a network of relationships. Visual representation of the relationships formed a conceptual map which condensed the ideas formulated by lecturers and interpreted by students in relation to the architects and philosophers studied on the course. As a final exercise, a short essay was written which was an elaboration of ideas contained within a portion of the collective conceptual map.

In contemporary creative practices, in art as well as in design and architecture, each product has become inexorably linked to a critical discourse – a framework that endows it with meaning throughout its life, from inception to appraisal. Each product contributes to constructing the world not merely in the physical sense, as artefact, but more as a symbolic work which adds new meanings to reality; it becomes a node in a network of symbols in continuous interaction with each other. Building an intellectual framework – the concepts, meanings and values associated with artefacts – has become intrinsic to artistic creation. An art form becomes, then, the manifestation of a form of thought.

‘Image’: Thinking in the Age of Visual Culture

In contemporary culture, it is no longer possible to distinguish between reality and appearance, between idea and image. Today, images can no longer be considered as reflections of a transcendental reality or as simulacra which have nothing to do with reality – rather, they constitute a reality of their own.

182. ARKINET and IMAGENET have been developed by the research group ARC Engineering and Architecture La Salle (<http://www.salleurl.edu/arc>).

The ubiquity and promiscuity of the image distinguishes our contemporary culture. Images not only represent the world but are also inherent to it; they are not copies of things – they are appended to the things themselves. Images no longer act as mediators between the subject and the world but they have taken hold of both; they do not need the gaze of the subject to exist, they have replaced the world with its visual counterpart. In our visual culture, it is no longer possible to differentiate between the world and its representation; they have become one. All the realms of existence – art, politics, communication – converge in a single realm: the world of images.

By their very nature, images are reproductive – an image always points to another image; it contains it or is reflected in it. Therefore, understanding an image means discovering in, or from, it a series of permanently fluctuating images. Thought based on images can, therefore, only be relational and transitory. Due to their associative nature, images cut across disciplinary boundaries; a photograph can refer to a TV commercial, a TV commercial to a movie, a movie to a painting, and so on. Since the late 1990s, a new field called Visual Studies has emerged, the subject matter of which is the image, detached from the field of study and technique. According to Nicholas Mirzoeff, the purpose of Visual Studies is to fill the gap between the wealth of visual experience in postmodern culture and the individual's ability to analyse it.¹⁸³ Its transdisciplinary approach brings together all disciplines that are related to the production and interpretation of images, including art history, film, media studies and sociology.

In order to foster the associative thinking that images convey, students used a learning environment called IMAGENET, which supports collaborative reflection based on images and concepts. IMAGENET is a digital library, created specifically for this course, which contains images that students collected and described in connection with the themes discussed in class. With this visual material, they carried out knowledge-discovery processes, associating images to concepts, grouping images and relating them to each other. The ideas discovered in the learning environment were then discussed in class or further elaborated in written or visual form.

In today's culture, an image works as a vehicle between ideas and works from different fields. A space of creation arises around images, which cannot be confined to a particular discipline. Creating with images first requires an understanding of the meanings of images and then an ability to transfer meanings from one piece of

183. N. Mirzoeff, *An introduction to visual culture*. (Routledge, 1999).

work to another – from a photograph to a building – and from one discipline to another – from film to an advertisement, for example.

‘Space’: Relating Spaces

Space, like form, is amongst the most universal categories permeating our experience, from thought to being. Space may be thought of as a reality which is external to the subject, an extension or interval that can be measured. But it is also a subjective construction insofar as things are ordered in relation to our bodies (up and down, left and right) as Maurice Merleau-Ponty has suggested.¹⁸⁴ For Kant, the reality of space was more conceptual than physical; it did not derive from experience but was an *a priori* form of intuition – an order that the mind has to impose onto sensations in order to make them intelligible. Heidegger’s notion of *Dasein* transcended the division between objective and subjective, between physical and conceptual ideas of space. According to him, neither space is in the subject nor the world is in space; it is not possible to separate our existence, our being, from space.¹⁸⁵

Space can be more easily categorised than defined. We can distinguish Euclidean and non-Euclidean, absolute and relative, interior and exterior, finite and infinite, real and virtual spaces. As we perceive space to be an external reality, we tend to assimilate it into form, and thus we refer to spherical or cubic space. Each discipline claims for itself a notion of space. Thus, space can be architectural, pictorial, mathematical or geometrical.

The consideration that the creation of space constitutes the essence of architecture was formulated by August Schmarsow at the end of the 19th century. Until then, the architect’s creations had been assessed in formal, rather than in spatial, terms.¹⁸⁶ Schmarsow endowed space with an aesthetic meaning. According to him, architecture is the outcome of a human spatial intuition that feels compelled to give artistic expression to a spatial feeling and a spatial imagination inherent in the human being.

184. M. Merleau-Ponty, *Phénoménologie de la perception*. (Éditions Gallimard, 1945).

185. ‘Der Raum ist weder im Subjekt, noch ist die Welt im Raum [...] das *Dasein*, ist in einem ursprünglichen Sinn räumlich’. M. Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*. (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001). p. 111.

186. ‘Die Architektur ist also Raumgestalterin nach den Idealformen der menschlichen Raumanschauung’. A. Schmarsow, *Das Wesen der architektonischen Schöpfung*. In F. Neumeyer, *Quellentexte zur Architekturstheorie*, (Prestel, 2002). p.325.

Architectural space has been often constrained by that which is delimited by a building (or an ensemble of buildings). However, as Philippe Boudon has claimed, a conceptualisation of architectural space should not be limited to the actual building but should include the conception of space as well. In this conceptualisation, different notions of spaces participate – not only the established perceptual and geometric concepts of space but also the spatial concepts arising from the contemporary cultural and technological conditions of our time.

With regard to the creation of architectural space, an architect needs to operate simultaneously in two irreconcilable worlds: the world of objective space, which can be represented by means of abstraction, and the world of phenomenal space, which can only be experienced directly (*Lebensraum*). In the design process, the architect creates spaces, turning them into abstractions that simplify the complexity of space, such as three-dimensional Cartesian space. Within this abstraction, rooms are conceived as voids carved into solids, as interstices left between planes and as areas bounded by lines. The experience of space, however, gives rise to its own abstractions, which are not always coincident with those deployed in designing the building.

A strict division between objective space and phenomenal space – that is, between the conception of space in geometrical terms and through direct experience – can no longer be maintained in our digital world. With virtual reality techniques, a geometrical model can become a real spatial experience. The experience of being in space can be acquired via an instant messaging programme or by being part of a social network. Today's digital technologies expand our capacities to perceive space in much the same way as technologies like the cinema did in the past.

We can consider space as a product which is determined by the technological and cultural conditions of the time, a cultural construct which makes the world intelligible and underlies our creations. Insofar as space constitutes the substratum of our creations, it also becomes the nexus between them. A notion of space materialised in a particular field can then be transferred to other productions in other fields. For example, a piece of literature can have a narrative that can be represented in terms of a hypertext, and a photograph of a city can capture its spatial structure.

The objective of assignments for this course was to explore the meaning of space in architecture from a contemporary perspective, according to which the prevalent concept of architectural space would be determined through multiple interactions between various concepts of space materialised in different art forms. Students used video techniques and digital editing software to carry out their work. The purpose was not so much to represent a space but to construct a space using the language of the animated image (video, film).



Figure 2. Video work of spatial analysis of pattern motions along las Ramblas in Barcelona, by Omayra Rivera, PhD student, 2005.

‘Method’ and ‘System’: Designing the Design Process

Method and system are two categories that have pervaded modes of thinking since the 17th century. At the outset, according to Michel Foucault,¹⁸⁷ it was thought that there were two main ways of acquiring knowledge: by establishing similarities and differences after comparing individuals from empirically constituted groups, and by choosing a complete set of features which were then contrasted with other individuals in order to identify constants and variations. The first corresponds to the idea of method; the second to system.

Examples of both paradigms can also be found in architecture. At the beginning of the 19th century, Jean-Nicholas-Louis Durand carried out a classification of buildings from the past in order to derive a method of composition that was to be applied by his students at the École Polytechnique. The process started with a *partie* – a simple geometrical schema of the plan of the building – with the level of detail increasing step-by-step. Later on, in the 20th century, after the crisis of the modern movement, Aldo Rossi applied a similar methodology as he analysed the morphology of the city, identifying building types from which to derive a compositional schema (e.g. a type). Rossi’s type, like Durand’s *partie*, provided both a starting point for design and a space for delimiting design exploration. More recently, architects like Ben Van Berkel and UN Studio¹⁸⁸ have developed methods to capture information about an environment before transforming it into a building’s form.

187. M. Foucault, *Les mots et les choses. Une archéologie des sciences humaines*. (Paris: Gallimard, 1966).

188. <http://www.unstudio.com/research>.

A system may be thought of as both physical and conceptual. In fact, distinguishing between the two is one of the difficulties that the notion of system conveys. This intermingling of the two notions of system is also manifest in architecture. We can think of a building – the actual artefact – as a system made up of subsystems, such as the structure and the envelope; but, in the design stage, we can also conceptualise a building as a system that reacts to the information it receives from an abstract environment. Furthermore, we can consider the whole built environment to be a system made up of physical and abstract subsystems. Accordingly, a region would be made of cities, which are made of neighbourhoods, which, in turn, are made of buildings.¹⁸⁹

The convergence of cybernetics and systems theory, in the second half of the 20th century, opened up the possibility of applying computers to the solution of complex problems. This required modelling, in the computer, of not only the problem but also a way of thinking about the problem. As systems thinking arrived in the realm of design, this was transformed into a problem to be solved, then a design was seen not only as an artefact but also as the outcome of a process that was amenable to systematisation and optimisation. It was thought that, by providing the designer with more powerful design tools – i.e. computers – design solutions would improve. According to Francis Ferguson, the system approach is a thought model based on two main principles – holism, or a perception of the relatedness of things, and rationality, or applying methods and procedures to problem solving.¹⁹⁰ More recent applications of the notion of system to design thinking acknowledge that design is a wicked problem – that is to say, that design solutions cannot be detached from the formulation of the problem and from the evaluation criteria applied to the solutions. Furthermore, the designer is now seen as a 'self-organising system who is observing the evolving artefact plus him- or herself observing the evolving model'.¹⁹¹

Nowadays, the idea that the most crucial part of the creative process is the process itself, instead of its final outcome, pervades many creative practices, from art to architecture. The openness of the process promotes the participation of multiple actors, including

189. J. Habraken, *The Structure of the Ordinary, Form and Control in the Built Environment*. (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1998).

190. F. Ferguson, *Architecture, Cities and the Systems Approach*. (New York: George Braziller, 1975).

191. W. Jonas, 'Design Research and its Meaning to the Methodological Development of the Discipline' in R. Michel (ed.), *Design Research Now*. (Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 2007).

users of the final product, who can participate in the formulation of design requirements as well as in the evaluation of solutions. Designers, artists or architects can be designers of processes as much as creators of artefacts – processes which can have different degrees of autonomy and self-regulation, processes which can be driven both by humans and machines working in close interaction. The work that students made on this course explored the notions of method and system either in architectural treatises or in the design processes of a particular architect.

Conclusions

This PhD programme provided a space of encounter in which different disciplines could interact and develop interdisciplinary thought, in line with today's cultural trends, while exploiting the capacities of current technology to support new ways of thinking and representing. In this knowledge construction process, the role of architecture was to contribute to building a system of thought – that is, an *Architektonik* – which would belong to our times. The interdisciplinarity of the thinking processes – as suggested by the lectures and then materialised in the students' works – was conveyed through the use of multiple media, traditional and digital. By combining media in the realisation of student works, the disciplines became interrelated as well. Altogether, this doctoral programme provided a space of reflection in which faculty and students could explore ways of thinking which transcended the rather fixed limits of the educational spaces typically assigned to undergraduate courses and programmes. Ultimately, the outcomes of this PhD programme – the ideas discussed and the outputs produced by students – helped to improve our teaching in lower-level courses, thus bringing about a productive link between graduate and undergraduate programmes.

5. C. 5. 'Discipline Problems and the Ethos of Research' (Mick Wilson)

For only two centuries, knowledge has assumed a disciplinary form; for less than one, it has been produced in academic institutions by professionally trained knowers. Yet we have come to see these circumstances as so natural that we tend to forget their historical novelty and fail to imagine how else we might produce and organize knowledge.¹⁹²

Now, no discourse can claim to be free of presuppositions for the simple reason that the conceptual operation by which a region of thought is thematized brings operative concepts into play, which cannot be thematized at the same time. No discourse can be radically stripped of presuppositions; nevertheless, no thinker is dispensed from clarifying his presuppositions as far as he is able.¹⁹³

This text began life as a keynote presentation made at 'More Than an Island', a research conference held on a small island in Helsinki's harbour in spring 2009. The conference was co-organised by the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, Gothenburg University and the University of Leeds. This text concerns itself with some of the problems raised by individual artistic research projects engaging across multiple disciplines. It proposes that the movement across disciplines requires a critical re-thinking of the privileged perspective often accorded to art as a form of enquiry within debates on artistic research. The text retains something of the character of a spoken presentation, but it has been modified for presentation in print.¹⁹⁴ An earlier print version appeared in the *Writings from the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts* journal series.

Introduction: The Apparatus of the Four Questions

In GradCAM, the experimental graduate school that we have established in Dublin, my colleagues and I very often challenge our doctoral students with four questions. These questions cause lots of difficulty and debate among us as a community of researchers. They are:

- (I) what are you trying to find out?
- (II) why is it worth knowing?
- (III) how do you go about finding it out?
- (IV) how will you know when you are finished finding out this 'something'?

192. E. Messer-Davidow, D. R. Shumway and D. J. Sylvan (eds.), *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*. (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993). p. vii.

193. P. Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*. (London: Routledge, 2003). p. 303.

194. This text may be read in relation to an earlier essay, in which a slightly different tack through similar waters is taken. See M. Wilson, 'Four Theses Attempting to Revise the Terms of a Debate' in James Elkins (ed.), *Artists with PhDs: On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art*. (New Academia Publishing, LLC, 2009).

These questions have a kind of blunt, almost mechanical, force about them. They are not very easy questions to ask or to answer. They force a particular agenda about 'finding something out'. We find these questions useful – instrumental, even – for developing a research culture, rather than just creating a situation of ongoing professional practice and art-making. Our musicians and artists often say things like – 'I am a musician. I don't find things out. I just do things that interest me!' There is sometimes a certain frustration that accompanies this declaration, as if the artists and musicians are protesting – 'Stop asking us these difficult questions. Stop trying to make us into something we're not'.

This is, of course, the right response in one sense. We are trying to 'make people into something they're not'; we are trying to 'make' them into researchers. We propose that the identity 'researcher' cannot simply be collapsed into the identity 'artist'. We propose that the idea of research education is precisely about creating a context in which there is a wilful orientation towards becoming something other than that which one already is, a willed change in the positionality of the subject who wishes to know something not yet known. This is a tremendous challenge for any professional practitioner – regardless of whether they are working in the discipline of medicine, engineering, computer science, music performance, visual arts or design etc., and regardless of any professed curiosity, experimental attitude or other propensity for enquiry. Typically, most people, most practitioners, are not already researchers in the strong and systematic sense of the word. Of course, the apparatus for 'making' researchers is not a mere mechanical apparatus; it is a *dispositif*, a systematic articulation of behaviours, ways of speaking, ways of doing and ways of coordinating people, resources, space and time. It is, in some sense, a disciplinary apparatus¹⁹⁵ and one which creates subject positions. The subject position that the apparatus we construct in the graduate school attempts to create is, in part, that of a researcher and, more importantly, that of a peer within a community of researchers. ('Disciplinary' is not used here in the specific sense of an academic discipline but in the general sense of a formation of subjectivities and collectivities.)

195. It is, of course, unusual for the Foucauldian themes of *dispositif* and subject formation to be used in this affirmative sense, precisely because disciplinary apparatuses are seen to be technologies of power. However, we posit an aspiration and a goal for this apparatus to be reconstructed even as it reconstructs us as subjects. It is this peer-community dialogue and system of interactions that intervenes in the apparatus so as to stop it becoming totally dominant and univocal. This is a fragile ecology of association and one that is always threatened by the overbearing impulse of an individual or an institution or any other controlling principle that attempts to assert itself. This fragile ecology of association perhaps inevitably collapses or reaches a kind of limit-crisis at times.

Traditionally, educators, especially those of a *Foucauldian* bent, are loathe to speak of themselves as consciously enfolded by, constructive of and operative within an apparatus – preferring to speak of ‘openness’ while disavowing any deep investment of desires and subjective anchorages within the apparatuses they inhabit. We believe that such a disavowal is a very thin shield against our inscriptions within apparatuses, and we place our hope in the vulnerability of arguments premised on the insufficiency of all operations and rationales. We note that this is sometimes dismissed as naïveté, but we will risk naïveté in preference to risking ‘old-man Europe’s’ self-confirming pessimism of *après moi, le deluge*.

But what if artists and musicians really don’t want to become researchers? What if they just wish to be artists and musicians, just doing their own thing and getting on with stuff? Well then, it seems probable that doing a doctorate and studying to become a researcher is not the thing for them. We try to establish this right from the outset, when people first make contact with the graduate school, by emphasising the research orientation of our activities. Most artists, musicians, designers, architects, poets and so on just want to do what they do. They don’t want or need to become researchers in a formal sense – with formal education and accreditation and qualifications and so forth (which is not to say that they might not be active as agents of research, in an informal sense, within their own existing professional practice). This is perhaps exactly the way it should be. But some artists and musicians do want to formally become researchers, and they want this for all kinds of reasons: for employment opportunities; for personal growth; for renewal or extension of their existing practice; for building a community of shared interest; for pursuing something they love; for simply knowing something that seems important to them; for the greater good that they believe in working to create; for constructing a counter-institutional practice that operates on a different register from the market or the various art scenes; and so on. Motivations for becoming a researcher are very diverse and seldom fully clear to people when they begin a course of study to become a researcher.

The approach that we have adopted in GradCAM is that ‘research’ – while being a broad portfolio category – is not a completely elastic term. For us, research refers to an intention to know something that is not yet known, an intention to find out about something, or some aspect of the world, of experience in the world and even of world-making processes. When we repeatedly ask the questions cited above,

we are trying to cultivate a strong intention to know something that is not yet known and to seek this in a deliberate and considered way. Of course, epistemological doctrines and practices that might come into play when claiming to 'know' something (or claiming to prioritise knowing as situated action rather than *knowledge* as reified property or thing-to-be-owned etc.) is subject to critical contestation within the research context.

Assumptions Challenged

When outlining this position in debates with colleagues from across Europe at various conferences, workshops and seminars on art and research (including several within the SHARE network), the challenge has arisen that certain flawed assumptions are being made here:

- (I) That research is about the production of well-defined questions rather than being open to the radically unspecified process of opportunistic discovery, intuition, hunch, contingency and serendipity.
- (II) That all doctoral education is for the PhD, when, in fact, some doctoral programmes are for the DEA or DMus (i.e. not research doctorates but professional doctorates).
- (III) That artistic research is about 'knowing', or 'knowledge production', rather than being the production of 'meaning' or a special mode of aesthetic, experiential or embodied knowing, seemingly more relevant to traditions of artistic production.
- (IV) That textual production is being prioritised as the master discourse, rather than recognising the discursive specificity of artworks and media or even the primarily 'non-discursive' nature of many arts practices.

We are not necessarily operating with these assumptions; however, the saliency of these points is clear. Again, there is a wider set of debates that needs to be engaged with, which cannot be brought to a conclusion in this single paper, which is but one more contribution to these ongoing exchanges. (See the other sections of this book for an outline of these different positions.) However, the fundamental operational assumption that we do employ at the graduate school is that the process of asking, and the struggle to answer, these four questions, precisely in the instrumental form in which we produce them, is but one moment in the pedagogical process – importantly, a recurring moment – but these questions can be contested within the process of responding and re-negotiating the terms of engagement.

We are very conscious of working with one set of choices while colleagues in other situations and institutional settings operate differently. It is essential for us that different strategies are being used

in different institutions. The process of networking, exchanging, comparison and critical dialogue with other approaches to artistic research is a central activity of our school (just as it is for all the institutions represented in Helsinki). However, each of our institutions requires a *modus operandi* to set the energies, enquiries and conversations in play within an initial ordering of intention. For us in GradCAM, that initial ordering is provided by the apparatus of the four questions and the teaching team's collaborative technique in developing a pilot programme of teaching and learning for early-stage researchers. Inevitably, what emerges in response to this question-apparatus is widely divergent in format, modality, goal, frame of reference and agenda. However, the researchers we work with are expected to be able to articulate and defend an epistemic practice and orientation within a discursive exchange with a group of assessors.¹⁹⁶ This is not without the potential for contradiction, disagreement and anomaly. However, we seek to keep these dynamics in play rather than allowing them to congeal into a fixed knot of inaction and impasse. We seek to do this by not pretending that all operational assumptions can be critically thematised in the same moment.¹⁹⁷ (Of course GradCAM is much younger than the Helsinki, Leeds and Gothenburg programmes, so we have a long way to go and lots to learn from the experience of these very well-established and internationally recognised programmes.)

This description of the orientation of the Dublin School is necessary by way of contextualising the particular approach to the challenge of working across disciplines that this paper introduces. The approach outlined here is significantly informed by negotiating the challenges presented by individual projects developed by doctoral researchers at the school. The majority of researchers are pursuing projects at the intersection between several disciplines and dependent upon familiarity with material derived from a wide range of discourses and practices. Even though there is a great enthusiasm, within contemporary institutional rhetorics, for something vaguely construed as 'inter-disciplinarity', there is nonetheless a series of challenges represented by this move across disciplines, including questions around the meaning and value of the qualification within the existing system of disciplines and functional units of higher education.

196. This applies even if their preferred practice and orientation is a version of methodological anarchism as espoused by Feyerband or some other self-consciously anti-systematic or anti-methodic perspective.

197. This approach is based in part in the work of Ricoeur who, in a terse and eloquent expression of the idea, is employed as an opening quotation to this paper.

The Doctorate and Questions of Discipline

In the historical development of European institutions of knowledge since the early 19th century, there has been a strong integration of the PhD (as certification of training in research) into the construction of the disciplinary architecture of the modern university. The doctorate is part of the apparatus of production and reproduction central to the system of academic disciplines. It is clear that a key problem, contested in debates on artistic research and the PhD, is the relationship between the distributed field of contemporary art – which occupies multiple social loci beyond the academy – and the institutionally delimited disciplinary formations that primarily inhabit the space of the academy or university. The problem arts-based doctoral researchers face, then, is the question of whether their field of practice can, or should, be constituted as an academic ‘discipline’ without doing a disservice to the nature and dispersal of the field. Does being an artist constitute a disciplinary identity or simply a professional or social identity? Expressed in more prosaic terms, should we expect an artist working at doctoral level to have a broad knowledge of their field, as it is practised within and beyond the academy, or are they merely required to attend to the immediate concerns of their own practice and its idiosyncratic content? (It is worth noting that, very often, doctoral researchers in contemporary art have limited knowledge of the broad field within which they operate and very rarely attempt to provide mappings of the ‘state of the art’ as part of contextualising their doctoral contribution to the field. This is something we are currently exploring in the school.¹⁹⁸)

Notwithstanding the limitations outlined above, the real challenge we face is that of getting a clearer sense of what constitutes a discipline in general. Is there a general construction of academic discipline that can be applied across a broad spectrum of practices and fields (e.g. political economy, comparative literature, civil engineering, ecology, law, philosophy, classics and computer science)? Arguably (and this is an argument that cannot be properly rehearsed here, given the limits of the essay format), the ways in which we choose to answer the question ‘What is a discipline?’ are significantly determined by our location with respect to the disciplinary schemata of the university and the academy. Thus, an anthropologist may elect to understand the question of disciplinarity in terms of ‘tribes and territories’ (i.e. people sharing a local identity, form of social organisation or field of expertise); a cultural studies scholar may elect to see

198. Rather than seek to answer this question of whether there is a clear discipline formation or not head on, in Dublin we employ the second question – ‘why is this worth knowing?’ – as a means of asking researchers to locate a context of relevance and an existing state of knowledge against which to position their new initiative.

disciplinarity through a Foucauldian analytic (i.e. disciplines as systems of power-knowledge producing docile bodies and the undisclosed limiting discursive horizons that enable and disable in the same moment); a physicist may elect to see disciplines as convenient functional units and mechanisms for a division of labour more or less adequate to the way the objects of the world and experience carve up at the joints; and an art historian may elect to see disciplines as simply the canonical backbone of historically achieved bodies of scholarship, which, while driven by the contingencies of historical happenstance, now provide the given horizon from which contemporary research begins (e.g. the differentiated ways in which, for example, the history of sporting activities and the history of art-making activities are pursued and accommodated within higher education).

This proposition – that one's disciplinary identity and perspective on the nature of discipline formations is strongly correlated – should not be overstated. However, it does serve to introduce something of the ways in which different disciplinary formations might operate different epistemic cultures, paradigms and value systems. In turn, this may enable at least a partial response to the question 'What is a discipline?' that might, to some degree, be generalisable across disciplines. Disciplines are systems of knowledge-work organisation that entail enculturation (induction, immersion, training, education, certified progression, and so forth) that coordinate and regulate a division of labour, competence and authority while also establishing broader subjective orientations or intellectual and attitudinal dispositions.

The usefulness of this particular formulation is that it immediately throws into relief the potential sources of tension that manifest themselves when individual researchers begin to mobilise across different disciplinary formations. Clearly, a discipline is more than a set of abstract knowledge contents (a mere catalogue of facts, opinions, sources, debates, methods and author names); it is a broad technology and apparatus of professional subject formation. A discipline produces attitudinal and intellectual dispositions and un-thematised habits of thought, behaviour, valuation and commitment that are not typically shared with professionals formed in other disciplinary formations. When we begin to traverse the disciplinary archipelago, we begin to encounter a kind of professional cultural difference that cannot be simply reduced to superficially assimilating local customs. ('That's the way they say 'hello' and that's the way they 'do things' here on the island of art history or here on the island

of microbiology'). There is a further twist here, inasmuch as some professional cultural differences are precisely attuned so as to exclude the uninitiated. Exclusionary and specialist terms, practices and devices are used to ensure that opportunity within a given arena of knowledge work is contained within the guild or corporation of those who are proper bearers of the discipline – properly trained and educated, and properly equipped with the right reputation and attitude. These differences across professional and disciplinary formations are often calculated so as to shore up the 'professionals' in possession of their field of intellectual labour.

These circumstances have engendered an expectation that, when one engages across disciplines, one tries to engage 'responsibly' and 'in-depth', precisely because there are traps calculated to make the uninitiated stumble – there are what lawyers call 'terms of art', words that seem like ordinary familiar words in everyday usage but which have specific technical, and sometimes even counter-intuitive, applications within the 'trade'. Any contemporary artist who has ever had a long dinner conversation with a sociologist or an economist or, indeed, a lawyer who hazards a speculation on the nature of art or alludes to their own hobbyist interest in painting, for example, will recognise the potential for disconnection in the interaction between a specialist and non-specialist – the ways in which the unspoken rules of conversing about contemporary art are 'instinctively' known to the insider and unknown to outsiders, even though they are otherwise exceptionally competent conversationalists. The situation is often aggravated when these professionals move from a convivial arena of conversation into professional pronouncements on art and culture from within their disciplinary frame. Thus, sociologists and economists who produce studies of contemporary art are often taken to task for their lack of understanding of the domain of contemporary art.

Indeed, one important aspect of the controversy over what is now called the creative and cultural industries is the way in which professional pronouncements by economists, policy analysts and social scientists are produced and accorded great political weight even though a profound gap appears to exist between the instrumental reasoning of these professionals and the established logics of esteem, reputation and evaluation held by arts and cultural professionals. Thus, the distinction between an artists' studio group, operating in the marginal real-estate of a provincial urban centre, the members of which have typically exhibited in local restaurants, and the artists' residency

programme of a major international art institution is all-important for insiders but perhaps less so for outsiders. Indeed, the difference may be seen as one of an essential kind for the insider and merely one of relative market value for the outsider. In this example, the local studio group might not be properly seen as 'contemporary artists' by an insider while they might be seen as less commercially viable contemporary artists by the outsider and, therefore, in need of the outsider's help to develop a marketing strategy or an area-based cultural policy to boost their visibility. This example is schematic and, in a certain measure, fictional; however, it illustrates the tendency for insider/outsider divisions and role differences to produce fundamental misapprehensions even as we appear to be talking about the same thing. While those of us operating within the arts might readily recognise this disconnection when non-specialists talk about the arts, it is perhaps less easy for us to identify the same process when artists move into other disciplinary discourses – say, for example, producing political economic analyses of the art market or of the logics of precarity, post-Fordism and immaterial labour. We may be less ready to recognise the potential for reductive misreadings of other disciplines and professions by artists and assume special exemption from these risks.

Introducing the potential problems of interaction across disciplines in this way is not meant as an argument for policing disciplinary borders (to use a well-worn spatial metaphor). On the other hand, this is not a simple call for the disciplinary walls to be taken by storm, to establish a great level playing field of knowledge lacking in divisions and hierarchies. The purpose of this somewhat caricatured scenario of cross-disciplinary conversations occurring at cross-purposes is to begin to interrupt the assumption that the artist is necessarily the great generalist, capable of standing outside disciplinary limitations because the artist is the one without discipline and without disciplinary restriction.

There is a risk in working with schematic scenarios, as I have done here: the risk of substituting the simple outlines of a caricature for the dense complexity of our lived encounters with each other and with the world. For example, there is a tendency, in the celebratory rhetoric of interdisciplinarity, to construct a reductive account of disciplinarity that operates along the following lines:

- Knowledge requires organisation, and hence the disciplines have been developed.
- Research needs competence within disciplines, and hence induction into, and training in, the discipline.

Interventions: Position Papers and Dialogues

- Disciplines are clearly established and already well-bounded and divided
- Disciplines may even, to varying degrees, be ‘obvious’, ‘natural’ and ‘given’, determined by how the world logically carves up, and, for this reason, it has already been possible to have them successfully formulated and delimited.
- Disciplines force disconnection with other disciplines and impose mental habits and limitations while also fostering heightened competence within narrow fields of operation.
- In order to progress, therefore, we need education through the disciplines to be supplemented, or even overcome, by asserting interdisciplinarity as intrinsically virtuous.

The shortcomings in this analysis are many, emphasised by the reductive nature of the schematic outline provided. One key gap in this model is critical consideration of the initial drivers to form disciplines.¹⁹⁹ Mirroring this deficit is the failure to interrogate the impetus to interdisciplinarity which has characterised so much policy and development rhetoric since at least the 1970s. Other shortcomings of this approach include the assumption that disciplines are, by and large, already accomplished formations rather than highly unstable, contested and mutable heteroclitic constellations in need of constant maintenance and subject to ongoing intrinsic and extrinsic processes of change and conflict.

Rather than unpacking this rhetoric further, the goal here is to develop an approach which retains the right of critique – i.e. the right to question these various formulations of disciplinary and interdisciplinary mechanisms – while also seeking to pragmatically negotiate the fact of working within a disciplinary institutional framework that interacts with a broader policy framework which lauds an ill-defined interdisciplinarity. Most importantly, the need to negotiate a working path between the competing claims of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity must be rooted in the actual content of the research enquiries which aspiring researchers bring to the institution. In the majority of cases, these enquiries – whether produced by artists, curators, musicians or critics – harbour an impulse to work across disciplines, simply by virtue of the questions produced within the enquiry, which – while rooted in the practices

199. It is argued that ‘There is no more stunning fact about the academic profession anywhere in the world than the simple one that academics are possessed by disciplines, fields of study, even as they are located in institutions. With the growth of specialization in the last century, the discipline has become everywhere an imposing, if not dominating, force in the working lives of the vast majority of academics’. Burton R. Clark, *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advanc

of art-making, curating, performance, composition and criticism – bring us to other domains such as political economy, philosophy, history, cultural studies, psychology, anthropology, technology studies, and so on. So, given that we operate within an emerging artistic research framework – with competing claims and unfinished arguments about our own identity, role and remit as researchers, practitioners and professionals, – how might we broadly negotiate the movement across disciplines?

In responding, it is important to recognise the tendency, already evident across debates about artistic research, to assume that the artist's discipline is to be the interdisciplinarian par excellence. This special pleading for the universal access of the artist is, in part, an aspect of the radical change in art practices that has taken place since the 1960s, which sees the rampant impulse of contemporary art to thematise anything and everything. We encounter some familiar claims in the debates around artistic research: art is not a self-contained discipline but a primary feature of human existence; the artist provides a 'unique' perspective on all disciplines by valuing another order of cognition or an aesthetic view of the world; art is an essentially 'undisciplined' and/or 'anti-disciplined' space of rule-breaking and transgression; art is much more than a discipline – it is a form of 'world-making' and, indeed, constitutes multiple worlds unto itself; and so forth. However, it is notable that many disciplines make a similar bid for universal right of access to the entirety of human experience, including the right to thematise the broad conditions of other disciplines and practices and their place in the world. In philosophy, in sociology, in economics and in literary criticism, for example, one finds many instances of an overarching claim that positions the discipline in question as having (at least potentially) a uniquely comprehensive multiplicity or encompassing arc of perspectives on experience, knowledge and the world. Indeed, it may well be that, in the jostling for disciplinary status within an institutional game of special pleading, such overarching claims function precisely (and ironically) to secure disciplinary specificity, distinctiveness and legitimacy. Rather than agreeing or disagreeing with the special pleading of art as anti-discipline, un-discipline or supra-discipline, at GradCAM we seek to remain agnostic and accept the disciplinary status of art as an open question, foregrounding instead considerations of the role of the 'researcher' and identifying the work we can still do, the possibilities still in play for us to discover something meaningful in our worlds through artistic work developed within a framework of active and systematically-considered enquiry.

Ethos

In order to keep the question of disciplinary status open while generating agency for the researcher, we appeal to a notion of 'ethos', derived from traditions of rhetoric. We deploy the construct ethos in two key ways: (I) the ethos of research and (II) the ethos of host and guest in the movement across disciplines. Ethos is a Greek word originally meaning 'accustomed place', pertaining to 'custom' and 'habit'. It has a rich and resonant semantic field and can be translated in different ways. Some possible glosses on the term are: 'starting point', 'appearance', 'disposition' and another meaning derived from this: 'character'. Ethos is also the name for a rhetorical technique that makes use of direct appeal to an authority (typically to the good character of the speaker) in order to strengthen the persuasive claims of an argument presented by the speaker.

In GradCAM, we are experimenting with an approach to research that not only employs the four questions outlined above, but which also posits research as a particular kind of ethos. Rather than using the tired model of research ethics, as an exercise in form-filling and box-ticking (what is usually pejoratively called 'arse-covering'), we decided to see what might happen if we approached research as an ethical relationship with the world – more properly, as an ethos in itself. We proposed that the ethos of research is that of seeking an alteration in existing shared knowledges, understandings and values. It entails a 'readiness' to undergo a change in thinking, knowing, understanding, believing, positioning or value, based on considered reflection on experience in the world. This is not just about being 'open', or even 'actively open', but systematically active in seeking to open out an alteration in shared understandings. Importantly, this formulation speaks of shared understandings and underlines the need for inter-subjective dialogue and exchange in the research process. This cannot be reduced to an ethos of self-improvement and self-reflection. It is, fundamentally, a relational ethos, positing dynamic interaction with the world and others. Admittedly, this is a very abstract formulation and hard to readily concretise without refining the use of key terms (system, active, open); however, it does provide a basic set of principles with which to begin building a pragmatic framework of action and enquiry. There is a fundamental shift in this formulation – away from the primary desire to be correct or to be the first one with the right answer or to be able to hold onto and defend one's views at all costs against the challenges of others. Instead, the key quality that this ethos espouses is that of a willingness to change one's mind about

things – not in a careless and irresponsible way, simply reacting to any change of context or new information, but through due consideration of experience and activity in the world. This emphasis on an ability to change one's mind, as against an emphasis on being the one with the conclusive answer, is an important shift. While this new formulation allows for the limitedness of any single perspective produced at any given moment of the process of enquiry, it does not simply institute a regime of all opinions being equally valuable and all perspectives being equally legitimate all of the time. Positing the ethos of research as a matter of self-fashioning and subject-formation must carefully negotiate the risk of inadvertently fostering a culture of narcissistic self-reflection and uncritical valorisation of artistic selfhood. Indeed, the value of interdisciplinary encounters may lie in the ways in which these exchanges can counter the self-regarding tendency of special pleading found in many art rhetorics.

Ethos is a useful term here. It also pertains to relations between 'host' and 'guest' and the value of observing the rules of hospitality which mean that we make certain changes to our habits and behaviours when we are 'guests' or 'hosts' – in either role, some modifications are made to accommodate the other and to meet as insiders and outsiders beside each other. Interdisciplinary engagement by the artist-researcher can be thought of as (in part) the experience of being a 'guest' in another's 'place' (in their *topos* or their 'disciplinary turf') where we recognise that our host has *a way of doing things*. However, as guest, we are not giving up the right of critique, merely suspending the moment of critique until we have engaged in learning the local ways. Guests in another place or another culture, we are not required to become anthropologists, colonisers, slaves, tourists, sight-seers or assimilated as 'locals', but there is a general mode of being a guest which produces mutual obligation and constrains us 'to be on our best behaviour'. There is a requirement to be attentive to the way things are done and find some provisional accord with a new or unfamiliar perspective. We don't have to enter into a comparative valuation; we can enter into a role of guest in which we adopt a strange combination of relaxed engagement, allowing the host to put us at our ease, combined with heightened attentiveness of the local rules and rituals of conduct.

The Guest Shows Gratitude

This allegory of interdisciplinarity, as the encounter and exchange between guests and hosts, clearly allows that we don't seek to become masters in another's house, but we seek to learn something of the

house rules. The allegory is not to be applied exhaustively. However, it does provide a basic framework for considering how we approach interdisciplinary dialogue with an attentiveness that is not the same as a desire to assimilate, control or own another way of doing things, seeing things, saying things, valuing things, recognising things, and so forth. It is an enabling fiction, but it also has an important critical moment. This moment is when we begin to interactively and dialogically rethink both 'home' and 'away', through reflection upon the experience of both guests and hosts in multiple interactions and exchanges. Uncritical reflection upon the encounter can lead to a shoring up of differences, a freezing of identities into clichés and an aggressive policing of boundaries and territories. This often happens. However, another kind of encounter is possible, with guests and hosts becoming 'critical friends', enabled by the strange and unstable reciprocation of the rules of hospitality and ethos. Sometimes, as guests, we are even invited to come to our host's island and there speak of our local customs, sharing them as objects for further interrogation and debate. This is perhaps one of the greatest hospitalities that a guest can enjoy. Thank you for extending this hospitality to me on this occasion.

Conclusion

By this point, it will be clear that this volume represents not a single view but a diversity of perspectives on artistic research education. However, it is also clear that, within this diversity, there is more than a simple principle of *laissez-faire* at work. We see different commentators arguing for different positions with greater or lesser degrees of normalising intent, with many contributors attempting to establish the primacy of a particular way of framing artistic research education. In itself, this might be seen as an important resource for the practice of artistic research education.

It would seem that doctoral-level studies necessarily encounter questions of a broadly foundational nature, which compel the researcher to specify their epistemic beliefs and broad theoretical and practical commitments, in a way that opens these to critique. The lively contestation of research in and through artistic practices means that current doctoral researchers have an opportunity to consider competing perspectives and construct an orientation based on both the espoused positions and actual research practices of colleagues.

The challenge for the research educator is, perhaps, to create a climate of expectation in which it is to be expected that an artistic researcher would have a broad familiarity with the contested field and would be able to critically situate their own strategies in relation to this contested space. It is clearly not currently the case that the majority of doctoral-level artist-researchers are able to meet this expectation. Rather, perhaps too often we see a tendency to posit an undifferentiated 'science' against which the radical alterity of artistic processes are routinely and uncritically declared, without doctoral researchers being able to specify the research task that they have taken on, beyond a commitment to make more of their own work. There is great potential for a strange disconnect between highly articulated philosophies and debates on artistic research and the maintenance of the 'business-as-usual' of artistic production under the relatively unpopulated heading of 'artistic research'. This is not to be fixed by simply asking doctoral-level students to disclose what they believe is 'art' and what they believe is 'research'. There is an immense capacity for stultification in the trading of definitions of art and research that can best be offset by seeking a disclosure of the specific enquiry being proposed, in a way that is not simply a rehearsal of theoretical, critical or artistic principles or credos or a simple commitment to production. But, of course, this is just one more perspective. Each researcher or research group will have to negotiate their own settlement of these questions according to their own analysis.

6

Advocacy Strategies

This chapter takes a broadly discursive approach to the question of advocacy. It is supplemented by an ‘Advocacy Toolkit’, available via the SHARE website, which provides a specific practical approach and tools for advocacy work.¹ Inevitably, there is some divergence between the approach of this chapter and the orientation of the toolkit itself, and there is an attempt to thematise this difference within the discussion that follows. The chapter is in two sections. The first outlines a way in which the advocacy challenge may be conceptualised, while the second goes some way towards framing a way forward based on the work of the network to date. This chapter may be read as an attempt to provide a bridge between the variety of competing positions espoused in the previous chapter and the broadly established recognition of the saliency of a research culture within the arts.

6. A. Analysing the Broad Advocacy Challenges

The key challenge that the advocates of artistic research education face is to establish legitimacy with reference to two key frames: (I) the academic frame, i.e. the professional and institutional landscapes that constitute higher education; and (II) the very different frames of artistic practice, i.e. within the professional and institutional landscapes – occasionally overlapping, but essentially different from (I) – that constitute the different ‘art worlds’.² These challenges are not uniformly presented across Europe. Indeed, it is noticeable that, in the Scandinavian countries (although to a lesser extent in Denmark), in the UK and Ireland, in Spain and Portugal, the challenge to secure recognition

1. <http://www.sharenetwork.eu/downloads>

2. This simple division is of use in an introductory context, but of course needs to be treated with caution as the analysis is progressed.



by the national academic research funding system has largely been overcome. In these countries, the residual issue in terms of academic legitimacy tends not to be framed in relation to science and technology disciplines, but rather in relation to the social sciences and humanities, where there is often a more attenuated relationship to the worlds of non-academic practice (although generalisations like these are always a little clumsy).

The general picture across Europe is further complicated by the sedimentation of different legitimising schemata and rhetorical norms within both the institutional landscape of higher education and the different art worlds in which art practices are constituted and endorsed. These art worlds are always, in some measure, plural, and often criss-crossed by local hierarchies of ‘mainstream’/‘marginal’; ‘commercial’/‘experimental’; ‘traditional’/‘radical’; ‘emerging’/‘bluechip’ and various value tensions and national and regional frameworks. In response to this complicated field, several strategies are emerging, ranging from cautious attempts to assert the value of the arts within the dominant economic-political discourse (such as the ‘deferred value’ construct cited above) to a re-assertion of the radical alterity of artistic values (including the avant-garde concept of the transvaluation of all values).

In trying to produce a basic analysis of the advocacy challenge, one comes into contact with a fundamental concern that is present whenever the constructs ‘art’ and ‘research’ are brought into conjunction. This is the concern that one may be witnessing the colonisation of one universe of theory-practice (the arts, the broadly aesthetic domain of praxis) by another universe of theory-practice (academic and scientific research). This, in turn, is often seen as one instance of a larger process through which the terms of a radically de-socialised economic model come to constitute the only rhetorical mode that has ‘currency’, that works; where talk of ‘investment’ and ‘return’ becomes the only way of speaking that is deemed to make sense. This is based on a reading of political cultural change which proposes that, in recent decades, we have witnessed the reduction of all social and political realms to a fundamental logic of economic calculability.

This process is seen, by many commentators on the contemporary university, as underpinning the imbalanced resource competition between ‘the sciences’ and ‘the humanities’, or between the STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, medicine), on the one hand, and those areas of enquiry less directly integrated into professional and marketable career systems, on the other. This question of broader changes, is further complicated by the recent tendency

for diminishing public arts subsidy to become subject to a calculus of return-on-investment, with reference to such indicators as job creation, tourism stimulus, urban branding and renewal, social-inclusion and other criteria that are not (at least for some commentators) immanent to the terms of the arts.³

It is noticeable that, within the arts sector, there has been a lot of work done on the question of advocacy, with new rhetorical strategies being developed to make the argument for sustained public investment. An important example of this is the work of Common Practice, London, an advocacy group founded in 2009 to promote the interests of small-scale arts organisations in the English capital.⁴ Its declared aims are ‘to promote the value of the sector and its activities, act as a knowledge base and resource for members and affiliated organisations, and develop a dialogue with other visual art organisations on a local, national and international level’. The group’s members are Afterall, Chisenhale Gallery, Electra, Gasworks, LUX, Matt’s Gallery, Mute Publishing, The Showroom and Studio Voltaire, which represents a range of arts activities that includes commissioning, production, publishing, research, exhibitions, residencies and artists’ studios. One of the main contributions of the group has been the publication, in 2011, of *Size Matters*, authored by Sarah Thelwall. This position paper produces an argument around the value of the arts in terms of ‘deferred value’.⁵ This argument is worth citing here, by way of indicating a contest over which metrics are applied in an artistic context (rather than contestation of the use of any metrics whatsoever):

In considering the value generated by small organisations beyond the fiscal realm, this paper demonstrates that artistic, social and societal value are often realised long after a commission has left the initiating organisation. By taking examples of the types of commissions made by members of the Common Practice group and following their trajectory through the art world, we see that value accrues over the lifetime of an object or idea, which is often capitalised upon by larger institutions and the commercial sector. However, this research exposes the inapplicability of current metrics to measuring this ‘deferred value’.

This analysis of deferred value, in turn, leads to a reading of precarity in the publicly funded arts sector:

3. Of course, this is, in turn, a matter of contestation.

4. <http://www.commonpractice.org.uk>

5. <http://www.commonpractice.org.uk/Common-Practice-London-Size-Matters.pdf>

6. A. Analysing the Broad Advocacy Challenges

A consideration of the expenditure of the small organisations under discussion reveals spending to be concentrated in programme and staffing costs, which are closely linked to direct organisational outcomes. What this analysis reveals is the lack of scope for development that exists within small organisations. This reinforces the poverty trap in which many arts workers are caught, allowing scant possibilities for promotions and pension security.

This connects with a key theme in current debates about artistic research – the precarious employment conditions of both the artist and the artist-researcher. Interestingly, this analysis also identifies research needs and opportunities within the independent arts sector. Thelwall argues that the ‘intangible assets generated by small organisations as part of routine operations offer significant promise’ and ‘combined with the tangible assets that even non-building based organisations possess – archives, for example – they represent an important, yet under-researched, area of enquiry’. It is noticeable that the discussion of artistic research in Europe, as opposed to the discussion of practice-based and practice-led research in the UK, has tended to downplay the potential of partnership with the small-scale independent arts sector as a framework within which research questions and research tasks might emerge. The potential for alliances here may actually be crucial to developing effective advocacy strategies for the future.

As indicated, this question of strategies for garnering public resource and legitimation is central to the publicly funded art system. One recurring tactic deployed within this sector is the appropriation of dominant rhetorics, in order to win a ‘place at the table’ of decision-making, using the opportunities thus secured to try and influence policy and recast the terms of the dominant political rationality in a sectorial debate or within any given institutional setting. However, this strategy has been denounced by critics as wishful thinking at best, or as a form of self-destructive complicity at worst.

It is important to register that this critique of engagement with the dominant policy terms also engenders a critical research paradigm for the arts, rooted in the artistic field of practice beyond the academy. For example, in a sustained investigation into the privatisation of a UK city’s cultural services provision, Rebecca Gordon-Nesbitt provides a compelling case for extreme caution in embracing the rhetoric of culture, creativity and economy. In her analysis of Glasgow’s cultural

privatisation through the creation of Culture and Sport Glasgow, she makes explicit the erosion of public value and public good in the colonisation of culture by economic rhetoric. The emergence of privatised cultural enterprise in place of public service, she claims:

[...] represents the wholesale takeover of culture by business interests. It posits a strategy for economic regeneration that depends on the whims of elite tourism and its pace of consumption in a period of economic crisis. It demonstrates an ethos that is smothering this city and others like it, regarding culture solely in terms of its use value, stripped of any emancipatory potential. Far from being considered in terms of the universal creativity to which every citizen has a right, culture in Glasgow is framed in terms of passive participation and money-making potential, with the city's burghers fast accumulating cultural capital in the process. It remains to be seen how this approach will affect the creativity of future generations as Glasgow's cultural communities are rendered impoverished and complicit in the new Bohemia -G. Nesbitt, 2008⁶

Elsewhere, Gordon-Nesbitt has noted actions taken by Culture and Sport Glasgow in an attempt to suppress the claims of this kind of critical research, including the attempt to restrict circulation of the journal, *Variant*, which carried the text cited above. Interestingly, Gordon-Nesbitt's investigative research was conducted, in part, under the auspices of graduate study in a social sciences programme, rather than an arts programme. It is notable that the radical tendency of this research is premised on what it enacts in the public sphere – a kind of speaking truth to power – rather than on what it claims about itself as intrinsically counter-hegemonic. This suggests a potential danger of positing artistic research at some remove from traditional models of investigation and research. Proclaiming the radical specificity of artistic research as a way of resisting economic instrumentalism may, in fact, simply subordinate this work to a set of institutional logics that are left unmolested by the relatively toothless critique performed by, say, institutional critique, as style or sensibility rather than as a political project. Gordon-Nesbitt's research is compelling precisely because of its contribution to knowledge in the public sphere and its advocacy of critical artistic practice. What, then, are the implications of these different perspectives and experiences for the advocacy challenge?

6. R.G. Nesbitt, *The New Bohemia*, *Variant* issue 32, <http://www.variant.org.uk/32texts/CSG.html>

6. A. Analysing the Broad Advocacy Challenges

This question emerged very forcefully in the closing plenary of the final SHARE conference in Brussels. The ensuing discussion lasted for almost three hours, with contributions being made by participants from more than 20 different countries, from the perspective of more than 30 different institutional settings. While some colleagues, notably from the Scandinavian countries, insisted on the importance of maintaining the demand that public funding for the arts remain primarily tied to the arts as an end in themselves, some of the speakers from the former bloc countries indicated a very different operational context in which an unprecedented defunding of arts practice and research was accompanying the intrusion of not only economic but also ethnic-nationalist imperatives into policy rhetoric.

The implication of these analyses and debates is that there are no simple answers to the question of how to advocate for artistic research education and for how to lobby for recognition and resources. But necessarily, it becomes a matter of revisiting first principles here, to ask: 'For what do we wish to advocate?' 'Who are the 'we' who adopt this shared project of advocacy?' 'To whom is this advocacy addressed?'

6. B Advocacy: Of what? By whom? To whom?

The first question is: 'For what do we wish to advocate?' Given that we have seen a diversity of positions on what artistic research should be, and given that we have a wide variety of educational models proposed for artistic researchers, the answer here must provide common ground that is not restricted to the terms of any single national, disciplinary or research paradigm.

The basic elements that we have in play here, then, are: (I) the third cycle award; (II) its application to the fields of the arts in such a way as to prevent the specificity of art forms being subordinated to extrinsic logics derived from other knowledge and practice domains; (III) recognition of the legitimacy and equivalence of the cycle in arts practice within the academy; and (IV) the societal contribution and public good of this work. The advocacy challenge begins in the attempt to translate the description of the third-cycle award into the terms of the different art forms in a way that is not alien to these fields of practice but legible as equivalent to the doctoral awards in other domains. The reference document in Europe is the Dublin Descriptors, with which each set of national descriptors of award levels is supposed

to be congruent, so let us take this as our reference here. This prescribes that qualifications which signify completion of the third cycle are awarded to students who:

- have demonstrated a systematic understanding of a field of study and mastery of the skills and methods of research associated with that field;
- have demonstrated the ability to conceive, design, implement and adapt a substantial process of research with scholarly integrity;
- have made a contribution through original research that extends the frontier of knowledge by developing a substantial body of work, some of which merits national or international refereed publication;
- are capable of critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis of new and complex ideas;
- can communicate with their peers, the larger scholarly community and with society in general.⁷

Each educator, institution, or other agency advocating the application of the third cycle to the arts, will be required to make an argument that translates the terms of the descriptors into terms that are recognisable and acceptable within the current field. There are many examples of this translation having been accomplished in Europe by a wide range of institutions. These translations are constrained by the particular approach adopted by the different national qualification frameworks, but it is clear, from the extensive experience across Europe, that this translation can be successfully orchestrated.

Interestingly, it is already encoded within the third-cycle descriptor that doctoral graduates should be able ‘to communicate with [...] the larger scholarly community and with society in general’. This converges with the advocacy task of building recognition for the legitimacy and equivalence of third-cycle arts research within the academy and making explicit the societal contribution of this work. It is precisely in the elaboration of doctoral education for artists that we must also elaborate the means of communication with colleagues in other disciplines and with broader society. One of the core advocacy challenges is, then, simply to take the work that we do within the education of doctoral researchers in the arts and to represent this in non-specialist terms to broader constituencies. Most certainly, if artistic research educators cannot do this, then we cannot be in a good place to facilitate our doctoral students in being able ‘to communicate with [...] the larger scholarly community and with society in general’.

7. European Consortium for Accreditation, *Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area*, http://www.ecaconsortium.net/ecapedia/Framework_for_Qualifications_of_the_European_Higher_Education_Area

6. B. Advocacy: Of what? By whom? To whom?

But, are we not left with the problem, then, that, as we translate the descriptors into the arts, we are also smuggling in, below the radar, an economic fundamentalism and instrumental agenda that is concealed within the descriptors' terminology of outcomes? Where are the emancipatory claims of art and artists, where are the liberatory potentials and where is the agency of knowledge in these descriptors? This will very much depend on how one approaches the question of 'scholarly integrity', of 'critical analysis' and of 'communication [...] with society in general'. Could these terms not become a basis for the elaboration of critical cultural and intellectual projects that are deeply embedded within an ethos of criticality, of social transformation and of resistance to economic absolutism? Returning to Rebecca Gordon-Nesbitt's critical investigative research project, cited above, could this type of enquiry not be conceived and implemented within a doctoral project, an arts practice or a curatorial practice? Indeed, would the attempts to silence her research not constitute a really important context within which to examine what scholarly integrity might entail?

The next question that we face, then, is 'who are "we" who propose to adopt this shared project of advocacy?' The advocates of this way of working will, presumably, be the educators and institutions that have elaborated a third cycle for the arts or those who wish to do so. However, this is perhaps too narrow a construction of the collectivity of interests that should be mobilised around the question of artistic research education. If there is a societal contribution to be made by research in the arts, then there is a wider constituency of potential advocates to be mobilised here. This is perhaps the key advocacy task that needs to be taken on – the constitution of alliances across sectors.

Within higher education, alliances need to be consolidated with the critical wing of humanities and social science scholarship and with a wide range of science and technology researchers who are actively seeking the cross-pollination of their research cultures through the active engagement of artists, designers, musicians and filmmakers. At the level of individual projects, these alliances have already taken place, but it is noticeable, on the larger stage of institutional contestation that, in their current attempts to maintain their status within the university, the humanities have not been brought into broad strategic alliance with higher arts education and research. Indeed, the pressure of competition for resources within institutions may, in certain cases, precipitate the opposite tendency, creating divisions amongst potential allies. At the level of discrete courses

and projects, there is also a tendency for the arts to be introduced as exotic creative leavening into the perceived stodginess of certain disciplines. This may inhibit recognition of the potential for more substantial alliances in the register of national and international lobbying and advocacy work.

There is, of course, a further problem here, which is the difficulty posed by the particularly unsettling rhetoric of innovation and creativity (comprised of a blend of entrepreneurialism, techno-utopianism and market-fideism⁸) that seems to have caught much of higher education unawares. This talk of creativity is unsettling because it divorces questions of individual agency, competence and capacity from the ongoing critical analysis of conditions of possibility and from any serious consideration of social and economic structural inequality. However, it is not necessarily the case that art academies have been any more cogent or critical in their historical rhetorics of creativity and original talent. Perhaps the opportunity here is for the elaboration of a more coherent rhetorical framework for the arts and arts education. Precisely through dialogue with critical friends from other domains, could we develop a framework that is not forever caught up in the tension between nostalgic Bohemianism and anaemic professionalism?

Another alliance suggested by the introductory analysis provided above is that with the independent arts sector, which is also wrestling with the task of constructing public support for the arts, in and of themselves. In some ways, this is not only a question of building alliances for advocacy purposes but also for the purposes of enquiry. Then, the question becomes: 'Could we build more research alliances between higher arts educators and the independent arts sector?'

Whatever one's position on the different problems listed here, it seems that, within each institutional setting, there is a need to move beyond the divisive jostling for resources to generate broad-based alliances that seek to reconstruct the dominant language of policy rationality within institutional settings and within wider national education systems. This is a political task that can be taken on by drawing upon the social conviviality that attaches to many aspects of the arts.

The final question that we face, then, is: 'To whom is this advocacy addressed?' In a critical sense, the first space within which we must undertake our advocacy work is the higher education sector itself.

8. The term 'market fideism' is employed here to signal the absolute faith in market processes, and for this reason the theological resonance of the term is salient.

6. B. Advocacy: Of what? By whom? To whom?

We have not yet fully constructed the broad alliance that is required to position the higher arts education sector as a champion for its own cause. ELIA has accomplished a great deal in the past two decades, laying a formidable basis for sectoral advocacy at all levels of higher arts education. The SHARE network, enabled by ELIA, has also built a critical mass within the sector, championing the cause of artistic research education. But we have still a little way to go in consolidating a durable platform for artistic research education and supporting the advocacy work that is required. Clearly, there is great enthusiasm for this work among various players, indicating a willingness to move the SHARE project forward, but the essential requirement here is a unified front. This is the basis of political organisation required at this moment for the sector; we need to be integrated into a common framework that facilitates the elaboration of our differences but does not allow these to obscure our fundamentally shared task – to secure a hearing for arts education and research in terms that are, at least in part, established by the arts themselves. To do this, we must come to terms, in the sense of adopting a shared minimum agenda, and we must make a provisional settlement on which to proceed. This could be supplied by careful and critical use of the Dublin Descriptors.

There are, then, four key areas in which we must carry out our advocacy work: (I) the artistic community; (II) the research community; (III) the formal state political process; and (IV) society at large. Within each of these spaces, we will probably need to adopt different communicative tactics, but each institution and educator will need to construct a consistent rhetorical formulation, and most importantly, a formulation that is not *merely* rhetorical. The way that we can avoid ‘merely’ rhetorical claims is by subjecting our rhetorics to some form of interrogation, to some form of listening to the arguments proffered and subjecting them to critical enquiry. It would seem imperative that we avoid short-termist approaches, which would involve simply adopting the dominant institutional discourse of the day, and invest ourselves instead in this mode of self-presentation. On the other hand, we should probably avoid the use of a special-pleading approach which asserts the essential incommensurability and inalienable specificity of everything that is entailed in art. This is unlikely to have sustained persuasive hold on anyone’s attention, not least our own.

7

Judgments: The Questions of Quality and Evaluation

The question of assessment is always a thorny one within educational practice, and especially so in relation to education in the arts. Contemporary arts educators operate in the wake of various modernisms and cultural and artistic revolutions that have re-shaped the landscape of the fine arts. The system of the fine arts that was elaborated in Europe following the Renaissance brought together some aspects of the previously disparate fields of literature, dance, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, and so forth, within a system of high culture. Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, even as this new systematisation of the arts was being consolidated as the dominant system of high cultural value, it was subject to a series of internal and external jolts, with the emergence of various avant-garde, modernist and populist challenges from within the arts system, and with the development of new media forms somewhat beyond the fine arts system (e.g. journalism, photography, film, radio, television and digital network media). While the art academies and conservatories of Europe were not, for the most part, the engines of these new and often radical developments, there is a strong sense in which the contemporary academy wishes to lay claim to this heritage of avant-gardism, artistic revolution and cultural innovation. The contemporary higher arts education institution often wishes

to claim as its birthright the tradition of the transvaluation of values within the artistic sphere. For this reason, the assessment and judgment of artistic merit within higher arts education is deeply conflicted.

On the one hand, higher arts education wishes to claim the authority to endorse and transmit, from one generation to the next, the radical tradition of artistic experimentation; and, on the other hand, it does not want to repeat the exclusions that were historically performed by the institutions of official culture in their initial rejection of avant-gardism (which was defined, in part and somewhat circularly, as that which official culture rejected). So, arguably, there is always an anxiety at work in assessing new artistic practices within the academy. A part of this anxiety is manifested in the concern to find terms of assessment that are immanent to any given instance of artistic practice, rather than repeating the exclusions of the past by imposing a pre-established system of valuation.

This anxiety of assessment – this worry that what begins as judgment will turn into the imposition of restrictive norms and homogenising standards, that it might fail to recognise new artistic values in their moment of emergence – is an important factor in the elaboration of a research education in the arts. But, perhaps artistic research educators have been slow to recognise that the problem of assessment with respect to novel artistic practices is not so far removed from the more generalised problem of recognising novel epistemic practices. This latter problem is one that potentially emerges in any field of active enquiry. In some sense, it is incumbent upon all research educators to support and evaluate new creative insight and interrogate exciting ways of thinking and understanding, so that new ways of knowing and doing may emerge. Perhaps we should also recognise that there is a counter-risk at play here; this is the risk that, in assuming that higher arts education is the broker of radical innovation in artistic practice, we misrecognise the relatively conservative reproductive function that higher education more generally serves, and underestimate the degree of formulaic repetition that may be encoded within our pedagogies of individual novelty, talent and expression. However, the argument that is developed in this chapter, by Henk Borgdorff and Johan A. Haarberg, suggests that, by attending to the challenge of assessment as a revisiting of open criteria and descriptors, we will both negotiate the challenge of working with immanent assessment criteria and avoid the imposition of homogenising standards.

7. A. Research Assessment and Qualification Frameworks

(Henk Borgdorff and Johan A Haarberg)


As indicated previously, third-cycle artistic research education is part of the edifice of higher education, operating at the borderlines between the art world and academia. It therefore has relevance for, and impact upon, both the professional art scene(s) and higher education and research, in particular the sector of higher arts education. When assessing third-cycle artistic research, both contexts have to be taken into account, and any qualification framework or set of assessment criteria should reflect this extended field of relevance.¹

The dual identity of third-cycle research in the arts is, for some, mirrored in the requirement that the practice of the art form in question is coupled with a clearly articulated reflection on that practice, while, for others, the requirement is for an integrated submission that constitutes a singular contribution to knowledge which demonstrates competence in both the art form and the forms of academic practice without assuming a split between the two. For those doctoral pathways that employ a separation between artwork and reflective material, the form the latter part takes may vary; often, but not always, it implies a written thesis alongside the submission of practice (works of art, performances, etc.). The dual context of research in the creative and performing arts is also reflected in some of the formulations of national and international qualification frameworks set up to support the assessment of research. Thus, while some doctoral models employ a split (practice/reflection) approach and others employ an integrated (demonstration of the contribution to knowledge) paradigm, all doctoral educations in artistic research are faced with the challenge of ensuring that the work produced is able to claim the status of art as well as that of research (recognised within a formal educational setting).²

The Tuning Educational Structures in Europe, launched in 2001, brought experts in various subjects together to devise the European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (EQF), the upper levels of which (six, seven and eight) correspond to the three

1. The artistic research programme therefore has common traits with what is now called Mode 2 knowledge production or transdisciplinary research.

2. For a comprehensive discussion of the relationship between practice and writing, see: M. Schwab and H. Borgdorff, *The Exposition of Artistic Research – Publishing Art in Academia*. (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2013).



levels (first, second and third cycle) contemplated in the 2005 QF for the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).³ The EQF is based on a distinction between ‘Knowledge’, ‘Skills’ and ‘Competence’, arranged over the different levels. In this context, the HUMART project, which addresses the humanities and the creative and performing disciplines, has created two Sectoral Qualification Frameworks (SQFs) – one for the humanities and one for the creative and performing disciplines.⁴

The SQF for the creative and performing disciplines is organised alongside ‘dimensions’ – key categories chosen to describe the essential traits of the broad disciplinary domains. These are: (I) Making, Performing, Designing, Conceptualising; (II) Re-thinking, Considering and Interpreting the Human; (III) Experimenting, Innovating and Researching; (IV) Theories, Histories and Cultures; (V) Technical, Environmental and Contextual issues; (VI) Communication, Collaboration and Interdisciplinarity; (VII) Initiative and Enterprise. Each of these dimensions is crossed with the EQF categories: Knowledge, Skills and Competences, bringing about a comprehensive scheme of qualifications for the different levels in higher arts education.

At level eight, the third cycle in higher arts education, these qualifications amount to the following:

Knowledge:

- Knowing all the relevant methods and techniques of enquiry related to a particular field of study;
- Being fully familiar with work and health implications for those involved in their activity;
- Distinguishing between valuable and irrelevant enquiry, whether in the theoretical, practical and/or creative spheres;
- Understanding standards of excellence in their own field;
- Knowing the national and international context of activity and output into which their work has been/will be disseminated;
- Understanding the ownership rights of those who might be affected by their project (e.g. copyright, intellectual property rights, confidential information, ethical questions);
- Appreciating the economic potential and utilisation of their output.

3. EHEA, Qualification Frameworks/ Degree structures, <http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=1>

4. See: http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/images/stories/HUMART/SQFs_for_the_Creative_and_Performing_Disciplines_and_the_Humanities.pdf. In building the SQF, the set of criteria to distinguish the first, second and third cycle, known as the Dublin Descriptors and developed by the Joint Quality Initiative, were taken into account.

Skills:

- Integrating previous experience so as to demonstrate original creative insights;
- Functioning with complete creative autonomy;
- Extending and redefining our understanding and/or relationship with the discipline in a significant way;
- Framing research questions rigorously and lucidly – whether pertaining to practical, theoretical or creative issues or a combination of these;
- Talking or writing with complete authority about their special field within their discipline;
- Realising goals defined at the outset of their projects, whilst making appropriate adjustments to these in the light of their research experience.

Competences:

- Comprehending the transferability of their research capabilities to other fields;
- Displaying professional, creative and scholarly integrity;
- Seeing their own shortcomings and untapped potential, and devising strategies for maximising their performance;
- Showing sustained commitment to the development of new ideas or practices at the forefront of any work or study context to which they apply themselves, including research;
- Disseminating highly specialised information clearly and appropriately, in any relevant form and to different target audiences so as to improve public understanding of their field;
- Establishing and maintaining cooperative relationships within the scholarly and creative community;
- Responding with understanding and responsibility to critical considerations.

This qualification framework for the third cycle in the creative and performing arts is a significant help for higher arts education institutes in structuring and benchmarking their programmes and in corroborating the supervision and assessment of the work of their students. Qualification frameworks are not aimed at the elimination of differences between educational traditions and cultural environments, but rather at their transparency and the possibility of comparing them and putting them into communication. They in no way seek to restrict the independence of academic and subject specialists or to undermine local and national academic authorities.

The SQF for arts education is formulated at a generic level. In the local and day-to-day practice of supervising and assessing doctoral/ third-cycle students' research work, these generic guidelines or

assessment criteria should be supplemented by a tailor-made approach, leaving room for a motivated deviation from these criteria. Pertinent in the field of the creative and performing arts is the acknowledgement that each individual artistic research project might convey, to a certain extent, its own criteria for assessment.

Already in 2001, in a report entitled *Research Training in the Creative and Performing Arts and Design*, the UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) recommended the adoption of a so-called ‘needs-based model’ for the assessment (and support) of practice-based research in the arts.⁵ This model qualifies the importance of generic frameworks and stresses the relevance of a subject-specific and personalised approach, recognising that, generally, ‘qualifying procedures within institutions for both research and research training provide unreliable assessment criteria for practice’.⁶ And it is precisely in the practice of the creative and performing arts that frameworks and criteria are often challenged. At the same time, third-cycle artistic research is itself a practice, in which one might presume a reflective account of that practice.

At two parallel discussion sessions during the European Forum for Research in Art and Design (EUFRAD) conference in Vienna, 20–21 September 2013, the issue of research assessment and quality criteria was debated among supervisors of third-cycle graduate students in the creative and performing arts and design. Participants prepared for that discussion by comparing their own institutional criteria for the assessment of arts-based research with the criteria for assessment employed by the international *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)* in its peer-review process. In order to facilitate the discussion on research assessment and quality criteria, the focus was on a limited number of cases of published research, including the discursive elements which informed its assessment. For that purpose, participants confined themselves to work published in the third issue of *JAR*.⁷ One of the benefits of focusing on work published in *JAR* was that, with the published research, some criteria for research assessment and the final evaluations of peer reviewers were also given. The research, the criteria for its evaluation and the actual assessments were not yardsticks for the discussion, but they were considered to be points of departure to which the discussants could object or which might instigate further thought.

5. *Research Training For Humanities Postgraduate Students*. UKCGE, 2000. <http://www.ukcge.ac.uk/publications/reports.htm>

6. Loc.cit.

7. See: www.jar-online.net.

It was recognised that – if at all – the assessment of research in the arts takes place in different contexts, both academic and non-academic (if that opposition makes sense). Thus, an inclusive understanding of the issues involved should take into account these different contexts, i.e. faculty research and third-level programmes in higher arts education, national and international research funding bodies and art councils, life events (e.g. exhibitions, performances), journals, forums for art criticism, etc.

During the sessions several topics were addressed:

Relationship between the Practice Part and the Written Part of the Submission

It was noted that many third-cycle programmes ask for a written thesis/dissertation as a main criterion for qualification, although the length/number of words varies significantly over different programmes. Two examples from different countries and academic cultures (Estonia and the UK) illustrate this diversity of approach:

In the Estonian Academy of Music, candidates for the doctoral degree have to write a thesis in addition to concerts or other creative work. This written part of their work has to fulfil the following criteria:

The written Doctoral thesis of the creative branch is an independent research paper, the length of which is 80,000 to 100,000 characters without annexes. The subject of the paper has to be a significant issue from the speciality viewpoint and the paper has to support the creative Doctoral project as a whole or a part of it. The Doctoral dissertation has to demonstrate comprehensive familiarity with the literature addressing the problem, be based on scientifically justified methods and present original solutions or additions to the existing knowledge base. The paper shall be prepared in accordance with the academy's approved presentation requirements for degree papers.⁸

At Bath Spa University in the UK, the basic demand for a doctoral thesis – submitted in science, art and design practice and practice-based music and performing arts subject areas – should not exceed 40,000 words. The format of a submitted thesis shall normally be in A4 format, in permanent and legible form, using either typescript or print. However, the regulations admit exceptions, inasmuch as 'Parts of the thesis, and very exceptionally all of it, may be presented in other formats (such as CD-ROM) or using paper sizes other than A4,

8. 'The Organisation of Doctoral Studies and the Terms and Conditions of and the Procedure for Doctoral Degrees at the Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre'. See: <http://www.ema.edu.ee/index.php?main=1047>

where it can be demonstrated that the contents can be better expressed in that form and are capable of being assessed'.⁹

The Bath Spa University Research Degree Handbook also offers more specific alternative conditions for the doctoral degree in creative fields:

In creative fields it is entirely appropriate that an integral part of the submitted work should take the form of materials derived from practice, such as those involved with creative writing, musical composition and the making of images or forms. Research students working in these fields may pursue an interdependent programme of theoretical and practical work, leading to new knowledge expressed through the thesis as a whole;

Practice may be used in balance with theory and as an integral part of the work in order to explore, annotate and critique the central ideas or argument. The size and extent of the practical work is dependent on the degree to which it contributes to the intellectual whole;

In general terms, there should be a balance between the creative materials submitted and the written thesis within the range and maximum word counts as specified [...] above. However, students are particularly advised to guard against interpreting this as a dual requirement, thereby developing not one thesis, but two – one written, one practice. The emphasis is on integration and purposeful exploration through practice.¹⁰

Some programmes/countries would, however, not demand a written thesis – based on traditions within the humanities, for instance – but ask for reflection to find other forms of manifestation closer to the artistic discipline in question. An example of this is the assessment basis of the Research Fellowship Programme that operates under the direction of the Norwegian Artistic Research Programme. Here, the focus is on artistic result and critical reflection. Regarding the latter, the candidate is free to choose the appropriate medium and form. There is, as such, no demand for a delivery in writing; however the candidate must address the following issues:

9. Bath Spa University, *Graduate School – Research Degree Handbook*. p. 29. <https://thehub.bathspa.ac.uk/services/research-and-graduate-affairs/graduate-school/research-degree-handbooks>

10. Bath Spa University, *ibid.* p. 9.

- 'Personal artistic position/work in relation to chosen subject area nationally and internationally;
- How the project contributes to professional development of the subject area;
- Critical reflection on the process (artistic choices and turning points, theory applied, dialogue with various networks and the professional environment etc.);
- Critical reflection on results (self-evaluation in perspective of the revised project description);
- The results of the critical reflection shall be available to the public and of a permanent nature.'¹¹

Assessment Scope and Focus

Assessment criteria are developed within different sorts of academic environments. Within third cycles, as such, they will often be based on interpretations of qualification frameworks. This may be established locally, within an institution, or on a broader scale as, for instance, a national standard, with varying degrees of generic level. While in some countries, assessment procedures focus on the overall result of the individual study (such as the Norwegian assessment criteria mentioned above), the procedures in other countries seems to demand that all elements listed in the national qualification framework are taken into account.

Many workshop participants expressed concern that assessments too often tend to focus not on the artistic achievements but more on general academic skills – identified as *academic craft*. As the criteria at hand for the specificity of achievements within the art fields seems to be less developed than those for generic academic skills, the tendency in the viva voce examination, for instance, leaned towards a focus on these skills rather than the artistic part(s). For this reason, further focus on developing criticality in relation to achievements within art praxis should be a theme for future international events.

Assessment Criteria – The Example of JAR

During the workshop in Vienna, it was proposed that the only international standard for the assessment of artistic research was the one developed by JAR (published by the Society for Artistic Research). Certainly, there is a principal difference in scope and purpose between assessing a journal submission and a doctoral one. But it was felt by many in the seminar that the set of criteria developed by JAR could serve as an exemplar for local, institutional assessment standards.


11. Norwegian Fellowship Programme, *Reglement for Stipendiatprogrammet* [Regulations for the PhD programme], http://artistic-research.no/?page_id=1025, P. 4.

In the peer-review guidelines of JAR, questions are asked about both the artistic and academic relevance of the research. In relation to the latter, they stipulate that the claim to be artistic research implies a relationship, in one way or another, with academic criteria for the conduct of research. Hence, the questions asked pertain, among other things, to the advancement of knowledge and insight, originality, contextualisation and methodology. During the workshop in Vienna, the value and relevance of this set of criteria for the assessment of artistic research activities was debated. In general, there was strong support for them, although a concern was expressed by some parties in relation to the emphasis placed on the design component of the presented results (which is one of JAR's assessment criteria).

In line with the open-ended and reflective character of any set of assessment criteria or qualification framework in the field of the creative and performing arts, the workshop session supported JAR's suggestion that a research submission 'need not comply with all (or even one) of the points listed here. But one might question whether it does, and if not, what the artistic, aesthetic or intellectual rationale is'.¹² However, it should be noted that, within the wider SHARE network, there are some who would argue that this is not a viable strategy when it comes to satisfying the requirements of many national qualifications systems, which require that all doctorates, regardless of subject, demonstrate that they meet the learning outcomes specified in the national qualifications framework, and that these outcomes can be relatively easily transposed into the terms of each art form. Again, there is live contestation here across the network.

Dialogue

One of the outcomes of the workshop sessions at the EUFRAD conference was that reservations were expressed about overbearing attempts to implement universal standards in the territory of artistic research. Dialogue is the key; as is the steady growth of the artistic research, in which the work can react to its own discoveries and realities. The criteria for assessment lie within the enfolding dialogue, between supervisor and candidate, between material practice and formal assessment. Criteria could and should always be in-becoming, emerging, as in the work of art, out of a tension between the internal logic of the work itself and external standards or judgments. More important in the context of third-cycle research is the assessment of the ability of the candidate to develop specific criteria relevant to their work throughout its own production. This 'meta-assessment' is quintessential for the advancement of artistic research and its protagonists.



Part Four

The Next Generation of Artistic Research Education

Having looked at a broad portfolio of platforms and structures for, and practical examples of, third-cycle projects within the arts; and taken into account the lively debate that populates this field, this part looks into how the next generation of artistic research education might develop.

Chapter 8 looks at the role both long-term and project-specific networks play in the further development of the field, by evaluating a set of recent and current networks, attempting to establish their (potential or actual) contribution to the development of the doctoral level of studies.

In chapter 9, under the heading 'Think About the Future', some scenarios and reflections in relation to the future development of artistic research education are proposed. Based on a SHARE workshop in Venice, in June 2013, these reflections are offered as a provocation for debate and a stimulus intended to generate new enquiries and collaborations within the domain. The chapter caps off with a set of speculative scenarios on how the field might have developed in 2018.

8

Networking and Communities of Practice

The terms networks and network analysis perform two critical functions in our understanding of the human and social condition. The first is analytic: Networks allow us to express well both the individual entities that make up the system and the interrelationships between them. They present a form of analysis that can reflect both structure and choice, both system and self. The second function is historical: The particular set of perturbations that underlies many of the present changes in the organization of economic, social, and political life are driven heavily by the introduction of networked information technology into an increasing range of aspects of life— Y. Benkler, 2010.¹

The emergence of networking as the key trope of 21st-century globalisation has received a fair degree of critical study and public debate. For example, in his 2006 book, *Organised Networks: Media Theory, Creative Labour, New Institutions*, Ned Rossiter advocated the critical transformative potential in network practices, while others have seen networks as potential systems of soft repression, imposing un-interrogated societal norms by stealth. It is an accepted feature of the contemporary research landscape, and of knowledge work in general, that networks are a key requisite for the coordination and development of work. The word ‘network’ has a special resonance at a cultural historical moment characterised, in part, by the global integration of networks, most prominently identified with the ever-extending ubiquity of the internet, as the network of networks.

1. Y. Benkler, ‘Networks of Power, Degrees of Freedom’ in *International Journal of Communication* 5. 2011. pp. 721–755. http://www.wzb.eu/sites/default/files/u32/benkler_background_networks_of_power_degrees_of_freedom_final.pdf

However, there is a need to think of the question of networks as socio-technical, and not reduce it to a discrete technological layer, such as digital electronic signal processing systems. It is worth noting, then, that historical forms of networking emerged in the early modern period and co-evolved with transformations in natural philosophy and the emergence of new knowledge domains. These networks ranged from the frequently cited letter sharing of the Newtonian era to the complex commercial, social and professional networks that underpinned ambitious projects such as the *Encyclopaedia*. In the contemporary era, we might also take note of the significance of face-to-face interactions, alongside the asynchronous networking of electronic communications, and the importance of the traditional conference, symposium and exchange systems that bring people together in professional contexts of co-location and immersive dialogue. Indeed, it is notable that so much of the past decade of work in the development of artistic research has been rooted in orality (rather than formal textual prescription), typified by practice and research contributions based on spoken and illustrated conference presentations as opposed to formally read papers.

In tandem with the acceptance of networking as key not only to the dissemination phase but also to the entire lifespan of research projects, there has been broad and growing interest in the structures and processes of ‘communities of practice’. The term has gained wide currency in business, educational, management and organisational science contexts, through its use in publications such as the *Harvard Business Review*.² However, the emergence of the concept lies in anthropology and cognitive science, with its first formal appearance in 1991, in Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger’s ‘Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation’.³ Wenger has subsequently formulated the term with reference to three key themes:

- Mutual engagement (community), referring to forms of social-professional interaction generating norms, making collaboration possible through the complementarity of informal and formal relationships;
- Joint enterprise (domain), referring to the shared understanding of what joins members of a community together, a shared project or wider horizon of intelligibility, sometimes referred to as the ‘domain’ of the community of practice;

2. Etienne Wenger and William Snyder, ‘Communities of practice: the organizational frontier’ in *Harvard Business Review*. January-February, 2000. pp. 139-145.

3. First published in 1990 as Institute for Research on Learning report 90-0013, Cambridge University Press.

- Shared repertoire (practice), referring to the shared communal resources generated by the practitioners interactions and their sharing and exchange of concepts, information, experience, tactics and tools. This shared repertoire can include attitudinal and work-style orientations, and should not be seen simply as a matter of technical-practical, analytical and categorial resources.

The examples employed by Lave and Wenger, in their first formulation of the construct, pertained to the situational dynamics of informal learning and included groups of Yucatán midwives, tailors, navy quartermasters and butchers. The term has been co-opted in different ways by conservative social commentators, such as Robert Putnam, who have elided the construct with the concept of ‘social capital’. However, it remains an open question as to whether or not the construct is intrinsically conservative and normative, or open.

It is clear that some form of community of practice thinking is operational in the construction of doctoral-level study groups, research student cohorts and informal artist-researcher networking situations. It is worth noting that the construct is, in part, to be understood as a counterfoil to the behaviourist and instrumentalist view of learning, which threatened to confine learning to individualised processes of knowledge acquisition and mastery, relatively divorced from social and situational dynamics and considerations.

It is worth noting that one of the recognised effects of networks and communities of practice is their orchestration of norms among professional groups; their capacity to impose informally policed standards is widely acknowledged. Within those art practices that attach value to the broadly transgressive ambitions of radical culture (whether in terms of aesthetic autonomy, avant-gardism, cultural democracy, social reform or revolutionary praxis), this normative dimension of networks and communities of practice is treated with a caution verging on suspicion. Nonetheless, it is notable that there has been a wide range of initiatives to create, facilitate and/or seed networks and communities of practice. This chapter provides some examples of these, by way of indicating the array of possibilities open to arts educators in developing doctoral-level artistic research. The chapter is divided into three sections:

8. A. Longer-term networks

8. B. Project-specific networks

Each section will discuss a number of examples, which will be described in terms of their stated remit, membership model, *modus operandi* and contribution to doctoral-level studies.

8. A. Longer-term Networks

Introduction

The networks that are described in this section have been established with a long-term perspective, rather than being time-limited in the conception of their mission. The development of these networks, and sub-network initiatives with a key research focus, is very important as it signals the degree to which third-cycle work is connected to the overall orientation of these educational domains and fields of practice. In looking at these networks, the primary concern is to establish their (potential or actual) contribution to the development of the doctoral level of studies.

SHARE is constituted out of extant networks, such as the European Artistic Research Network (EARN), established in 2004, and the European Forum for Research Degrees in Arts and Design (EUFRAD), established in 2009. SHARE works in close dialogue with emerging networks, such as the Society for Artistic Research (SAR), which was established in 2010 and is responsible for the Journal for Artistic Research (JAR). Another important development in the networking of artistic researchers is the emergence of a strong focus upon research within the programme activities of long-established artistic education networks such as the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA), established in 1990, and the European Association of Conservatoires (AEC), established in 1953. ELIA initiated a substantial engagement with the question of artistic research within its biennial conference programme in 2002, with a dedicated strand on 'Monstrous Thinking: On Practice-Based Research', which was followed by the EU Socrates re:search – in and through the arts, project (2003–2005), which culminated with a major international conference in Berlin. Through its 'Polifonia' series of EU-funded projects since 2004, AEC has developed a strand of activity on artistic research in music and doctoral education for musicians. Looking at various subjects related to professional music training in Europe, Polifonia is the largest project on higher music education to date, and it has included a strong emphasis on the development of artistic research within the music domain in each iteration of its working cycle. Although, strictly speaking, Polifonia is a project-based network – or series of

project-based and time-limited networks (2004–2007, 2007–2010, 2011–2014) – it is included here under the heading of longer-term networks because of its longevity and cumulative contribution. The European Association for Architectural Education, established in 1975, created its own Research Committee in 2009, and this group working on research questions now comprises 53 members from 20 different countries.

While it is notable that the key enabler for initiatives by the AEC and ELIA (and for SHARE) has been the EU programmes, Erasmus and Socrates, it is also important to note that networks such as EARN and EUFRAD have largely operated on a self-organised basis, opportunistically accessing funds from educational and cultural sources and from both national and international funds, as well as utilising core institutional funding to facilitate their work. The interaction of these initiatives demonstrates an emerging network ecology for research. It might be helpful to identify some issues of sustainability in terms of the longer-term development trajectory of doctoral-level work in higher arts education.

8. A.1. **European Artistic Research Network (EARN)**

EARN Remit

The European Artistic Research Network was established to: share and exchange knowledge and experience in artistic research; foster mobility, exchange and dialogue among arts researchers; promote wider dissemination of artistic research; and enable global connectivity and exchange for artistic research. Within its programme of activities, there is a predominant focus on the visual arts. A key priority for the network on research that is primarily premised upon art making and upon the terms of contemporary art practice, as opposed to the terms of academic protocol as such.

EARN Membership

The membership model of EARN is loosely institutional, comprised of academies and universities from within Western Europe. Ten members are formally listed as: Kuvataideakatemia [Finnish Fine Arts Academy], Helsinki; Graduate School of Visual Art and Design, MaHKU, Utrecht; Akademie der Bildenden Künste [Academy of Fine Arts Vienna], Vienna; Malmö Art Academy; Lund University; Slade School of Art, UCL, London; Università Iuav di Venezia, Venice; Valland Academy, Gothenburg University, Gothenburg; LUCA School of Arts, Brussels; Centre for Practice-Led Research in the Arts, University of Leeds, Leeds; Graduate School of Creative Arts

8. A. Longer-term Networks

and Media (GradCAM), Dublin. However, re-organisation processes within various national contexts mean that the membership is currently shifting. For example, in the beginning of 2013, Kuvataideakatemia merged with the Sibelius Academy and Theatre Academy Helsinki to form a university of the free arts called Taideyliopisto [University of the Arts Helsinki]. The appropriate name is now the 'Academy of Fine Arts, University of the Arts Helsinki'. In practice, membership of EARN appears to be primarily based on the ongoing collaboration of individuals, rather than institutions per se. Thus, Prof. Jan Kaila, Prof. Henk Slager, Prof. Gertrud Sandqvist, Prof. Jan Cools, Prof. Angela Vettese, Prof. Mika Hannula and others are the key nodes of the network, working in concert to realise different projects, often organised on a sub-group basis, bringing together three or four academies at a time to realise a given project. It is also notable that, as the network has evolved and new players have become prominent, it seems likely that the list of active participants and the diversity of concerns will increase in the next two years, while the number of membership institutions may not increase.

EARN Modus Operandi

The network operates through a variety of means, including regular international working-group meetings, workshops, seminars, symposia, conferences, winter/summer school programmes, exhibitions and publications. The network's website carries a detailed archive of these activities, and it is notable that there is a strong emphasis on partnership between academic and art world institutions. EARN has realised projects in partnership with (or in the context of) major art world platforms such as Manifesta, DOCUMENTA⁽¹³⁾ and the Venice Biennale. But it has also worked at a local level, with smaller art world venues such as galleries in Europe and the US. Interestingly, the network has accessed EU funds, but typically by means of the cultural strand and by working in smaller groups. The *modus operandi* of the network is best characterised as informal, without any system of membership fees or formal organisational protocols.

EARN Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

EARN does not have an exclusive focus on doctoral-level studies, and it has organised events which address the masters level of study, as well as broader questions around artistic research beyond the academy. However, it is notable that many of the events organised between 2006 and 2012 prioritised the question of the doctorate and brought doctoral researchers together to present their work-in-progress to international peers. Other events organised by the network

provide opportunities for immersion in temporary communities of doctoral researchers, such as the *Manifesta* winter school of 2010. Reflecting the network's emphasis upon the priorities of art practice and the contemporary art system beyond the academy, there has been a significant amount of exhibition making as part of the EARN programme of activities, including projects such as *As The Academy Turns*, *Manifesta 8*, Murcia (December 2010), *The Academy Strikes Back*, Brussels (June 2010), *Tables of Thought*, Helsinki (April 2010), *Critique of Archival Reason*, Dublin (March 2010), *Nameless Science*, New York (December 2008–January 2009), *A Certain MA-ness*, Amsterdam (March 2008). A key contribution of EARN has been that of advancing the question of artistic research and doctoral-level work by artists in the international arena, especially within the circuits of the mainstream contemporary art system, ensuring that the question of artistic research always bridges the academy and art world.

8. A. 2. **European Forum for Research Degrees in Arts and Design (EUFRAD)**

EUFRAD Remit

EUFRAD explicitly identifies its mission with reference to creating a larger international context for doctoral-level students in the arts. It also identifies a specific networking goal with respect to doctoral-level teachers, seeking to create opportunities for tutors of doctoral-level students to exchange experience and build competence in an international context. While the name of the network identifies arts and design as its operative domain, a prominent role is played by the performing arts, notably dance, with the second EUFRAD conference being hosted in Stockholm by the University of Dance and Circus (DOCH) and Konstnärliga Forskarskolan [National Research School in the Arts, Sweden] together with the other higher seats of learning in the arts in Stockholm. A key priority for the network is that of bringing doctoral level researchers and their supervisors together in exchanges that emphasise the individual project level as opposed to institutional research strategies or other activities. Within this prioritisation of the individual artist-researcher and her project/practice, however, there is an interest in interrogating national and supra-national definitions and policy prescriptions with respect to research.

EUFRAD Membership

The membership model of EUFRAD is loosely institutional but, as with EARN, its activities are premised on the agency of individual participants, who always lead the organisation of meetings and

events in conjunction with ELIA. The initiative was begun when Prof. Klaus Jung (then based at Glasgow School of Art) extended an invitation for supervisors and researchers to come together for a peer-networking event. The second and third iteration of the EUFRAD conference were organised under the auspices of SHARE. There is no formal system of fees or protocols, but an informal set of working relationships between key personnel. While EARN operates an informal but closed membership system, EUFRAD operates an informal but open system. It seems likely that EUFRAD will develop further as a broad networking platform for doctoral-level researchers and take on a more formal membership model by working in closer collaboration with ELIA, consolidating its remit as a multidisciplinary network with a particular focus on doctoral level education in the arts.

EUFRAD Modus Operandi

The primary network activity is to bring together artist-researchers working at doctoral level, whether as students or supervisors, in ways that provide opportunities to address the working realities of undertaking doctoral research in the arts. Network conferences (Glasgow, 2009; Stockholm, 2011; Vienna, 2013) have adopted flexible formats, and changed from one session to the next. The first edition paired researchers and their supervisors. The second iteration mainly focused on the (international) networking of researchers, with an emphasis on performing arts, and included a separate strand in which supervisors could meet. The most recent conference brought doctoral supervisors together, and focused on issues such as quality assurance and the validation of doctoral research. With this open format, it seems likely that EUFRAD will adopt a working model similar to the ELIA-enabled fine art network, Paradox, but with an interdisciplinary focus on the third cycle. This means that it would maintain an informal working culture based on professional collegial relations and participant-directed funding for events rather than a membership fee system (with underlying membership being provided by ELIA, eradicating the need to duplicate this layer of administration). This is a form that would seem to marry well with the remit of EUFRAD and its focus on the individual researcher or research supervisor and their capacity to act in a conceptual space that is not unduly cluttered by bureaucratic protocols and procedures.

EUFRAD Contribution to doctoral level studies

EUFRAD primarily focuses on doctoral-level studies, and, as such, it provides an important developmental infrastructure for the third cycle. It is to be anticipated that, in taking advantage of the administrative

resource and longer-term planning capacity of ELIA, EUFRAD could become the key forum for the networking of individual doctoral researchers and their supervisors within Europe.

8. A. 3. **Society for Artistic Research (SAR)**

SAR Remit

SAR is an independent, non-profit organisation, created in 2010 with the purpose of publishing the *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)*. It is a formal body with a well-defined constitution, membership terms and an operational model. In its articles of association, it clearly defines its mission as ‘offering artistic researchers the opportunity to disseminate their research in a variety of ways including a combination of a journal publication with research documentation and exposition in a research catalogue’.⁴ It is multidisciplinary, operating a broad remit for all the arts and seeking to provide the key dissemination platform for artistic research as well as an experimental framework within which to develop strategies for artistic research communication. It has a very ambitious and innovative approach to digital networking technology, epitomised by the open-formats approach to the research catalogue function that it offers to users. SAR also has a special role in developing a peer-review culture, providing the organisational home for the first peer-reviewed publishing forum for artistic researchers.

SAR Membership

SAR is comprised of both individual and institutional members from around the world, who support the society through payment of a membership fee, sponsorship and the gifting of their time and expertise. Its organisational model – combining individual and institutional membership with a sliding scale of membership fees – and its formal protocols and procedural framework (allied to an open-systems approach to questions of format and information sharing) make it a strong dialogue-partner for the larger formal apparatuses of the academic research system. (Note: Voting rights are the same for institutional and individual members.) With more than 40 leading players in the development of artistic research serving as founding members and approximately 50 institutional memberships – including academies representing all disciplines, non-academic cultural providers, such as the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, and institutions in Australia and the US as well as most of Europe – SAR will be a very important network in the future development of the artistic research field. The Executive Board for

4. JAR, terms of use, <http://www.researchcatalogue.net/portal/terms>

8. A. Longer-term Networks

2013–15 is comprised of: Gerhard Eckel, President (Graz, Austria); Johan A. Haarberg, Vice-President (Bergen, Norway); Rolf Hughes, Vice-President (Stockholm, Sweden); Alexander Damianisch (Vienna, Austria); Julie Harboe (Lucerne, Switzerland); Efva Lilja (Stockholm, Sweden); and Giaco Schiesser (Zurich, Switzerland). While the geographical distribution partly echoes that of EUFRAD and EARN with regard to the prominence of Western and Northern European players, it should be noted that this pattern may be based on national and institutional levels of investment in artistic research (e.g., Norway, Sweden, Austria and Switzerland).

SAR Modus Operandi

The primary networking activity of SAR is to provide the organisational and resource basis for the *Journal for Artistic Research*. Legally registered in Switzerland, SAR operates according to a standard set of protocols for a charitable society, and it manages its affairs through its Executive Board, which also has the function of appointing the Editor-in-Chief of the journal for a five-year term. Consistent with the differentiation of SAR from EARN and EUFRAD, on account of its formality, it is a key operational difference that SAR is a direct employer and has responsibility for such roles as Editor-in-Chief.

SAR Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

SAR was not formed to specifically address doctoral-level studies; however, it clearly provides a key forum for the dissemination of doctoral research and the education of doctoral researchers. It is to be anticipated that, with the accumulation of journal issues over the next few years and the aggregation of material in the research catalogue in as-yet-unforeseen ways, a radical change in the context of doctoral education for the arts will be forthcoming. An experimental space for peer review will be available, together with a body of reference works, which will be added to as new peer-review contributions respond to earlier contributions and a trajectory of research progression and dialogue begins to come into view.

8. A. 4. AEC – Polifonia

Polifonia Remit

Polifonia began as a three-year study of professional music training in Europe in 2004. A second iteration of the project took place from 2007 to 2010 and, in 2011, a third three-year project cycle for the period 2011–2014 was approved by the European Commission. In every iteration of the project, a strand of activity has looked at the question of artistic research. In the first iteration, there was a working group

for third-cycle studies in music; in the second iteration, one third of the project was made up of a special ‘research’ strand, which aimed to study the role of research in conservatoires; and, in the current iteration of the project, there is a strand on ‘curriculum reform: artistic research in higher music education’.⁵ Among the current objectives of the Polifonia network are: (I) the establishment of a European Platform for Artistic Research in Music; (II) a study of the content of second-cycle Higher Music Education programmes as routes to artistic doctorates; and (III) the creation of a European register of peer reviewers for artistic research in music.

Polifonia Membership

In its current iteration, Polifonia has a membership comprised of 55 organisations in professional music training and the music profession, drawn from 26 European countries and four countries outside of Europe. In its previous iteration, it had a membership of more than 60 organisations drawn from 30 different European countries. Each iteration of the network has been led by a different institution: Royal Conservatoire The Hague (2011–2014); Royal College of Music in Stockholm (2007–2011); and Malmö Academy of Music, Lund University (2004–2007). Again, we see a similar pattern of Northern and Western European leadership, and again we can refer to the relative distribution of resources, history of investment in research, and so forth. (However, we must assume that Northern and Western European hegemony in longer-term networks is not without its issues, which will be discussed further below.) The membership model is institutional, based on the standard operational practices of EU-funded networks which stipulates that members make a contribution – often by investing staff time – to complement the EU resources being used to cover travel and accommodation for networking meetings and the production costs of online and print outputs.

Polifonia Modus Operandi

The basic working models are those of expert meetings, bringing representatives from partner institutions together in various forms (working group meeting are typically closed and aimed at addressing specific, well-defined problems among a limited, task-specific membership), workshops (targeted skills- and knowledge-sharing events, typically orientated towards the needs of network members, as identified in working group meetings), symposia, conferences (the latter servicing a wider community beyond the network itself

8. A. Longer-term Networks

and acting as a key dissemination platform) and publications. (Polifonia has been very effective at generating multilingual publications that address key issues within music education, including an especially useful 2007 handbook, *Guide to third cycle studies in higher music education*.⁶)

Polifonia Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

Polifonia has been a driver of the debate on doctoral-level education for music. This contribution is primarily ‘indirect’, by which it is meant that Polifonia’s contribution has been to build the sectoral context for doctoral-level studies by providing guidelines, discussion forums and broader frames of reference for national policymakers, institutions, educators and researchers. Indicative of this kind of contribution were the recommendations from the 2007 handbook, which included the recognition that:

Because the Third Cycle involves the ability to generate new knowledge and skills, its outcomes can feed back into the programmes for the First and Second Cycles as well as into the teaching staff:

- by having students present their artistic and reflective work to students and staff
- by examining together with members of staff the received wisdom and conventional methods in musical practice
- by having staff teach first and second cycle courses in which new research results are communicated and discussed
- by having first and second cycle students participate in research projects

This creates a sense of vitality and a model for good practice, and encourages course designers to keep their curricula up-to-date and foster innovation as a part of good practice.⁷

Conclusion

These long-term networks will have a decisive effect in shaping the future landscape of artistic research education. In the introduction to this chapter, it was indicated that there exists both a recognition of the importance of networks – indeed, their status as key requisites in underpinning a viable research culture – and a caution in relation to their normative function. On the latter point, it has been noted that networks can act as effective lightweight apparatuses of governance, allowing (central) governmental and other powers (economic, supranational agencies) to condition social and professional

6. <http://aecsite.cramgo.nl/DownloadView.aspx?ses=16464>

7. Polifonia Third Cycle Working Group, *Guide To Third Cycle Studies In Higher Music Education*, AEC Publications 2007.

sub-systems in such a way as to reduce dissidence, thereby augmenting compliance with norms that are made to seem immanent to a particular field but which are, in fact, conditioned by (for example) strings-attached and rhetorically-normative competitive funding and public subsidy systems. This question is especially important in the context of a specifically European project. There has been a great deal of discussion about the role of networks, particularly certain kinds of policy networks, within European governance. In relation to the development of research and the setting of research agendas, these long-term networks will clearly have a decisive role. Indeed, it may be the case that the contest to stabilise the predominant terms of the artistic research debate that is currently playing out between these different networks – set for some in terms of epistemological and ontological questions and issues of artistic autonomy; set for others in terms of the pragmatics of organisational behaviour, peer-review, quality assessment, and legibility and equivalency to other domains; and set for yet others in terms of legitimation within the wider art world – is itself already indicative of how the existent networks can establish within themselves certain norms by stealth. On the other hand, the existence of this plurality of networks and their divergence from each other may be an important condition for a diverse research enterprise. This makes it all the more important to attend to Northern and Western Europe hegemony within all these networks.

8. B. Project-Specific Networks

Introduction

The radical potential of networks is often identified with project-based and time-limited incarnations, which avoid becoming long-term fixed structures, instead providing temporary platforms in which particular tasks can be aggregated and implemented. In this section, consideration will be given to some shorter-term network projects that have made a contribution to the development of the third cycle in the arts. There are many examples that could be given, and the selection made here is relatively arbitrary, based as it is on an attempt to present a variety of types of network project (in terms of scale, character, levels of resourcing, and so forth), by drawing on information that is readily available to some of SHARE's most active members. We use the term network broadly, to cover a range of formations from small, closed clusters to relatively distributed and open systems.

The examples we have chosen to use here are: TAHTO, a Finnish network bringing together elite artist-researchers in an interdisciplinary doctoral cohort including fine art, scenography, theatre and music

8. B. Project-Specific Networks

performance (2012–2015); ADAPT-r architecture, design and art practice training research, a Belgian-led EU FP7⁸ Marie Curie funded Initial Training Network (ITN) programme (2013–2016); PARIP, a UK-based and Arts and Humanities Research Board-funded network on Practice as Research in Performance (2000–2006); CICA, a three-year EU project on Artistic Research as the new Paradigm for the Arts (2010–2012); and Artist as Citizen, a one-year EU project on the role of artistic research in activating civil society and broader societal debate (2009–2010). It is noteworthy that three of these projects were funded under research-targeted funding (one EU, and two national) while two were funded under the EU cultural policy stream.

8. B.1. **TAHTO****TAHTO Remit**

The Doctoral Programme in Artistic Research is the first joint (four-year) doctoral programme (2012–2015) of Finnish art universities that focuses solely on artistic research and explores artistic practices, thinking and observations. The purpose of the doctoral programme is to develop and enrich the common research culture of Finnish art universities, strengthening the status of artistic research in Finland, amplifying its social significance and creating international networks. During the programme period, at least five students are expected to graduate with the degree of Doctor of Arts (Art and Design).

The programme focuses on (I) the methodology and practices of artistic research; (II) art, aesthetics and society; and (III) a new notion of artistic agency. The outcomes will include not only new degrees and researchers but also methodologies, practices, academic pedagogies and assessment criteria for artistic research as well as expertise in the interaction between art and society.

TAHTO Membership

The Doctoral Programme in Artistic Research is a joint project between the three faculties of the University of the Arts Helsinki – Theatre Academy Helsinki, the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, the Sibelius Academy – and the Aalto University School of Art and Design.

TAHTO Modus Operandi

The international activities of the Doctoral Programme in Artistic Research focus on the Nordic countries, in particular two Nordic doctoral programmes: the National Research School in the Arts,

8. European 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, <http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/>

Sweden and the Norwegian Artistic Research Programme in Norway. The programme encourages cooperation between Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian students by arranging joint seminars in each country. The idea is for the host to be responsible for the programme, and the guests for their own travel costs. The doctoral programme also promotes the broader international cooperation of its students.

The doctoral programme runs on a term schedule (two per year, eight in total). Each term, one of the partner universities hosts the programme. The first term's host is Theatre Academy Helsinki, followed by the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, the Sibelius Academy and the Aalto University. During the four-year period, each partner university will have hosted the programme twice.

Together with members of the steering committee and the coordinator, students are responsible for the implementation of teaching and research. The programme for each term is structurally similar and consists of three stages: (I) Research seminar. Students present their research projects and receive feedback. The study plans that students draft for the doctoral programme must follow the seminar timetable. The research seminar is organised over two or three days in January and August. Each student is expected to present his or her progress during the seminar. (II) Theme seminar. Students work together on a jointly agreed issue or phenomenon related to the programme objectives. Each student addresses the topic from the perspective of his or her own research and goals. The open seminar (see below) is prepared. The theme seminar is organised in March and October and lasts approximately 1.5 days. (III) Open seminar. The open seminar is a shared research opportunity for all the affiliated art universities. The topic is the same as that of the theme seminar. The open seminar is organised over approximately two days in May and November/December. It is followed by a meeting of the students of each doctoral programme, providing them with an opportunity to reflect on what they have learnt at the open seminar. Open seminars may be arranged together with Swedish and Norwegian doctoral programmes.

Each of the three stages may involve teaching, visits, workshops, demonstrations and personal meetings with the supervisor, as agreed. If necessary, students can also supplement their studies by participating in postgraduate education at partner universities.

8. B. Project-Specific Networks

TAHTO Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

The primary function of TAHTO is to provide a doctoral education that allows for interaction between the leading doctoral candidates in each field in Finland. It is a key experiment in building doctoral education, drawing upon the two decades of work by the member institutions in giving leadership in Europe to doctoral education by artists for artists. Within Finland, this project will be one of the key reference points for other experiments in doctoral education across disciplines, and it may be taken as a next generation of doctoral education informed by the early accumulation of experience in educating doctoral candidates in the arts.

8. B. 2. **ADAPT-r****ADAPT-r Remit**

ADAPT-r is a 4 million Euro, Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) Marie Curie Initial Training Network (ITN) offering a new approach to PhD training for creative practitioners. The programme received four years of funding (January 2013–December 2016).

The ADAPT-r ITN aims to significantly increase European (artistic) research capacity. At its core is the development of a robust and sustainable training network in the emerging supradisciplinary field of research across a range of design and arts disciplines. ADAPT-r trains new researchers and increases supervisory capacity. It also forms research partnerships with private-sector Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), providing substantial opportunity for real-world training and testing of the research, introducing creative practice research methodologies to a new generation.

The research that is produced through the ADAPT-r ITN strives to contribute to a wider effort to increase knowledge, understanding and the quality of research in creative disciplines. Marie Curie ITN funding will enable existing bilateral research training relationships to be expanded to include multiple partners from across Europe, creating a greatly enhanced international research training network with a long-term future.

ADAPT-r Membership

Sint-Lucas School of Architecture (Belgium), University of Ljubljana (Slovenia), Glasgow School of Art (UK), The University of Westminster (UK), Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (Australia), Estonian Academy of Arts (Estonia), Aarhus School of Architecture (Denmark).

ADAPT-r Modus Operandi

Over the course of four years, implementation of the ADAPT-r ITN will result in 40 Fellowships, eight training conferences, a major research conference, a major exhibition, three key books and a website that provides public access to research and events.

Fellowships are allocated through open calls in which the partnership looks for adventurous practices in art, design or architecture. These practices are the key territory for the fieldwork of the fellows. The young researchers build their research on the experience from activities within the selected practices. See also figure 1.




Figure 1. Overall ADAPT-r fellowship structure: fellows present their research every six months at a Practice Research Symposium and extend their academic contract with a period of art/design practice.

ADAPT-r Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

ADAPT-r is indicative of a key future direction of doctoral education in the arts, which is the embedding of individual doctoral research projects into integrated research platforms with well-defined shared research problems. This model is long established in the sciences but has only recently been deployed within the arts. It is also extremely important that this project leads the way in mapping the role of artistic research within the highly competitive European research funding landscape. It is a landmark in the development of artistic research and should be a key reference for everyone building new initiatives in this field.

8. B. 3. Practice as Research in Performance (PARIP)

PARIP Remit

PARIP was a five-year project (2001–2006) directed by Prof. Baz Kershaw in the Department of Drama: Theatre, Film, Television at the University of Bristol. It was funded by the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB).

8. B. Project-Specific Networks

PARIP's objectives were to investigate creative-academic issues raised by practice as research. Consistent with AHRB and Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) documentation, performance was defined as: theatre, dance, film, video and television. As a result of PARIP's investigations – and in collaboration with colleagues, educational institutions and professional bodies throughout the UK and Europe – PARIP aimed to develop national frameworks for the encouragement of the highest standards in representing practical-creative research within academic contexts.

PARIP Membership

An advisory group was set up, with representatives from: Bristol University; Middlesex University; Royal Holloway, University of London; Manchester Metropolitan University; Digital Performance Archive, Nottingham Trent University; Exeter University.

PARIP Modus Operandi

PARIP set out to build:

- A survey, taxonomy and database of practice as research in all UK HEIs;
- A website and/or electronic journal to broadcast the database and case studies and promote debate;
- Working papers on the key issues in performance arts and media relevant to PARIP, in an attempt to initiate debate about the various critical frameworks that might best inform practice and analysis;
- A seminar series with leading practitioner-researchers in the field;
- Regionally based inter-institutional working groups to develop theoretical frameworks in relation to selected practices in their areas;
- A continuous online symposium, geared towards mapping out the relationships between theories and criteria, to form the first comprehensive account of the interaction between scholarship and creative achievement in PAR and PBR in UK Higher Education.
- Collaboration with a series of creative projects in key areas of concern to PARIP, providing a practical platform for investigations into advanced uses of new digital technologies for the documentation and dissemination of processes and outcomes;
- Innovative applications of video-based recording for simultaneous multi-viewpoint documentation. The aim was to create digital documentation frameworks for PARIP that would be transferable across institutions;
- Case studies of selected representative practices from a range of HEIs, aimed at investigating the most effective approaches to documentation/ dissemination.

PARIP Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

PARIP was extremely important in demonstrating the effectiveness of networking in building a field, in this case performance research, and it provided a vital platform for communicating the diversity and extent of doctoral research in and through performance. Through the PARIP website, a broad profile of the variety of doctoral projects in this domain was made possible.⁹ The legacy of this early initiative continues to be significant in providing a model for developmental work within artistic research that utilises an inter-institutional process to build critical mass and visibility.

8. B. 4. CICA

CICA Remit

Changing Identities and Contexts in the Arts: Artistic Research as the New European Paradigm for the Arts (CICA) was a two-year network (2011–2012) funded by the EU Culture Programme. CICA aimed to open up an intellectual dialogue around the changes taking place in the artist's identity and the societal potential of creativity. The network set out to:

- Map, reflect, analyse and demonstrate the diversity of artists' identities and to articulate this trajectory to arts communities, institutions and general publics in Europe;
- Benchmark best practices and further develop artistic research throughout the continent;
- Inform the general public about new artists' identities and artistic research as a new sector of artistic innovation and area of creativity, and to stimulate creativity and public engagement;
- Establish a lively intercultural dialogue around artists' identities and artistic research in European forums for art and culture, and to create a critical platform for the role of artistic research, art and knowledge production in relation to the current cultural, economical and political climate in Europe;
- Benchmark and further develop interdisciplinary activities in Europe and stimulate a cross-cultural exchange of institutional approaches in relation to mediating artistic research processes.

CICA Membership

CICA was a joint initiative by three pioneering artistic research clusters and four central museums (and art centres) in Finland, Sweden and the UK: Finnish Academy of Fine Arts (Helsinki), KEHYS: Finnish National Gallery, University of Gothenburg, Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts, Göteborgs Konsthall, Centre for Practice-Led

9. See: http://www.bris.ac.uk/parip/PhD_list.htm

8. B. Project-Specific Networks

Research in the Arts (CePRA), Leeds University; Project Space Leeds (PSL) and Henry Moore Institute.

CICA Modus Operandi

CICA organised workshops in Helsinki (2010) and Leeds (2011). The closing seminar, Staging Knowledge, was organised in Istanbul in June 2012

CICA Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

CICA provided an important space for the dissemination for doctoral projects, through public conferences and seminars in Leeds, Helsinki and Istanbul which brought researchers together from many different countries and platforms. Importantly, CICA sought to make an argument for the transformative potential of artistic research, providing a new paradigm for artistic practice outside the academy. The book generated by the project contains some of the most interesting individual research reports yet produced by artist-researchers and demonstrates both the breadth and depth of individual artistic research projects at doctoral level. It also gives a strong sense of the wider milieu of debate within which much Northern European doctoral practice has been elaborated.

8. B. 5. Artist as Citizen

Artist as Citizen Remit

The Artist as Citizen: European Publics and the European City took place between 2009 and 2010, during which EARN affiliates worked as part of a policy grouping, to consider the links between art, research and the public sphere.

Artist as Citizen Membership

The Artist-as-Citizen policy grouping comprised members of EARN, including Academy of Fine Arts, University of the Arts Helsinki; MaHKU, Utrecht; GradCAM, Dublin; and LUCA School of Arts, Brussels. It was responsible for hosting events in Gothenburg, Malmö, Vienna, Venice, London and Leeds, with contributions to the programme from exhibitors, speakers, expert advisors and artist-researchers. Other contributions were also provided by Centrifugal artists' network.

Artist as Citizen Modus Operandi

The policy grouping addressed the ways in which the growth of artistic research across Europe could be enriched, and achieve enhanced public relevance, through promoting greater interaction and exchange across both formal and informal networks of cultural producers/providers and institutions of higher education across Europe. Participants

included artists, researchers, educators, curators, research leaders, cultural providers, policymakers, art academies and higher education institutions and informal artists' networks from Europe and beyond.

During the 12-month period, the policy grouping undertook a series of international conferences, workshops (11 days of public dialogues in total) and experimental exhibition platforms and touring exhibitions in Dublin, Helsinki, Brussels and Zagreb (more than three months of public exhibitions). The exhibition platforms entailed the significant mobility of artists and artworks (40 artists and 33 different artworks and performances travelled internationally through these exhibitions, while more than 100 educators, researchers and policy specialists travelled internationally in the context of the associated workshops and conferences).

Artist as Citizen Contribution to Doctoral-Level Studies

In a manner similar to the CICA network described above, the Artist as Citizen network provided a series of international platforms for the profiling of individual projects as well as for a series of propositions on the function of doctoral education in the arts. One key proposition elaborated in this network was the potential contribution of artistic research education to the question of public culture in a historical moment, which was characterised, for some commentators, by the erosion of public space and the apparent final demise of the public sphere. Importantly, this network sought to bridge between artistic research education and wider questions of cultural policy in Europe. In this way, the project sought to make the connection between individual research projects and the wider dynamics of the cultural field.

Conclusion

It would seem clear, from the material in this chapter, that networking at different scales is key to generating a vibrant artistic research culture and educational infrastructure across Europe. It would also seem that there is a challenge for networking initiatives to balance the need to be inclusive (to move beyond the usual regional alliances) with the need to avoid the stealthy imposition of norms through the action of networks, since networks can often privilege the wealthier institutional players able to devote resources to exploiting the opportunities that networks provide. There is another challenge emerging here, which is the need for these networks to bridge into other fields. We need networks that connect us not only within the arts but also from the arts into other domains and with other societal actors and agencies, especially civil society. It is notable that, while networks like Artist as Citizen

8. B. Project-Specific Networks

invoke a rhetoric of civil society, they are still focused primarily on networking within the arts domain. In some degree, the push to engage in wider alliances and exchanges with civil society, the humanities, the sciences and the agricultural and industrial sectors on the part of artistic research platforms, without forfeiting the ability to set the dialogue agenda, will be a key challenge for the future.

9

Think about the Future

This chapter proposes some scenarios in relation to the future development of artistic research and doctoral-level study. These reflections are offered as a provocation for debate and a stimulus intended to generate new enquiries and collaborations within the domain. The chapter is based, in part, on a workshop hosted by Università Iuav di Venezia (IUAV) in Venice in June 2013.¹ The workshop worked with a series of questions that had been presented to leading educators and practitioners in the field, inviting them to consider how they envisaged the future of the field, such as:

- What do you want to see happen next?
- What will keep you interested in working in the doctoral level of the arts?
- If you could set an agenda for research in the arts, what would you ask your colleagues to debate and to experiment with?
- If you were advising on the development of a new programme at doctoral level for the education of artists, what would you propose?
- What future networking do you believe is required for doctoral education?
- What is the research content that you believe will be most important or significant for doctoral level researchers? Will it be research into art making itself, reflections on how artists do their art making, on their processes?
- Will the doctoral level work in the arts be based on ‘big’ research themes (e.g. ‘societal challenges’ environmental and climate change, new technologies, globalisation, global north-south differences, cultural politics and identity, the public sphere)?

1. Workpackage 1, Meeting Venice 14–15 June 2013; attending: Mick Wilson (chair, GradCAM/DIT); Andrea Braidt (Academy of Fine Arts Vienna); Jan Cools (LUCA School of Arts); Hans Hedberg (University of Gothenburg); Jan Kaila (Finnish Academy of Fine Arts); Leandro Madrazo (Universitat Ramon Llull); Ruth Mateus-Berr University of Applied Arts Vienna; João Paulo Queiroz (Faculdade de Belas Artes da Universidade de Lisboa); Schelte van Ruiten (ELIA); Ólóf Gerður Sigfúsdóttir (Iceland Academy of the Arts); Henk Slager (HKU University of the Arts Utrecht); Angela Vettese (Università Iuav di Venezia).

- Arguably, the dominant form of doctoral-level work in the arts has been the solo project by an individual 'auteur' artist. The submission of a project for third-cycle purposes has generally been in the form of a single person's contribution, usually very discrete and not connected to the work of other doctoral students or colleagues. Is this currently a true description of the field?
- Will this continue to be the norm for doctoral level work?
- What alternatives are there?

Discussion of what the future might hold was not only framed by these organisational, formal and thematic questions but also by the wider context of cultural critique that had been generated by many of the participants in previous conferences, publications and artistic and curatorial projects. The workshop was timed to coincide with the launch of two books: *Art as a Thinking Process: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production*, edited by Mara Ambrožič and Angela Vettese, and *Offside Effect (1st Tbilisi Triennial)*, edited by Henk Slager. These publications emerged from the research development work of participants in the workshop, and both offered multiple perspectives on the future. For example, in his contribution to *Art as a Thinking Process*, Prof. Jan Kaila declared that:

For the purposes of the future development of artistic research, doctoral programmes established within art universities as part of their regular operations are a more interesting option than national and international cross-disciplinary and artistic research schools: a carefully drawn-up curriculum for doctoral research in an art university, with all the seminars, symposia, and other activities for researching artists that that entails, is [...] a new and radical player in the world of art.²

Writing in the same volume, Franco Berardi sounded a more declamatory note but also asserted the potential agency of art, declaring that:

The core project of Europe nowadays is destroying collective intelligence, or if you want to say it in a more prosaic way, destroying the school, destroying the university, subjugating research to [...] the narrow interest of profits and economic competition. [...] 'Not having a future' is already a kind of refrain [...] Now cynicism has invaded the sphere of thought, not less than the sphere of politics. [...] A light of possible intelligence and openness seems to come not from philosophy but from art.

2. M. Ambrožič and A. Vettese (eds.), *Art as a Thinking Process: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production*, June 2013, Sternberg Press, p. 119

The artist, Marion von Osten, writing in Henk Slager's volume on the Tbilisi Triennial, reflected on the impact of artistic research debates on questions of manual skill:

In times of cognitive capitalism, manual skills are not only highly undervalued but also poorly paid all over the globe. To me, the emphasis on production aesthetics in visual arts over the last decades has not changed anything with regard to the devaluation of manual skills. From the perspective of a research-based art practice, this devaluation is even more manifest and, thus, the devaluation of manual labour is partially an offside effect of the very debate on artistic research.³

At the same time, Slager himself argued that:

In the discussion of research as a paragon of the capacity to generate a free, artistic space for thought, the [...] homogenizing dangers of neo-liberal instrumentalisation still necessitate [...] (that we) [...] engage in the dialogue on the specificity of art education with those academies and platforms that are outside the Bologna Process and its sphere of influence. After all, in such a confrontation, the awareness of one's own institutional identity is not only accentuated, but also expanded in a continuous process of rethinking and reassessment.

These contributions – from different political, philosophical, artistic and institutional perspectives, in response to the question of how to think about the future – share a common preoccupation with what Slager terms 'higher emancipatory values', such as the 'critical process of self-enlightenment or experimental, speculative thinking and associating'. This renewal of the connection between education and emancipatory ideals is perhaps one of the most striking things about the debate on artistic research. It is interesting to note that critical and emancipatory pedagogies appear as themes within artistic research praxis at precisely the moment at which these values appear to be the most attenuated and vulnerable in the discourses of the humanities and sciences. Both critique and emancipation depend upon the possibility of things being otherwise. They depend upon the possibility that what happens next, in our discourses and in our practices, is not already exhaustively pre-determined by existing conditions. To put it in simpler terms, critical and emancipatory practices require us to believe that different futures are possible. Thus, even as we speculate about what the future may hold, we must make the gamble that the future is not already foreclosed within the current horizon of activity.

3. H. Slager (ed.), *Offside Effect, Academy as Exhibition, 1st Tbilisi Triennial*, June 2013, Metropolis M Books, p.5

There is a particular future-orientated character to all ambitious research, which has the form of an anticipation: an anticipation that that which is not known may yet become known; that the as yet un-thought may become thought; and that new modes and styles of sense, perception, expression and subject construction might yet emerge and re-shape our worlds. Whether at the level of the first tentative framing of a research proposal or at the level of planning institutional and sectoral research agendas, activities rooted in enquiry necessarily require that we act in the present through an orientation towards near and not-so-near futures. Of course, the temporalities of research have many more folds, nuances and displacements than this simple orientation to a future. However, a speculative future horizon characterises research activity and operates either implicitly or explicitly.

In the initial waves of discussion around the doctorate in the arts, there was a lot of concern about the future threat to art practices and art education represented by narrowly construed ideas of academic standards being imposed upon artistic education and research from outside. These concerns were not always ill-founded. It is certain that situations have emerged in which a doctoral education in the arts has been elaborated without much real critical, intellectual and artistic interrogation, in a way that merely reacts to external drivers from policy or audit regimes. It is also clear, when one looks at specific projects and platforms, that we have seen serious and considered work, undertaken across a wide variety of arts fields and driven by the immanent logics of art practice and not simply by the protocols of the academy or university. The future orientation of research has the potential to move away from these anxiety formations of ‘this-means-the-end-of-things-as-we-know-it’ which can characterise some of the more conservative professional settings. This is not to downplay the importance of cultural tradition and historicity or to valorise change as intrinsically good, but rather to introduce a variety of forms of future thinking.

The modalities of future orientation that dominated 20th-century European artistic culture were typically premised on the progressive narratives of modernism(s), on the revolutionary narratives of avant-gardism, on the counter-narratives of decolonisation, historical revision (e.g. feminist, queer, history-from-below) or (in a slightly later formulation) alter-modernities. The debates on research, and the practices of building research processes, introduce the possibility of different temporal imaginaries and of structuring new ways of

thinking through time. Research proposes a potential for both continuity and discontinuity, by positing a context within which an enquiry emerges and a process of enquiry that introduces some change in insight, understanding or knowing, however modest. Research can do this in a way that is not subsumed within the established logics of progression and revolution. While some research paradigms propose a continuous accretion of small steps in the growth of knowledge and other paradigms (most notably the Kuhnian one, which gave currency to the term ‘paradigm’ in the first place) propose moments of revolutionary rupture and the re-formatting of a domain of knowledge, the cultivation of research cultures within academies and art schools has tended toward a more sceptical, modest and sanguine approach to future thinking. This has, perhaps, been informed by the recent tendency in art criticism and cultural theory to re-think temporal categories (such as the modern, the postmodern and the contemporary) whereby some artists and critics now speak of such themes as ‘chrono-politics’, indicating that the imaginaries of time and different ways of positing modes of historical being are central preoccupations within current art practices. Against this backdrop, we present the following scenarios and speculations, anticipating that these may be useful in fomenting others to think their own alternate futures for artistic research education.

9. A. Some Responses

The following is a sampling of the responses that emerged during the Venice workshop. It is clear from these that the development of the artistic research field within higher education and the development of the doctoral, is still in the first phase. However, the initial aims of the SHARE network to establish a step change within this process is evidenced here in the shift from questions around the specificity of ‘artistic’ research to questions around the specificity of the artistic research task:

‘Interdisciplinary team-work is the future’.

‘It is very difficult to break with the inertia of the PhD being seen as a work of very specialised knowledge (technical, scientific, historic...). These kinds of theses will keep being produced in PhD programmes in architecture faculties, even in the most renowned ones (see, for example, doctoral studies programmes of ETHZ, Harvard, etc.) In advance of this dominant trend, however, stands the possibility to create alternative spaces – combining theory and practice and

9. A. Some Responses

crossing disciplines – to move the frontiers of knowledge and question disciplinary boundaries’.

‘The present model must prove its validity over a reasonable period of time before other models can emerge’.

‘Educating artists at doctoral level is a very important action for the art and design universities. Creative innovative solutions will be found, reflective practice facilitated and promoted, new scientific methods established’.

‘In contemporary creative practices, in art as well as in design and architecture, each product has become inexorably associated with a critical discourse which becomes inseparable from it – a framework that endows it with meaning throughout its whole life, from inception to appraisal. Each product contributes to constructing the world not just in the physical sense, as artefact, but mostly as a symbolic work which adds new meanings to reality; it becomes a node in a network of symbols in continuous interaction with each other. Building an intellectual framework – the concepts, the meanings and the values associated with artefacts – has become intrinsically united with artistic creation’.

‘The third cycle is already the teaching requirement degree for a full-time teaching position at university in Portugal (since 2009, with a transitional period of five years)’.

‘Future research will tend to remain focused on the students’ concerns and on their expressive means. There is, and continues to be, a concern with the so-called “big” themes (environment, global issues), but big themes are not to be subjects by themselves. This is something that will happen and change as the background concerns in wider society change’.

‘The engagement of doctoral education in the arts with societal challenges is inevitable in terms of tradition and historical significance, and in terms of maintaining the arts’ position in European culture. It is the major road ahead. At the same time, there is a need for developing internal knowledge within the arts, as there is in all the sciences. It is important not to create an opposition between the two – external and internal – however, the first perspective is the most important and is a matter of survival for the field’.

‘The isolation of the PhD researcher, fighting with his or her own “research problem”, is something to overcome, for the sake of the students and for the third-cycle *raison d’être*. There are, however, different issues to distinguish – that a PhD thesis becomes a single person’s contribution, and the research topic itself is also ‘single’, this means an object of study isolated and detached from any shared critical framework’.

‘We need to bring together two antagonistic forces or drives: one to create spaces of reflection, critical thought, systematic production of knowledge, which promotes interaction between fields and disciplines; the second to demand rigour and systematisation in the production of knowledge. Without the second one, the first would only give rise to ‘interesting’ experiences of exchanges across fields, and this is certainly not what is expected from a PhD programme. However, if we are restricted to only the second drive, this means we only rely on established knowledge, on established boundaries and frames, thus preventing us from creating alternative forms of thinking’.

‘The question would be who is setting the agenda, which topics are qualified as “research”, by who and in which context. In principle, *anything* could be a matter of research but the question is who has the power to decide – a person, an institution, national policy-makers, private and corporate interests, the European Commission...’.

‘I would envision artistic research without the prefix of “artistic” in the future. Or maybe it will change into a noun instead of an adjective: arts research, as in humanities research, social sciences research, etc. It is important for researchers in any field to reflect on their own discipline, their methodology and legitimisation. However, it is also important to continue investigating common issues from different academic viewpoints, be it social, cultural, political, philosophical or whatever phenomena there are to be studies. Within the social sciences, there are numerous ways to approach the same subject, and why shouldn’t the arts be one of them? However, the two domains (external issues vs. internal) do not exclude one another. While studying a particular subject, one could develop new methods and insights on the way, just as the world works in other academic disciplines. Among the most interesting questions higher education institutes (in general) ask themselves today are: “What is third-cycle education aimed at?” “Is it only directed at academic careers, as hitherto, or does it have any chances of an afterlife outside the academic context?”’

9. B. Some Scenarios

In 2018, ELIA has evolved a specific platform within its wider network, which facilitates research consortium-building within global partnerships and provides a biennial forum for reporting on the state of the art in the research activities of the various art forms.

In 2018, with the decline of the biennial model outside the major historical centres, the strategies of anti-festivalism and anti-heritage have emerged as organising forces within the cultural ecology of major cities, as artistic-researchers, working with civil society groups and community activists, develop new cultural platforms and practices, bridging concerns of local democracy and strategies of self-organisation with historical models of artist-led culture.

In 2018, a multi-national doctoral education platform has been established, centred on the Nordic and Baltic countries, with associate members in Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Portugal, Singapore, Spain and the US. The platform is specifically geared towards research framed from within the interaction between art, design, performance and emergent technologies, with a particular focus on sustainability and environmental damage-amelioration strategies.

In 2018, researchers from art, pedagogics and the humanities have been working together for several years to develop collaborative and critical platforms in post-conflict situations with a particular focus on urban segregation, economic and social exclusion and the cultural politics of policing.

In 2018, a performance and design research network is in operation across the full span of European countries. It places special emphasis on linking performance and design researchers with researchers in the humanities and the sciences, with particular attention to questions of bodily cognition and comportment. Specific research projects emerge within the area of health, aging, transport, spatial and urban planning and rural re-development, funded through a combination of local state cultural and European research funding.

In 2018, a consortium between academies in Germany, Iceland, Poland and Spain, working with partners in Canada and South America, has been working for three years on the question of sustainable and adaptive food-ways, investigating strategies for waste recycling and

new food production processes orientated by themes of environment, health and food sovereignty. A key outcome of this work has been the promotion of international networking among independent primary food producing cooperatives and international knowledge exchange among small farmer and agricultural sector associations and activist groups.

In 2018, artist-researchers based in Antwerp, Bologna, Copenhagen, Dakar, Granada, Hamburg and Istanbul, working in collaboration with migrant rights activist groups, organise a new form of online and virtual mass mobilisation, creating forums for public activism by unofficial migrants, displaced people and asylum seekers, systematically excluded from the public sphere except as objects of moral panic and political grandstanding. The project emerged from an informal network of artist-researchers working independently on research into artists' labour organisations and precarity.

In 2018, a major university in Northern Europe awards its second annual artistic research prize of 1 million Euro to a team of film-makers and artist-researchers for their work on critical media literacy through socially engaged art practices.



Toolbox: Curriculum Resources

This book operates as a handbook for artistic research education, addressing a wide range of organisational and procedural frameworks and competing positions. This last section provides a set of resources directly tied to artistic research education by giving a sample of pedagogical strategies that have been used in research education across a wide range of performing arts and visual arts disciplines.

This is very much a work in progress, but the following two chapters seek to provide an account of two key themes within the current debate on artistic research – method and discipline – as a resource to be deployed as part of the very first stage of the doctoral level of education.

This model does not claim universal validity, or generic transferability, but rather serves to instantiate a model of research educational praxis that may be used as a reference in developing alternate models. It may also serve as a useful counterpoint to the organisational and procedural nature of the discussions in the earlier chapters, by addressing the very different level of curriculum content and pedagogy in early stage researcher education. These chapters may be considered course notes for an introduction to research education for doctoral-level artistic research.

10 Questions of Method

All researchers, all theoreticians must ask themselves the question of their personal relation with their ideas, that is, of the relationship of their ideas to their idiosyncrasies, their dreams, fantasies, desires, interests, respects, that is to say, everything within them that pushes them to select and hierarchically arrange facts and ideas in such a way as to tend toward such and such a conclusion. But such an incitement is not only a stimulus toward introspection –Edgar Morin, 1983¹

This chapter provides a very schematic treatment of the question of method as it might be introduced within the first phase of a doctoral-level education in and through arts practices. It is presented as a means of induction into a research environment and into a cautious negotiation of the lexicon of research from within different arts by artist practitioners. This material is drawn from the Dublin-based platform, GradCAM, and may be read in conjunction with the discussion in section 5.C.5. The chapter is divided into two large sections and a shorter closing section:

- 10. A. Pedagogical model for method disclosure
- 10. B. Rhetorics of method
- 10. C. Serendipity and the Happy Accidentalist

In the first two sections, the artist-researcher is invited to proceed through a series of tasks, reflections and critico-historical propositions that introduce, familiarise and problematise the rhetorics of method and methodology.² The closing section, on serendipity, is proposed as an incitement to further debate and discussion within a research seminar process.

1. E. Morin, 'Social Paradigms of Scientific Knowledge', *Sub-Stance*, No. 39, 1983. p. 4.

2. This should also be contrasted with the broad account of procedure provided by Prof. John Rajchman in his contribution to the SHARE London Conference in 2012. See 5.A.2. above.

10. A. Pedagogical Model for Method Disclosure

This is a provisional lexicon; we introduce it here, anticipating that it will be problematised and revised in different ways as the pedagogical process develops. Some of these definitions have been indicated earlier in the book; however, we repeat these here for the purposes of creating the chapter as a discrete and self-contained resource that may be used directly within doctoral education.

Research: finding something out; enquiry; study; looking for something (*recherche*); seeking understanding; testing beliefs; exploring possibilities; making new ideas; generating potentials; not knowing, not understanding, and trying to modify this state of not knowing, not understanding, in some considered way.

Research instrument and research tool: something one substantially uses to undertake research; something that has the character of a means to an end, as proposed within a process of enquiry.

Research method: way of working; way of using instruments and tools to conduct research; the considered way in which one proceeds in trying to find something out, conduct an enquiry or explore something.

Methodology: explanation, argumentation or rationale for adopting a particular way of working. This can also include the theoretical basis informing choices about ways of working.

It is proposed to use this simple lexicon as a basis from which to work through the following tasks.

10. A. 1. **First Task: What are you Trying to Find Out?**

Initiating the pedagogical treatment of method, the researcher is asked to elucidate the nature of their current work by responding to four questions:

- I What are you trying to find out or understand or otherwise enquire into?
- II Why is it worth knowing or understanding or enquiring into?
- III How do you go about finding it out or conducting the enquiry or seeking a change in understanding?
- IV How will you know that you have found it, how will you know when you are finished finding out or conducting this enquiry?

Within this pedagogical model, these questions are introduced early in doctoral education, in order to prioritise the question of conducting an enquiry, of attempting to find something out, of attempting to understand something. These questions are subsequently raised at different points in the course of a research undertaking. Despite their apparent simplicity, they are not very easy questions to answer. They force a particular agenda about ‘finding something out’. This programme of questions is proposed in order to cultivate a strong intention to know that which is not yet known and to seek this in a deliberate and considered way.

Operationally and strategically, the ways in which one realises a ‘deliberate’ and ‘considered’ approach is, of course, an open question. But this is not to suggest that it is an inconsequential, throwaway question, nor indeed one that can be left hanging without some attempt at provisional resolution. The key issue is that the researcher is being asked to demonstrate a sustained critical consideration of the framing of her/his own practical enquiry (solo or collaborative), as part of a pedagogical exercise rather than as a form to be completely adopted and implemented without later problematisation. That this is difficult or in some way contrary to the intrinsic principles of the researcher’s existing art practice is not under dispute at this moment in the research pedagogical process. The request is that, within this process, the researcher tries to answer these questions first and then problematise them afterwards. This sequence is understood as pedagogically significant in relation to cultivating a sense of the specificity of research in the context of a highly developed artistic production process. With respect to individual projects and practices, it is expected that what emerges in response to this question-apparatus will be widely divergent in format, modality, goal, preferred frame of reference and agenda.

10. A. 2. **Second Task: ‘What are you Actually Doing?’**

The material presented here and in the following sub-sections will look closely at question (III) ‘How do you go about finding it out?’ (An analogous process could be undertaken for question (II) ‘Why is it worth finding out?’ which addresses questions of research contextualisation, something that artist-researchers often need to give special consideration because of a reluctance that may sometimes appear on the part of artists, to disclose relations with other artists’ practices and achievements.) There are two aspects to this question – ‘How do you go about finding it out?’ – that will be considered: (I) disclosure of what one is doing (II) disclosure of the

10. A. Pedagogical Model for Method Disclosure

reasoning and affective grounds for these choices of action. However, in practice, these two aspects don't always separate out neatly in the way described here. The first aspect is the requirement to make explicit the particular ways of working that have been adopted and the particular instruments and/or techniques that have been used to develop the enquiry. The second aspect is to explain why these, from all the available options, are the ways of working most appropriate to the task and situation of the research. There are logical, practical and affective relationships to be explored between what the research proposes to explore and how this exploration is to be conducted. In practice, the 'what' and the 'how' typically co-evolve during the first phase of doctoral-level study.

It is often hard to consider the ways of doing research (methods) in isolation from concrete examples of research. On the other hand, in order to think about questions of method, it is sometimes necessary to step back from what we are actually doing, right this moment in the research process, and consider, from a distance, the overall structure of the activities and assumptions that we are working with – to step back and state the obvious, if sometimes not quite fully explicit, aspects of what we are doing. This can be a little frustrating as it necessarily interrupts 'business-as-usual' by asking seemingly 'dumb' basic questions. It can also be annoying because it throws up questions about the researcher's own value systems and asks her/him to state that which can normally be taken as given. By being stated explicitly in a shared language, these assumptions and values can start to become subject to contestation, revision and interrogation by peers, especially by peers from different disciplinary backgrounds or practices.

However, the easiest way to begin discussing ways of working is to look at specific examples of work in which specific methods have been proposed and/or implemented. Later in this pedagogical process, there will be a turn to a critico-historical reflection on how disclosures of method have become so prominent in the discussion of research, and why this task is given such prominence in doctoral education. In opening up this question, an attempt will be made to problematise the rhetorics of method, even as these are used to pedagogically cultivate an orientation towards enquiry.

The researcher is asked to consider what the actual activities are that s/he is currently engaged in, has recently completed or will initiate shortly. The reference to 'actual' is an attempt to focus on the mundane

level of description (going to the studio; collecting samples; rehearsing a piece daily for several hours; reading texts; writing a funding bid; viewing an oeuvre, etc.) rather than an elaborated interpretative description (such as ‘I am currently engaged in a rhizomatic project that seeks to un-ask questions rather than posit a dichotomy of subject/object relations’). The latter approach mobilises a level of interpretation that can often obscure the prosaic, but highly important, decision-making that happens in relation to choice of dialogue partners, reading matter, discursive community, practical contexts and locales, media, references, etc.

The researcher is then asked to work through a series of sub-questions, soliciting detail about what has been done – the points at which a decision was taken, something seemed interesting and was consciously selected or something emerged as an activity that presented itself as ‘natural’, ‘given’, ‘obvious’, ‘part of my process’, etc. The purpose of this question-and-answer phase is simply to establish that there is an existing *modus operandi* – which may have substantial elements that are un-thematised and as yet un-interrogated – an already operative way of doing things that includes more-or-less conscious choice and a horizon of ‘natural attitude’.

10. A. 3. **Third Task: Why Do these Activities Seem to Work?**

The researcher is asked to consider what these activities might contribute to the task of finding something out, enquiring, exploring, thinking through, understanding, questioning, and so forth. The task is not to produce an ex post-facto rationalisation but simply to disclose what seems salient about current actions. It is also an opportunity to identify the potential paradox that arises from artificially (i.e. by means of the apparatus of these four question) separating an operation or lived practice into the two moments of ‘what?’ and ‘how?’

10. A. 4. **Fourth Task: Could it be any Other Way?**

The researcher is asked to consider the contingent nature of these activities: ‘What are the alternative ways of doing things?’ ‘What might recommend for or against these alternative ways of doing things?’

10. A. 5. **Fifth Task: What Assumptions?**

The researcher is asked to consider which ideas, practices or in-built logics of production or valuation might be operative in the given ways of acting and working. Questions of the following sort are posed: ‘What are the grounding assumptions that I have been working with explicitly or implicitly?’ ‘What does a dialogue partner have to ‘go

along with' in order to accept the arguments presented for why these ways of working are good?'

10. A. 6. **Sixth Task: What has been Modified by Asking these Questions and Pursuing these Tasks? What has been Enacted or Produced?**

The researcher is asked to consider the awkward interruption to the 'flow' of work that these questions potentially introduces, and the affect that this may engender, or to make other observations about the mood, tone and power dynamics that arise from this interrogative system. At this point, a number of different rhetorical and intellectual sources might be brought into play, ranging from traditional theoretical sources employed across the arts (critical theory, hermeneutics, feminist criticism, Foucauldian analyses of apparatuses and subject formation) to the traditions of critique and analysis immanent to the arts and different arts pedagogies. The goal here is to in some way thematise the processes of reflection-in-practice, dialogue, questions of equity and asymmetries of power in pedagogy, institutional dynamics, and so forth. It is proposed that the researcher identifies their preferred mode of problematising this institutional encounter of prescribed questioning, and that this should also be subject to a critical exploration and search for underpinning rationales and values.

The production of these questions and responses may be realised over an extended or compressed period, and it may be carried out in multiple settings. The process of questioning should be presented as both a contract, enacted in pedagogical space, and a non-neutral and contestable practice, premised on an explicit avowal of the power to prescribe a 'curriculum', however minimal, on the part of the institution. The key thing is that power is not naturalised or disavowed but marked and enacted, and, while there is an initial deferral, there is also a potential for critique. What unfolds in this process will often be surprising to all participants and should be approached with a high degree of care.

At this point, the researcher is also asked to consider the proposition that, in actual working practices, the abstract model of method and methodology – of well-defined and clearly outlined ways of working, accompanied by clearly articulated reasoning about the chosen ways of working – is seldom encountered, and perhaps not even desirable in many cases. The proposal is made that, within an educational process that is about developing a range of research competencies, the very effort of trying to meet these requests to disclose method

may serve to clarify the researcher's thinking, make explicit the actual enquiry process and prompt consideration of the ways in which this enquiry could be communicated to others. This is a pedagogical process, whereby entering into a relationship with others in a 'learning community'/'educational institution'/'research environment' (as the formal research educational milieu might be constructed) the artist-researcher opens up to a reciprocal questioning about 'what?' 'why?' 'how?', etc. within a community of peers.

This requirement of the researcher –that they engage in some form of method disclosure– arises as part of the educational process in doctoral-level work, rather than as a part of a particular artistic project or a single research project. This is an area fraught with concerns and reservations, as is evidenced elsewhere in this book and in the various contributions to the debate on artistic research. It should also be noted that these structured and directed processes of questioning will be greatly influenced and contextualised by the particular disciplinary mix at play within a given research education context.

10. A. 7. **Seventh Task: Reflecting on the Rhetorics of Method Disclosure**

At this point, the researcher should be referred to examples of method statements, so that there are concrete examples with which to tease out the reflection on what is possible and what is difficult in making disclosures of method. These examples should be drawn from a wide range of disciplines including, but not limited to, the arts. It is recommended that these should be three doctoral-level projects selected in consultation with the participants in a given iteration of this pedagogical process.

The researcher is asked to very closely consider the examples introduced into the pedagogical process at this point, and to make evaluative comparisons of them by working through a series of questions:

- What do these projects have in common in terms of their approach to questions of method?
- What are the most pronounced differences between them?
- Are these discussions of method persuasive for the 'general' reader (i.e. someone who is not specialised in the discipline being discussed)?
- What is the role of metaphor in these discussions of method?
- Is the appropriateness of the method to the research task addressed in each case?
- Can each of these methods be generalised to other research tasks?

10. A. Pedagogical Model for Method Disclosure

- Which extract deals most with actual research techniques and research instruments (as opposed to general reflections on method)?
- What questions are you left with after considering each example?

Having worked through these questions, the researcher is then invited to consider a range of critico-historical themes that provide discursive contexts for problematising the question of method (applied to the specifics of research projects from within the given group of researchers). This exploration of themes can be conducted in a wide range of formats, including criticism and analysis discussion groups, solo and group tutorials, seminars, lectures and reading groups. Rather than a single pedagogical instrument, a variety of formats is recommended, and these should be attuned to the size of the group and the time available for this work. These themes should also be developed with reference to the examples of method disclosure introduced above. The next section provides an indicative sample of the kinds of material and issues that might be treated with respect to method, including a short review of the genealogies of method, and a preliminary treatment of the interchange between rhetoric and method.

10. B. Rhetorics of Method

Introduction

Now that we know what kind of knowledge is necessary for us, we must indicate the way and the method whereby we may gain the said knowledge concerning the things needful to be known. In order to accomplish this, we must first take care not to commit ourselves to a search, going back to infinity – that is, in order to discover the best method for finding out the truth, there is no need of another method to discover such method; nor of a third method for discovering the second, and so on to infinity. By such proceedings, we should never arrive at the knowledge of the truth, or, indeed, at any knowledge at all. The matter stands on the same footing as the making of material tools, which might be argued about in a similar way. For, in order to work iron, a hammer is needed and the hammer cannot be forthcoming unless it has been made; but, in order to make it, there was need of another hammer and other tools, and so on to infinity. We might thus vainly endeavour to prove that men have no power of working iron. But as men at first made use of the instruments supplied by nature to accomplish very easy pieces of workmanship, laboriously and imperfectly, and then, when these were finished, wrought other things more difficult with less labour and greater perfection; and so gradually mounted from the simplest operations to the making of tools, and from the making of tools to the making

of more complex tools, and fresh feats of workmanship, till they arrived at making, with small expenditure of labour, the vast number of complicated mechanisms which they now possess. So, in like manner, the intellect, by its native strength, makes for itself intellectual instruments, whereby it acquires strength for performing other intellectual operations, and from these operations gets again fresh instruments, or the power of pushing its investigations further, and thus gradually proceeds till it reaches the summit of wisdom.

That this is the path pursued by the understanding may be readily seen, when we understand the nature of the method for finding out the truth, and of the natural instruments so necessary for the construction of more complex instruments, and for the progress of investigation. I thus proceed with my demonstration.³

Spinoza's beautiful parable, of the *mise en abyme* generated by the search for method, is presented here as one example among many in which two key issues in method disclosure are apparent. Firstly, there is a strong correlation between claims to know and claims to provide a disclosure of method as offering some kind of rhetorical guarantee for a knowledge claim; secondly, method disclosures have the capacity to create instabilities in the discursive unfolding of knowledge. These two themes are useful in constructing a field of tensions within which to problematise the questions of method disclosure and the making of methodological claims. These two themes can be related to the different kinds of work that talk of method may seek to accomplish. On the one hand, there is talk of method as a means of securing a foundation for knowledge (this way is *guaranteed* to work), and, on the other hand, there is talk of method which seeks to simply disclose a way of working (this way works) – a way of doing things that does not claim foundational status but merely operational coherence or viability. Understanding these ambivalences in the talk of method, and, indeed, problematising the question of method, can proceed by looking at these themes within a critico-historical framework. It helps to begin with the imperative that Spinoza introduces when he states that 'we must indicate the way and the method whereby we may gain the said knowledge'.

10. B. 1 **The Method Doctrine.**

The imperative that Spinoza rehearses is one instance of a widely dispersed discursive phenomenon that may be termed the 'method doctrine'. The method doctrine roughly states that 'legitimate' or 'credible' knowledge-making requires a well-defined, reproducible

3. B. de Spinoza, *On The Improvement of The Understanding*. 1677. trans. R. H. M. Elwes. (New York: Dover, 1955).

and reliable way of proceeding. The classic statement of the method doctrine is often thought to be found in Descartes. However, there is a (claimed) confusion between a system of thinking and (retrospective) justification of a thinking process, and the actual way in which Descartes operated his own enquiries into, for example, the structures of the eye or the motion of bodies. It has been argued by some that there is a tension – a mismatch – between what Descartes says he does and what he actually does when he investigates the world. In the development of method discourses in 16th and 17th century Europe, we see the interaction of an established tradition of rhetoric and an emerging tradition of ‘experimental science’. In figures like Ramus – a 16th century rhetorician who was singularly successful in giving currency to the term ‘method’ – we see the combination of a systematic ordering of knowledge, a systemic approach to pedagogies and a rise in the suasive potency of an explicitly declared ‘method’. In figures like Bacon and Descartes, we see a further development of this suasive potency accorded the term method. The interaction between the popular rhetorical innovations of Ramus and the persuasive argumentation of the early exponents of ‘experimental method’ culminated in the idea of a singular, monolithic ‘scientific method’. There is now a recurring claim for the specificity of the ‘scientific method’, which underpins a sustained dynamic in the modern reorientation of knowledge taxonomies. As one commentator points out (in challenging precisely this assumption), ‘Descartes, Bacon, Galileo, Harvey, Huygens and Newton were singularly successful in persuading posterity, historians of science included, that they contributed to the invention of a single, transferable, and efficacious scientific method’.⁴ At this point, it may be useful to introduce the anthropologist, Clifford Geertz’s wry challenge: ‘Such questions as ... “what method is common to palaeontology and particle physics?” or “what relation to reality is shared by topology and entomology?” are hardly more useful than “is sociology closer to physics than to literary criticism?” or “is political science more hermeneutic than microbiology, chemistry more explanatory than psychology?”’.⁵ It can also be helpful to consider some examples of methodological theorising from within the humanities, where, for more than a century, there has been a lively debate on the rhetorics of ‘method’ and research. These examples can be used to indicate the broad

4. J.A. Schuster, ‘Whatever Should We Do with Cartesian Method? Reclaiming Descartes for the History of Science’ in V. Stephen (ed.), *Essays on the Philosophy and Science of Rene Descartes*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). p. 195.

5. C. Geertz, *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topic*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). p. 150.

historical trajectory of the question of method in academic contexts. Thus, some methodological works from the German tradition might be used (e.g. Dilthey, Gadamer and Habermas) as a way of emphasising the historical diffusion of the method doctrine and its contestation from within different subjects (history, philosophy, anthropology, etc.).

Thus, for example, one can note Habermas' claim that a narrow focus on questions of method emerges from the refusal of the undecidability of epistemology (the quest for foundations) in favour of the explication of the already 'given' success of science. (Habermas, 1998, Chapter 1.) Habermas summarises his interpretation in relation to the function of early positivism in such exemplars as Comte and Mach:

Positivism marks the end of the theory of knowledge. In its place emerges the philosophy of science. Transcendental-logical enquiry into the conditions of possible knowledge aimed as well at explicating the meaning of knowledge as such. Positivism cuts off this enquiry, which it conceives as having become meaningless in virtue of the fact of the modern sciences. Knowledge is implicitly defined by the achievement of the sciences.⁶

According to Habermas' reading of this reduction from epistemology to philosophy of science, methodology becomes the order of the day, and 'any epistemology that transcends the framework of methodology as such now succumbs to the same sentence of extravagance and meaninglessness that [epistemology] once passed on metaphysics'. By drawing upon these canonical sources within philosophy, it is possible to problematise any simple positing of a 'scientific method' and also to demand much greater specificity from researchers who declare themselves to be pursuing something contrary to, divergent from or irreducible to 'science'. In terms of the development of the pedagogical dialogue, the key issue here is that attending to the critically vulnerable rhetorics of method necessarily also implies attending to the equally fragile rhetorics of anti-method. (There are many sources that may be used in this context, and it is important to note that these sources are not presented as being broadly consistent with each other in anything more than the fact that they problematise the presumed hegemony of an undifferentiated 'scientific method'.)

6. J. Habermas, *Knowledge & Human Interest*. 1968. (Oxford: Polity, 1998). p. 67.

10. B. 2 **Other Methods**

The researcher is now asked to consider another genealogy of method discourses. This is the contributory strand to the semantic field of the term ‘method’ that proceeds from the ancient Greek root *methodos*. This had the source meaning of ‘to be on a road, way or path, that already exists’. It emerges from a combination of *meta* and *hodos*, an etymology which points to a ‘travelling road’, a ‘way’ or ‘path’ (*hodos*) that one follows ‘after’ (*meta*). This gives rise to the root meaning of following after, or along, a given path or way.⁷ Many commentators point to the application of this term in the pre-Socratic philosopher, Parmenides’s ‘proem’ on the process of knowing. This imagery, of finding knowledge by means of following a journey or a ‘way’, is proposed, by Karl Popper, to be a source of the strong correlation (in the broadly Greco-Judaeo-Christian-Islamic tradition) between the question of knowledge and the question of sound procedure or method. In an essay on Parmenides, Popper argues that ‘there started a tradition of epistemological prefaces that is still alive; most probably owing to its having been reinforced by Plato’s epistemological preface to the *Timaeus*, in which he is heavily indebted to Parmenides.’⁸

The researcher is asked to consider the fragments of Parmenides’s poetic text, in which he speaks of two ways: ‘The first, namely, that It is, and that it is impossible for anything not to be, is the way of conviction, for truth is its companion. The other, namely, that It is not, and that something must needs not be, – that, I tell thee, is a wholly untrustworthy path. For you cannot know what is not – that is impossible – nor utter it’.⁹ The imagery of the ‘way’ or *hodos* is pervasive in Parmenides’ text, and this made it an originary point of reference not only for Popper but also for Heidegger, who has made extensive use of this imagery of method and ‘way.’ Interestingly, this provides a divergent reading of Parmenides. Heidegger speaks of the ‘originary Greek word for “way”’ and points out that ‘our borrowed word “method”’ which derives from this ‘does not mean for the Greeks “method”’ in the sense of a procedure with the aid of which man undertakes an assault on objects with his investigations

7. R. K. Barnhart, *Chambers Dictionary of Etymology*. (Edinburgh: Chambers/H. W. Wilson Co., 2004). p. 657

8. K. Popper, *The World of Parmenides: Essays on the Presocratic Enlightenment*. (London and New York: Routledge, 1998). p. 159.

9. Translations vary considerably, see R. Waterfield, *The First Philosophers: The Presocratics and the Sophists*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). pp. 49–68; P. Curd *A Presocratics Reader: Selected Fragments and Testimonia*. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co. Inc., 1996). pp. 43–52; M. Ring, *Beginning with the Pre-Socratics*. (Mountainview: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1987). pp. 88–92.

and research'. Rather, the Parmenidean *methodos* is 'to-be-on-the-way, namely on a way that already exists'. This way is not 'the "procedure" of an inquiry but rather is the inquiry itself'.¹⁰

The researcher is asked to consider that, while Parmenides' lines are somewhat difficult and open to multiple readings, we have established a different genealogy to the practice of making 'statements about method' that pre-dates the scientific revolution of the 17th century and is rooted in a tradition of poetic practice (and the significant role of metaphor). Taken in conjunction with the already noted use of the term by the 16th century rhetorician, Ramus, the researcher may be asked to consider that, in the domain of knowledge and enquiry, method discourse is not the exclusive property of the natural sciences, nor is the question of method disclosure necessarily an attempt to displace epistemic worries through the simple reduction of knowing to methodical operations.

The function of this critico-historical digression, then, is not to institute philosophy or history as the master discourses within an artistic research pedagogy, but rather to do some propaedeutic work that critically challenges, indeed potentially disrupts, certain habitual rhetorics that regularly appear in early-stage dialogues around the formation of artistic-research projects and which are often deployed as magical charms against having to accept the challenge to disclose a research method. (Art is different from science; artists don't have/are not interested in methods; scientific method enforces a masculinist subject/object dichotomy, etc.).

The researcher has been asked to consider: that the rhetorical force of method claims may be countered by recognising the divergence between claims about method and the actual processes deployed by particular enquirers; that the positing of a monolithic 'scientific method' is a questionable historical legacy that has been critically assailed for many decades; and that method talk in the context of knowledge/known/enquiring is not the exclusive property of the sciences. This critico-historical material works to undermine the assumption that method and its disclosure are somehow being naturalised and uncritically reproduced in the pedagogical process. However, this material also serves to meet the critical challenge that these tasks are alien to the practice of art or poetry and dictated by some uncritical notion of 'scientificity' or that talk of method is

10. M. Heidegger, *Parmenides*. 1982. trans. A. Schuwer and R. Rojcewicz. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998).

somehow an attempt to evade or nullify the vagaries of radical epistemic doubt, inchoate experience, lived uncertainty, language, history and contingency. While the task of naming, describing and, in some sense, explicating ways of working is proposed to the researcher as a core task in the process of a research education, it is not reduced to rhetorical game play, precisely by identifying the historical trajectory of these rhetorics and the kind of discursive gaming that can proceed from it. This material is also a framework within which it is possible to consider the complicated nature and potential productivity of method disclosure – identifying that claims of the form ‘this is how I am working’ not only introduce a tension between doing things and ways of representing what we are doing but also open the possibility of misrecognition and the potential mis-match of claims to actual behaviours and practices. This also leads to the possibility of looking at the rhetorics of anti-method, or the disavowal of method, as predicated within this same genealogy.

Other themes that may be introduced into this discussion pertain to the historical development of methodological discourses and key moments of methodological contest. Examples include: the construction of a social sciences/natural sciences division in the 19th century university system; the *methodenstreit* (method war) and Dilthey’s 1883 statement of the foundations and nature of the human sciences, *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, as a key moment in the dispersion of the theme of method within the humanities;¹¹ the ongoing currency of these method wars as indicated by a symposium on the question of methodological distinctions between the natural and the social sciences, convened in June 2006 by the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science. The brief for this conference stated: that ‘The conceptual pair of ‘Erklären’ [explanation/elucidate/give account of] and ‘Verstehen’ [understanding] has been the object of philosophical and methodological debates for well over a century.¹² To this day, discussions remain centred on the question of whether certain issues – such as those dealing with humans or society – require a special approach, different from that of the physical sciences.

11. W. Dilthey, *Introduction to the Human Sciences: An Attempt to Lay a Foundation for the Study of Society and History*. 1883. trans. R.J. Bentanzos. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989).

12. U. Feest, ‘Historical Perspectives on “Erklären” and “Verstehen”: An Interdisciplinary Workshop’ (Berlin: Max-Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2006).

The basic drive of this critico-historical work, then, is to establish that ‘one disdains method, by reducing it to a set of technical norms, rather than maintaining it as a problematic that intimately concerns the subject in search of truth’.¹³ Of course, the term ‘truth’ is used here as a placeholder for a wide range of possible research ambitions, including understanding, knowledge, insight, etc.

10. B.3 **Madness in the Method**

Today, philological and historical disciplines consider it a methodological given that the epistemological process that is proper to them is necessarily caught in a circle. The discovery of this circle as the foundation of all hermeneutics goes back to Schleiermacher and his intuition that in philology ‘*the part can be understood only by means of the whole and every explanation of the part presupposes the understanding of the whole.*’ But this circle is in no sense a vicious one. On the contrary, it is itself the foundation of the rigour and rationality of the social sciences and humanities. For a science that wants to remain faithful to its own law, what is essential is not to leave this ‘circle of understanding,’ which would be impossible, but to ‘stay within it in the right way.’ By virtue of the knowledge acquired at every step, the passage from the part to the whole and back again never returns to the same point; at every step, it necessarily broadens its radius, discovering a higher perspective that opens a new circle. The curve representing the hermeneutic circle is not a circumference, as has often been repeated, but a spiral that continually broadens its turns –Giorgio Agamben, 1975¹⁴

‘[T]he problems of real-world practice do not present themselves to practitioners as well-formed structures. Indeed, they tend not to present themselves as problems at all but as messy, indeterminate situations –Donald A. Schön, 1987¹⁵

Having worked through a series of tasks as per section 10.A and having undertaken some critical-historical explorations on the theme of method as per sections 10.B.1 and 10.B.2, the researcher is asked to re-visit their own framing of the research process within their artistic

13. E. Morin, op. cit. p. 4.

14. G. Agamben, *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy*. (Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 1999) p. 96.

15. D.A. Schön, *Educating The Reflective Practitioner*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Baas Publishers, 1987).

practice. The task now is differentiated between four moments: (I) method as the disclosure of how one is doing what one is currently doing – within a pedagogical dialogue; (II) method as the retrospective disclosure of how one has constructed and implemented a research undertaking; (III) method as the comparative disclosure of where one converges and diverges with peers in relation to the organisation and mobilisation of a research project; (IV) methodology as the disclosure of the reasoning and premises upon which one has elected to operate. There is, however, a new emphasis brought into play at this point – the disruptive potential of the splitting that takes place when one speaks of a project and a way of doing the project as an isolatable dimension. This theme can be introduced simply by inviting the researcher to describe their experience of trying to produce a disclosure of how they are working, or it can be brought into play by looking at examples of instances in which method disclosures have fallen foul of themselves (e.g. the closing dialogue of Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge*).

In re-iterating this process of questioning, it is worth re-stating for the researcher that the goal is not the production of an unassailable statement of method but rather the production of an orientation towards enquiry, and this talk of methods is, in some degree (but not exclusively), a pedagogical ruse to solicit a conscious attempt to find something out, build insight, achieve understanding, enact *research* in a considered way. At this point, the researcher should also be invited to consider the method claims that are made in the process of this very pedagogy. They might be invited to consider the statement of method in this proposed research pedagogy, to identify the critical fissures, aporia and prejudices operative within it, to consider whether this rhetoric of method is working or not and to give further consideration to the alternatives they wish to build. There is, of course, always a little madness in the talk of method.

16. This section is in part a digression, but its purpose is to qualify some of what has already been said above.

10. C. Serendipity and the Happy Accidentalist¹⁶

In ancient times there existed in the country of Serendippo, in the Far East, a great and powerful king by the name of Giaffer. He had three sons who were very dear to him. And being a good father and very concerned about their education, he decided that he had to leave them endowed not only with great power, but also with all kinds of virtues of which princes are particularly in need. [...] Three goodly young princes were travelling the world in hopes of being educated to take their proper position upon their return. On their journey they happened upon a camel driver who inquired if they had seen his missing camel. As sport, they claimed to have seen the camel, reporting correctly that the camel was blind in one eye, missing a tooth, and lame. From these accurate details, the owner assumed that the three had surely stolen the camel, and they were subsequently thrown into jail. Soon the wayward camel was discovered, and the princes brought to the perplexed Emperor of the land, who inquired of them how they had learned these facts. That the grass was eaten on one side of the road suggested that camel had one eye, the cuds of grass on the ground indicated a tooth gap, and the traces of a dragged hoof revealed the camel's lameness – T.G. Remer, 1557¹⁷

You don't reach Serendip by plotting a course for it. You have to set out in good faith for elsewhere and lose your bearings serendipitously – John Barth, 1991¹⁸

This exotic (and 'orientalist') tale, told of ancient princes in Sri Lanka, then known as Serendip, inspired Horace Walpole, the English politician and author of *The Castle of Otranto*. Walpole coined the term 'serendipity' while writing to the British diplomat, Horace Mann, on 28 January 1754. Walpole's neologism referred to the combination of accident and sagacity that was necessary to recognise the significance of a discovery. 'Serendipity' is a propensity for making fortunate discoveries while looking for something unrelated – it suggests chance and insight working together.¹⁹ However, due in part to its use as a name for a 'method', in a variety of disciplines but especially sociology

16. This section is in part a digression, but its purpose is to qualify some of what has already been said above.

17. T.G. Remer, 'Serendipity and The Three Princes' in *The Peregrinaggio*. 1557. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965). Adapted from *The Peregrinaggio (aka The Three Princes of Serendip)* which was originally published in Venice by the printer Michele Tramezzino.

18. J. Barth, *The Last Voyage of Somebody the Sailor*. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1991).

19. According to Wikipedia, serendipity has been voted as one of the ten English words that were hardest to translate in June 2004 by a British translation company. Wikipedia contributors, 'Serendipity', Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serendipity> (accessed 27 September 2010).

10. C. Serendipity and the Happy Accidental

and ethnography,²⁰ the word has been imported into many other languages. The key element in serendipity is the facility of the researcher to achieve insight through the unplanned occurrence, event, or chance encounter that is the occasion of the serendipitous discovery. The overarching context is one of systematic enquiry, but it is an accident or interruption in the systemic or considered approach that yields the insight. However, this is not the same as suggesting that a generalised attitude of serendipity or 'waiting for the unexpected' can be implemented as a general method.²¹ There are those who see this kind of optimism as a viable *modus operandi* in production, but it is a moot question as to whether this is a viable *modus operandi* in enquiry.

20. See G. Fine and J. Deegan, 'Three Principles of Serendip: Insight, Chance, and Discovery in Qualitative Research', <http://www.ul.ie/~philos/vol2/deegan.html#text%201>. See also B.G. Glaser and A.L. Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Strategies for Qualitative Research*, 1967.

21. For further discussion of this, see R.K. Merton and E. Barber, *The Travels and Adventures of Serendipity: A Study in Sociological Semantics and the Sociology of Science*. 1958. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

11

What is a Discipline?

In the debates on artistic research and on the education of artist-researchers, recurring questions arise in relation to the disciplinary status of artistic research: ‘Is this a new discipline?’ ‘Are we casting the different art forms as discrete academic disciplines that ought to be incorporated into the research culture of the university?’ Within this discussion, there is a consistent failure to adequately account for the nature of disciplines. Furthermore, there is a tendency to presume that disciplines are inherently ordered and well-formed (well-disciplined) entities in their own right. This is counterposed by a recurring pattern of anti-disciplinary sentiment, in which disciplines are reduced to characteristics such as ‘narrowness’, ‘restrictiveness’ or ‘internality’.

If artistic researchers are to be asked to take a position on the question of disciplinary alignment or status, it would first seem useful to define ‘discipline’, by providing resources with which to evaluate the possible stakes of the questions cited above. This would seem especially important in the context of a consideration of the significance of doctoral-level studies for both artist-researchers and the institutional setting, given the historical part played by doctoral-level study in producing disciplinary forms and achieving disciplinary identity and status.

The material here is broadly critico-historical and seeks to contextualise the question of whether the candidate in an artistic research programme is seeking disciplinary positioning or something else. This is proposed as the basis of a seminar to be conducted within the first few weeks of a doctoral-level project. It is envisaged that this reading would be used in conjunction with a second text that would be elected by the seminar group, functioning as a counterpoint to both

the content and style of argumentation used in this prescribed text. The broad intention of this text is to problematise both the 'obviousness' of disciplines and the familiar denigration of discipline as intrinsically narrow and unsympathetic to aesthetic or other modes of practice and affective reasoning.

It is worth emphasising here that the role of this material (as with the previous chapter on method) is to give an example of a pedagogical resource and strategy for use in doctoral education. In this case we have a textual resource that elaborates the question of the definition of academic discipline in a way that is designed to challenge the doctoral student to interrogate their already operative understandings of what constitutes an academic discipline. The model is again drawn from the Dublin school and based on a particular pedagogical model. It is therefore presented as an example not to be replicated, but preferably to be used as a reference in constructing alternative approaches and pedagogical resources.

11. A Who can ask 'What is a discipline?'

11. A.1 Unnatural Divisions

It is surprising to see how comfortably the category of *discipline* sits within the conversation of academics yet how hard it is to find a satisfactory treatment of the construct. There are many well-known overviews of the question of academic discipline, ranging from the impressionistic – such as C. P. Snow's famous and controversial 'two cultures'²² model – to the robust and highly influential – such as Kuhn's account of 'paradigms' and 'normal science'.²³ There is the example of Biglan's successful 'hard/soft' and 'pure/applied' taxonomy, which has been absorbed into the general parlance of academia.²⁴ There is also the comprehensive account provided by Becher and Trowler's 'tribes and territories' ethnographic model.²⁵ However, across these studies, there is a general sense in which the basic understanding of what a discipline is has somehow already been conveyed in a relatively unproblematic way. The category of 'discipline' appears to operate akin to the naturalised presumption of the category 'species'.

22. C. P. Snow, *The Two Cultures*. 1959. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

23. T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 1962. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973).

24. A. Biglan 'The characteristics of subject matter in different scientific areas' in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 57, No. 3, 1973. pp. 195-203.

25. T. Becher and P. Trowler, *Academic Tribes and Territories*. 1989. (Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 2001).

A species is a construct that is taken to have a 'good fit' with the way in which the world of living things divides into relatively discrete sub-systems. Similarly, the system of disciplines seems, to many, to be the natural and obvious way in which the world of knowledge carves up. This habit of mind, combined with the everyday familiarity of discipline-related practices, behaviours and typologies, is perhaps what makes for the relatively unreflexive deployment of the term within the university, even in moments of conflict and crisis-driven self-examination.

Of course, a naturalised approach to the discipline construct as somehow 'obvious' is to be expected. Universities carry out their business – from the day-to-day enrolment of students to programming classes, tutorials, seminars and research projects in the various disciplines – with relative ease. Occasionally, when interacting with other institutions, in which different disciplinary dispensations hold sway, they will migrate from a local system of discipline classification into an unfamiliar system. There is even a sense in which members of a university can identify the attitudinal framework of their colleagues by correlating these with their disciplinary allegiances. In this way, computer scientists may be construed as 'nerdish' and habituated to systems and protocols;²⁶ fine art people are perceived as resistant to systems celebrating individuality (often read as being disorganised and excitable);²⁷ art historians are effete, conservative and keenly alert to social hierarchy;²⁸ and so forth, in any number of more-or-less clichéd models of expected disciplinary behaviours. There is even a sense in which certain areas deserve to be regarded as disciplines while others – such as culinary science or gay and lesbian studies – are more appropriately treated as being too cognitively impoverished or faddish and tendentious to properly constitute legitimate disciplines. As Becher and Trowler (2001) point out, 'people with any interest and involvement in academic affairs seem to have little difficulty in understanding what a discipline is, or in taking a confident part in discussions about borderline or dubious cases'.²⁹

26. J. Wang, 'Computer nerds can be buff, too: Professors show they do more than research', *The Stanford Daily*, 21 April 2003, http://daily.stanford.edu/tempo?page=content&id=10976&repository=0001_article.

27. A classic example of this pedagogical *mythos* is provided by Robert Motherwell's description of a 'little school of art' as presented at a conference on education in 1949: The way to learn to paint – to begin one's orientation, I mean – is to hang around artists. [...] We talk to students as we do to one another, trying to break down ignorance and clichés, encouraging each individual to find his own expression of his inner life. This kind of teaching must be done by artists[...] Still in a basic sense art cannot be taught, and we do not try to (cited in Singerman, 1999, p. 141).

28. A journalist reviewing Dan Brown's literary characterisation of an art historian ('a Harvard professor of religious symbology') declares: 'Now that's quite a trick, getting audiences to identify with a character defined by interests that usually have signalled the vicious, fantastic, remote or effete'. (Artner, 2006).

29. T. Becher and P.R. Trowler, op. cit. p. 41.

11. A. Who can ask 'what is a discipline?'

This issue of what a discipline is, and the question of academic discipline-ness more generally, will be indicated by the word 'disciplinarity' as a means of pointing out this abstract question of discipline quality. The problematic connotations of this term are identified in the next subsection. The value of employing such a term is that it interrupts the taken-for-granted quality that many treatments of disciplines adopt in addressing the construct. It is, perhaps, even the case that the naturalisation of the system of disciplines is interrupted in the very process of defining the category 'discipline' and addressing oneself to disciplinarity.

11. A. 2 **Between Disciplinarity and Discipline.**

Having asserted that we cannot study disciplinarity without using disciplinary terms, but we can use many disciplines to study it, let us proceed to note the inherent heterogeneity of any attempt to think about disciplinarity, by declaring that:

It is neither a field in itself nor a metafield in which one can study disciplines. It is neither the essence of disciplines nor their foundation. Rather, disciplinarity is about the coherence of a set of otherwise disparate elements: objects of study, methods of analysis, scholars, students, journals, and grants, to name a few [...] if disciplines are such by virtue of a historically contingent, adventitious coherence of dispersed elements, then to study that coherence is necessarily to begin questioning portrayals of disciplines as seamless, progressive, or naturally 'about' certain topics. In studying disciplinarity, one defamiliarises disciplines – E. Messer-Davidow, et al., 1993³⁰

Perhaps inevitably, there is a certain problem with this position, inasmuch as, according to this model, the student of disciplinarity appears free to mobilise various discipline-based resources – methods, concepts, established canons – in a free-wheeling manner that leaves the researcher unconstrained – allows the student of disciplinarity a disciplinary vagrancy – and yet, such a student would appear to be able to operate competently within the university and to inhabit its matrix of departments and divisions with relative ease – as, indeed, Messer-Davidow et al. appear to do. If disciplinarity operates as these authors present it, how do they present it at all? But then, perhaps

30. E. Messer-Davidow, D. R. Shumway and D.J. Sylvan (eds.), *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*. (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993). p. 3

paradoxically, this account demonstrates the inherent tendency of disciplinary cultures to constrain interpretation and, as indicated above, to privilege certain objects, methods and assumptions as natural and habitual.

This term ‘disciplinarity’, as deployed by Messer-Davidow et al. and other cultural studies practitioners, combines the conventional term ‘discipline’, as used in the everyday affairs of the university with a critical concept famously developed through the work of Foucault in his various treatments of the ‘governmentality’ and the disciplinary practices of modernity.³¹ This appropriation of the -arity suffix to imply a repressive air is a typical terminological move for critical scholars habituated to the Foucauldian lexicon. Thus, when Messer-Davidow et al. explain their use of the term ‘disciplinarity’, they parse this with the expression ‘our concern is with the *possibility conditions* of disciplines’.³² Within a cultural studies context, this phrasing is resonant with the Foucauldian study of the ‘historical *apriori*’ (meaning the ‘conditions of possibility’ of various discourses and practices).

The salient point is that, when used in this way, the term ‘disciplinarity’ automatically establishes an equivalence between the construct ‘academic discipline’ and the ‘discipline’ of *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault’s analysis of the internalised systems of self-management integral to modern subject construction and the production of what he terms ‘docile bodies’.³³ Of course, there are strong theoretical reasons for making this association. However, the use of the term ‘disciplinarity’ prioritises this identification for anyone working within a Foucault-informed cultural studies framework; it is a rhetorical accomplishment. Thus, Peters, treating the same material in his *After the Disciplines: The Emergence of Culture Studies* opens with the frank declaration: ‘If I begin with Michel Foucault, it is because it is difficult to go past

31. As a typical example of Foucault’s critique of disciplinary processes one might take his assertion that: ‘sovereignty and disciplinary mechanisms are two absolutely integral constituents of the general mechanism of power in our society.’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 108; orig. 1977.)

32. Emphasis in original. E. Messer-Davidow, et al., op. cit. p. 2.

33. It is argued that, ‘By “docile bodies” Foucault meant that in modern societies people did not generally have to be ruled by force from above. Individuals are produced as docile bodies through various forms and techniques of discipline, including those they exert over themselves.’ (Ramazanoğlu and Holland, 1993, p. 261.) This construct might be compared with Norbert Elias’ theme of ‘the civilising process’ as exemplified in his assertion that: ‘The social standard to which the individual was first made to conform by external restraint is finally reproduced smoothly within him, through a self-restraint which may operate even against his conscious wishes.’ (Elias, 1998, p. 54.) (This is excerpted from *The Civilizing Process* originally published in 1939.) This unreflective ‘self-restraint’ is an integral aspect of the concept of disciplinarity. Used in relation to ‘academic discipline’ it points to the socialisation of the academic individual into a cultural frame that elicits unreflexive attitudinal and behavioural comportments.

11. A. Who can ask 'what is a discipline?'

or beyond him'.³⁴ Of course, it is probably relatively easy for a psychologist or a policy analyst to conduct an enquiry into the nature and role of the disciplinary organisation of knowledge without having to confront Foucault, never mind get past or around him. (Thus, Becher and Trowler have cause to mention Foucault only once in their major study of academic discipline cultures, and do so in a highly schematic and off-hand manner.) But, within the arts, Foucault's legacy seems unavoidable.

While initially it may have appeared that the question 'What is a discipline?' may seem to draw us away from the familiar habit of being embedded within a discipline, it now appears that the question is only asked within the terms available to us in the disciplinary base from which we look out. Consider Bechler and Trowler's contention that 'The concept of an academic discipline is not altogether straightforward, in that, as is true of many concepts, it allows room for some uncertainties of application'.³⁵ The unlikely solution to this conundrum that Bechler and Trowler propose comes via the observation that disciplines are 'in part' identified through the existence of 'relevant departments' but 'it does not follow that every department represents a discipline'.³⁶ In fact, they displace the matter of defining a discipline altogether, through recourse to ethnographic ideas such as 'socialisation' and enculturation, with disciplines being presented as tribal cultures occupying various territories within the university. Thus, they assert that, 'Despite their temporal shifts of character and their institutional and national diversity, we may appropriately conceive of disciplines as having recognizable identities and particular cultural attributes'.³⁷ Interestingly, Bechler and Trowler single out the role of language use in constituting disciplinary identity and culture, to assert that it is in 'the medium of language that some of the more fundamental distinctions emerge'.³⁸ Ultimately, they resolve the question of what a discipline is by pointing to a 'knowledge community' or 'subculture' within the university, which is reproduced and maintained by the use of 'myth', 'unifying symbols', the 'canonisation of exemplars' and the 'formation of guilds'.³⁹

34. M. Peters (Ed.), *After the Disciplines: The Emergence of Culture Studies*. (Westport: Bergin and Garvey, 1999). p. 2

34. M. Peters (Ed.), *After the Disciplines: The Emergence of Culture Studies*. (Westport: Bergin and Garvey, 1999). p. 2

35. T. Becher and P.R. Trowler, op. cit. p. 41.

36. Loc cit.

37. Ibid. p. 44.

38. Ibid. p. 46.

39. Ibid. p. 56.

Clearly, there is something unsatisfactory about both Messer-Davidow et al. and Bechler and Trowler's approaches as regards fixing a clear sense of disciplinarity. However, it is worth considering that, between these two approaches, perhaps there is an emergent sense of the themes that need to be considered in framing a definition. Clearly, there is the issue of knowledge organisation and the ways in which organisational divisions interact with taxonomic mappings of knowledge. There is also the issue that discipline-status is a validity matter – that being accorded the status of discipline is a matter of being legitimised. There is also the issue of disciplines serving to fold together heterogeneous elements, such as established authorities, objects or methods of enquiry, behaviours, ways of speaking and concrete social relations of belonging. There is also, in the appeal to the theme of 'culture', a suggestion that a significant part of being a discipline is the establishment of a tacit knowledge base, an 'already said' that may be allowed to go unspoken and undeclared, and therefore to go unchallenged, within the discipline. This image of disciplinarity, as the power to establish 'that it is already accepted', is a matter of enculturation but also a matter of power – the power to reproduce that which is 'already accepted'.

11. A.3 **The Power to Reproduce**

Rockwell asserts this point with a clarity and confidence that is worth repeating: 'A discipline is born when a field takes control of its means of reproduction, specifically the ability to produce "disciples" or students'.⁴⁰ Indeed, Rockwell has cause to repeat this observation, drawing attention to the ways in which interdisciplinary initiatives might overlap with discipline formations but ultimately diverge:

[...] one could say a discipline is a loose family of people who tend to gather in certain places to discuss certain things in certain ways and who perpetuate that discussion through mechanisms. We are defined by our journals, our conferences, our membership in societies, our speech, what we do, and where we do it. Of all these characteristics, many of which are shared by interdisciplinary fields, that which distinguishes a discipline is the control over the means of educational reproduction.⁴¹

40. This may be contrasted with Roger Geiger's assertion that: 'If there is a single crucial point in the process of academic professionalisation it would be the formation of a national association with its attendant central journal.' (Geiger, 1986, p. 22.)

41. G. Rockwell, (2002) 'Multimedia, Is it a Discipline? The Liberal and Service Arts in Humanities Computing', in G. Braungart, K. Eibl, and F. Jannidis (eds.) *Jahrbuch für Computerphilologie* 4. [<http://computerphilologie.uni-muenchen.de/jg02/rockwell.html>] (29/5/06)

11. A. Who can ask 'what is a discipline?'

The impulse to repeat this observation may be a response to the fact that this issue of institutional reproduction – caught in the hoary image of discipleship – is surprisingly downplayed in many discussions of disciplinarity, even where the induction of students into specific social worlds, through disciplinary processes, is discussed. It is also interesting to note that Rockwell produces his observation not in an attempt to produce an account of disciplinarity in general but rather by way of a consideration of a specific proto-discipline 'humanities computing' (his own area of expertise) and its ambivalent disciplinary status. Marjorie Garber provides an interesting counterpoint to the image of the discipline-based scholar in terms of the ('comical') figure of the 'autodidact', and, in so doing, underlines the critical theme of disciplines as engines of self-reproduction. In a remarkably wide-ranging and inventive essay, entitled 'Discipline Envy', Garber begins with a discussion of the 'vanity of small differences' in relation to disciplines that are irked by the proximity of near-neighbours (e.g. Plato's philosophy grounds itself in its difference from the work of the sophists) and proceeds via a consideration of the stakes of interdisciplinarity and the Romantic theory of genius to arrive at the 'dark twin' of the scholar, the 'plodding' autodidact who 'by definition' is not a member of 'the discipline'.⁴² Drawing on examples from literature – 'the Self-Taught Man' of Sartre's *La Nausee*, the Reverend Casaubon in George Eliot's *Middlemarch* – Garber suggests that the scholar must disavow the autodidact as a ridiculous figure because of the uncanny threat to the scholar's identity that is posed by the bearer of an illegitimate erudition realised beyond the discipleship of authentic learning. The autodidact is dismissed as untrained, 'makes elementary mistakes, thinks that knowledge can be collected, stored up'.⁴³ The autodidact forces an unwelcome moment of self-reflection on the scholar, 'a quandary of self-questioning', while the autodidact must envy the scholar who 'inhabits the discipline'. This prompts Garber to pronounce that 'the whole nature of the discipline is, precisely, that it can't be self-taught. It must be transmitted [...] in order to exist'.⁴⁴

Returning to Rockwell's reflections on the roots of his subject area in laying claim to the 'prerogatives of discipline', it is clear that the construction – foundation – of a new discipline provides a possibility for greater insight into the dynamic of disciplinary culture. The development of a new discipline is described by him as 'a rupture in the existing structure of institutions'; it is 'outside the founded

42. M. Garber, 'Discipline Envy' in *Academic Instincts*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

43. G. Rockwell, *ibid.* p. 88.

44. *Loc cit.*

discipline, being the condition of its becoming'. The founding of a new discipline is a 'liminal moment', and thus enables reflection on the process through which the 'already said' passes into the 'goes without saying'. It is also worth noting that Rockwell draws upon Derrida's *Mochlos*, or the conflict of the faculties' to illustrate the performative contradictions enacted in moments of institutional founding, which 'rupture' the existing institution and 'break' with the already established law. In his closing paragraphs, Rockwell counsels against the risk of the emerging discipline coming to behave like older disciplines, potentially developing an intolerance to any future disciplinary novelties. He does so with a turn of phrase that precisely suggests the importance of attending to the turning of phrases – of listening to the work of rhetoric – by declaring that 'If we are to discipline our speech let us be careful about a discourse of aggrievement'.⁴⁵

This question of the emergence of new disciplines is also dealt with by Becher and Trowler. They provide a typology of modes of emergence, distinguishing between internal and external 'genesis' to suggest that 'there are those disciplines that owe their origins to internal causes, and those that come into being for reasons that lie outside the sphere of purely academic influence'.⁴⁶ And so, internal genesis may come about through the fusion of existing disciplines to generate a new one (e.g. biology and chemistry interacting to produce a subsequently discrete domain of biochemistry) or through the splitting-off (fission) of a new discipline, a specialist sub-domain detached from a host discipline (e.g. the separation of computer science from mathematics and the development of design history from within the history of art).⁴⁷ By contrast, the external genesis of disciplines is most clearly exemplified by the emergence of market-orientated, professional

45. Loc cit.

46. T. Becher and P.R. Trowler (orig, 1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories: Second Edition*, (Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, 2001) p. 171.

47. The example of a disciplinary domain which is currently emerging from the complex intersection of design history (as a splitting-off of a sub-domain within art history) and the study of material culture (as an interdisciplinary domain characterised by the heterogeneous interaction of archaeology, anthropology, social history, and cultural studies) suggests that the smooth taxonomy of modes of discipline formation identified by Becher and Trowler (2001) need to be treated as only schematic and indicative. One commentator describes the study of material culture as an 'inherently multidisciplinary space where a number of disciplines converge' but one which 'remains eclectic,' i.e., as a 'discipline' material culture retains a self-consciously hybrid character. (Miller cited in Buchli and Lucas, 2001.) Such 'interdisciplinary' disciplines might best be understood as demonstrating that an eclectic 'discipline' need not be exhaustively specified by a study object, a study method, a canon or indeed any assemblage of these, but rather may be constituted by the professional network that generates a relatively discrete reputational economy. See Section 3.8 below for a discussion of discipline and reputational economy.

11. A. Who can ask 'what is a discipline?'

studies or niche-targeted specialist disciplines (e.g. business administration or medical instrumentation). The diverse amalgams of 'interdisciplinary' studies, which constitute various area studies disciplines (e.g. South-East Asian or Slavic studies) that proliferated in the post-war era and are indicative of the direct interaction of external political requirement and university responsiveness to 'the need for new knowledge'.⁴⁸ Another mode of emergence, which may be termed 'hybrid,' is the extension of academic institutions to incorporate new subject areas that have emerged outside the university but which correlate with some aspect of studies currently accommodated by the university (e.g. psychoanalysis and its connection with aspects of psychology and philosophy or film studies and its relationship with aspects of literature and the history of art). Whatever their mode of emergence, once established, each new discipline requires a mechanism of institutional reproduction and (most often) a means through which to perpetuate a lexicon that characterises the specificity of the discipline thus created. This brings us to the question of disciplinary reproduction which is elaborated further in the next section.

11. B. Reproductions

11. B.1 Disciplined Speech

The transmission of university disciplines has often been epitomised as the transmission of ways of speaking, of specialist languages – of 'jargons'. The guild system of professional protectionism has long understood the importance of maintaining a closed language of expertise. This is exemplified by the legal profession's 'terms of art' – a phrase which, in itself, actualises the specialised use of language in pursuit of professional interests while serving to exclude the uninitiated. Predictably enough, the 'disciplined speech' of specialised knowledge communities has, on many occasions, been the target of irreverent criticism. One reviewer eloquently caricatured a species of this 'disciplined speech' in a *Village Voice* supplement of the early 1990s: 'Everybody knows that literary and cultural critics, who were once genteel independent, plain-talking men of letters [...] are now a bunch of academic jargon spouting technodroids who've purchased their disciplinary legitimacy simply by making up languages so difficult that no one but a specialist can understand them'.⁴⁹

48. In an interesting treatment of comparative literature – *Death of A Discipline* (2003) – Spivak summarily asserts the contingent processes shaping the formation of disciplines such as area studies and comparative literature: 'these two institutional enterprises can perhaps be recounted as follows. Area Studies were established to secure U.S. power in the Cold War. Comparative Literature was a result of European intellectuals fleeing "totalitarian" regimes.' (p. 3.)

49. M. Bérubé, 'Egghead Salad Or, I Was a Tenured Intellectual' in *Voice Literary Supplement*, December 1993. p. 29

With this in mind, the simple question – What is a discipline? – allows, if not requires, us to revisit the question of legitimate speech and the transmission of ways of speaking expertly, with authority and ‘the prerogatives of discipline’. This may also be connected to Bourdieu’s analysis of academic discourse as operating a process of enculturation into a specific mode of socially privileged speaking. If we take Bourdieu’s treatment of the essay submission for instance:

The essay, as it is prepared and assessed under the current examinations regime, makes elegance, ease, assurance, and distinction the true [...] essayistic qualities, and penalises vulgarity of style, clumsiness of expression and awkwardness of formulation. Through [essay] rhetoric, the ability to manipulate a language which remains the language of a social class – even when decorated with the values of universality – becomes the unique criterion of academic judgement, and the essay one of the most apt instruments for perpetuating cultural privilege.⁵⁰

This does not have to be reduced to the proposition that essays are simply bad, mere ritual instruments of hegemonic control. More generally, it may be taken to propose that the practice of assessment and reinforcement, realised through the essay under these circumstances, is orientated around a very specific cultural practice – a way of using language – which is naturalised and reproduced through academic education but not normally explicitly thematised as such within academic discourse. One may make the challenge to Bourdieu that what he describes is specific to the pre-1968 university system in France. It is easy to recognise aspects of this process as being specific to French educational practices that have privileged a ‘Cartesian’ clarity of prose and a French cultural tradition which has developed a highly codified language standard.⁵¹ But it may be worth considering the broader critical proposition that Bourdieu is making, which is that

50. P. Bourdieu, *Academic Discourse*. 1965. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994). p. 93.

51. This is, perhaps, ironic given that the most common criticism of academic language is targeted precisely at its tendency towards obscurity rather than clarity. However, the salient issue here is that Bourdieu is identifying a process of cultural induction into a privileged mode of discourse, a process of transmitting symbolic or ‘cultural capital’. The nature of the privileged mode of discourse may shift across different domains and periods (for example shifting from prioritising clarity to prioritising self-reference or technical difficulty in academic prose) but the critical issue is that a differentiation of ways of speaking is enacted and reproduced. This linguistic practice also works as a mechanism for differentiating reputational status and hierarchy. Barthes has provided a classic argument in respect of the French academic context which seeks to unmask the ideological investments of ‘clarity’ in French academic prose of the pre-1968 moment. “‘French clarity’” is a language whose origin is political. It was born at a time when the upper classes hoped in accordance with a well-known ideological practice – to convert the particularity of their writing into a universal idiom, persuading people that the ‘logic’ of French was an absolute logic’ (Barthes, 2004, p. 10; orig. 1966).

11. B. Reproductions

the university and its disciplines are built on academic practices that are, for the most part, un-reflexive, unexamined and carrying out a conservative function of social reproduction. He is asserting that a key aspect of learning is the un-thematised inculcation of norms that establish the unspoken rules of the game. Indeed, these *unspoken* rules often determine what may be *spoken* – what may properly find ‘serious’ reflective treatment and a secure passage into accredited language.⁵² (Foucault’s construct of ‘discourse’ in his work of the late 1960s and early 1970s also served, in part, to address this theme.)⁵³

When we consider the critical test of a discipline – the ability to self-reproduce – the role of the PhD appears to be a central plank within any disciplinary platform. The naturalisation of disciplinary divisions promotes an ahistorical understanding of the PhD in relation to this role. In the course of a jeremiad against American university education, Page Smith declares of the PhD that ‘We have become so accustomed to it, it is so ingrained in our ways of thinking about higher education, that we consider it part of the natural order of the universe’.⁵⁴ The gold standard of the PhD is most often presented as a fixed measure – a metric with an unambiguous solidity.⁵⁵ Thus, in debating the protocols of an emerging doctoral process in the visual arts, one commentator was prompted to ask: ‘Should practice-based doctoral students be expected to write thesis [sic] of the same proficiency as conventional PhD students?’⁵⁶ This question presumes an already established, unproblematic and fixed measure in PhD literacy standards.

The typical moment of discipline-constitutive institutional self-examination is the point at which the allocation of PhDs within a ‘new’ discipline is broached. For example, in relation to art and design studio

52. In an article, entitled ‘The Institutional Unconscious; or, The Prison House of Academia’, a related form of argument has been proposed in respect of the American competitive ‘tenure’ system which Chun claims entails ‘the introduction of a whole panoply of micropractices that necessitates various routines of everyday conduct by invoking norms of etiquette, rites of professional performance, moral obligations, strategies of writing, and political maneuvering that cannot easily be deduced by a pure pursuit of knowledge’ (Chun, 2000, p. 52). This strongly suggests that these practices are determined by something other than epistemological or cognitive considerations.

53. See M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. 1969. trans. A.M. Sheridan Smyth. (London: Tavistock, 1972).

54. P. Smith, *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America*. (New York: Viking Penguin, 1990). p. 108

55. The understanding of doctoral awards as being ‘of equivalent value in all circumstances, no matter which university had granted them’ is present in the medieval university and reasserts itself today. (Verger, 2003, p. 36.)

56. F. Candlin, ‘A Proper Anxiety? Practice-based PhDs and Academic Unease’ in *Working Papers in Art and Design*, Vol. 1. (unp., 2000). <http://www.herts.ac.uk/artdes1/research/papers/wpades/vol1/candlin2full.html>

practice, this process has been broadly underway for just over two decades in Australia, the UK, Northern Europe, Ireland and North America. Interestingly, within these debates, a critical point of contest has centred on the textual dimensions of the PhD submission to be made by practitioners.⁵⁷ This is indicative both of the central importance of textual production as the key to cognitive legitimacy and of the significance of codifying proper utterance in producing a discipline. Privileging the cognitive given-ness of textual production in the ‘practice-based’ art and design PhD is untroubled by the kinds of epistemological quandaries that artefactual or other material production presents. In this way, Katy MacLeod claims – while defending the cognitive role of the artist-theorist and asserting the intellectual content of ‘making’ vis-à-vis ‘writing’ – that ‘This is theory which is not written; it is made or realised through artwork. This theory is the result of ideas worked through matter. [...] It may well be dependant upon the relationship between the written text and the artwork but it is demonstrative of the intellectuality of making, which is not the same as the intellectuality of writing’.⁵⁸

Thus, while a great deal of time is spent trying to establish what the textual component of a practice-based submission should actually do, for the majority of commentators it is a given that: (I) ‘doctorate-ness’, *per se*, is a viable and stable category that just needs to be populated with the appropriate criteria and (II) the cognitive claims of a text written according to certain conventions of established academic genres – the use of an apparatus; the incorporation of established rhetorical formulae, e.g. the literature review; the univocal narrativisation of content (introduction, body, conclusion); the rules of voice (e.g. use of pronouns I, we, they) – are given, and the question is simply how the text and the material production of art and design coincide in a practice-based submission. In principle, then, the textual component is presented as being capable of operating with epistemological stability, and its role is only complicated by the

57. Indicative of the uninterrogated prior ascription of an untroubled cognitive role to textual production in academic practice evident in these debates is one commentator’s observations that: One can now find regulations that specify that a PhD thesis should be 80000 words, but in art and design, and other areas that offer so-called practice-based research, the word count can be reduced to 40000 words when the thesis is accompanied by a submission of artefacts. This has an implication: the initial 80000 word requirement referred not to an arbitrary 80000 words but 80000 words of relevant content. Therefore if as much as 50% of the word count is remitted in the case of artefact-thesis submissions we must conclude that the University considers that 50% of the relevant content can be communicated via the artefact. (Biggs, 2004, unp.)

58. K. MacLeod, ‘The Functions of the Text in Practice Based PhD Submissions’ in *Working Papers in Art and Design*, Vol. 1. (unp., 2000). <http://www.herts.ac.uk/artdes1/research/papers/wpades/vol1/macleod2.html> (accessed 12 March 2005).

11. B. Reproductions

question of its interrelationship with the material component and specificity of the discipline. This kind of debate is indicative of the significance of codifying language-use in constructing disciplinarity.

The model of epistemic stability is associated with an overarching genre – academic writing – while the dilemma of the would-be self-reproducing discipline is the appropriation of these genre conventions to the ‘subject area’ in a way that generates a sub genre of discipline-specific academic writing. Garber’s ‘vanity of small differences’ may also be in play here, as part of the concern in the debate about practice-based submissions lies in differentiating the textual component of the practice-based submission from the textual priorities of cognate domains such as art history or visual culture, which have traditionally provided the textual training for third-level teaching of artists and designers.

In his treatment of the disciplinary formation of English literary studies, Scholes makes a similar argument, observing that ‘The English department as we know it was in place in the first decade of [the 20th] century [...] All that happened in the ensuing decades was growth [...] Along with growth came increasing specialization and professionalisation, as the doctorate and Germanic methods began to dominate instruction’.⁵⁹ A consequence of the attempt to achieve equivalence with the professional standing of established disciplines – by implementing the doctoral system of study – was ‘to add intellectual stiffening’ to the curriculum. This intellectual stiffening – the requisite rigour for realising a PhD – is considered by Scholes to be the engine of the theoretical oscillations of literary study from rhetoric to philology to the new criticism to structuralism to post-structuralism and back to rhetoric.⁶⁰ (See Chapter 4 for a related discussion of the allegation of a theory-based expansionism on the part of literary studies.)

This strategy, within literary studies, for achieving disciplinary legitimacy, through adoption of the PhD and related disciplinary trappings, has prompted a critical reaction. Sosnoski asserts that

59. R. Scholes, *The Rise and Fall of English: Reconstructing English as a Discipline*. (New Haven and London: Yale

60. Scholes perspective may be complemented in part by Lambert’s. The latter argues: ‘English’ for example, particularly as this idea manifested in the institutional history of the American university, bears all the marks of a contingently conceived product of a certain era of our historical imagination, one which has grown so outdated in its representation of ‘what is called literature,’ as a form of cultural and historical knowledge, as to lead many to wonder whether it can any longer be called a good idea! (Lambert, 2001, p. 37.)

‘disciplinarity – a condition wherein control over the production of knowledge is gained by training in methods [...] has shown itself to be a dubious rationale for literary studies’.⁶¹ The problem, Sosnoski proposes, is that these disciplinary formulae are indebted to an inappropriate model derived from science – a model at odds with the subject area but nonetheless inherent in the disciplinary constitution of any subject domain. The argument underlying Sosnoski’s claim is that disciplinarity emerges as a specific local strategy for the sciences, with the development of the broad domain of natural philosophy into a system of rigorously separated sub-domains from the late 19th century onwards. In an attempt to maintain and augment their standing as legitimate knowledges, the non-science traditions of the ‘humanities’ import the discipline systems of the sciences – including the PhD construct – and, as a consequence, an inappropriate model of scholarship and research is applied with ‘dubious rationale’.⁶²

11. B. 2 **Genealogies of Disciplinarity**

The question – What is a discipline? – has thus led onto the question of what a PhD might or might not be in terms of servicing a logic of discipline-reproduction and legitimation, but it has also brought us back to the well-worn debate around the differences between the sciences and the humanities. Thus, the significance of an earlier conflict between the faculties – C. P. Snow’s famous ‘two cultures’ controversy with F. R. Leavis – begins to assert itself.⁶³ Also of interest in this context is the German version of this conflict, as realised in Gadamer’s *Truth and Method*⁶⁴ and Habermas’ *Knowledge and Human Interest* and *The Theory of Communicative Action*.⁶⁵ However, before tackling the theme of disciplinary distinctions across the apparently primary axis of science/

61. J.J. Sosnoski, *Modern Skeletons in Postmodern Closets: A Cultural Studies Alternative*. (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1995). p. 35.

62. Loc. cit.

63. ‘The Two Cultures’ was the title of an influential 1959 Rede Lecture by British scientist and novelist C.P. Snow. In this lecture he proposed that the breakdown of communication between the ‘two cultures’ of the sciences and the humanities was a major hindrance to social progress. Snow was a scientist and a popularly successful novelist and seemed to many to be well placed to pose the question of the ‘two cultures.’ Controversy grew when the well-established literary critic F.R. Leavis fiercely defended the established view of literary intellectuals against Snow’s critique. Openly contemptuous of Snow’s ability as a novelist, Leavis was unwilling to admit that the physical scientist could fill the role of a true intellectual. In subsequent usage ‘the two cultures’ has become a shorthand for describing the mutual incomprehension of practitioners across the science-humanities divide. For an account of the Snow/Leavis controversy see Collini (1998).

64. H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method: Second Edition*. 1960. trans. J. Weinshammer and D.G. Marshall. (London: Sheed & Ward. 1989).

65. J. Habermas, *Knowledge & Human Interest*. 1968. (Oxford: Polity, 1998).

11. B. Reproductions

humanities or *Naturwissenschaften/Geisteswissenschaften*, it will be helpful to consider the historical emergence of disciplinary sub divisions in the university system from the late 19th century onwards, before placing the development of the PhD in this context.

The doctorate has been awarded by universities since the 13th century. However, as most commentators acknowledge, it has profoundly changed in character in the modern era.⁶⁶ For most of its history, the practice was to award doctorates specific to each of the four faculties – Medicine, Law, Theology and Philosophy – but, in the early 19th century, the Doctorate of Philosophy (PhD), which had previously been a less-esteemed award, emerged with a new prestige. Under the influence of university reformers such as Humboldt and Fichte, it became predominantly employed as an award for achievements in research (i.e. originating new knowledge) as opposed to distinction in scholarship (i.e. mastery of an established corpus).⁶⁷ This new PhD construct became especially associated with aspects of the lower faculty, (general knowledge subjects in distinction from the professional subjects of medicine, law and theology) most notably the natural sciences (chemistry, biology, physics) and historical studies. From its origins in Germany, the PhD spread slowly, and was particularly resisted in some British universities.⁶⁸

As indicated previously, within the German system, the subject areas of chemistry and history were pivotal domains for working out the PhD system; chemistry established the relationship between the PhD and advanced research training in the service of technological and economic development, while history consolidated the institution of the seminar – as exemplified in Ranke's research seminar and the training of his students in the rigours of source

66. It is interesting to note however that the pervasive adoption of the PhD construct that characterises the contemporary global reach of the university system has had an uneven history of development. Thus, for example, universities in Australia did not award the PhD until 1948. (Buder, 2004, p. 280.) This was a century after the establishing of the first Australian universities in the mid-nineteenth century. The first PhD award in Australia was made by the University of Melbourne to Joyce Stone for her thesis entitled, 'Virus haemagglutination: a review of the literature' (indicating the significance of the natural sciences in initially driving the adoption of the PhD construct.) By 2003 more than 50,000 PhDs had been awarded by Australian Universities, and there were more than 30,000 students enrolled in doctoral programmes at 40 different Australian universities. (See Evans et al., 2003.)

67. Once developed in Prussia, variations on the new PhD construct were imported into France (Victor Cousin at the *Ecole Normale* in the 1830s); Britain (University of London, 1857); and America (Yale, 1861.)

68. A British report on professional doctorate awards notes that '[i]t is salutary to recognise that in the early years of the last century, there were many voices raised in favour of the view that research obstructed the core university activities of scholarship and teaching.' UK Council for Graduate Education (2002).

criticism – and the priority of the *Doktorvater* relationship.⁶⁹ In the migration of the PhD construct across subject areas, the diverse aspects of this genealogy have been activated in different ways at different times. We have seen already, for example, that the PhD has been used as an instrument in constructing disciplinary legitimacy and distinction. Thus, the accession of disciplines like English literary studies or area studies to the status of discrete departments within university structures was bound up with the construction of a PhD process specific to these domains and the reciprocal construction of these disciplines as appropriate areas for application of the PhD award.

Similarly, an idea of the ‘discipline’ was already at work in the 13th century university, delimiting the progress of studies in the faculty of arts (later more usually called the faculty of philosophy) from the *trivium* and the *quadrivium* and then on into the higher faculties of law, medicine and theology. However, the disciplines of the lower faculty were not ‘disciplined’ in the way in which we have seen that term operate in respect of the modern university system.⁷⁰ It is, rather, through a varied and multiply determined set of historical processes that disciplinary divisions became an especially significant resource in the organisation of knowledge across the 19th century. These processes may be summarily listed as follows: (I) The humanities emerged as a specific pedagogical system during the Renaissance, both inside and outside the universities of Northern Italy; (II) The field of natural philosophy was profoundly changed by the scientific revolution of the 16th and 17th centuries; (III) Historical and anthropological studies were profoundly rethought through the renewal of the 18th century tradition of humanities in response to this earlier mathematisation of natural philosophy (e.g. Vico and Herder). This reorientation of humanist studies also responded to the tremendous growth in critical reflection on political and civil society (in the wake of the Reformation and in response to the political instabilities of the notoriously complex political history of the 17th century); (IV) The encyclopaedic projects of the Enlightenment provided a sharper sense of sub-dividing the tree of knowledge (even as these projects proposed a unified vision of total knowledge). The encyclopaedic approach worked to thematise

69. Gilbert (1990) asserts: ‘History was an autonomous discipline; this was the core of the new concept of history on which Ranke’s work was founded. He claimed a place for history in the university structure that it had never previously held. [...] Chairs devoted exclusively to the teaching of history did not exist at German universities.’ (pp. 20–21.) While professor at Humboldt’s University of Berlin (1825–71), Ranke initiated the seminar system of teaching history and trained an entire generation of historians, who in turn perpetuated his ideas and his scientific model of history as a discipline. (See Smith, 1995.)

70. J. Verger, ‘Patterns’ in H. De Ridder-Symoens (ed.) *A History of the University in Europe: Vol.1: Universities in the Middle Ages. 1992.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). pp. 40–1.

11. B. Reproductions

both the interconnectedness of and differentiation between different knowledge domains.

The argument, then, is that, during the course of the 19th century, the conceptual and organisational resources that the category 'discipline' provided were mobilised in response to a new historical situation. This was engendered by the dynamic, reciprocal interactions of 19th century sciences, the re-modelling of the university and the rapid growth of technologically dependent industrial capitalism. Disciplinarity provided a resource with which to manage knowledge production and reproduction and, in so doing, the category of 'the discipline' evolved and acquired a new semantic resonance and organisational density, as witnessed in the institutionalisation of departmental divisions and specific formalised scientific research communities and networks.

In a similar way, the PhD construct evolved, changed and diversified as it was imported and transferred across different national educational systems and subject areas. In this process, it also acquired new semantic resonances. Thus, while discussing the adoption of the PhD within the US system from 1860 onwards, Cowen observes that 'the doctorate was an extra layer on a system with very varied standards'.⁷¹ Cowen goes on to note that in 'ways that reverberate with the 1990s', the system of the PhD as an award marking a kind of 'completion' of studies and certification of the professional teacher was consolidated 'under pressure of working out international equivalences' between the US, UK and Germany. This contingent pattern of development was later presented as a teleological process implying an inevitability in the emergence of the PhD. Intriguingly, Cowen points to World War I – and the attempt by Britain to establish its universities as alternative destinations for US émigré students – as a formative moment in the emergence of a cohesive British PhD system, whereby 'the Foreign Office itself building on a movement within the universities, assisted in encouraging the creation of a PhD structure'.⁷²

In the process of narrating the professionalisation of US university historians in the late 19th century, Novick disabuses the hoary myth of the German PhD system when he declares that 'American students in Germany generally received the doctorate within two years of their arrival, usually for a very brief dissertation based on printed sources – hardly more than what would later count as a seminar paper'.⁷³

71. *ibid.*

72. R. Cowen, 'Comparative Perspectives on the British PhD' in Graves and Varma (eds.), *Working for a Doctorate*. (London: Routledge, 1997). p.190

He goes on to note that, while universities providing the PhD may have conceived of themselves as ‘centers from which scholarly missionaries poured forth’, they were often little more than ‘service stations for legitimization’.⁷⁴ Of course, Novick’s account attempts to aggressively debunk an ahistorical foundational narrative for the discipline of history; however, a different image of German PhD practices and disciplinary success emerges if we follow the development of the PhD with respect to chemistry and the remarkable multiplication of scientific disciplines in the second half of the 19th century.

As Bensaude-Vincent notes, ‘Chemistry has provided a paradigmatic example of the whole process of disciplinary specialisation’.⁷⁵ She notes three specific processes in the ‘paradigm’ of disciplinary identity: (I) the institution of national specialist societies; (II) the emergence of specialist journals from within these societies; and (III) the introduction of the international disciplinary conference (pointing to the 1860 Karlsruhe Congress of 140 chemists from 13 countries).⁷⁶ As such, the discipline-formation process is described as both intrinsic and extrinsic to the university system, but also as determined, in part, by the inherent tendency and epistemological or cognitive consequence of particular discoveries within the research process. David Cahan makes this broader point well when he states that ‘the sense of belonging to a national or international scientific community was very much based on scientific disciplines and their specialized associations, and these in turn were due to new or expanded intellectual developments’.⁷⁷ This suggests that there was ‘a dialectical relationship between intellectual developments and the surrounding social and cultural worlds’.⁷⁸ On the other hand, the institutional division of chemistry within the university system ‘was the cornerstone of the process of professionalisation’.⁷⁹

It is clear, from Bensaude-Vincent’s review of the literature on the history of 19th century chemistry, that the full dynamics of this process of discipline formation have not yet been mapped out. However,

73. P. Novick, *That Noble Dream: The ‘Objectivity Question’ and the American Historical Profession*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). p. 48.

74. Loc. cit.

75. B. Bensaude-Vincent, ‘Chemistry’ in D. Cahan (ed.) *From Natural Philosophy to the Sciences: Writing the History of Nineteenth Century Science*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). p. 213.

76. Loc. cit.

77. D. Cahan, *From Natural Philosophy to the Sciences: Writing the History of Nineteenth-Century Science* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2003). p. 11.

78. Loc. cit.

79. B. Bensaude-Vincent, op. cit. p. 211.

11. B. Reproductions

it is also clear that disciplinary differentiation and border demarcations were a significant aspect of this process: 'Chemistry's changing boundaries with physics and biology have also shaped its identity. The borders with physics have been renegotiated numerous times'⁸⁰ and '[t]he boundaries between physiology and chemistry, for their part, raised passionate debates during the nineteenth century'.⁸¹ In the context of such controversies, new discipline formations did not always get their way. Thus, it has been argued that 'physiological chemistry failed to institutionalize as a discipline in the 1850s because university chairs were divided' between the cognate disciplines of 'organic chemistry and physiology',⁸² which, in turn, contested the proper study of chemical and material transformation processes in respect of the living organism.

Emphasising the question of professionalisation, Bensaude-Vincent turns to the question of academic-industrial relationships, and, while noting a need to study a broader range of interactions between both these poles of activity, she re-affirms the significance of the close dialogues and partnerships between the university and the new chemical industries, not only in forging disciplinary sub fields, such as industrial chemistry, but also in promoting the status of chemistry in general. There is, then, a fourth theme in this process of disciplinary emergence for the sciences, which is the specific value of scientific knowledge and particular specialisms for the larger expansion of technologically grounded 19th century industrial capitalism. However, this process is itself the subject of historiographical debate. As one commentator has argued:

Both the history of science and the history of technology, as they have come down to us, lend themselves to a heroic 'push hypothesis,' whereby science pushes technology and technology in turn pushes industry toward innovation. This once pervasive 'linear model,' which continues to be used to influence and legitimize public spending on research and development, has lost much of its persuasiveness over the last decades. If on the other hand we conceive of a triangle of science, technology, and industry and do so in terms of systematic interrelatedness, the result is a much more complex and plausible pattern of multidirectional pushes and pulls to and from each of the three elements.⁸³

80. B. Bensaude-Vincent, op. cit. p. 208.

81. B. Bensaude-Vincent, op. cit. p. 209.

82. B. Bensaude-Vincent, op. cit. p. 320.

82. B. Bensaude-Vincent, op. cit. p. 320.

83. U. Wengenroth, 'Science, Technology, and Industry' in D. Cahan (ed.), *From Natural Philosophy to the Sciences: Writing the History of Nineteenth-Century Science*. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2003). p.224.

Thus, in the narrative of the emergence of increasingly specialised disciplines in the 19th century German university system, there are multiply determined, reciprocally active and multifaceted processes which cannot be reduced to a singular narrative of causation. The implications of this must be that the specific disciplinary ecology manifested in the university is profoundly contingent and not simply an unmediated translation of the already given carve-up of the natural world. However, it is still possible that, despite the contingency of specific discipline configurations, ‘disciplinarity’ might, in itself, be an inherent teleology of advanced knowledge cultures. This is to say that, while a given disciplinary taxonomy may be a contingent construct (e.g. the co-existence of ‘quantum physics’, ‘area studies’ and ‘English’), the co-ordination of knowledge in discrete sub systems and sub units may be a necessary aspect of knowledge organisation once a certain critical threshold in knowledge accretion has been passed. (Advanced knowledge cultures may be loosely conceived of as those collective processes of archiving, transmitting and evaluating texts which have exceeded, in volume and complexity, the potential for mastery of such a corpus of knowledge by any single individual no matter how accomplished a polymath.)

In pursuing the nature and role of disciplines, we encounter a complex set of themes which tend to historicise disciplinarity as a product of 19th century transformations in knowledge organisation. In this transformation process, a pre-eminent role is played by the sciences, newly liberated from the overarching construct of ‘natural philosophy’. While the contingency of the specific disciplinary ecology emerging from this transformation process is identified, there also arises a question as to whether or not disciplinarity itself is, in some sense, an inevitable development. This concerns whether or not disciplinary sub-divisions of some form are necessary in the growth and organisation of knowledge. Is discipline formation an inevitable consequence of the increased complexity, volume and centrality of knowledge and systems of higher learning for a given social world?

In attempting to address this question, we turn now to Whitely’s *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences*.⁸⁴ This text recommends itself against the backdrop of a rather meagre supply of treatments of the concept of academic discipline, because it is a broadly conceived analysis of epistemic organisational and structural dynamics. This account has maintained currency over the past decade, albeit with

84. R. Whitely, *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences*. 1984. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

11. B. Reproductions

varying degrees of controversy. It seeks to build an overarching view of the coordination of knowledge across the sciences. The focus on the sciences is informed by the claim that modern discipline formations across the spectrum of knowledge (variously sub divided along moveable divisions between arts, humanities and sciences) are extensions of an organisational logic originally developed for 19th century natural sciences such as chemistry.

It has been proposed above that, by providing a ready means with which to reproduce a required base of presupposition (that which goes without saying), and by coding how and what to speak of (that which can and should be spoken), disciplinarity historically provided a grounding that enabled further accretions of knowledge without giving rise to the overwhelming disorientation that multiple lines of research, rapidly developing across a wide spectrum of knowledge, would no doubt have precipitated for individual scholars attempting to assimilate these developments in a broad way. The formation of a discipline also provided a means with which to organise the reproduction and certification of expertise at a historical moment in which technical and scientific expertise became crucial to the broader project of industrial capitalism. An aspect of this discipline-reproductive process has been presented as the reproduction of specialised discourse. Also in the preceding discussion, a relationship emerged between discipline formation and conflict processes, in which disciplines are implicated in conflict (I) by attempts to police the boundaries between different domains; (II) by attempts to maintain a disciplinary ecology that preserves a given discipline's status, territory and network of external relationships. Drawing on Garber's (2001) analysis, a particular force of exclusion was also identified with the role of the autodidact as a dark twin of the discipline-based authorised knowledge-bearer.⁸⁵

11. C. Disciplinarity, Complexity and Knowledge Management

Whitely produced his major thesis on the organisation of the sciences in 1984, in the wake of the controversies between Kuhn and Popper. In this, he states a desire to exceed attempts to distinguish the sciences in terms of 'simple dichotomies', such as 'hard vs. soft' or 'consensual vs. conflictual', and to 'go beyond the simple reproduction of Kuhn's analysis'.⁸⁶ Importantly, Whitely declared

85. M. Garber, op. cit.

86. R. Whitely, op. cit. p. xi.

the intention to produce a framework for ‘comparative analysis’ that did not require ‘philosophical judgements of epistemological rationality’.⁸⁷ He introduces the most recent edition of this work by noting the widely recognised economic role of the sciences and the general claim that the organisation of knowledge in the last quarter of the 20th century is represented as undergoing a process of ‘radical’ change.⁸⁸ Whitely’s basic thesis is that scientific fields may be characterised within a typology that distinguishes organisations along to a number of key axes in which two are central: function (‘work’) and value orientation (‘reputation’). The sciences are thus described as ‘reputational work organisations’. However, they are also amenable to more refined levels of differentiation across other indices such as ‘the degree of task uncertainty’, of ‘mutual dependence’, of ‘impersonality and formality over control procedures’, of segmentation and the levels of ‘hierarchization of sub-units’, etc.⁸⁹

Interestingly, Whitely employs two additional indices for differentiating reputational work organisation which pertain to the theme of conflict: ‘scope of conflict’ and ‘intensity of conflict’. The key term ‘reputational’ augments the theme of competitiveness, introduced by Kuhn in his analysis but left relatively underdeveloped. The reputational aspect of the sciences is introduced succinctly in the observation that, ‘By relying on peer review to assess the merits of research projects, on scientific journals to decide the worth of research results, and on practising researchers to evaluate the qualities of job applicants and promotion candidates, states effectively institutionalize intellectual reputation as the key to rewards. They thus substitute reputational control for bureaucratic directions and evaluation’.⁹⁰

Whitely goes on to claim that, with reputational control of a field – of work and practitioners – there is no need for a science to directly control jobs and the labour markets as long as the reputations managed by the discipline are ‘socially prestigious’ and associated with ‘material rewards indirectly’.⁹¹ This may be taken to mean that, while the organisation of the sciences is ‘distributed’ and multiple local institutional and employment dispensations abound, the coherence of a science as an organisation is gained through the overarching mechanisms of reputational control – mechanisms which have an impact on individuals and institutions. (In this sense, reputation operates somewhat like Bourdieu’s ‘symbolic capital’, generating a

87. Loc. cit.

88. Ibid. p. ix.

89. Ibid. p.169.

90. Ibid. p. xxiii.

91. Ibid. p. 42.

parallel economy of ‘status’.) Whitely also points to the importance of the university system:, whereby ‘the combination of training programmes, certification agency, jobs and facilities in universities was a powerful influence on the structure of the sciences’.⁹²

In his analysis, Whitely posits four key issues in the historical emergence of any science as a reputational work organisation. These are: (I) the attainment of a level of ‘prestige’ within the broader social world and an articulation of specific reputations with ‘rewards’ as a consequence of this prestigious standing; (II) the control by the scientific field of access to such rewards through the relatively autonomous management of reputations within the field itself, e.g. through peer review journals, etc.; (III) the control of ‘competence’ and standards of ‘performance’ and a specific set of techniques of ‘methods’ which demonstrably work to reduce ‘task uncertainty’ within the field (this is a variation on the theme of a discipline being able to self-reproduce and having some set of relatively discrete and differentiated exemplary practices, canons and instruments (i.e. a set of – Kuhnian – paradigmatic models); (IV) the adoption of a ‘distinctive language’ which describes ‘cognitive objects’ and affords communication of ‘task outcomes’ with other practitioners while reducing laypersons’ participation in assessment of task performance and the construction of reputation.⁹³

Later in his work, Whitely maps a nuanced distinction between a ‘scientific field’ and a ‘discipline’. While many ‘scientific fields become transformed into disciplines’, a discipline is historically narrower – a ‘unit of labour market control’ which trains ‘knowledge producers’ in particular skills that ‘monopolize’ contributions to particular ‘intellectual goals’.⁹⁴ Whitely expands upon this by declaring that ‘[d]isciplines, therefore are seen as the institutionalization of scientific fields in training and employment units’.⁹⁵ Thus, disciplines are linked to the reputational organisations that are the sciences, but a discipline may not always be identical to a scientific field since the emphasis in the discipline is the certification of training, the inculcation of a relatively well-defined skill-base and the guild control of a labour unit within, for example, the university. Essentially, the key difference here hinges on a closer relationship between disciplines and the

92. Loc. cit.

93. R. Whitely, *op. cit.* p. 34.

94. R. Whitely, *op. cit.* p. 81.

95. R. Whitely, *op. cit.* p. 113.

co-ordination of employment practices, while the scientific field somewhat more indirectly relates to the employability of individuals through the management of reputations. Whitely suggests that the emergence of the discipline system worked to reduce conflict and controversy within scientific fields because it provided a basis for institutionalised reputation transfer and reproduction that served to contain the personal and idiosyncratic tendencies of the pre-disciplinary sciences, in which a single figure might have attempted to exert reputational control over a broad swathe of scientific enquiry.

Significantly, in addressing the emergence of the discipline system in conjunction with the modern system of scientific organisation, Whitely points to the 19th century German university system as the formative moment. He identifies four key consequences of this process of institutionalisation of knowledge production: (I) it linked the search for intellectual innovation with specific networks of dissemination, certification and training in research skills, giving rise to standardisation in textbooks and a distinction between ‘pure’ and ‘applied’ research; (II) it normalised research and team-based hierarchies in the research process; (III) in combining the production of innovative knowledge with the reproduction of established skills, it organised ‘distinct labour markets into separate “disciplines” which collectively constituted the system of legitimate knowledge’; (IV) it provided a model of how intellectual work in all domains could be organised.⁹⁶

In attempting to establish what constitutes a discipline, a number of quandaries are encountered, among which is the fact that a disciplinary vantage point tends to shape the way in which the question of disciplinarity may be raised. However, in accepting this and operating from the perspective of a research pedagogy that seeks to promote enquiry (rather than to conclude it), it is possible to identify a range of themes pertinent to the *topos* of disciplinarity: (I) The extra-institutional standing secured in national and international networks; (II) The institutional standing in formal mechanisms of accreditation that allow for reproduction of the discipline; (III) The disciplinary ‘habitus’ or socialisation into a broad cultural frame that entails the acquisition of an attitudinal framework that correlates with disciplinary identity but is realised in an unspoken process or ‘hidden curriculum’; (IV) The legitimisation strategies through which disciplinary status confers entitlement with respect to the distribution of reputation, rewards and resources; (V) The territorial rhetorics in the ‘policing of

96. R. Whitely, op. cit. pp. 76-5.

11. C. Disciplinarity, Complexity and Knowledge Management

boundaries' and marking of differences with neighbouring disciplines and unaccredited scholarship; (VI) The structured units of competition for tangible and intangible rewards (employment, promotion, capacity to exert control inputs on disciplinary self-regulation processes and status); (VII) The management of reputation as a *modus operandi* with which disciplines police and control a given territory; (VIII) The construction of specialist language practices that confer reputational standing and exclude the uninitiated not only from participation but also from judgements of value and consequential merit with respect to the productions of the discipline, etc.; (IX) The central role of the PhD as an instrument of disciplinary reproduction; (X) The naturalisation of recent institutional innovations in epistemic co-ordination as somehow grounded in ontology – in how the world actually carves up 'naturally'; (XI) The paradoxical tension between the enabling aspect of disciplines (grounding research by legitimating certain problem/solution couplets) and the repression of certain questions as un-ask-able or non-viable because unanswerable etc.; (XII) The paradoxical tension between the discipline as a basis of reproduction of the already known and as a means to engender the production of the not-yet-known, a tension between conservative and innovatory moments of disciplinarity; (XIII) Disciplinarity arises as a paradigm for the natural sciences in the 19th century but is then transferred into a range of other non natural-science disciplines such as history and political science and English literature, and so forth; (XIV) Finally, 'discipline' may be understood to operate as a metaphorical construct that is deployed by analogy across a network of instances rather than a definitionally delimited construct which can be exhaustively pre-specified; disciplines change, they re-map the inside and outside of their territories.

In thinking through various accounts of discipline, a sense emerges that there is a significant degree of contingency to both the particular set of disciplines and the overall paradigm of disciplinarity. In each instance of thinking through disciplinary issues, there is recourse to the question of language and the imposition of a correct or appropriate way of using language. The discussion of disciplinarity is also permeated by the theme of continuity and discontinuity and various attempts to think through the image of continuity and rupture in institutional narratives and genealogies.

It might be helpful to consider one such contingent discontinuity in the ascendancy of the disciplines, which is the question of a path-not-taken in the history of the modern discipline-based research university ideal. It is notable that, in the attempt to reconsider the

emergence of the modern research university ideal, the question of the doctorate has begun to be critically historicised. So, for example, in his analyses of the emergence of the American graduate school in the late 19th century, James Turner argues that ‘Our present notions of research and what it implies are not self-evident, not “natural”. They have a history, from which “research”, as we use the word, gets its meaning. And unless we recover that history as best we can, we will never understand very well just what it is we all are ultimately about when we do ‘research’.’⁹⁷

For Turner, one of the paths-not-taken in the adoption of a research ideal was that of ‘common erudition’. Turner presents this as an alternative research ideal, derived from philology, the ‘great nineteenth-century model of scholarship’, which provided a counterpoint to the emerging hegemony of the ‘specialized-disciplinary’ research ideal that today appears as the only legitimate, indeed natural, model of research. The key feature of the general erudition ideal is described as follows:

Philology spawned an ideal of research quite different from that in physics or astronomy. Rather than subdividing the map of knowledge into specialised territories, it encouraged efforts to situate information within the broad boundaries of entire civilizations or cultures. Rather than erecting methodological barriers that made it hard for non-specialists to pursue learning, it tended to push all sorts of diverse knowledge together into a common arena, accessible to any curious inquirer.⁹⁸

Remembering such paths not taken, as a consequence of the construction of a disciplinary ecology of specialised research cultures, is about retrieving a value that has fallen into disrepute. This is a matter of attending to breadth and synthesis as well as to analysis and close reading in the quest to extrapolate from the local to the global, from the micro to the macro, without necessarily constructing a frozen, overarching and totalised system. Consider, for a moment, a field of practice – such as contemporary art – that may be characterised by, for instance, an expansive movement to thematise anything and everything that is offered in the everyday. What might such a field of practice gain in its attempt to achieve disciplinary legitimacy by remembering philology’s path-not-taken?

97. J. Turner, *Language, Religion, Knowledge: Past and Present*. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003). p. 106.

98. J. Turner, op. cit. p. 100.

It is also worth noting here that the question ‘Is artistic research a new discipline?’ may be the wrong formulation. This question might better be recast as: ‘Does the variety of resources and limits (enablements and disablements) that the contested construct of disciplinarity brings into play have any utility or meaning for the development of specific research undertakings within the arts?’ ‘What is at stake in anti-disciplinary, interdisciplinary transdisciplinary and post-disciplinary rhetorics, given the multiple constructions of disciplinarity that might be invoked?’ ‘What is the status of the arts system(s) – visual arts, performing arts, etc. – as forms of professional-sectoral construction, educational division and contingent ideological formulation of (universal) human capacities and propensities?’ ‘In what way might arts systems, construed as *informal* reputational work systems, interact with the *formal* reputational work systems of the university?’ ‘How might debates on artistic research education be reconceived if we look at them as a contest between equally contingent but differentially formal/informal reputational economies, rhetorically jostling to establish the power of legitimation and control over emerging fields of research and practice?’

12

Art as a Context for Research



'Re : Public' performance
by Sandra Johnson in response to
*Permanent People's tribunal on War
Crimes in Sri Lanka*.
Curated by Daniel Jewesbury.
Photo: Joe Carr. (2010)

The closing chapter of this book provides a short account of a project that proposes art as a context for research education.¹ By way of a conclusion, we suggest reframing the question of the relationship between art and research in the third cycle by shifting emphasis from the subject position of the artist-researcher to focus on the possibilities that emerge from producing a work of art as the research milieu within which third-cycle education may unfold.

The basic proposition of artistic research would seem to be quite simple: the action of undertaking artistic work – composing and performing music, producing artworks and exhibitions and enacting all kinds of cultural practices – can be undertaken as part of a self-conscious strategy to find something out, to conduct an enquiry, to ask questions about something, to pursue an exploration of some aspect of the world. The questions arising in respect of this core proposition pertain to

1. This essay is based on a paper delivered at Kunstraum Niederoesterreich in Vienna in March 2010, later published under the title 'Cultural Research for New Urbanisms' in the journal, *Derive*.

method, relevance, compatibility with existing academic and disciplinary systems, intellectual content, the role of textual production, degrees of specificity, epistemological foundation, the nature of peer review, the role of explication and disclosure in the mediation of artworks as research, and so forth. These issues have been discussed elsewhere in this volume. While these questions are rightly subject to ongoing contestation, this volume has argued that developing research through producing culture and pursuing various artistic practices is a viable undertaking and one that enriches the various pedagogies of arts academies, universities and schools as well as making contributions to knowledge, society and the public good. Arguably, sustained attention to the precise nature of arts and artwork as contexts for research education represents a gap in the discourse on artistic research education. What might it mean to think of the arts, and of specific works of art, as research contexts, rather than as research instruments or sources of research problems and themes?

For the purposes of indicating why this question might be worth pursuing, this short chapter outlines an example of what happens when a doctoral school is transposed into the context of a curatorial project. The project in question is an expanded exhibition platform called 're : public', which took place in Dublin from late January to mid-March 2010 and was curated by Daniel Jewesbury and co-produced by Mick Wilson.² The project took place at Temple Bar Gallery and Studios and within the broader environs of the gallery, which is in the centre of Dublin's Temple Bar cultural quarter (an infamous urban regeneration project from the early 1990s). The project took as its animating principle the question: 'Can something happen in public again?' Everything that took place within the framework of the exhibition was orientated in some way towards the question of what was at stake in the idea of 'public-ness' – an awkward term which sought to capture the multiplicity of the condition of being 'public'. The project announced itself as follows:

re : public [...] is a public provocation, a series of diverse events designed to help us think again about what we can do 'in public'. [...] 'Public-ness' is now central to debates around contemporary art and curating, as well as to urbanist, architectural and planning discourses. The nature of 'the public' is also a recurrent concern in political and social theory. There is already a wealth of prior artistic experiment,

2. See http://www.gradcam.ie/re_public.php

publication and exhibition-making in this area: Bruno Latour's *Making Things Public* (ZKM, 2005); Simon Sheikh's reader *In The Place of the Public Sphere?* (B-Books, 2005); and Cork Caucus: *On Art, Democracy and Possibility* (NSF, 2005), to name only three recent examples.³

The project was further anchored by two themes that the exhibition adopted as 'guiding principles for all the actions' which took place under the heading of 're : public'. These were announced in the publicity materials as:

1. Architecture and humane planning won't save us now! The first point of engagement could be thought of as a counter-architectural gesture. For the last two hundred years, a central tenet of architecture and urban planning has been the influence that public space (the built environment) has on the nature of the broader public sphere. Can we really continue to imagine that 'good' architecture is still somehow going to produce good cities and 'good citizens'? This idea has been criticised by urbanists of many different hues, and yet its functionalist logic persists in the schemes for perpetual regeneration to which our cities are subjected. Can questions of public-ness be meaningfully addressed without ever problematising relations around real estate, private development and the property market?

2. There can be no safe distance! A second point of engagement will be the need to globalise our notion of the public – to place it firmly in a global context of capital, labour and production. The original theorists of the 'public sphere' premised their ideas on stable nation-states, within whose borders peoples with shared cultures strove to achieve common interests. These nation-states still exist in name but their functions are now assumed by global, mobile markets; meanwhile the peoples within them have a multiplicity of cultures and interests, and 'citizenship' is ever more jealously guarded and exclusionary. The 'public sphere', inasmuch as it ever really existed, simply cannot 'hold in check' the global markets that dictate the texture of modern life. Various recent approaches, describing multiple 'counterpublics' or making demands for greater inclusion, are still firmly rooted in obsolete notions of the nation-state and of the structure of the civic. Meanwhile capitalism has created – made fact – a homogeneous, globalised 'mediascape', which has in turn produced a kind of 'pseudo-public sphere', one that operates at a safe distance from its actors – whether that's us, the first world bourgeoisie,

3. M. Wilson, *re : public- programme of events*, 2010. p 2. http://www.smallfatman.com/web_pics/re_public/re_public_cation_00.pdf

or the mass proletariat of the third world, or the dispersed ‘precariat’ that problematises the old model of first, second and third worlds. The ‘public sphere’ – as an idealised realm of commitment and engagement and discourse and ideology – is getting further away from us all the time, rather than, as the liberal theorists would have it, getting closer with each reform. Attempts to reconfigure our relationship to the public, if they’re only imagined at the local or regional or national level, are therefore largely superfluous. The scope for ‘democratic’ participation grows ever more restricted, as government itself comes to resemble merely the management of a franchise. Those ‘decisions’ to which we have access, whether through the sacred ritual of the ballot box or through some other discursive activity that we label as ‘political’, are just so much tinkering with the delivery systems of global markets which cannot be made accountable. What function can a theory of the ‘public sphere’ really have any more for us in the consumer economies? Might we be better off trying to reconceptualise altogether our relationship with the demands of global markets?

While invoking an uncomfortable collective identity (‘whether that’s us, the first world bourgeoisie, or the mass proletariat of the third world, or the dispersed “precariat” that problematises the old model of first, second and third worlds’), the project employed many different modes of address both within and outside the gallery space.

Attempting to enact a public performance of some kind, in the wake of the property crash and the ensuing economic turmoil from September 2008 onwards, the project also declared a certain scepticism with respect to the critical public role of art and architecture:

After the fiasco of the property crash, we examine the role played by architecture and urban planning in the construction of physical public space. And in a world controlled by globalised markets, loyal to no nation, we ask if we can still talk of meaningful democratic participation by ‘the public’ in the institutions that shape our lives? Even if we can, is there any room, or any need, for the contributions of artists?

The project, announced in this way, then aggregated through a series of actions in a phased development over a two-month period, interweaving moments of material production, performance, practical workshops, seminars, lectures, performances and debates. In phase one, a structure was built in the gallery, which acted as a framework for screenings, talks, workshops, etc. This platform structure was

commissioned from architect, Mark Hackett, and artist, Robert Anderson. In phase two, another artist, Dan Shipsides, was invited to intervene into this original structure in some way. The proposal was that the interaction between the structure and the intervention would, in some way, establish a tension that framed the space as one of interactions, dialogues and cross-cutting initiatives. These initial production phases were followed by phase three, during which a series of works and events was staged, both directly in the space and in the broader city centre locality within which the gallery complex was situated. These events, workshops and seminars were based on an open call – made via the internet and email – and on a series of targeted invitations to individuals and groups with a particular interest in questions of public-ness and civil society. Exhibitors, presenters and screenings included Igor Grubić, Owen Hatherley, Aisling O’Beirn, Dennis McNulty, Simon Sheikh, Sandra Johnston, The Thamesmead Archive, Robert Porter, Leigh French, Conor McGarrigle, Neil Gray, Amanda Ralph and Linda Doyle, and many more. Among the workshops presented, there was an examination of wireless regulation and the ‘public’ spectrum in broadcast space, a demonstration on hacking wireless CCTV systems⁴ and a practical workshop on ‘Open Street Mapping’ (OSM), using web-based mapping tools to create open-access digital maps. Among the seminar and presentation topics were: public health systems; squatting and occupation laws with reference to public spaces; the dynamics of public-private partnership in the built environment; independent film culture and cinema activism in recent urbanism; the public role of non-governmental human rights advocacy and parallel international justice systems; alternative economies and forms of associationism; spatial chaos; urban imaginaries; and many other themes in which diverse registers of the idea of public-ness could be examined.

During this phase of the programme, there was engagement by a series of masters programmes and doctoral seminars that were invited to inhabit the exhibition space. The simple prerequisite was that these activities would be organised in the space in such a manner that even casual visitors to the space would be able to engage in the dialogues of these educational groups should they wish to do so. Through this means, several masters groups conducted sustained programmes of activity in and around the gallery complex. These

4. CCTV is an abbreviation for Closed Circuit Television, a security surveillance technology widely used in contemporary urban spaces. Wireless CCTV employs a range of standard frequencies to transmit security images, and these can be hacked once one knows the basic technology in use.

involved students and staff from several universities in Dublin and Belfast including the MA in Urban Design (University College Dublin, UCD), the MA Art in Public Space (Ulster University, UU), and the MA Art in the Contemporary World (National College of Art and Design, NCAD) as well as undergraduate Fine Art students (Institute of Art, Design and Technology, IADT) and doctoral researchers from a range of institutions (Dublin Institute of Technology, Trinity College Dublin, NCAD and UCD). Many of these groups engaged in direct cultural production in the gallery, and, in this way, a shifting dynamic of interchange between discursive exchange, performance and material production was established.

In phase four, the artist, Peter Liversidge, was invited to 'de-commission' all the material produced in the gallery space and the accumulated documents and objects left in the space after the various workshops and activities, and, in this way, to reinstate the 'white-cube' space of the gallery. Over three days, Liversidge actualised an elaborate performance work, reducing all the material in the gallery down to a disposable mass of rubble, fragments and dust. This phase also entailed a range of performative actions and a debate around public subsidy for the arts and the role of the state in cultural planning and programming. Finally, in phase five, an open discussion was organised to discuss the potential of forming an independent free university of some sort that would extend the initiative from being a relatively short-term exhibition platform, enquiring into the conditions of 'public-ness' and the nature and role of public culture, into becoming a durational project, examining the possibilities of public education and public knowledge coproduction in civil society.⁵

This format of exhibition-as-discursive-platform is well established, and it is not being claimed here as a new departure in exhibition production. The exhibition model employed built upon earlier projects both nationally (such as the Cork Caucus project on Art, Democracy and Possibility, 2005) and internationally (such as *unitednationsplaza* and the work of artists such as Can Altay). These and many other precedents were cited within the programme of activities. However, this project was an important development in terms of mobilising the local infrastructure of galleries, universities, art academies and independent practitioners as well as urban councils in order to constitute an artwork – the exhibition as a whole and the works

5. This last phase was taking place in Dublin while this paper was being presented in Vienna. In the wake of this discussion a series for proposals for a new free university initiative are being developed for realisation in 2011.

enfolded within the platform – as a research milieu that was not subordinated to the formal logic of the academy but enacted the academy in new ways. It was important that the public role of arts education was also raised in foregrounding the problematic construction of ‘public-ness’ at a time when economic instrumentalism appeared to threaten the very possibility of public contestation in the international media.

The question of how the exhibition operated as a context for research is worth unpacking. There were four key aspects of the relationship with research: (I) the exhibition framework was a space in which researchers could be educated in public; (II) the exhibition was a space in which research work could be enacted and communicated; (III) the exhibition framework was a research process in itself, structured around questions as to what constitutes public-ness and related questions as to the role of the gallery as a space of public-ness and the potential of the exhibition format as a relay between the academy and the other art systems beyond the academy; and (IV) the exhibition framework was a space in which research models and rhetorics could be queried, challenged and contested by specialists and non-specialists. A simple example of this last issue emerged when some masters students, participating in an aspect of the exhibition programme, protested about the way in which their teaching and learning situation was being put on display in a manner that instrumentalised them and subordinated their education to the exhibitionary impulse and the curatorial agenda. In this way, the research claims produced by the exhibition process became subject to a lively critical contestation. This, in turn, has prompted further work in exploring and defining the nature of such research actions, their ethical challenges, the accountability (or otherwise) of decision-making processes and the kinds of agency produced for different orders of participation and engagement with a project.

The proposal made here is that this mode of education and research – as direct artistic production, taking place at the intersection between multiple institutional agendas and in the ambivalent and unstable spaces of ‘public culture’ – enabled a substantial contestation of the educational setting and hierarchy, while also creating direct encounter with the problem of collective agency. This was accomplished by denaturalising the social dynamics, spatial logics and professional detachments of standardised educational institution operations by displacing them into the space of exhibition. The exhibition operated as an artistic research education milieu that mobilised doctoral and master level researchers in many different configurations and roles,

precipitating energetic debate on the basic rationale of the research content of the students' projects that displaced the question of the subject position of artist-researchers or architect-researchers or designer-researcher in favour of a consideration of substantive content and the public contribution of the many different research projects that intersected and inhabited the space of exhibition.



'Re: Public' exhibition structure
by Mark Hackett and Robert Anderson.
Curated by Daniel Jewesbury.
Photo: Joe Carr. (2010)



'Re: Public' workshop
Open Street Mapping workshop
led by Conor McGarrigle.
Curated by Daniel Jewesbury.
Photo: Joe Carr. (2010)

Bibliography

This bibliography and overview was compiled originally for the final publication of the 'artenetEurope' and has been updated during the lifespan of the SHARE network. Its primary focus is on publications and conferences about artistic research, i.e. it is not a record of dissertations and research publications in the arts at large. The full overview (also incorporating conference proceedings, conferences, yearbooks and series and reports and resources) can be found on:
www.sharenetwork.eu/artistic-research-overview/bibliography

Authored Books

- B. Bolt, *Art Beyond Representation: the performative power of the image*. (London: IB Tauris, 2004)
- H. Borgdorff, *The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. (Forthcoming, 2012)
- H. Borgdorff, *Artistic Research within the Fields of Science. Sensuous Knowledge 6*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2009)
- H. Borgdorff, *The Debate on Research in the Arts. Sensuous Knowledge 2*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2006)
- P. Carter, *Material Thinking: the theory and practice of creative research*. (Carlton, VIC: Melbourne University Publishing, 2004)
- K. Coessens, D. Crispin and A. Douglas *The Artistic Turn. A Manifesto*. (Ghent: Orpheus Instituut / Leuven University Press, 2009)
- P. Downton, *Design Research*. (Melbourne: RMIT University Press, 2003)
- R. Filliou, *Teaching and Learning as Performing Arts*. (Cologne: Koenig, 1970)
- C. Frayling, *Research in Art and Design*. (London: Royal College of Art, 1993)
- J. Freeman, *Blood Sweat and Theory: Research Through Practice in Performance*. (Libri Publishing, 2010)
- C. Gray, *Developing a Research Procedures Programme for Artists and Designers*. (Aberdeen: Centre for Research into Art and Design, Robert Gordon University, 1995)
- C. Gray and J. Malins, *Visualizing Research: a guide to the research process in art and design*. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

- M. Hannula, J. Suoranta and T. Vadén , *Otsikko uusiksi. Taiteellisen tutkimuksen suuntaviivat* [Title Revised: Outlines of artistic research]. (Tampere: niin & näin, 2003)
- D. Higgins, *Unloud. Sensuous Knowledge 5*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2008)
- K. Jung, *Enabling Knowledge. Sensuous Knowledge 4*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2008)
- S. Kjørup, *Another Way of Knowing: Baumgarten, Aesthetics, and the Concept of Sensuous Cognition. Sensuous Knowledge 1*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2006)
- P. Leavy, *Method meets Art: Arts-based Research Practice*. (London / New York: The Guilford Press, 2009)
- S. McNiff, *Art-based Research*. (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1998).
- P. Nilsson, *The Amphibian Stand : A Philosophical Essay Concerning Research Processes in Fine Art*. (Umea: H:ström Text & Kultur, 2009)
- A. Nyrnes, *Lighting from the Side: Rhetoric and Artistic Research. Sensuous Knowledge 3*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2006).
- A. Pritchard, *Don't touch me, you don't know where I've been. Sensuous Knowledge 7*. (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2009).
- L. Ryynänen, *Arts, research and doctoral studies in Finland*. (Helsinki: Academy of Finland, 1999)
- J. Siukonen, *Tutkiva taiteilija – Kysymyksiä kuvataiteen ja tutkimuksen avioliitosta* [The researching artist – Questions concerning the open marriage of visual arts and research]. (Helsinki: Taide, 2002)
- H. Slager, *The Pleasure of Research*. (Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, 2011)
- G. Sullivan, *Art practice as research : inquiry in visual arts*. (London: SAGE, 2005)

Edited Books

- M. Ambrožič, A. Vettese (eds.), *Art as Thinking Process, Visual Forms of Knowledge Production*. (Sternberg Press, 2013)
- L. Allegue, S. Jones, B. Kershaw and A. Piccini (eds.) *Practice-as-Research in Performance and Screen*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)
- artesnetEurope [Thematic Network for Higher Arts Education] *Peer Power! The Future of Higher Arts Education in Europe*. (Amsterdam / Sofia: ELIA / NATFA, 2010)
- A. Balkema and Henk Slager (eds.) *Artistic Research. Lier & Boog series*. (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V. 2002)
- E. Barrett and B. Bolt (eds.) *Practice as Research: approaches to creative arts enquiry*. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007)
- G. Bast and B. Felderer (eds.) *Art and Now. Über die Zukunft Künstlerischer Produktivitätsstrategien*. Vienna: Springer 2010)

- G. Bast, J. Mittelstrass and J. Ritterman (eds.) *Kunst und Forschung. Art and research. Können Künstler Forscher Sein? Can artists be researchers?* (Vienna: Springer 2011)
- M. Biggs and H. Karlsson (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts.* (London: Routledge, 2010)
- E. Bippus (ed.) *Kunst des Forschens: Praxis eines ästhetischen Denkens.* (Zurich/Berlin: Diaphanes, 2009)
- M. Bleeker, L. van Heteren, C. Kattenbelt and K. Vuyk (eds.) *De Theatremaker als Onderzoeker.* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006)
- H. Borgdorff and F. Dombois (eds.) *The Exposition of Artistic Research: Publishing Art in Academia.* (Amsterdam: Leiden University Press, forthcoming 2012)
- R. Buchanan, et al. (eds.) *Research in Art and Design in Finnish Universities.* (Helsinki: Publications of the Academy of Finland, 2007)
- B. Buckley and J. Conomos (eds.) *Rethinking the Contemporary Art School. The Artist, the PhD, and the Academy.* (Halifax: The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design 2009)
- K. Busch, and D. Lesage (eds.) *A Portrait of the Artist as Researcher: the Academy and the Bologna Process.* (Antwerp: MUHKA, 2007)
- C. Caduff, F. Siegenthaler and T. Wälchli (eds.) *Kunst und künstlerische Forschung. Art and Artistic Research. Zurich Yearbook of the Arts 6.* (Zurich: Zurich University of the Arts / Scheidegger and Spiess, 2009)
- M. Cahnmann-Taylor and R. Siegesmund (eds.) *Arts-based research in education : foundations for practice.* (London: Routledge, 2008)
- E. Le Coguic P. Gosselin (eds.) *La Recherche Création: Pour une compréhension de la recherche en pratique artistique.* (Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2006)
- A. Cole and J. Gary Knowles (eds.) *Handbook of the Arts in Qualitative Research: Perspectives, Methodologies, Examples, and Issues.* (Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage)
- J. Cools and H. Slager (eds.) *Agonistic Academies.* (Brussels: Sint-Lukas Books, 2011)
- K. Corcoran C. Delfos and F. Solleveld (eds.) *ArtFutures. Current Issues in Higher Arts Education.* Amsterdam: ELIA, 2010)
- R.T. Dean and H. Smith (eds.) *Practice-led research, research-led practice in the creative arts.* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009)
- F. Dombois, U. Meta Bauer, C. Mareis and M. Schwab (eds.) *Intellectual Birdhouse: Artistic Practice as Research.* (London: Koenig, 2012)
- F. Dombois, C. Mareis, Y. Ofosu and A. Scheurmann (eds.) *Neuland – Ein Grundlagenprojekt zur künstlerischen Forschung. Forschungsbericht.* (Bern: Bern University of the Arts, 2010)
- J. Elkins (ed.) *Artists with PhDs. On the New Doctoral degree in Studio Art.* (Washington D.C.: New Academia Publishing, 2009)
- S. Gehm, P. Husemann and K. von Wilcke (eds.) *Wissen in Bewegung: Perspektiven der künstlerischen und wissenschaftlichen Forschung im Tanz.* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2007)

- J. Gesche, C. Mareis and K. Kimpel (eds.), *Entwerfen – Wissen – Produzieren. Designforschung im Anwendungskontext*. (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010)
- M. Hannula, J. Kaila, R. Palmer, K. Sarje, *Artists as Researchers – A new Paradigm for Art Education in Europe*. (Academy of Fine Arts, University of the Arts Helsinki, 2013)
- M. Hannula, J. Suoranta, and T. Vadén (eds.) *Artistic research – Theories, methods and practices*. (Helsinki and Gothenburg: Academy of Fine Arts, Finland and University of Gothenburg, Sweden. 2005)
- R. Hickman (ed.) *Research in art & design education : issues and exemplars*. (Bristol: Intellect, 2008)
- M.A. Holly and M. Smith (eds.) *What is research in the visual arts? : obsession, archive, encounter*. (Williamstown, Mass. : Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute ; New Haven : Distributed by Yale University Press, 2008)
- J.Kaila and P. Kantonen (eds.) *The artist's knowledge: Research at the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts*. (Two volumes. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, 2006, 2008)
- H. Karlsson (ed.) *Forskning-Reflektion-Utveckling*. (Stockholm, Sweden: Swedish Research Council, 2004)
- S. Kiljunen and M. Hannula (eds.) T. Snellman (trans.) *Artistic Research*. (Helsinki: Fine Art Academy, 2004)
- B. Laurel, (ed.) *Design Research, Methods and Perspectives*. (MIT Press, 2003).
- P. Leavy, (ed.) *Method meets art: arts-based research practice*. (New York: The Guildford Press, 2009)
- T. Lind (ed.) *Konst-Kunskap-Insikt. Årsbok KFoU (Yearbook Artistic research)* (Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, 2004)
- T. Lind (ed.) *Metod & Praktik. Årsbok KFoU 2005 (Yearbook Artistic research)* (Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, 2005)
- T. Lind (ed.) *Konstnärlig forskning – artiklar, projektrapporter & reportage. Årsbok KFoU 2006 (Yearbook Artistic research)* (Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, 2006)
- T. Lind (ed.) *Konstnärlig forskning under lupp. Årsbok KFoU 2007 (Yearbook Artistic research)* (Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, 2007)
- T. Lind (ed.) *Autonomi och egenart : konstnärlig forskning söker identitet. Årsbok KFoU 2008 (Yearbook Artistic research)* (Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, 2008).
- T. Lind. *Konst och forskningspolitik. Konstnärlig forskning inför framtiden. Årsbok KFoU 2009 (Yearbook Artistic research)* (Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, 2009)
- T. Lind (ed.) *Forskning och kritik – granskning och recension av konstnärlig forskning. Årsbok KFoU 2010 (Yearbook Artistic research)* (Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, 2010)
- E. Mika (ed.), T. Snellman (trans.) *Toisaalta tässä. Valokuva teoksena ja tutkimuksena / Here then. The photograph as work of art and as research*. (Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki and Finnish Academy of Fine Arts)
- M. Mäkelä and S. Routarinne (eds.) *The Art of Research*. (Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki, 2006)

- K. Macleod and L. Holdridge (eds.) *Thinking through Art: Reflections on art as research*. (London: Routledge, 2006)
- J. Malins, (ed.) *European Academy of Design: Design Connexity*. (Aberdeen, EAD & Robert Gordon University, 2009)
- D. Mersch and M. Ott (eds.) *Kunst und Wissenschaft*. (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2007)
- P. O'Neill and M. Wilson (eds.) *Curating and the Educational Turn*. (London / Amsterdam: Open Editions / De Appel, 2010)
- D. Newbury (ed.) *Research Perspectives in Art and Design*. (Birmingham: The Research Training Initiative, University of Central England, 1996)
- N. Nimkulrat and T. O'Riley (eds.) *Reflections and Connections: on the relationship between creative production and academic research*. (Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki, 2009)
- P. Paavolainen and A. Ala-Korpela (eds.) *Knowledge Is a Matter of Doing (Acta Scenica 1)*. (Helsinki: Theatre Academy, 2012)
- A. Payne (ed.) *Research and the Artist: Considering the role of the Art School*. (Oxford: Ruskin School of Drawing and Fine Art, University of Oxford, 2000)
- A. Rey and S. Schöbi (eds.) *Künstlerische Forschung: Positionen und Perspektiven*. (Zurich: Zurich University of the Arts / Scheidegger and Spiess, 2009)
- S. Riley, R. and L. Hunter (eds.) *Mapping landscapes for performance as research: scholarly acts and creative cartographies*. (Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)
- P. Strandman (ed.) *No guru, no method*. (Helsinki: University of Arts and Design Helsinki, 1998)
- H. Slager, *Offside Effect, Academy as Exhibition, 1st Tbilisi Triennial*. (Metropolis M Books, 2013)
- J. Wesseling (ed.) *See it Again, Say it Again. The Artist as Researcher*. Amsterdam: Valiz, 2011)
- R.V. Zein (ed.) *Projeto como Invesigação: antologia*. (São Paulo: Altermarket, 2009)

Journals

- Art & Research. Glasgow School of Art
- Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education. Intellect
- Art Monitor. The Swedish Journal for Artistic Research. Gothenburg University
- Artefact. IAAH
- Co-Design. Taylor and Francis
- Dance Research Journal. University of Illinois Press.
- Design Research Quarterly, Design Research Society
- Design Studies. Elsevier
- Design Issues. MIT Press
- Design Principles and Practices: an international journal.
- Design and Technology Teaching, <http://ojs.lboro.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/DTT/index>
- Digital Creativity. Taylor and Francis

- European Journal of (Higher) Arts Education. ELIA
- Higher Education Review.
- International Journal of Art and Design Education. Wiley
- International Journal of Design Sciences and Technology. Europa
- International Journal of Technology and Design Education. Springer
- Journal for Artistic Research. Society for Artistic Research
- Journal of Writing in Creative Practice. Intellect.
- Journal of Visual Arts Practice. Intellect.
- MaHKUzine: Journal of Artistic Research. Utrecht School of Arts
- Journal of Media Practice. Intellect.
- Knowledge, Technology, Policy. SpringerLink
- Nordic Journal of Architectural Research. Chalmers
- Point Art and Design Research Journal. The Council for Higher Education in Art & Design
- Research in Dance Education. Taylor and Francis
- Royal College of Art Research Papers.
- Technoetic Arts: A Journal of Speculative Research. Intellect
- TEXT <http://www.textjournal.com.au/>
- Visual Arts Research. University of Illinois
- Working Papers in Art & Design.

Biographies

Henk Borgdorff

Henk Borgdorff is Professor of Research in the Arts at the University of the Arts in The Hague (The Netherlands). Until September 2013, he was Visiting Professor in Aesthetics at the Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden). Borgdorff is editor of the *Journal for Artistic Research* and has published widely on the theoretical and political rationale of research in the arts. In 2012, a collection of his articles was published as *The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia* (Leiden University Press).

Anna Daučíková

Anna Daučíková is Associate Professor of New Media at the Academy of Fine Arts in Prague (Czech Republic). Between 2003 and 2013, she was Vice Rector for Foreign Relations and Head of the BA/MA programme in Video and Multimedia at the Academy of Fine Arts and Design, Bratislava (Slovakia). Since 2013, she has been Vice Rector for Science, Research and International Affairs at the Academy of Fine Arts Prague. Daučíková is a member of the Board of *Tranzit(SK)* in Slovakia and of the Patterns Lectures project of the Erste Foundation (Austria). A member of the international panel of experts QE-Arts (ELIA), she chaired the working group 'Development of the third cycle of the SHARE network'. She is also active in various research projects and has exhibited internationally as a visual artist.

Scott de Lahunta

Scott deLahunta is Senior Research Fellow at Coventry University, R-Research Director at Wayne McGregor|Random Dance and Project Leader of Motion Bank for the Forsythe Company. He has worked as writer, researcher and organiser on a range of international projects, bringing performing arts, with a focus on choreography, into conjunction with other disciplines and practices.

James Elkins

James Elkins's writing focuses on the history and theory of images in art, science and nature. Some of his books are exclusively on fine art (such as *What Painting Is* and *Why Are Our Pictures Puzzles?*). Others

include scientific and non-art images, writing systems and archaeology (such as *The Domain of Images and On Pictures and the Words That Fail Them*) and some are about natural history (*How to Use Your Eyes*). His most recent books are: *What Photography Is*, written against Roland Barthes's *Camera Lucida*, and *Art Critiques: A Guide*. Texts, works in progress and a lecture schedule is at: www.jameselkins.com

Bojan Gorenec

Bojan Gorenec is Professor of Painting at the University of Ljubljana Academy of Fine Arts and Design (Slovenia). Between 2007 and 2013, he was the head of the Academy of Fine Arts and Design in Ljubljana, where he was actively involved in the preparation and execution of the programmes of first and second cycles, specifically in the writing of the Painting programme (Painting, Printmaking, Video and new media). Gorenec is head of the Commission for Third-Cycle Study in the Field of Art at the University of Ljubljana, and he is leading preparations at the Academy of Fine Arts and Design.

Johan A Haarberg

Johan A Haarberg has extensive experience of creating framework conditions for higher arts education and artistic research. He is presently Director of the Norwegian Artistic Research Programme, a national, crossdisciplinary, government-funded organisation with that aims to stimulate the development of artistic research within higher arts education in Norway. From 1996 to 2009, he was Director at Bergen National Academy of the Arts. In the period 1992–1994, Haarberg was the second president of ELIA, and he has been part of a wide range of committees and working groups within ELIA over the years. He is Vice President/Treasurer of the Society for Artistic Research and an external board member for the Faculty of Architecture and Fine Art at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim. Haarberg works as a freelance advisor and consultant, both nationally and abroad.

Efva Lilja

Efva Lilja is an artist working with choreography, visual art, film and writing. She has set a world record, danced at the North Pole and received a number of prizes and awards. From 1985 to 2005, she was Artistic Director of the E.L.D. company based in Stockholm, producing work in more than 30 countries. Since the late 1990s, she has worked with artistic research and been an active force nationally and internationally, working to improve conditions for artists undertaking research. Lilja is engaged in the boards of the Swedish

National Research School in the Arts, ELIA, PEEK and SAR. Since 2003, she has been Professor of Choreography and, since 2006, the Vice Chancellor of the University of Dance and Circus (DOCH) in Stockholm. www.efvalilja.se

Steven Henry Madoff

Steven Henry Madoff served as Executive Editor of *ARTnews* magazine from 1987 to 1994, where he remains a contributing editor. He is also a contributing editor of *Modern Painters* magazine. He has written widely for many other publications, including *Artforum*, *The New York Times*, *Art + Auction*, *Art in America*, and *Tate Etc.* His writings have been translated into many languages. He has served as an art critic for *Time* magazine and held the position of president and editorial director of a division of the Museum of Modern Art in New York. He has also served as an editorial director of Time Inc.

His books include *Art School (Propositions for the 21st Century)* published by MIT Press; *Pop Art: A Critical History*, from University of California Press; *Christopher Wilmarth: Light and Gravity*, from Princeton University Press, along with monographic works on such artists as Marina Abramović, Ann Hamilton, Rebecca Horn, and Kimsooja, among many others.

Madoff is the recipient of various grants and awards, among them from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Academy of American Poets. He has been a curator throughout Europe and the United States, including at the Venice Biennale and his most recent project, a nine-exhibition program held at the Tel Aviv Museum of Art in May–June 2013. He is at work on a book on the theory and history of interdisciplinary art. He has served as Senior Critic at Yale University's School of Art and is on the founding faculty of the MFA in Art Practice at the School of Visual Arts in New York. He is the founder and chair of the MA in Curatorial Practice at the School of Visual Arts. Madoff received his B.A. at Columbia University and did his Master's and doctoral work at Stanford University. He is a member of an advisory committee of the College Art Association that is drafting the policy statement concerning the doctorate in artistic practice.

Leandro Madrazo

Leandro Madrazo is a professor at the La Salle School of Architecture at the Ramon Llull University in Barcelona (Spain). He obtained his architecture degree at the Polytechnic University of Catalonia (1984), a Master of Architecture at the University of California at Los Angeles

(1988) and a PhD at the ETH Zürich (1995). From 1996 to 1999, he was director of the postgraduate programme of the Chair for Architecture and CAAD at the ETH Zürich, and, from 2002 to 2009, he led the PhD programme Representation, Knowledge, Architecture at La Salle. He has been coordinator of three pedagogical research projects supported by the Lifelong Learning Programme – HOUSING@21.EU (2003–2006) and OIKODOMOS (2007–2009, 2010–2011), and he is currently coordinating OIKONET (2013–2016), an Erasmus Network co-funded by the same programme.

Nina Malterud

From 2002 to 2010, Nina Malterud was Rector of Bergen Academy of Art and Design (KHiB). She was active in establishing the Norwegian Programme for Artistic Research in 2003 and has been a member of the steering committee since this time. At KHiB, Malterud was responsible for the project Sensuous Knowledge (2004–2009), which focused on artistic research through conferences and publications. She has been involved in several external evaluation and accreditation processes, mainly in Sweden. She is also a part-time senior adviser for the academies in Oslo and Bergen. Her professional background is in ceramics, in which subject she was a professor at KHiB from 1994 to 2002. Since 2012, she has resumed her artistic work and exhibiting.

Ruth Mateus-Berr

Ruth Mateus-Berr is an educator, artist and design researcher based in Vienna. Her art/design work deals with interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary questions, and her works have been included in exhibitions in Austria and abroad. Her research is situated at the interface between art/design and science, and she is author of several articles and publications in this area. Mateus-Berr is Professor at the University of Applied Arts Vienna, at the Institute of Art Sciences and Art Education, and she is Head of expertise Design in the Department of Social Design at the Institute of Art and Society Head of department for special didactics in art, design & textile design.

Alen Ožbolt

Since 2005, Alen Ožbolt has been Professor of Sculpture and Head of the Sculpture department at the Academy of Fine Arts and Design in University of Ljubljana (Slovenia). Between 2009 and 2013, he was Vice Dean for projects and development. From 1984 until 1995, he performed with the artistic group Do You Painter Know Your Dues (VSSD). He has been working as an independent artist since 1996, and has realised numerous diverse art projects and exhibitions both

nationally and internationally. He has published several artists' catalogues, 'visual essays', articles and some theoretic discourses on art, art spaces and phenomena. In 1997, he published a book of art statements, texts and visual essays, entitled *The Word of Painting* (VSSD in Words). In 2006, together with Žiga Kariž and Primož Čučnik, he published an artists' book, entitled *Love Is a Battlefield*. In 2007, he issued a catalogue, entitled *VSSD – 20 Years Before*, and, in 2010, the book *Ensembles – Three-Dimensional Rebuses/A Stone in the Sky*.

John Rajchman

John Rajchman is a philosopher and Professor of Art History at Columbia University, New York (US). A contributing editor at *Artforum*, he was a founding editor of *Semiotexte*, a member of the editorial board of *October* and the only non-architect member of the board of ANY, an itinerant global architectural symposium in the 1990s. His books and articles have been translated into many languages. His most recent publication, co-edited with Etienne Balibar, is *French Philosophy Since 1945: Problems, Concepts, Inventions* (The New Press, 2011).

Schelte van Ruiten

Schelte van Ruiten is a designer by training, holding a bachelor in Corporate Communication and a masters degree in Organisational Science. He has run a design agency for several years and has worked as a manager for a literature and film organisation. He has been Managing Director of the renowned modern dance company, Emio Greco|PC, and the International Choreographic Arts Centre Amsterdam, and he was the Managing Director of the Haute Couture brand of Dutch fashion designer JANTAMINIAU.

Since 2010, van Ruiten has been Deputy Director of the European League of Institutes of the Arts, and he has coordinated the SHARE network together with Mick Wilson.

Matthias Tarasiewicz

Matthias Tarasiewicz is a curator, researcher and technology theorist. Active as a digital bricoleur since the 1990s, he has been developing experimental media prototypes and creating projects at the intersection of media, arts and technology. He is project lead of the PEEK project, Artistic Technology Research, at the University of Applied Arts Vienna (Austria). Tarasiewicz founded the group *super.net* and the CODED CULTURES media arts festival and research platform. In 2011, he started the Artistic Bokeh initiative to qualitatively explore, map and extend the electrosphere with parameters of artistic research

and development, which includes artists' exchange network and an exhibition space in MuseumsQuartier Vienna. Recent projects include the crypto currency, Bitcoin, experimental documentation formats and mappings of the research methods of artistic production cultures. He co-edited the book, *Coded Culture* (Springer Wien/NY, Edition Angewandte, 2011), and is actively publishing in the field of artistic research.

Andris Teikmanis

Andris Teikmanis is Associate Professor of Art History, Semiotics and Research at the Art Academy of Latvia (Riga). He is Vice Rector of Academic and Research Affairs at the Art Academy of Latvia and member of National Council of Higher Education. He represents the Ministry of Culture of Latvia on the National Board of Accreditation.

Johan Verbeke

Johan Verbeke is Professor of Research Design at the Sint-Lucas School of Architecture (LUCA) in Brussels (Belgium) and Professor of Research by Design at the Aarhus School of Architecture (Denmark). Between 2003 and 2009, he was Head of LUCA. Since then, he has been Director of Research. He also initiated and runs LUCA's Research Training Sessions (RTS) programme, which have been aiming to develop and stimulate 'research by design' since 2004. He is actively stimulating and supervising research connected to art, architectural and design practice. Verbeke is currently coordinating the ITN ADAPT-r (Architecture, Design and Art Practice Training-research) project, which develops creative practice research. He is president of Education and research on Computer Aided Architectural Design in Europe (eCAADe), and he is active as scientific reviewer for many international conferences. Verbeke is Associate Editor of the *International Journal of Architectural Computing (IJAC)* as well as the *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)*.

Mick Wilson

Mick Wilson (BA, MA, MSc, PhD) is an educator, artist, writer and researcher. Since 2012, he has been Head of the Valand Academy of Arts at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden). Between 2008 and 2012, he was the founding Dean of the Graduate School of Creative Arts and Media in Dublin (Ireland) and, between 2005 and 2007, the first Head of Research at the National College of Art and Design. Since 2005, he has been a member of the European Artistic Research Network. He completed his doctoral thesis on the subject of *Conflicted Faculties: Rhetoric, Knowledge Conflict and the University*, (2006).

Recent publications include: ‘We are the Board, but what is an Assemblage?’, in M. Ambrozic & A. Vettese, (eds.) *Art as a Thinking Process*, Sternberg Press, (2013); “Come Promises From Teachers” in *Offside Effect: Papers from the 1st Tbilisi Triennial*, H. Slager (ed.), MetropolisM Books, (2013); “Blame it on Bologna” in *MetropolisM No.2*, April/May, Amsterdam (2013); “Art, Education and the Role of the Cultural Institution”, in B. Mikov and J. Doyle (eds.) *European Management Models in Contemporary Art and Culture*, Gower, London (2013).

Recent art projects / collaborations / group exhibitions include: “Joyful Wisdom”, Rezan Has Museum, Istanbul, Turkey (2013); “The Judgement is the Mirror”, Living Art Museum, Reykjavík, Iceland (2013); “some songs are sung slower”, (Solo) The Lab, Dublin (2013); “The Producers”, Dublin (2013); “Of The Salt Bitter Sweet Sea: A Public Banquet”, CHQ, Dublin(2012).

Ongoing art research projects include “the food thing” (2011-on); and “dead publics” (2009-on).

The European League of Institutes of the Arts

ELIA is the primary independent network for higher arts education. With approximately 300 institutional members in 47 countries, it represents over 300,000 students. ELIA advocates the arts at a European level as well as at an international level. It creates new opportunities for its members and facilitates the exchange of best practices.

Together with its member institutions, ELIA initiates conferences, symposia, publications and research projects, targeting all sectors of the higher arts education community – artists, teachers, leaders, managers and students – as well as the wider public. Representing all artistic disciplines, ELIA has well-established links with other networks and cultural organisations worldwide and with national and international authorities.

Events and Partnerships

ELIA's biennial conferences profile current developments in higher arts education and facilitate dialogue, while its teachers' academy and leadership symposia focus on specialised themes. ELIA co-hosts all of these events with its member institutions, providing a vital networking function. Members can also use the international ELIA network to promote and disseminate their events, publications and conferences.

Projects

ELIA manages both institutional and student-centred projects. SHARE is an example of the thematic projects ELIA initiates in close collaboration with her members, which receives support from the EU. Another example is the 'artesianet' network (2007–2010), which brought together 67 partners from across Europe on the issues of creative partnerships and curricular quality assurance.

A variety of student-centred projects reflects the level of excellence and achievement at member institutions. The annual NEU/NOW Festival showcases graduating students, both live and online, and various competitions offer unique opportunities to selected students.

New projects are always in the pipeline, whether initiated with an eye on the interests of members or in response to opportunities created through broader educational policy development and programmes.

Resources

ELIA has more than 20 years of experience at representing higher arts education in Europe. Its Executive Office, elected board, specialist steering groups and members all provide the organisation with a wealth of expertise that bolsters its advocacy and forms an extensive resource for research, the development of new projects and networks, policy review and future scenario planning.

ELIA makes this expertise accessible through quality assurance resources, peer-review visits on curriculum development, publications, extensive archives, continually developing web-based environments and much more...

Colophon

Editors:

Mick Wilson, Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT), GradCAM (Graduate School for Creative Arts and Media), Dublin, Volland Academy, University of Gothenburg.
Schelte van Ruiten, the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA)

Copyediting:

100percentproof.org

Design:

J. Mestdagh, Amsterdam

Printing:

Zwaan Printmedia, Wormerveer

ISBN

978-90-810357-0-5

Amsterdam, Dublin, Gothenburg, November 2013

Distribution:

ELIA

Beulingstraat 8

1017 BA Amsterdam

+31 (0) 20 626 5417

elia@elia-artschools.org

www.elia-artschools.org

SHARE, Step-Change for Higher Arts Research and Education

This publication has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme





SHARE Partners:



SHARE was jointly coordinated by DIT/ GradCAM and ELIA.

The SHARE steering group consisted of: Mick Wilson (GradCAM), chair; Kieran Corcoran (DIT); Carla Delfos (ELIA); Snežina Tankovska (National Academy for Theatre and Film Arts, Sofia); Schelte van Ruiten (ELIA).

ELIA (European League of Institutes of the Arts) / DIT (Dublin Institute of Technology), Ireland / Academy of Fine Arts and Design Bratislava, Slovakia / Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, Austria / Academy of Media Arts Cologne (KHM), Germany / Art Academy of Latvia, Latvia / Brno University of Technology, Faculty of Fine Arts, Czech Republic / DOCH University of Dance and Circus, Sweden / Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre, Estonia / European University Cyprus, Cyprus / Faculdade de Belas Artes da Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal / Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, Finland / GradCAM (Graduate School for Creative Arts and Media), Ireland / Hacettepe University, Turkey / HKU University of the Arts Utrecht, The Netherlands / Iceland Academy of the Arts, Iceland / LUCA School of Arts, Belgium / MOME Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design, Hungary / Nantes school of art, France / NATFA (National Academy for Theatre and Film Arts), Bulgaria / National University of Arts Bucharest, Rumania / Norwegian Artistic Research Programme, Norway / Royal Academy of Art, The Hague, The Netherlands / School of Art and Design Saint-Étienne, France / The Glasgow School of Art, United Kingdom / The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, The Schools of Visual Arts, Denmark / UAL: University of the Arts London, Camberwell, Chelsea and Wimbledon colleges (CCW), United Kingdom / Università Iuav di Venezia, Italy / Universitat Ramon Llull, Spain / University of Applied Arts Vienna, Austria / University of Arts in Poznań, Poland / University of Gothenburg, Sweden / University of Ljubljana, Academy of Fine Arts and Design, Slovenia / University of Malta, Malta / Vilnius Academy of Arts, Lithuania



The SHARE Network 2010–2013

SHARE has been (co)funded through the ERASMUS Lifelong Learning Programme for the period 2010–2013. During this period, the network worked towards specific objectives, as laid out by the consortium in the original application.

The key aims of the network were to:

- (I) Share knowledge and facilitate existing and new networks;
- (II) Build an international research community and peer-review network;
- (III) Inform national and European policy and funding agendas;
- (IV) Link research and teaching;
- (V) Foster collaboration.
 - within the arts
 - across the arts
 - between the arts, sciences, technology, humanities, etc.

SHARE consisted of three subnetworks (working groups), which worked independently of each other. These were:

1. Graduate Schools

A network of existing graduate schools, set up to develop innovative, crossdisciplinary approaches and programmes of world-class excellence, building upon the current European Artistic Research Network (EARN);

2. Development of Third-Cycle Education

A newly formed network for developing third-cycle education, providing information, support and a collaborative base for programmes in the start-up phase;

3. Artists + Researchers + Supervisors

A forum for exchange between artists, PhD researchers and supervisors, continuing and expanding the EUFRAD forum for research degrees in arts and design;

Further working groups were concerned with the advocacy, validation and dissemination of artistic research. An overview of all partners is provided on the preceding page.

Some of the key outputs were network conferences:

Helsinki (2011) – hosted by the Academy of Fine Arts, University of Arts Helsinki;

London (2012 – hosted by the UAL: University of the Arts London, Camberwell, Chelsea and Wimbledon colleges (CCW);

Vienna (2012) – hosted by the University of Applied Arts Vienna and the ELIA Biennial;

Brussels (2013) – hosted by LUCA School of Arts.

These events brought representatives of arts graduate schools and research centres together with educators, supervisors, researchers and cultural practitioners. All the conferences had more than 120 delegates participating; the Vienna edition (in conjunction with the ELIA Biennial) brought together approximately 500 delegates from all over the world.

Additional events organised in collaboration with/under the auspices of SHARE included:

EUFRAD 2011 Stockholm – organised by DOCH University of Dance and Circus and the Swedish National Graduate School for Artistic Research;

The 5th International Conference of Doctoral Studies in Theatre Schools, Brno (2012) – organised by Janacek Academy of Music and Performing Arts, Czech Republic;

The NIDA/SHARE Summer School for Artistic Research (2012) – organised by the Vilnius Academy of Arts and NIDA art colony, Lithuania;

The International Research Conference Tbilisi (2013) – organised by The Arts Research Institute of Ilia State University in collaboration with the Caucasus Foundation;

EUFRAD 2013 Vienna – organised by the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, Austria

Another tacit outcome of the network is the ‘advocacy toolkit’, an easy-to-use online tool, supporting educators and higher arts education institutes in their advocacy work and briefing national and European policymakers about new developments. The toolkit does not advocate a specific approach to artistic research but rather provides arguments and examples of good practice that can serve to underpin a variety of approaches. It also provides information about current and future trends in artistic research and emerging models, providing arguments for research in cultural and media production. The toolkit can be found at: www.sharenetwork.eu/downloads.

The SHARE website also features the supervisors’ database, generated by working group three, which lists experienced supervisors (and their discipline area), who have been connected to EUFRAD and have a view on international exchange and networking.

Contents

Part One

The Contexts of Artistic Research Education

Chapter 1 The Third Cycle in Arts Education: A Contested Construct

Chapter 2 Organisational Strategies and Platforms for Artistic Research Education

Part Two

Examples and Case Studies of Artistic Research

Chapter 3 Artistic Research Projects: Some Examples

Chapter 4 Case Studies

Part Three

Contested Values and Critical Debates

Chapter 5 Interventions: Position Papers and Dialogues

Chapter 6 Advocacy Strategies

Chapter 7 Judgments: The Questions of Quality and Evaluation

Part Four

The Next Generation of Artistic Research Education

Chapter 8 Networking and Communities of Practice

Chapter 9 Think about the Future

Part Five

Toolbox: Curriculum Resources

Chapter 10 Questions of Methods

Chapter 11 What is a Discipline?

Chapter 12 Art as a Context for Research

ISBN 978-90-810357-0-5



Lifelong Learning Programme



UNIVERSITY OF
GOTHENBURG