

The Exposition of Artistic Research Publishing Art in Academia

Edited by Michael Schwab
& Henk Borgdorff

Leiden University Press

The publication of this book is made possible by a grant from the University of Arts The Hague.

Cover design and lay-out: Mulder van Meurs, Amsterdam

ISBN 978 90 8728 164 9

e-ISBN 978 94 0060 092 8

NUR 640

© M. Schwab, H. Borgdorff / Leiden University Press, 2014

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

Contents

- 8 Introduction
Michael Schwab & Henk Borgdorff
- 22 **Considering**
- 25 Notes on Media Sensitivity in Artistic Research
Mika Elo
- 39 Artistic Researching: Expositions as Matters of Concern
Ruth Benschop, Peter Peters & Brita Lemmens
- 52 Exposition
Rolf Hughes
- 65 Aesthetic Sensibility and Artistic Sonification
Marcel Cobussen
- 78 **Publishing**
- 81 The Meaningful Exposition
Michael Biggs & Daniela Büchler
- 92 Expositions in the Research Catalogue
Michael Schwab
- 105 Practising the Artistic Research Catalogue
Ruth Benschop
- 118 Artistic Expositions within Academia: Challenges, Functionalities,
Implications and Threats
Lucy Amez, Binke van Kerckhoven & Walter Ysebaert

136 Practising

139 'Scaling Parnassus in Running Shoes': From the Personal to the Transpersonal via the Medium of Exposition in Artistic Research
Darla Crispin

153 Integrating the Exposition in Music-Composition Research
Hans Roels

165 When One Form Generates Another: Manifestations of Exposure and Exposition in Practice-Based Artistic Research
Ella Joseph

177 Writing Performance Practice
Siobhan Murphy

192 Placing

195 Distant Voices and Bodies in a Market Square
Andreas Gedin

206 From Wunderkammer to Szeemann and Back: The Artistic Research Exposition as Performative and Didactic Experience
Pol Debert & Karel Vanhaesebrouck

220 Between the White Cube and the White Box: Brian O'Doherty's *Aspen 5+6*, An Early Exposition
Lucy Cotter

237 Counter-Archival Dissemination
Henk Slager

246 Biographies

256 Index



Introduction

By Michael Schwab & Henk Borgdorff

Over the last two decades, the relationship between art and academia – under the heading of ‘artistic research’ – has been widely discussed. The border between these two domains, constantly renegotiated and transgressed, remains unstable and contested. Although art now contributes to academic knowledge, and academia in turn offers forms of knowledge that may be interwoven with or based on art practices, their relationship is far from settled.¹ Because of the need for a constant renegotiation, one might say that ‘artistic research is an activity for border-crossers’ (Dombois et al. 2012: 11), who, while violating boundaries, create new relationships and knowledges. Lacking established languages and disciplinary frameworks for the multiplicity of possible crossings, it seems that each and every artistic proposition needs to have the capacity to ‘expose’ itself as research in order to create a link to academia. The contributions in this volume address, from different perspectives, the consequences of this relationship between art and academia for the publishing of art as research, as well as looking at how artists have been engaging with publishing in order to make epistemic claims.

As a new term with a comparatively short history, ‘artistic research’ may signal a shift in the practice of art. However, it is one that many commentators do not perceive or value.² Indeed, before art academies reinvented themselves as research institutes and, as a consequence, began to advertise and fund artistic practice as research, the notion did not have much currency either in the art world or the world at large. It may thus be speculated that ‘artistic research’, rather than defining practice, simply announces the arrival of the art academy into academia. This is seen by some (Cf. Sheik 2006; Busch 2011) as the integration of art into the ‘knowledge economy’, threatening the autonomy of both art and the academy. In Europe, for example, discussions around ‘artistic research’ coincided with the development of what is known as the ‘Bologna Process’, which attempts to implement a particular educational model that is striated into bachelor, master and doctoral programmes within the European

1. Cf. Borgdorff (2012, pp. 56-73) for a discussion of the uneasy relationship between artistic research and academia.

2. For example, Elkins (2009, p. 148) suggests that ‘artistic research’ may be detrimental to artistic practice.

Higher Education Area (EHEA). Using a notion such as ‘artistic research’ may thus express compliance with a contested development.

There is, however, another way of looking at it. If we were to accept that historically art has always been an epistemic activity that has never required a notion such as ‘artistic research’ nor institutes of higher education for its existence, we might accept that art is already part of ‘knowledge society’.³ If this is the case, the focus should be placed not on establishing the epistemic qualities of art, but on the way in which those qualities can be made known, in particular in the context of academia, where other epistemic practices, most importantly the sciences, have a longer history. The danger is that as the art academy enters academia, art may be subjected to epistemic regimes that are not suitable to, and thus might compromise, the kinds of practices and knowledges in which artists engage.

In the short history of artistic research in academia, a fixed framework has in most cases been enforced, requiring an artistic as well as a written component that together form a proposition. To take one example in the UK, the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) ‘expect[s] ... practice to be accompanied by some form of documentation of the research process, as well as some form of textual analysis or explanation to support its position and to demonstrate critical reflection’, stating that without such support artists ‘would be ineligible for funding from the Council’ (AHRC 2009: 59). How are we to understand statements such as this?

If one of the two components – artistic or written – were missing, research could still be proposed, but it would either be outside of academia (as ‘art’) or it would be research of a different, non-artistic type. Implicit in this arrangement of two components is academia’s fear of having to assess work without the props that would help evaluate its epistemic relevance or provide a language to discuss and defend what such relevance may be. In this case, art would need to be judged in the way it is weighed up in art competitions, where the view of the jury is final, disagreement is pointless, and the jury refuses to discuss and defend its decisions. In an academic context, not to have the right to understand or contest a judgement contradicts all ideals of impartiality and fairness. Thus in academia, beyond the simple presentation of art, discourse needs to be entered into.⁴

3. ‘Knowledge society’ is a much wider term than ‘knowledge economy’. Following the 2005 UNESCO World Report ‘Towards Knowledge Societies’, there are different types of knowledges, only some of which are deemed useful for the ‘knowledge economy’. The term ‘knowledge economy’ describes ‘a particular knowledge-driven stage of capitalist development’ (UNESCO 2005, p. 46), which fuels a ‘knowledge divide’ both in terms of skills and access and also in terms of the value placed on different types of knowledges (UNESCO 2005, p. 22).

4. Traditionally, art criticism has provided discursivity in art. A possible role of art criticism for artistic research requires further investigation.

However, the double construct of art and writing that in most cases justifies art's entry into academia does not simply require discursivity, since an argument could be made that all art counts as discourse. This explains the use of words such as 'explanation', 'support' and 'demonstration' in the above-quoted example from the AHRC: all these terms suggest that one must defend one's artistic proposition as research.⁵ It is thus not a question of ontology – is art research? – but a question of epistemology – how do we know that a certain practice is research?

Here, we are faced with a problem, since if art does not already offer its own demonstration or explanation 'to support its position and to demonstrate critical reflection' – in short, its own discourse that confers its meaning – then anything that is said in relation to it through this supplementary piece of writing might be without ground. However, this fundamental epistemological problem, which we believe handicaps artistic researchers, who are asked to deliver artistic claims through academic writing without reliable epistemologies that connect such writing with their art, seems not to affect the current pragmatics of academia.

In some countries and regions – usually where artistic research is already incorporated into the research infrastructure – people no longer seem to see the need to convince academia of the validity of practice-based research in the arts or to engage the art world in the relevance of research; in many others, however, the feeling of unease and tension is still manifest. In Germany, for example, the German Research Foundation (DFG) was called upon to support arts-based research.⁶ However, to date it is reluctant to do so, since it cannot provide a fit with the conventional criteria for the conduct of academic research. Other funding agencies in Germany, such as the Ernst Schering Foundation and the Volkswagen Foundation, are more open to experimentation with the boundaries of academia and are seriously considering funding projects where art and writing are intertwined. The Berlin University of the Arts does not acknowledge advanced art practice as research at the doctoral level,⁷ while in some other German higher education institutes (e.g. in Hamburg and Weimar), doctoral programmes in the creative and performing arts have been established. In Sweden, a new artistic doctorate was introduced in 2010 that foregrounds the artistic component of the research proposition. However, it is unclear to many how that component relates to or coheres with the written component, the documentation.⁸ In Austria, a new funding scheme,

5. Schwab (2008) compares this construct to the possible defence of art as described in Book X of Plato's Republic.

6. See http://www.hkw.de/media/en/texte/pdf/2012_1/programm_5/thesenpapier_kuenstlerische_forschung.pdf (accessed 29-11-2012).

7. <http://gs.udk-berlin.de/> (accessed 29-11-2012).

8. <http://www.konstnarligaforskarskolan.se> (accessed 29-11-2012).

the Programme for Art-based Research (PEEK), was introduced.⁹ Although it is furnished by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), by avoiding the German term *Forschung* (research) in its programme description, it displays scepticism towards its academic validity. And in the Netherlands – where so far no third cycle in higher arts education exists – arts-based projects in higher education are only eligible for funding when they address societal needs and contribute to social welfare and economic growth. This instrumental view of research in the arts, under the label of ‘validation’, does not leave much room for a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between art and academia. Meanwhile, research on art and design practice-based PhDs (Hockey 2007) has shown that the tension between art and writing is one of the central problems experienced by both students and their supervisors in the degree programmes. This unease is persistent even where degree programmes have been in place for more than fifteen years, as in the UK, Australia or Scandinavia. This points to a more fundamental problem.

A fresh approach

This book attempts to question the still-dominant distribution of research between art (‘practice’) and writing (‘theory’) and to lay new foundations for a more considered approach. In order to explain its context, it is important to stress the international and networked activities around the *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)*, the Society for Artistic Research (SAR) and the Artistic Research Catalogue (ARC) project.¹⁰ These connected initiatives neither operate within a singular national framework, nor are they bound to the limits of academic institutions. This allows for a wider perspective on academia and a degree of flexibility that would otherwise not be possible, in particular since they engage in a pragmatic, bottom-up approach that aims to demonstrate new possibilities for the academic publication of artistic research. However, rather than reiterating *JAR*’s position, which is discussed both in its editorials¹¹ and in Schwab (2012a; 2012b), in this book we wish to trace responses and possible connections in the wider field.

Due to this flexibility, it has become possible to suspend assumed or existing definitions of ‘art’ and ‘writing’ and instead engage in what may be called an experiment set up to create new orientations for artistic research practice. In this experiment, the overriding concern lies with the types of practices and knowledges (and their interrelationships) that may emerge as publications of artistic research before a particular purpose is inscribed that may narrow outcomes. More specifically, the experiment to which we refer raises the distinct

9. <http://www.fwf.ac.at/en/projects/peek.html> (accessed 29-11-2012).

10. Borgdorff (2012, chap. 11) describes the genesis of these initiatives.

11. <http://www.jar-online.net/> (accessed 07-10-2013).

possibility that if space is to be provided for fundamentally artistic processes in academia, then academia may need to be critiqued and transformed. This is also the reason why this book is firmly rooted in artistic concerns, while further publications will need to address in more detail possible consequences for academia.

Art is not the only field that calls for change from academia. What has been summarised as ‘mode 2 knowledge production’ (Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotny et al. 2001) can be seen as a corrective to the standard model of scientific research that has dominated all research policies in the twentieth century. In contrast to ‘mode 1 science’, ‘mode 2 knowledge production’ takes place in the ‘context of application’. It is interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary, involving both academics and other parties. Its research is localised in heterogeneous, diversified, often transitory configurations made up of universities, governmental agencies, third-party organisations and other actors that assemble around a particular set of issues. And – importantly in the context of this volume – the research is assessed by an extended peer group in which the voices of those who do not traditionally belong to academia are incorporated. On a theoretical level, this transformation of academia parallels a broader understanding of ‘research’ that allows for non-discursive knowledge forms, unconventional research methods and enhanced means of documentation and presentation, as witnessed by developments in areas such as visual anthropology and cultural studies that are increasingly acknowledged by national and international research councils and funding agencies.¹²

In this general transformation of academia, art may be the most extreme case to date, and perhaps offers the most radical challenge due to its association with ‘autonomy’ (going back to Kant) or ‘negativity’ (Adorno). Although Romantic definitions of art that stem from the nineteenth century have been withering, art remains connected with notions of ‘resistance’, in particular regarding what has been called its ‘academization’ (Cf. Steyerl 2010; Busch 2011). Rather than suggesting that such positions are outdated and that the conflict between art and academia has either diminished or has disappeared into some form of ‘third culture’ (Snow 1998), it seems more appropriate to accept that they persist because they defend a set of values that is important to practitioners of art.

Without speculating on what exactly ‘art’ is, it may be sufficient for the purpose of this introduction to state two of these values that we believe underpin most of today’s art education:

1. Art is self-determined and suffers when it is told what to do.
2. Art challenges existing forms of practice.

12. Recently, the European Research Council has acknowledged artistic research as eligible for funding. Cf. the statement of its president, Helga Nowotny, in Biggs and Karlsson (2011, p. xxii).

From these assumptions, a number of conclusions can be drawn, which appear in varying degrees in the literature on 'artistic research'. For example, despite talk of 'discipline formation', there seems to be continued doubt regarding the possibility of providing a definition of 'discipline' that could be used for the regulation of artistic research.¹³ A notion such as 'transdisciplinarity' seems to offer a way out, since it proposes a relationship both to disciplinarity and to its transgression (Mittelstraß 2000; Borgdorff 2012: 235f.). Likewise, it remains questionable whether artistic research applies methods like other fields of study (Slager 2009; Boomgaard 2011), or whether its ability to break with accepted methodologies and to facilitate paradigm shifts is not one of its key powers (Feyerabend 1990). It seems that whatever we think art is, we have to allow for the possibility that something else, while still remaining art, will come along that breaks with all such understandings. In fact, it may be questionable whether our Western definition of art even allows us to accept something as art that does not surprise us by extending the possibilities of what art might be.¹⁴

The lack of disciplinary frameworks puts some strain on key academic processes, such as peer review, which in their criteria make reference, for example, to existing disciplines, fields of study and methods. If, as suggested, art may transgress any criterion for its evaluation, since it transforms the ground on which the evaluation takes place, a practical solution needs to be found that allows for academic evaluation processes and peer-review without fixed points of reference. The fact that academic processes of evaluation are challenged does not, however, signal the fact that artistic research may not fit into broad definitions of research, as employed, for example, by the current Research Excellence Framework (REF) in the UK, which defines research as 'a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared'.¹⁵

In order to explain those essential aspects of artistic research that cannot be governed by disciplinary or methodological frameworks, reference is often made to experiential, embodied or material dimensions (Cf. Carter 2004; Pakes 2004). Linked with these are notions of situatedness, transformation and difference that contradict a possible transparency, universality and objectivity of knowledge and which suggest a fundamental openness of art and meaning.

13. The question of 'discipline' is an ongoing concern. Most recently, for example, the dOCUMENTA(13) conference 'On Artistic Research' asked: 'What do we mean by "artistic research"? Is research a discipline in its own right?' <http://d13.documenta.de/#programs/the-kassel-programs/congresses-lectures-seminars/on-artistic2> (accessed 04-11-2013).

14. The same has been said about 'knowledge': 'You won't, for example, tell us, nor could you possibly tell us, what the criteria are by which we know which uses of "know" in the future will be legitimate' (Putnam 1995, p. 32).

15. <http://www.ref.ac.uk/pubs/2011-02/> (accessed 07-10-2013).

However, in a more radical understanding, this openness may need to include the questioning of any fixture, whether it is 'art', 'the body' or 'material' that is meant to provide an origin to knowledge, since those fixtures may be the outcomes of particular epistemic regimes that have inscribed them *as origin*. A perspective onto artistic research through deconstructive approaches (Schwab 2009; Öberg 2010) supports the idea that attention needs to be paid to how knowledge is constructed and proposed, which in turn requires one to question whether the 'written component' in fact represents the sole site of writing.

The distribution of research between art and writing might also be considered from the perspective of Science and Technology Studies, which acknowledge that between the world and our understanding of it transformations take place that constitute both world and understanding. This dynamic condition of research tells us that in our understanding of the world, understanding is already presupposed and at work, and that in our understanding of understanding, world is already presupposed and at work. Latour's notion of 'constructivist realism' (Latour 1999: 135) captures this interdependence of world and understanding, which – transposed to art and writing – underscores the idea that in all art practice a form of writing is at work.

The exposition of practice as research

With the notion of 'exposition', we wish to suggest an operator *between* art and writing. Although 'exposition' seems to comply with traditional metaphors of vision and illumination, it should not be taken to suggest the external exposure of practice to the light of rationality; rather, it is meant as the re-doubling of practice in order to artistically move from artistic ideas to epistemic claims. As suggested elsewhere (Schwab 2012b), depending on the practice in which one is actually engaged, constructs such as 'to perform practice as research', 'to stage practice as research', 'to curate practice as research', etc., are all equally suitable. Through such re-doubling, artistic practice is able to install a reflective distance within itself that allows it to be simultaneously the subject and the object of an enquiry. In this way, practice can deliver in one proposition both a thought and its appraisal.

As is illustrated by the many examples – past and present – that are mentioned in this book, artistic practice is already very much engaged in such reflective structures, and a notion such as 'artistic research' is not necessary to trace its operation. At the same time, an investigation into the various modes that can deliver varying degrees of reflexivity and the development of an awareness of those modes seems important. Moreover, the distinct possibility exists that reflexivity may be engaged along other, potentially non-epistemic dimensions, such as ethics or aesthetics, which in addition complicates the appreciation of any one example. In fact, it might be fair to say that pure forms of artistic research may not exist. However this may be, it is clear to us that much more

work needs to be done to better understand what it means to expose practice as research; this book may offer a few hints into possible avenues for investigation.

As discussed above, existing institutional frameworks for artistic research fundamentally operate according to the same principle, since art is also put forward and appraised. Here, however, a second practice – that of academic writing – is required, which artists are usually unable to negotiate as part of their practice, since it is determined by academic standards that are difficult to challenge in any one publication. If, as part of the suggested re-doubling, what is expected of writing is actually carried out as a component of practice, the need for additional academic texts may vanish, or, more provocatively put, we may open our eyes to modes of ‘academic writing’ that produce hybrid texts, or even no texts at all. Debates around the publication of artistic research may thus contribute to the wider developments in the field of enhanced publication, where, likewise, non-textual and often interactive elements are used to facilitate particular types of communication.

In order to support a workable model for ‘the exposition of practice as research’, two arguments need to be won. The first is to prove that writing (or ‘theory’) can be exercised in artistic practice that may not produce text. Assuming a positive answer to this, as a second step it needs to be argued that this writing can actually be conceived of as academic so as to facilitate exchange with other research cultures in academia. While the first part requires attention to artistic practice and reference to art theory, the second part requires a critique of academic standards of writing and a demonstration that more complex models can practically be managed in editorial processes and peer-review. Needless to say, with this book, we can only offer potential inroads into this wide and complex field.

Regarding the first argument, it is possible to trace how notions of ‘exposition’ have emerged from debates around artistic research. Although earlier publications such as Graeme Sullivan’s *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in the Visual Arts* (2005) carry the construct ‘as research’ in their titles, it is in particular *Thinking Through Art: Reflections on Art as Research* (2006) by Katy Macleod and Lin Holdridge that makes its relevance clear. Two aspects in the book’s introduction deserve particular attention. The first is the ‘as’, or rather the ‘counting as’, that the authors take from a catalogue essay by Stephen Melville (2001). In it, Melville makes the point that a painting is not simply a painting, but rather, a work that counts as painting, and that, moreover, the counting may be done by the work itself insofar as ‘matter thinks’ (Melville 2001: 6).¹⁶ The second aspect is the suggestion made by Macleod and Holdridge that such thinking matter may be related to the writing practice of ‘artist scholars’, and that ‘we need to bring our writing nearer to our making’ (Macleod and Holdridge 2006: 12).

However, while both Melville and Macleod and Holdridge suggest thought in art, they fall short of calling it writing. Melville contrasts the works

on show with the texts in the catalogue, which ‘explore in the most general terms the conceptual apparatus we take to be entailed by the work itself’ (Melville 2001: 2), thus seeming to define the works on show as art rather than writing. Likewise, Macleod and Holdridge suggest that we take inspiration from the *writing* of artist scholars in order to ‘build an appropriate vigorous research culture’ (Macleod and Holdridge 2006: 12) without questioning whether making and writing may actually be one and the same activity to those artist scholars when they produce academic texts. However, if the distribution of research across predefined components (art and writing) is to be challenged, this is precisely what is at stake, so as not to contradict the first assumption made above – art is self-determined – and not to limit *artistic* ownership of the proposition as a whole.

Just as Melville sees a painting as a work that counts as painting, it must be possible for a work to count as research. As suggested above, ‘counting as’ is ingrained in material practice that, depending on how it counts, can be perceived as either painting or research (or any other form as which it counts). What a work is supposed to count as is as important in the overall artistic proposition as what the work is. When practice counts as research, however, a simple description of that practice as ‘thinking’ is not sufficient, since a number of specific activities are associated with ‘research’ and usually require a researcher to engage with academic writing, since otherwise the work may not count successfully as research. This can again be illustrated using Melville’s example of painting: if a work does not engage with what we may expect from ‘painting’ it may be difficult for the work to count as such. In other words, artistic practice that strives to count as research needs to engage in notions of research and academic writing.

Although criteria for the identification of research differ in detail from discipline to discipline, there is a broad degree of agreement as to what should be understood by research. It often begins with questions or issues that are relevant in the research context (academic and/or societal), and it employs methods that are appropriate to the research and which ensure the validity and reliability of the research findings. From this generic description of what research is, the criteria for the assessment of research can be distilled. These pertain to the research questions, the methods, the contexts and the outcomes of the research. One may ask of every study to communicate what it is about,

16. Melville references a number of theories to make his point, including work by Claude Lévi-Strauss, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Michael Fried, Martin Heidegger, Jean-Luc Nancy, Immanuel Kant and G.W.F. Hegel. We believe that the work of further thinkers, such as Walter Benjamin, Georges Didi-Huberman, Gilles Deleuze or Jacques Rancière is also pertinent to the debate, as is the research on experimental science by, for example, Hans-Jörg Rheinberger or Steven Shapin, where matter is equally conceived as ‘active’.

why and for whom it is relevant, how it investigates the issue, and what the outcomes are.

Usually, this is done in the form of a text that adheres to standards of academic writing. In order to understand how art may be perceived as academic writing, one needs to look at the purpose of academic writing rather than particular conventions of language. Focusing on writing for art students, for example, Apps and Mamchur (2009: 271f.) suggest four fundamental writing skills (discovering a subject, sensing an audience, searching for specifics, creating a design) that may equally be found in artistic practice and that allow for the 'thesis to be a complete *work of art*' (Apps and Mamchur 2009: 272). Needless to say, such statements are the result of a long-standing and ongoing transformation of the art academy that, according to Holert (2009), provides the historical trajectory for current debates on artistic research and that allowed for 'talk' to enter the studio.

If we look more specifically at academic writing, its key characteristics may be: complexity, formality, precision, objectivity, explicitness, accuracy, hedging and responsibility (Gillett 2010). But in one way or another those expectations of academia may equally be traced in art that exposes itself as research in practical terms. It needs to be said, however, that most of those characteristics are highly problematic and that the critical discourse in and around art is so advanced as to require a rethinking of the types of values that academia might expect. Most prominently, ideas of 'objectivity' have all but vanished and have been replaced by the creation of sometimes temporary communities and a striving for transpersonality. The same is true of the other points on the list: it is not that art does not wrestle with the values that those characteristics represent; it is just that simplified expectations – for example, when a study is assessed in terms of 'academic writing' – are not possible for artistic reasons.

One can see in the dominant two-component model of art and writing a first, primitive approximation of artistic research where thinking is spread across the two components while art and writing are not. Pragmatically, this has the advantage of leaving art largely undefined, while the written component delivers an academically credible case for this art to count as research. The conceptual disadvantage, however, is that practice can potentially remain unchallenged by what we may mean by 'research' as long as the written component can operate as a supplement that compensates for this. It is important to keep in mind, though, that all possible distributions of research across art and writing are perfectly acceptable; the point to be made here is only that some of those are less artistically owned than others and that academic frameworks may distort practice if they do not allow for a self-determined negotiation of writing. Moreover, it should also be said that the writing of academic texts may, in fact, be one element of an artistic practice. Artwork and text are non-correlated variables that can both be used for the exposition of practice as research.

This volume is organised in four sections: *Considering*, *Publishing*, *Practising* and *Placing*. Each section is introduced by a short editorial statement and comprises four chapters. In the first section, *Considering*, we aim to open the horizon to questions of exposition and ask what ‘exposition’ may mean to the different authors. The second section, *Publishing*, introduces the concrete backdrop of academic publishing and, in particular, the work carried out in the context of the Artistic Research Catalogue (ARC) project. Section three, *Practising*, adds more specific artistic approaches that show how ‘exposition’ may be approached in practice. The last section, *Placing*, looks at how, as a consequence, spaces for a public may be conceived.

We would like to acknowledge the contribution that Daniela Büchler, one of the authors of this book, has made to the field of artistic research. She sadly passed away before we could go to print.

References

- AHRC, 2009. Research Funding Guide. Available at: <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundingOpportunities/Documents/Research%20Funding%20Guide.pdf> [Accessed 2 July 2009].
- Apps, L. and Mamchur, C., 2009. ‘Artful Language: Academic Writing for the Art Student.’ *The International Journal of Art & Design Education* 28(3), 269-78.
- Biggs, M. and Karlsson, H. eds., 2011. *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. London: Routledge.
- Boomgaard, J., 2011. ‘The Chimera of Method.’ In: J. Wesseling, ed. *See it Again, Say it Again. The Artist as Researcher*. Amsterdam: Valiz, 57-71.
- Borgdorff, H., 2012. *The Conflict of the Faculties. Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Busch, K., 2011. ‘Generating Knowledge in the Arts – A Philosophical Daydream.’ *Texte zur Kunst* (82), 70-9.
- Carter, P., 2004. *Material Thinking: The Theory and Practice of Creative Research*. Melbourne, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.
- Dombois, F. et al., eds., 2012. *Intellectual Birdhouse: Artistic Practice as Research*. London: Koenig Books.
- Elkins, J. ed., 2009. *Artists with PhDs: On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art*. Washington, D.C.: New Academia Publishing, LLC.
- Feyerabend, P., 1990. *Against Method*. London/New York: Verso.
- Gibbons, M. et al., 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Gillet, A., 2010. ‘Features of Academic Writing.’ Available at: <http://www.uefap.com/writing/feature/featfram.htm> [Accessed 3 October 2010].
- Hockey, J., 2007. ‘United Kingdom art and design practice-based PhDs: evidence from students and their supervisors.’ *Studies in Art Education* 48(2), 155-71.
- Holert, T., 2009. ‘Art in the Knowledge-based Polis.’ *e-flux journal* 3. Available at: <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/view/40> [Accessed 4 February 2009].

- Latour, B., 1999. *Pandora's Hope: An Essay on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press.
- Macleod, K. and Holdridge, L. eds., 2006. *Thinking Through Art: Reflections on Art as Research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Melville, S., 2001. 'Counting / As / Painting.' In: *As Painting: Division and Displacement*. Columbus: Wexner Center for the Arts MIT Press, 1-26.
- Mittelstraß, J., 2000. 'Transdisciplinarity – New Structures in Science.' In: *Innovative Structures in Basic Research*. Ringberg Castle. Available at: <http://xserve02.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/ringberg/Talks/mittels%20-%20CHECKOUT/Mittelstrass.html> [Accessed 18 April 2011].
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P. and Gibbons, M., 2001. *Rethinking Science: Knowledge and the Public*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Öberg, J., 2010. 'Difference or Différence?' In: C. Caduff, F. Siegenthaler, and T. Wälchli, eds. *Art and Artistic Research: Music, Visual Art, Design, Literature, Dance*. Zurich Yearbook of the Arts. Zurich: Zurich University of the Arts/Scheidegger & Spiess, 40-45.
- Pakes, A., 2004. 'Art as action or art as object? The embodiment of knowledge in practice as research.' Available at: http://www.herts.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0015/12363/WPIAAD_vol3_pakes.pdf [Accessed 7 October 2013].
- Putnam, H., 1995. *Pragmatism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schwab, M., 2008. 'First, the Second: Walter Benjamin's Theory of Reflection and the Question of Artistic Research.' *Journal of Visual Art Practice* 7(3), 213-223.
- Schwab, M., 2009. 'The Power of Deconstruction in Artistic Research.' *Working Papers in Art & Design* 5. Available at: http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol5/msfull.html [Accessed 25 November 2011].
- Schwab, M., 2012a. 'Exposition Writing.' In: *Yearbook for Artistic Research & Development*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council, 16-26.
- Schwab, M., 2012b. 'The Research Catalogue: A Model for Dissertations and Theses in Art and Design.' In: R. Andrews et al., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Digital Dissertations and Theses*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Sheik, S., 2006. 'Spaces for Thinking.' Available at: http://www.textezurkunst.de/NR62/SI-MON-SHEIKH_en_1.html.
- Slager, H., 2009. 'Art and Method.' In: J. Elkins, ed. *Artists with PhD: On the new Doctoral Degree in Studio Art*. Washington: New Academia Publishing, LLC, 49-56.
- Snow, C.P., 1998. *The Two Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steyerl, H. ed., 2010. 'Aesthetics of Resistance? Artistic Research as Discipline and Conflict.' *MaHKUzine* 8, 31-37.
- Sullivan, G., 2005. *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in the Visual Arts*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- UNESCO, 2005. *Towards Knowledge Societies*. Paris: Unesco Publishing. Available at: unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001418/141843e.pdf [Accessed 9 November 2012].

Considering

In order to consider the publishing of art in academia, emphasis must be placed on the borders, limits or gaps between established identified territories, whether within or outside both art and academia. Thus, rather than looking at those in-between spaces from a secure position, we propose a thinking situated in a border space, so that an intellectual landscape may be constructed. However, while from a centre all borders look alike, at the margins they multiply, become specific and local, making an overview over those border spaces impossible. This, in turn, handicaps epistemological and even methodological responses to the question of art and research.

While there may be many more approaches that can explain such border-thinking, for this first section we selected four chapters, each one of which in its own way highlights contexts and languages through which expositions of artistic research may be reflected upon. As is the case throughout the book, our approach is strictly multiple. We refuse to single out any particular intellectual or artistic framework, but those presented here make space for modes of reflective redoubling and an exposition of artistic practice as research that is built from within rather than constructed using external scaffolds and conventions.

In *Notes on Media Sensitivity in Artistic Research*, Mika Elo uses the notion of 'touch' to describe how integrity may be maintained across the diverse faculties of intellect and intuition. To Elo, 'touch' implies 'tact' and with it, an ethical dimension. Only through tact, through what is touched, can we speak of meaningful contact between, say, an artwork and an audience. This suggests that if something lacks the tact that allows for touch (for example, through institutional regulations), the exposition of artistic practice as research may not go as deep as it could. Elo explains the quality of touch in reference to Walter Benjamin's notion of 'translation', which is not simply the passage of meaning from one context, language or medium to another, but a reflective relationship between those contexts, languages or media across which meaning is established. To highlight the role and importance of touch, Elo pits it against modes of research that engage in generalisation to make their claim. He suggests that artistic research through touch has the capacity to approach epistemically that which is specific to a phenomenon, and which may otherwise be missed, and to engage with the limits of knowledge.

Ruth Benschop, Peter Peters and Brita Lemmens approach the publish-

ing of artistic research from the perspective of Science and Technology Studies (STS). Following Bruno Latour, in their chapter *Artistic Researching: Expositions as Matters of Concern*, the authors discuss the fundamental operations of agency through which objects of knowledge (including works of art) may be characterised. While agencies may be different across science and art, the authors argue that at the heart of any discipline lies the ability to preserve the flow of meaning (and its translation) across diverse moments of action, including publishing. The authors suggest that in expositions, ‘matters of concern’ that engage with extended agency can emerge from those trajectories, allowing for the inclusion of more complex characteristics that may otherwise be seen as external to works of art.

In his chapter *Exposition*, Rolf Hughes focuses on the ways in which art itself might count as research. The chapter starts with the tension between writing and rhetoric, between critical and creative practice, and refers to the problem of communicating, even identifying, the experiential content of what artistic research aims to address. Surveying central difficulties with the documentation of art and with its exposition as research – contemplating, among other things, the nature of the author in reflective art practice – Hughes asks whether or not our focus should shift to the quality of the encounter and the conversation in artistic research.

Marcel Cobussen, in his chapter *Aesthetic Sensibility and Artistic Sonification*, bases his account of artistic research on a close reading of Immanuel Kant’s third critique. Following Kant, he characterises artistic research as free play between imagination and understanding, which in order to remain ‘free’ needs to be defended against notions of translation or interpretation based on understanding rather than imagination. Having shifted that basis, Cobussen emphasises the need for aesthetic sensibility that allows knowledge and non-knowledge to come together in the aesthetic output of an artistic research project. Looking at a number of examples, he argues that attention needs to be paid to the gap between the gathering of information in a research project and the creation of aesthetic output, through which artistic researchers are destined to expand what is possible for scholars, thus enriching academia. More specifically in relation to the fields of music and sound art, he illustrates his argument by reinterpreting ‘sonification’ in the light of aesthetic sensibility.

As all the chapters in this first section suggest, there are good reasons to believe that art can engage with academia if the specific complex negotiations between artistic and academic standards are accepted as part and parcel of an artistic proposition, and not ignored or removed in an attempt to comply with more traditional notions of knowledge – notions that even in some corners of the sciences lose credibility. The following section focuses on what academic publishing might be if we accept that its form and function may need to shift to accommodate the negotiations that art brings to the table.

Publishing

In the previous section, it was argued that through its very constitution, artistic research cannot simply add knowledge to academia without at the same time engaging with the mode in which that knowledge appears and with the contradictions that exist between the different faculties that make up our intellectual lives. While it is possible to claim that artistic research does not lend itself to academic publishing and that it should instead focus on artistic formats such as exhibition or performance, one could ask if it would not be possible for artistic research, supported by advanced rich-media publishing technology, to engage with one of the most valued formats for academic publishing, the peer-reviewed journal article.

This second section zooms in on the research that was carried out between 2010 and 2012 as part of the Artistic Research Catalogue (ARC) project, which was closely related to the *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)* and its online software framework, the Research Catalogue (RC), whose foundations were laid during ARC. Initiatives like these that aim to facilitate the publishing of artistic research in academia need to take into consideration the academic realities that exist for artistic researchers and the technologies that can be utilised to support expositions of artistic practice as research. The contributions in this section address such considerations.

In their chapter, *The Meaningful Exposition*, Michael Biggs and Daniela Büchler discuss the wide range of research-output formats in the UK Research Assessment Exercise 2008, with a focus on what formats, significant for the artistic research community, communicate content best. Although the transformation of traditional output categories by artistic researchers – the authors name the experimental journal, the book-as-artefact and the tailored conference exchange – has little impact on how academia at large defines these categories, the use of these experimental forms do, Biggs and Büchler suggest, underscore the value of meaningful experiences for the artistic research community.

In *Expositions in the Research Catalogue*, Michael Schwab describes the conceptual and technical framework of the RC that was developed in response to the needs of the artists and researchers in the ARC project. He describes the kind of technology that may be necessary to give ownership of both the content and the form of a publication to an artist without compromising sustainability, for example. The chapter explains how in practice a researcher might go about

making an online exposition and what this entails with regard to data storage, design or authorship, etc. Schwab argues that the technical framework that the RC provides gives options and control to an artistic researcher without determining how in a particular case practice is exposed as research.

In the following chapter, *Practising the Artistic Research Catalogue*, Ruth Benschop provides a summary and an analysis of the final conference of the ARC project, which took place on 1-2 March 2012 in The Hague. Benschop's reflections give access to both the difficulties and the prospects that the ARC artists and researchers experienced during the project. In her account, it becomes clear that any publishing framework will pose a challenge to a research community, both practically and conceptually, and that much depends on finding the right purpose for a technology, in particular when compared with more established modes of presentation. This includes the question of when a publication is actually finished and how and at what stages a researcher might engage with processes of 'publication'. When new publishing technologies such as the RC enter the field, she suggests, new communities may arise.

Lucy Amez, Binke van Kerckhoven and Walter Ysebaert, in their chapter *Artistic Expositions within Academia: Challenges, Functionalities, Implications and Threats*, expand on the wider technological context of the ARC project. The authors describe how in academic publishing in general developments have been taking place that embrace the advantages of digital ways of working and that allow for more complex types of propositions in so-called 'rich internet publications', where multi-media or interactive content makes up the core of a publication rather than simply being offered as illustration or additional resource. The chapter makes the point that increased levels of complexity are experienced by all actors involved in a publishing process, including authors, editors and readers. Despite the emphasis on technology, the authors maintain that complex publishing solutions will only be successful if they serve the needs of a research community and add value to the work of its members.

By focusing on digital technology, this section suggests that only in recent years has academic publishing become capable of accommodating in principle the types of negotiation at the border of the sayable in which artistic researchers may engage. At the same time, developing technologies such as the RC should not be seen simply as productive tools but also as obstacles in a practice that aims to expose itself as research. In the next section, a selection of four voices illustrates how practice may respond, outside of the question of technology, when challenged with the question of exposition.

Practising

The choice of 'Practising' as the title of this section attempts to express our belief that notions of exposition need to be traced into the very fabric of the research that artists conduct before it is narrowed down to questions of academic publishing. As already suggested, on this level, what counts as expositional activity is highly specific and often part of long-established, individual practices, but also part of the specific materials in and with which those practices engage. In other words, the individual approaches to the issue of exposition presented in the following four chapters are so specific that in all likelihood they will not be easily transferable to other artists and practices. Yet by putting them forward as specific artistic examples, we hope to convey an emerging sense of expositiveness within artistic research itself.

In doing so, this section picks up on an important point that was raised in the previous section: the fact that the publishing of research poses a challenge to artistic practice, a challenge that started when artists first laid claims on research. Thus we see in the publishing of artistic research an extension and perhaps even an amplification of basic expositional structures with which artists engage when they enter into proximity with academia.

Darla Crispin addresses in her contribution *'Scaling Parnassus in Running Shoes': From the Personal to the Transpersonal via the Medium of Exposition in Artistic Research* the question of how the artist-scholar's subjective experiences and perceptions can be taken into account when exposing musical practice as research. Drawing on her understanding as a pianist and researcher of music performance, and using as illustration an example of fingering options in Schoenberg's piano music, Crispin argues that experimental research in music is not so much a matter of objectivity as of engagement and attention.

Starting from the observation that in artistic research on music composition expressive and rhetorical affairs are critical, Hans Roels, in *Integrating the Exposition into Music-Composition Research*, makes a case for what he calls 'the open sketch' as expositional form and research tool. Here a specific composition problem can be sonified, exposed and transparently discussed with selected audiences. Through its focus on sound and through its draft status the open sketch occupies a discursive place between the scholarly text and the finished composition, between theory and practice. It thereby offers composer-researchers an interactive and performative space in which to explore the unknown in music composition.

In her chapter *When One Form Generates Another: Manifestations of Exposure and Exposition in Practice-Based Artistic Research*, Ella Joseph engages a dialectics of exposure and exposition to describe the fact that as her work and research has developed, not only a practice but also a person has been exposed. In fact, Joseph argues that modes and objects of exposition are interrelated in such a way that they generate new modes and objects – or ‘forms’ as she puts it. The chapter thus suggests that new forms – such as published expositions of practice as research or, even, her text in this book – are complex responses to the history of a practitioner that at the same time put that history into perspective. However, Joseph is also clear that when an artwork encounters an audience, it is not only complicit in the exposure of the artist but also in that of the viewer.

Siobhan Murphy focuses on the role of writing in artistic research. In *Writing Performance Practice*, she distinguishes exegetical from dissertational writing in an attempt to advocate the positive role that writing can play as part of the practice of an artistic researcher. By favouring the latter over the former, Murphy makes the point that a piece of writing need not interpret – that is, bring to light, what may be invisible in a practice; rather, writing can open up a perspective that engages practice in such a way that performing and writing *together* can deliver a better understanding than could any single activity on its own. To achieve this, she describes how she had to find her own suitable – one may say, expositional – modes in what she calls ‘discursive writing’, ‘a narrative of practice’ and ‘poetics of practice’. The fact that many artistic researchers are locked into regulations that require them to write – for example, as part of a PhD programme – need not pose a problem if artistic practice and writing are engaged in an expositional relationship.

In this section, the issue of publishing is related to questions of practice. The final section will specifically investigate how artists and researchers engage with the more public face of ‘exposition’.

Placing

The publishing of artistic research may be understood as the considered placing of an epistemically underdetermined practice in a discursive field. While the previous section looked inwards at the expositiveness of creative research processes, this final section places particular emphasis on spaces of encounter. Introducing examples from the history of art and contemporary art, we suggest that bridges need to be built between existing artistic practices and those of academic publishing. Given that, over its history, art has found meaningful access to most if not all forms of expression, it is not impossible that artistic practice may, at some point, make academia its own.

In our understanding, this – admittedly optimistic – perspective goes beyond appropriation or cohabitation as a fundamental rethinking of art through academia. Just as one may say that painters are continually rethinking art through painting, the space of academia, its resources, histories and conventions continually offer new opportunities to art. At the same time, it is clear that academia, like any public space, is created and controlled by institutions and that institutional critique is necessary in all stages of the process. Rather than making artistic practice fit into academia, we suggest that academia should also fit art. Academia needs to respect artistic research practices and make space for precisely those critical manoeuvres without which art would be stripped of its worth, even if they challenge its very definition.

To open this section, we selected Andreas Gedin's text *Distant Voices and Bodies in a Market Square* in order to suggest how complex an object can become as it enters a new space. While the chapter is taken from Gedin's 2011 dissertation, *Jag hör roster överallt! – Step by Step*, it was considerably reworked for this book, now literally including the editor's voice in some passages that challenge editing processes and notions of authorship. Discussing the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, Gedin highlights the need for distance and dialogue, which creates space within texts that is comparable to the types of space we know from art. Developing this point further in the second part of his essay, Gedin argues, with Michael Holquist, that text is not only an abstract but also a physical being. With this, the author highlights the new and, to some degree uncomfortable, implications that arise when the boundary between conceptual and physical work is negotiated.

In their contribution, *From Wunderkammer to Szeemann and Back: The*

Artistic Research Exposition as Performative and Didactic Experience, Pol Dehert and Karel Vanhaesebrouck discuss their practice-based investigation into the potential role of exhibitions to expose practice as research. The investigation centred around the multi-dimensional festival (*Exhibiting*) *Baroque Bodies* (Brussels, November 2011), which marked the close of the artistic research project *The Monkey's World*, with a focus on its exhibition *Corpus Rochester*. The authors maintain that the exhibition should not be considered as the 'output' of the research, but as a performative tool, a pedagogic laboratory that provides insights into the research and exposes its results experientially. By combining the presentation and the experience of research results, the exhibition became an event of exchange, of shared understanding. The research used Harald Szeemann's curatorial innovations as a way into a new understanding of performative research exhibitions, thereby mirroring the theme of the research project – the lived experience of the baroque, and more specifically, the baroque body.

The importance of expositiveness for presentations of art can also be traced historically. In *Between the White Cube and the White Box: Brian O'Doherty's Aspen 5+6, An Early Exposition*, Lucy Cotter unfolds the reflective thinking within and between the works that the artist and critic Brian O'Doherty chose to include in the double-issue 5 and 6 of *Aspen* magazine. Far from being a simple collection of art, the issue is set up to activate thought in a differentially organised space, in which each piece can be seen both as a work in its own right and as a reflection on the ensemble. Cotter thus suggests that O'Doherty's exposition may be seen as a self-reflective unit that breaches its tight physical confines (*Aspen 5+6* comes in a box), affecting the space within which it is encountered – which includes the magazine's reader. Following O'Doherty's example, Cotter suggests that artistic research can successfully occupy a limited space – such as that offered by academia – if the space is given over to artistic concerns that allow art to register different modes of knowledge.

Expositions are not only units of presentation but also potential items in an archive. In his chapter *Counter-Archival Dissemination*, Henk Slager emphasises the need to deal with issues of power and control that threaten to override art as it enters academia. With reference to the history of art and also his work as curator, Slager makes clear that an academic space for art is also a contested space and that specific strategies for resistance need to be developed within artistic practice so as to self-define the workings of the archive. Emphasising specificity, the author suggests that the demands that artists place on archives do not simply require an increase in their capacity but also a re-thinking of their role and function for artistic research and society at large. The way in which artists interact with images may hint at alternative, novel relationships to knowledge.

Biographies

Lucy Amez

Lucy Amez works as a research-reporting analyst for the R&D Department of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Brussels, and for ECOOM, the Centre for Research and Development Monitoring. Her research topics encompass bibliometrics, publication policy and research evaluation. On those subjects she has published in leading journals such as *the Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* and *Research Evaluation*. Amez has also authored economic studies on the subject of preference patterns for the arts and performed impact assessments for the creative industry and tourism sector.

Ruth Benschop

Ruth Benschop is Senior Researcher at the Research Centre Autonomy and the Public Sphere in the Arts / Zuyd University in Maastricht. She completed her PhD (with honours) at the University of Groningen in 2001. Her thesis *Unassuming Instruments: How to Trace the Tachistoscope in Experimental Psychology* analyses the role of technology in visual psychological experiments. In this thesis, she develops a 'method of inattention' to create a historical ethnography that is able to detect the role of the ordinary. Later, at Maastricht University, she carried out postdoctoral research into the role of genetics in the workplace, and of recording technology in sound art. She has been involved in a variety of research and educational projects reflecting on artistic practices of research and documentation, and she is interested in ethnography as a site of experimentation and reflection for academics and artists alike. Moreover, she is concerned with the relationship between qualitative research and community art.

Michael Biggs

Michael Biggs is Professor of Aesthetics at the School of Creative Arts at the University of Hertfordshire. He is Visiting Research Professor at Mackenzie Presbyterian University, São Paulo and at the University of Lund and Member of the Board of the National Research School in Architecture, Sweden. He has

extensive experience as a professional artist and academic, and has published widely on research theory in the creative and performing arts.

Henk Borgdorff

Henk Borgdorff is Professor of Research in the Arts at the University of the Arts, The Hague, and was until September 2013 Visiting Professor in Aesthetics at the Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts at the University of Gothenburg. He 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).

Daniela Büchler

Daniela Büchler is Senior Research Fellow and project leader at the School of Creative Arts at the University of Hertfordshire; Visiting Research Fellow at Mackenzie Presbyterian University, São Paulo; and Guest Scholar at Lund University. She has degrees and experience as practitioner and researcher in architecture, urban planning and industrial design.

Marcel Cobussen

Marcel Cobussen studied jazz piano at the Conservatory of Rotterdam, and Art and Cultural Studies at Erasmus University, Rotterdam. He currently teaches Music Philosophy and Auditory Culture at Leiden University and the Orpheus Institute in Ghent. Cobussen is author of the book *Thresholds. Rethinking Spirituality Through Music* (Ashgate, 2008), editor of *Resonanties. Verkenningen tussen kunsten en wetenschappen* (Leiden University Press, 2011) and co-author of *Music and Ethics* (Ashgate, 2012) and *Dionysos danst weer. Essays over hedendaagse muziekbeleving* (Kok Agora, 1996). He is editor-in-chief of the open-access online *Journal of Sonic Studies* (www.sonicstudies.org). His PhD dissertation, *Deconstruction in Music* (2002), was presented as an online website, www.deconstruction-in-music.com.

Lucy Cotter

Lucy Cotter trained as an artist and exhibited internationally before turning to writing and curatorial practice. Her PhD dissertation from the University of Amsterdam offered a cultural analysis of curating from the 1950s to the present, drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's sociological view of the art world, post-colonial theory and Gilles Deleuze's notion of minor art. She was co-curator of *Here as the Centre of the World*, a two-year artistic research project in six cities

worldwide (2006-7), and is currently developing a series of new curatorial projects. Cotter has written extensively on contemporary art and guest-edited such journals as *Third Text* and *The HTV*. She is currently editing a book on artistic research, to be published by 17, Institute for Critical Studies, Mexico City, in 2014 and is writing a further book entitled *Art and Non-Knowledge*. Cotter is head of the Master Artistic Research at the University of the Arts, The Hague. See also www.lucycotter.org.

Darla Crispin

Darla Crispin is an Associate Professor in Musicology at the Norwegian Academy of Music (NMH), Oslo. A Canadian pianist and scholar with a Concert Recital Diploma from the Guildhall School of Music & Drama, London, and a PhD in Historical Musicology from King's College, London, she specialises in musical modernity, and especially in the music of the Second Viennese School. Crispin's most recent work examines this repertoire through the prism of artistic research in music. Her publications include a collaborative volume with Kathleen Coessens and Anne Douglas, *The Artistic Turn: A Manifesto* (Leuven, 2009) and numerous book chapters and articles, the most recent of which is 'Allotropes of Advocacy: a model for categorizing persuasiveness in musical performances', co-authored with Jeremy Cox, in *Music & Practice*, Vol. 1 (1) 2013. She is currently working on a book entitled *The Solo Piano Works of the Second Viennese School: Performance, Ethics and Understanding*.

Pol Dehert

Pol Dehert is a theatre and film director. He is a lecturer and researcher in the Performing Arts section of the RITS department of the Erasmus University College, Brussels, where he trains young actors and directors. He has coordinated artistic research projects on David Mamet, on the tragic and the political, on performance and outsider art, amongst others. He is currently finishing a practice-based PhD at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel on John Wilmot. Dehert has acted as artistic director of Arca N.E.T, Ghent, and Noordelijke Theatervoorziening, Groningen, and director and dramaturge at Theater Teater, Mechelen. He has also directed two award-winning art films: *Art Nouveau* and *Oedipe et le Sphinx*.

Mika Elo

Mika Elo is a lecturer in visual culture at Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Helsinki, and Associate Professor in Media Aesthetics at University of Lapland, Rovaniemi. His research interests include the theory of photographic media, philosophical media theory, and artistic research. He

participates in discussions in these areas in the capacity of curator, visual artist and researcher. He has published articles in Finnish, German and English, on Benjamin, Nancy, artistic research and photography theory, among other subjects. His doctoral thesis *Valokuvan medium (The Medium of Photography)* was published in Finnish in 2005 (*Tutkijaliitto*, Helsinki). In 2009-11 he worked on the *Figures of Touch* research project (figuresoftouch.com). Since 2011 he has been a member of the editorial board of *JAR*. Most recently he co-curated the Finnish exhibition *Falling Trees* at the Venice Biennale 2013.

Andreas Gedin

Andreas Gedin is a Swedish artist who lives in Stockholm. His works combine an interest in ideas, communication, logistics, text and power relations. Often his works interfere with given rules. They can be presented as small actions, videos, text, objects, photography, and Gedin's practice also involves curating and writing. He has made several exhibitions nationally and internationally and is currently participating in Göteborg International Biennial for Contemporary Art, 2013. In 2011 Gedin received a PhD in Fine Art at The Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing Arts, at the University of Gothenburg. His dissertation consisted of several artworks, exhibitions and a book, and artistic and curatorial practices were discussed and performed, mainly in the light of the philosophy of Mikhail Bakhtin. Since 2012, Gedin is part of *Living Archives: Pontus Hultén at Moderna Museet Stockholm and Centre Pompidou* in Paris, 1957-81, a research project at Sodertorn University, Sweden.

Rolf Hughes

A widely-published prose poet, writer, and essayist, Rolf Hughes is today Guest Professor in Design Theory and Practice-Based Research at Konstfack University College of Arts, Crafts and Design (Sweden's largest university for the arts, craft and design), where he teaches professional education courses in artistic research for practitioners across the artistic disciplines. He is also visiting Senior Professor at KU Leuven, Brussels, Belgium, where he has helped create an international, practice-led doctoral programme for architects, artists and designers, on which he has taught and supervised since 2006. From January 2013 he has been employed (50%) at the Swedish National Research Council as scientific advisor and research officer for Artistic Research and Development to strengthen and extend the field through developing the strategic dimensions and international reach of Swedish artistic research. He is Vice-President of the international Society for Artistic Research (2011-2015).

Ella Joseph

Ella Joseph trained in visual and physical performance at the Utrecht School of the Arts (HKU), photography and video art at the School of Art and Design Zurich (HGKZ), and painting at the George Enescu University of Arts. She holds an MA in Scenography from Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design, University of the Arts London, a MFA in Theater Design from the University of British Columbia, and a MSc in Textile Design from the Gheorghe Asachi University of Iasi. In 2004 she founded *ScenoArt*, with the mission to create works that push the boundaries of contemporary arts, where theatre, performance, art installations and fine-art exhibitions cohabit and influence each other, and titled her works and writings series on the process of creation under the collective name *Theatre of Truth(s)*. Consisting of over twenty-five original pieces across time-based genres, her work has been featured in Europe, Canada and the US. Since 2005 she has lived in Buffalo, New York.

Siobhan Murphy

Siobhan Murphy is a dance artist and academic based in Melbourne. Her dance career began with the Deutsche Oper Ballet in Berlin in 1992. She completed a Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and Spanish at the University of New South Wales in 2000 while beginning her independent choreographic practice. In 2008 she completed a practice-led PhD in Choreography at the University of Melbourne. Her live performance works are small-scale, intimate events, often taking place in unusual venues. Increasingly her practice focuses on dance screen works for single-channel and installation presentations. As a teacher, her principle focus is on the use of writing as a complimentary and illuminating modality for researchers in performance.

Brita Lemmens

Brita Lemmens was born in Zeist, and grew up in a Portuguese/Dutch household. During her bachelor studies in Arts and Culture at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Maastricht University, she undertook her thesis research as an intern at the Instituto de Etnomusicologia (INET-md) at Universidad Nova de Lisboa, Lisbon. The focus of her research was the learning process in fado singing, which she studied through artistic research. She published the results of her research project as an exposition in the Artistic Research Catalogue and as a contribution to the *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR2)*. Within the broader field of cultural studies, Lemmens focuses on researching singing techniques in various cultural contexts. Currently she is living in Ecuador where she is studying the indigenous South American language Kichwa and researching indigenous singing techniques.

Peter Peters

Peter Peters studied sociology in Groningen, the Netherlands. He is Senior Lecturer at the Department of Philosophy of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University. Currently, he is teaching in the Arts & Sciences Bachelor and Masters programme and in the Bachelor European Studies programme of the Faculty. Publications include *Eeuwige Jeugd: Een halve eeuw Stichting Gaudeamus* (Donemus, 1995), a history of post-war contemporary music in the Netherlands, and *Time, Innovation and Mobilities* (Routledge, 2006), in which he combines insights from social theory and science and technology studies in order to analyse cultures of travel. In 2008 he was appointed Professor in the research centre Autonomy and the Public Sphere in the Arts at the arts faculties of Zuyd University, Maastricht. In his inaugural address 'Grensverkeer: Over praktijkonderzoek voor de kunsten' (2009), he critically considered the discourse on artistic research. His research topics are artistic research and its relation to the broader field of science and technology studies, site-specific art as context for engaged research, and art in relation to mobile worlds.

Hans Roels

Hans Roels is a PhD researcher in the School of Arts, University College Ghent (www.schoolofartsgent.be), where he teaches live electronic music. Since 2010 he has also worked as a researcher in the Orpheus Research Centre in Music (ORCiM) (www.orpheusinstituut.be). Roels studied piano and composition and during the fifteen years that he was active as a professional composer his works were played in several European countries by ensembles such as Champ d'Action, Spectra ensemble, the electric guitar quartet Zwerm and Trio Scordatura. Between 2001 and 2008 he was responsible for the concert programming in the Logos Foundation, a centre for experimental audio arts (www.logosfoundation.org). See also: www.hansroels.be.

Michael Schwab

Michael Schwab is a London-based artist and artistic researcher who investigates postconceptual uses of technology in a variety of media, including photography, drawing, printmaking and installation art. He is a tutor at the Royal College of Art, London, and the Zürich University of the Arts, as well as research fellow at the Orpheus Institute, Ghent. He is co-initiator and editor-in-chief of *JAR, Journal for Artistic Research*. Educated in both philosophy (Hamburg University) and art (Royal College of Art, London), he focuses on the methodologies and epistemologies of artistic research. Concentrating on experimentation and the exposition of practice as research, he has developed

a conceptual approach that links artistic autonomy with academic criticality in support of what has been called the 'practice turn in contemporary theory'. Together with Florian Dombois, Ute Meta Bauer and Claudia Mareis, he co-edited *Intellectual Birdhouse: Artistic Practice as Research* (Koenig Books, 2012). He is the editor of *Experimental Systems: Future Knowledge in Artistic Research* (Leuven University Press, 2013).

Henk Slager

Henk Slager is Dean of MaHKU (Utrecht Graduate School of Visual Art and Design) and Visiting Professor of Artistic Research (Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, Helsinki). He was curator of the exhibitions *a.o. Flash Cube* (Leeum, Seoul, 2007), *Translocalmotion* (7th Shanghai Biennale, 2008), *Nameless Science* (Apex Art, New York, 2009), *Critique of Archival Reason* (RHA, Dublin, 2010), *As the Academy Turns* (Collaborative project, Manifesta, 2010), *Any-medium-whatever* (Georgian Pavilion, Venice Biennale, 2011) *Offside Effect* (1st Tbilisi Triennial, 2012), *Temporary Autonomous Research* (Amsterdam Pavilion, Shanghai Biennale, 2012), *The Judgment is the Mirror* (Living Art Museum, Reykjavik, 2013) and *Joyful Wisdom* (Parallel Event, Istanbul Biennale, 2013). Recent publications include: 'Differential Iconography', in Henrik Karlsson and Michael Biggs, *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, New York/London, 2010; *Agonistic Academies* (ed. with Jan Cools), Sint Lukas Academy Books, Brussels, 2011; *Context Responsive Investigations*, in *Intellectual Birdhouse, Artistic Practice as Research* (eds. Ute Meta Bauer, Claudia Mareis, Michael Schwab and Florian Dombois), Walther Koenig, Cologne/London 2011; *The Pleasure of Research*, Finnish Academy of Fine Art, Helsinki, 2012; and *Doing Research* (Documenta, 2012).

Karel Vanhaesebrouck

Karel Vanhaesebrouck is a Professor of the History and Theory of Performance at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, where he holds the chair in Theatre Studies. Before taking up that post he was an Assistant Professor in Cultural Studies at Maastricht University. He also lectures in cultural history and theatre history at the RITS department of the Erasmus University College, Brussels, where he coordinates the performing-arts section. He published *Le mythe de l'authenticité. Lectures, dramaturgies, représentations de Britannicus en France* (2009) and edited, together with Ruben De Roo and Lieven De Cauter, the widely discussed volume *Art and Activism in the Age of Globalization* (2011). His research has been published in *Poetics Today*, *Textyles*, *Phrasis*, *Théâtre / Public*, *Acta Fabula*, *Image & Narrative*, *Critique*, *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, *Etudes Théâtrales* amongst others. He occasionally works as a dramaturge for various artists and/or companies.

Binke van Kerckhoven

Binke van Kerckhoven studied at the KU Leuven, where she obtained a Masters in Communication Sciences. She worked as a scientific collaborator at the HIVA institute of the KU Leuven and as IT analyst for the UiTdatabank: a digital platform for cultural events in Flanders, hosted by CultuurNet Vlaanderen. Since 2010 she has been a researcher at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, where she works on a project covering IT (digitisation, CRIS) for research in the arts. She was also involved in the development of the Research Catalogue.

Walter Ysebaert

Walter Ysebaert works at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, as a historian (History Department) and as the head of the Research Unit Data and Policy (R&D Department). He is also affiliated with ECOOM, the Centre for Research & Development Monitoring, where he coordinates the research project with regard to the development of output and impact parameters and a database for Research in the Arts in Flanders. Ysebaert was formerly post-doctoral fellow of the National Research Foundation Flanders, lecturer at the Arteveldehogeschool Gent, and policy advisor at the Cabinet of the Flemish Minister of Science Policy and Innovation.