Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Version

This is the Accepted Manuscript version. This version is defined in the NISO recommended practice RP-8-2008 http://www.niso.org/publications/rp/

Suggested Reference

Fitzpatrick, E. M., Mullen, M., & O'Connor, P. (2015). Creating CRUAT: disrupting supervision and research through performance. *NJ: Drama Australia Journal*, *39*(1), 31-44. doi:10.1080/14452294.2015.1083140

Copyright

Items in ResearchSpace are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated. Previously published items are made available in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *NJ: Drama Australia Journal* on 16 Nov 2015, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14452294.2015.1083140

For more information, see General copyright, Publisher copyright.

Title: Creating CRUAT: Disrupting supervision and research through collaborative performance

Act One

Scene one: An inquiry begins

The door opens. Five adults enter into the room. It is an ordinary looking classroom: chairs, tables, a whiteboard and the computer in the corner.

'Shall we push the tables back and create a space?'

'What exactly are we going to do?'

'Don't we need a plan?'

'Perhaps we should just play with the ideas first! Like workshop the ideas.'

'I think we should start off by marching one by one into the space.'

'Oh yeah … like we're clocking into work!'

'OK let's start there.'

And so they started to play.

Scene two: Performing research

The curtain parts. Five doctoral students enter in a line onto the stage. They turn to look directly out at the audience and, robot like, state their university ID number and the enrolment date for their PhD.

Molly: Molly Mullen 5267780, November 1st, 2010.

Claire: Claire Coleman 2091570, December 1st, 2010.

Jane: Jane Luton, 5253030, February 1st, 2011.

Adrian: Adrian Schoone 9266480, March 1st, 2011.

Esther: Esther Fitzpatrick 2516840, July 1st, 2011.

This is the story of an ongoing, collaborative, arts-based project involving a group of doctoral students and their supervisor. Over a period of two years they participated in a series of workshops, usually lead by one of the students. In this space, they played; improvising, and disrupting traditional notions of the supervisor-student relationship. The workshop space

provided an environment of collaboration, which supported and encouraged innovative methods where students took risks and grew as scholars.

In this paper we argue that collaborative experiences in arts-based workshops can counter the traditional experience of loneliness and loss in a doctoral journey (Hughes & Tight, 2013). In this project, the creation of the collaborative postgraduate workshop was designed to trouble the process, often likened to 'Pilgrim's Progress' (Hughes & Tight, 2013), of the lone doctoral student battling the elements. Further, collaboration through art making works as a form of playful improvisation, distorting notions of hierarchical practices; especially regarding supervisor-student relationships (Belliveau, 2015; Fitzpatrick & Fitzpatrick, 2014; Grant, 2010). As students and supervisor working in a traditional Faculty of Education, these workshops enabled us to engage in methodologies that are emerging and which question established notions of empirical research. In this often risky terrain, the workshops provided a common source of sustenance and support.

We also argue that collaborative arts-based workshops have the potential to provide a productive environment; where all participants immerse themselves in exploring important questions regarding methodology, methods, knowledge and ethics. Through our monthly arts-based workshops participants experimented with ways to generate data, critically reflect on the research process, analyse data and/or disseminate findings. The embodied experience of immersing oneself in art making provides space for a felt experience of enacting methods, critical reflection , and challenging other perspectives (Belliveau, 2015; Maddison-MacFayden, 2013; Madison, 2014; Spry, 2011b).

When a call for papers came for a postgraduate research conference, the group decided to act on their commitment to researching through the arts and to tell the stories of their collaborative research and art making, through performance itself. While the move to performance was unintended, the workshops then led to the doctoral students collaboratively scripting and staging a performance to disseminate their embodied knowledge. Subsequently the group has presented for established researchers at several research conferences in New Zealand and Australia. This process of collaborative performance further provided an opportunity to disrupt traditional constructs of postgraduate supervision, ways of knowing, and valuing different knowledge. The extracts of dialogue used in this paper are taken from that performance work.

This paper stories the evolution of the arts-based project through the lens of two of the doctoral students (Esther and Molly) and the Supervisor (Peter). Threading together fragments of the whole story, where we draw on shared memories, photos, scripts and poems, each author

highlights significant learning that occurred for them in the collaborative performance space. We begin by introducing you to CRUAT (Critical Research Unit in Applied Theatre).

The CRUAT postgraduate workshops: An experiment with collaborative arts-based supervision

CRUAT was established in 2011 in the Faculty of Education at the University of Auckland. The Unit, directed by Peter O'Connor, has a range of traditional academic functions. It was always envisaged CRUAT would provide an academic home for postgraduate students researching applied theatre with particular interests in social justice. The CRUAT postgraduate workshop idea grew out of Peter's realisation students were often reading the same theorist, tussling with the same ethical concerns, and finding similar answers or questions, but had not found ways to work meaningfully with each other. The idea that each student might lead an arts-based workshop was primarily to provide an opportunity for them to share their research with other doctoral students. Over a period of two years, each doctoral student designed and facilitated a workshop based on the particular methodology they were implementing in their work.

For each facilitator the workshop provided a rehearsal space, an opportunity for critical reflection among peers on aspects of their theses, and offered opportunities for collaboration. The potential for new embodied knowledge occurred as a consequence of a growing ease and comfort with working in and through arts-based methods as the group learnt to trust each other in this space. An example of this can be found in one of the first CRUAT workshops led by Adrian Schoone. Adrian's doctoral research incorporated drama and found poetry as methods to explore the essences of alternative education tutors. He used the CRUAT space to rehearse the first found poetry/drama workshop he had designed. In this workshop Adrian engaged the CRUAT members in a research activity where they interacted collaboratively with the making, naming and description of a robot that distilled the qualities of a CRUAT researcher. The workshop provided an opportunity for Adrian to trial his ideas, get feedback, and critically reflect on the process before implementing this method with his research participants. Adrian later created a robot with a group of alternative education tutors, who they named Maximus. Importantly, Adrian's workshop involved the CRUAT team in collaborative art making, an embodied creative process that simultaneously involved exploring together the research ideas proposed (See Schoone, 2015 for the story of Maximus and Adrians research method). Adrian later described how 'The physical actions and interactions with Maximus [were] an unexpected innovation from the tutors, lending insight into their pedagogy which values embodied learning experiences, humour and encouraging language' (Schoone, 2015, p. 140). The physical act of making the robot in the CRUAT workshop extended the CRUAT members' thinking about

writing as inquiry (Richardson & St Pierre, 2005) and writing with the body (Spry, 2011a). Whilst engaging in the creative process the group shared their different perspectives on these methods and considered how the experience could enrich their own practice as researchers.

As highlighted in Adrian's story above, the embodied learning, through the CRUAT workshops and through the performance work, was significant to the participant's doctoral journeys. Elliott Eisner (2002) writes about the need to think of arts-based research as significant – not in comparison to, or in response to the scientific paradigm. Rather, arts-based research is a *particular* way of knowing. Eisner argues that the senses are a conduit for human 'sense' making (Eisner, 2002). For Eisner, the importance of this is realised in the classroom where teachers employ arts-based and collaborative pedagogies to enable their students to make sense of their worlds. Similarly, performing arts-based research can enable the researcher to tap into an embodied exploration, employing methods which require the researcher to be emotionally and physically involved in the sense making (Madison, 2012; Spry, 2011a). Madison describes how performance in research magnifies and puts into action sensory experience, thus becoming an act of interpreting through the senses (Madison, 2014). Finley (2011)describes how

> performativity is the quality criterion [she] emphasizes as being necessary to achieve arts-based approaches to inquiry that is activist, engages in critical reflection, resists neoconservatism in preference of social justice, and purposefully facilitates imaginative thinking about multiple, new, and diverse ways of understanding and living in the world. (Finley, 2011, p. 80)

The CRUAT workshops were an experiment with collaborative, arts-based pedagogy in doctoral supervision. Through this process individual's experienced meaning making through interaction, critical self-reflection, and embodied knowledge; resulting in a performance to disseminate our new knowledge.

The doing of collaborative research

We suggest that the CRUAT workshops became a form of collaborative research. Through the CRUAT workshops the doctoral students performed their research in collaboration with their peers and supervisor. For some students it meant sharing their art making. For some it was their poetry. And others engaged us in process dramas. All workshops involved collaborative participation. This collaborative exploration through performance created a different space, where now the art works were being interpreted through multiple lenses. Through this performative process the art work then became a conduit for the participants to speak to their own research in new ways. The following sections highlight the three authors' individual

experiences of CRUAT. All three were there at the beginning. All three arrived in the CRUAT space with their own objective, own prior experiences, and a desire to learn: The drama practitioner, the school teacher, and the Associate Professor: One about to hand in their thesis, one still analysing stories, and the other guiding the group to completion through experimental collaborative art based workshops. We therefore recognise this story is filtered through three lenses. As researchers we are focussed here on understanding what happens in a collaborative performance space to positively inform the doctoral journey.

Molly: Finding sustenance, encouragement and support.

Scene three: Sharing our lost moments

The doctoral students wander onto the stage, circling each other:

All (chanting): Lost, lost, lost.

Jane: I'm lost in words; where do I begin?

All (*chanting*): Qualitative, quantitative, subjective, objective epistemology, ontology.

Jane: What methodology?

All (chanting): Empirical, theoretical, narrative, historical, paradigm and praxis, complexity and chaos .... indecisiveness ... (*building to a crescendo*) Help! Help! HELP!

The CRUAT workshops and creation of the CRUAT performance challenged some established norms of the doctoral experience. A prevalent metaphor for the doctoral experience is of the journey, typically the student's individual quest for new knowledge (Hughes & Tight, 2013). On this journey the student may receive the guidance they need from their supervisor(s), but, as Hughes and Tight (2013) suggest, "For many doctoral students, particularly those in the arts, humanities and social sciences, their research can be a very lonely occupation…With loneliness can come confusion and disorder" (p. 770). Hughes and Tight suggest this loneliness can bring with it the experience of loss; the loss of a sense of identity and purpose. Through personally overcoming such obstacles the individual student builds the qualities they need to complete their quest. For Hughes and Tight, the metaphor of the journey and narrative structure of the quest, "speaks strongly to neo-liberal values of individualism, where personal motivation is all that is required to succeed" (p. 771). Working with new or emerging methodologies can exacerbate this sense of insecurity or 'being lost' because of the risk of doing something that puts you in

the minority, for which the protocols are not fully established, and/or goes against institutional norms (Hughes & Tight, 2013). Through CRUAT my doctoral colleagues and I could engage in collaborative activities that provided an important collective source of sustenance, encouragement and support:

Scene four: sharing our thoughts

Two doctoral students sit in a local café.

> **Molly:** Poetry has become part of so many of our research processes. One of the first emails you sent me, just after we met, was your 'Ontos' poem.
>
> **Esther:** Did I? (*laughs*) Yes, I felt encouraged to use arts-based methods. Remember how you kept prompting me to action my idea about the wire person? During my creating of a wire person as a form of A/r/tography I found a connection between my ancestors story where I constructed the poem about Wire.

Esther then stands and begins to perform the poem while others mime the drawing and manipulation of the wire, interpreting and rewriting the poem with their bodies.

Scene five: sharing our uncertainties

A group of doctoral students sit working at their desks, serious expressions on their faces.

> **Molly:** It feels like I have developed and articulated my creative research practice in a continuous dialogue right to the end when I was writing up my thesis. Adrian have you got a moment?
>
> **Adrian:** Sure.
>
> **Molly:** I've got this image I created by layering doodles and notes scanned from my research journal. I love the image and I use it at the start of one of my chapters, but I realise I never refer directly to it, breaking a golden rule of academic writing. Part of me wants the image to speak on its own, rather than have to be explained. I am completely stuck about what to say about it.
>
> **Adrian:** I love it! Don't cut it. To me it really communicates the experience of trying to make sense of all that data. It's a narrative in itself, but not a linear one.
>
> **Molly:** Yes, you've got it. Wait while I write something down. How's this? One challenge of writing applied theatre practice is to hold it still for a moment, but also

> conveying there is always something that exceeds what can be presented on the page...

In the CRUAT workshops and also in the informal interactions that developed out of them, my colleagues and I shared our developing methodologies and methods. My embodied awareness of the steps other CRUAT members were taking in using poetry, drama and other art forms in their research encouraged me to take my own methodological risks. Also important in this process was knowing that these risks, or experiments, were supported through Peter's supervision:

Scene six: shared risk taking

One doctoral student sits thoughtfully at his desk.

> **Adrian (*on the telephone)*:** Hi Peter, yes I want to study alternative education tutoring. Statistical aggressions (!), triangulations, extrapolations, falsifications, effect sizes collating, comparisons, and charts demonstrating computations of tutor effectiveness ratings 'The arts'? (*Adrian laughs*)

Laughter off stage

> **Adrian (looks up and smiles):** I digressed, I must confess, I do possess - Lyrical finesse.
>
> **Chorus:** I must confess, I do possess - Lyrical finesse!

Supporting collaboration and collegial relationships between doctoral students is not a new idea at all (see Condrad, 2007; Devenish et al., 2009). However, in many instances the benefits of doing so can be reduced to the students developing teamwork skills or other capacities that are transferrable (Devenish et al., 2009; Waite & Davis, 2006). This reflects the second metaphor for doctoral study proposed by Hughes and Tight (2013), of "doctorate research as a form of work:" (p. 771). Here there is an emphasis on the efficient management of the research project, development of skills and timely completion. As 'work', the doctorate is conceived predominantly as "a route to a professional role" (Hughes & Tight, 2013, p. 773). As opposed to an instrumentally productive space of collaboration, CRUAT created a playful space in which time was given for open-ended experimentation. It was a space in which risks could be taken and from which unexpected

outcomes could emerge. For myself and other members of CRUAT, collaborating through the arts and performance at different stages in our research journey encouraged synergy and the cross pollination of ideas. Rather than the generation of skills *per se*, the embodied, creative, collaborative experiences extended both individual and collective knowledge-making:

Scene seven: sharing our discoveries

Another meeting in a cafe with three doctoral students.

> **Jane:** You know ... it was at the *Drama in Education International Symposium* I discovered research based theatre and ethnographic performance.
>
> **Esther:** Ah, yes, the presentation by George Belliveau.
>
> **Jane:** To realise data could be generated, mediated and disseminated through drama was like a light illuminating a darkened stage. Performative inquiry: the third paradigm!
>
> **All:** Qualitative, quantitative, performative…aha!
>
> **Molly:** I remember your first CRUAT workshop Jane, remember where you created a dramatic encounter to generate data from your participants, and you worked with us to play and perform this method.
>
> **Esther:** I believe it was through these playful moments created within the CRUAT workshops, many of us developed some of the most important ideas and methodological practices in our doctoral research.
>
> **Jane:** And remember what happened to Claire with her interviews? You be Claire, Molly. Remember what her workshops were going to be like?

Molly takes Claire's object and addresses the audience

> **Molly (as Claire):** What did you think of today's lesson? How was it different from what normally happens in your classroom? Who is Andy? How do you feel when you are in role? What do you think the teacher wants you to learn? Who is in charge of the learning? Who is telling you what to do? Did you have fun? Why do you like or dislike learning in Mantle?

Esther: Then, thinking about what we had done in the CRUAT workshops, she decided to try something completely different.

Molly (as Claire): Hang on a minute! Having a thought….give me a moment. Ok, first we are going to move around the space imagining we are your teachers getting a cup of tea at break time and we start chatting about what we have heard going on in your classroom

Esther (as teacher): I heard they are doing something called Mantle of the Expert.

Rather than an individual quest, or a form of work (or perhaps in addition to these), the CRUAT workshops and collaborative performance have brought to the doctorate a quality of playfulness. Writing about twentieth-century art, David J. Getsy (2011) proposes that in spaces of play typical ways of being, working and relating are suspended, creating other possibilities for action that are 'intensely' felt:

> Participants' heightened engagement becomes possible because of this bracketing within the normal and the everyday of an alternate time and space of game/play in which they can and do act and identify differently and more intensely. (Getsy, 2011, P. xii)

Getsy (2011) argues while play is often understood as a "temporary world apart" from everyday life, it is not merely a "diversion" or "distraction" (p. xii). In its "push away from" the everyday, "play offers the capacity to skew the conventional, to treat the commonplace otherwise, and to offer a temporary site from which to revisualise our way of relating" (xii). There is a growing body of research to suggest current trends in Academia are closing down possibilities for 'play', for open ended collaboration and creative exploration (Verney et al., 2014). Verney et al. (2014) argue that working through the arts can be an effective way to create spaces where qualities including imagination, emotion, intuition and play are encouraged. The CRUAT workshops could be viewed as a 'play-space'; physically and intellectually a space in which performance was mobilised in ways that disrupted the institutional context of the University and the institutionalised processes of the Doctorate. The workshops created a space in which I, and my colleagues, found the often intangible, but deeply felt, resources that we needed to continue exploring and interrogating arts and performance-based methods in our own work.

Esther: Improvisation to disrupt the supervisor-student relationship

'I don't do art I just teach it'. If we reflect back to the beginning of CRUAT, and our early conversations what might you hear? We sat at the table, strangers mostly, and shared our initial

thoughts and ideas: 'interventions', 'semi-structured interviews', 'statistical aggressions', 'grounded theory', 'SPS'. And now we stand on the stage and perform our research.
I abandoned my original idea for my doctorate. I am now immersed in arts-based strategies to speak to ghosts. Using Derrida's (see Derrida, 1994) method of hauntology I seeks to understand what it means to be a Pākehā educator. Through an autoethnographic project I began to use the method of creative writing (Richardson & St Pierre, 2005) particularly writing research poems, as a way of analysing and sharing the research stories generated (Lahman & Richard, 2014; Lahman et al., 2011). One aspect of my poetry writing was the use of ekphrasis. Ekphrasis is a method of writing poetry in response to an art work. In response to some of the creative work by Pendergast and Maddison-MacFayden I expanded the notion of ekphrasis to include the creation of one art form speaking to another art form, to delve deeper into my subject (see Fitzpatrick, 2015; Maddison-MacFayden, 2013; Prendergast, 2004). This use of ekphrasis was most apparent when I performed poetry and fictional scripts in response to stories, photos and other visual art forms (Fitzpatrick, 2014, 2015). A further extension of this process was my writing of poetry in response to another's poetry, as a form of communication used to disrupt traditional power relations.

At the beginning of my research journey I wrote a series of poems with my co-supervisor Katie Fitzpatrick (see Fitzpatrick & Fitzpatrick, 2014), written to each other as email messages, to disrupt the traditional power relationship between supervisor and student. We speculate Peter's use of the collaborative arts-based workshops similarly provided space to disrupt the supervisor student relationship through the collaborative inquiry spaces that were implemented. These workshops created a space for the doctoral students involved to interrogate their own research processes; a place to play with ideas, through embodied practices, and establish a research learning community. Grant (2008) uses Hegel's Master-Slave dichotomy to analyse research supervision relationships. She suggests this metaphor is a useful framework for naming and thinking explicitly about this power relationship, and how it impacts student and supervisor expectations. Peter, in a traditional supervisor student interaction, would be cast in the role of the Master, and the student in the role of the Slave. When involved in the arts-based workshops this hierarchal structure is turned [somewhat] on its head. We speculate that Peter, as a participant, is encouraged to 'put on the shoes' of the Slave, whilst the student implementing the workshop plays the part of the Master.

In one of my poems to Katie (Fitzpatrick & Fitzpatrick, 2014) I describe the feeling of being 'not brave' but rather having to learning to walk in a 'Brave's shoes'.

Hi Katie

Thought you should know
I'm not brave.
I just wear a Brave's shoes

Masking my way into research.
Trying to walk
Upright tall, not trip or fall.

If the shoe doesn't fit
Will it fall?
Show my pale jandal line?

Soil between my toes.
A labourer's heels,
Player in the academy.
(Fitzpatrick & Fitzpatrick, 2014, p. 6)

So it was when I implemented my CRUAT workshop on hauntology. As the facilitator of the workshop I felt vulnerable as my methodology was still at its initial stages; it was more like a germ of an idea. However, working with the group of doctoral students who were similarly engaged in arts-based work, I was enthusiastic about the opportunity to try out some of these emerging ideas. As a group of doctoral students, we were fortunate Peter had worked deliberately to establish a positive supervisor student relationship. Grant argues the Master-Slave relationship can be distorted by the use of improvisation (Grant, 2010). This can occur where dialogue becomes a creative exchange of ideas that build upon one another. Improvising, Grant observes, requires: "certain capacities including an empathic ability to engage in intense listening… an ability to be fully caught up in the moment, a tolerance for ambiguity, and courage in the face of risk" (p. 273). She argues improvisation in research dialogue can contain a productive and creative fragility, requiring vulnerability from both parties. Grant's description of improvisation resonates with my experiences in the CRUAT workshops where participants engaged collaboratively in moments of art making, immersing their whole selves in the experience, intensely listening, vulnerable, and taking a risk.

Working collaboratively with others in an arts-based activity is not an easy task. It requires a willingness to listen to others ideas/perspectives and often to have your own ideas challenged and squashed. Working with the arts already places the researcher in a vulnerable

position, where the emotions are awake and sensitive. However, it is these moments when ideas are challenged and the emotions roused, transformation often occurs. Hence, the use of critical reflection as an ongoing practice in collaborative arts-based research is doubly significant.
An example of intense engagement is when I immersed myself in Jane's workshop. I describe this as an enriching experience which significantly impacted on my own research process (and also my teaching practice in the University). Through the embodied experience I began to interrogate my own research methods, critically consider my own position in the process, and think deeper about the research question itself. Jane's workshop required me to construct an installation to represent her doctoral journey, thus far. The physical activity of designing, constructing and presenting an installation of my Doctorate (during my provisional year) engaged me in a deeper level of critical interrogation of what I was proposing to do. At the time of Jane's workshop I was exploring Derrida's notion of hauntology (Derrida, 1994) where he urges the researcher to 'speak with the ghost'.

The physical activity of tying string to represent my journey (see Figures 1. and 2.), attaching labels to the string of significant moments and theorists, enabled me to make clearer links between the concept of hauntology and Traue's concept of 'ancestors of the mind' (Traue, 1990). Immersed in the embodied experience of art-making, interrogating the initial ideas of my Doctorate, I felt was an exciting and illuminating experience.

Figure 1. Immersed in the experience of art-making. **Figure 2.** Attaching labels to string

Arts-based research is often a 'messy' experience, however the messiness is an important part of the process where being able to explore and represent your emerging ideas through an art form brings clarity to the process. The cyclic to-ing and fro-ing, the cross-over, the leaping and 'Ah ha!' moments were given substance, rather than cerebral confusion.

Peter: Finding myself at the edge of learning

Four years ago at my interview for the job at the University of Auckland, I was asked if working in applied theatre altered how I supervised post graduate students. I said "No", of course I did supervision just like everyone else. I had, unquestioningly, bought into the traditional view of supervision as one on one teaching episodes, that focused almost entirely on shaping a written process. My supervision practice still provides one on one time, but the CRUAT workshops create a space where other more democratic and open learning can occur for students and myself. Students leading the workshop enable me to abdicate from the role of 'the fount of all knowledge'. Moving, and on occasions dancing, in the drama room with up to a dozen post

graduate students trialling work, rehearsing ideas, and performing our research anxieties, frees me from the stillness and narrowness of my office space. I reconnect to my own urgent desire to be playful with ideas, to create drama with all my students, to shape my own learning. I found myself on the edge of the learning. My original intention of simply providing a space for students to share their research was surpassed by the students taking the opportunity through the drama workshops to take control of their own learning as individuals and as a group.

Arts-based research had very limited recognition in the Faculty of Education or the University of Auckland prior to the establishment of CRUAT. Fourteen new postgraduate students, working in this way, suddenly turned this around, with workshops and presentations around the faculty and university fostering a growing interest amongst other postgraduate students and staff in using arts-based methods.

Most exciting for me has been the rediscovery of poetry through the CRUAT workshops. My own doctoral supervisor, Professor John O'Toole, had always stressed the importance of writing elegantly and accessibly. Increasingly I seek with my students the poetic, ways to find rhythm, assonance and playfulness in the way we write. The workshops reignited my own passion for writing and working in and through poetry.

This article was, like the CRUAT workshops, led by my students. I was graciously invited to be part of their work in explaining how their research had been shaped by the workshops. Like the workshops, the article is sprinkled with script, poetry, personal story, and a tussling with ideas not yet fully formed.

Finding the edge again

Final scene

Peter: You can cut from here to here.

Molly: Cut all of this?

(to Esther) I ask my co-supervisor. Should I really cut all this?

Co-supervisor: Yes, it's a bold move but a powerful way to end the thesis.

Molly: They want me to cut everything in the conclusion except for the three poems.

Esther: That sounds great, can I read the poems?

Molly: Ok… here goes. Highlight and delete.

(to Esther) I did it, it scared me, but I did it.

Esther: We are all doing some pretty scary stuff, because a lot of it is new.

Esther and Molly turn away from audience and take 3 steps back, turn out to audience, join hands as if standing on the edge, leaning forward

Esther: I'm on the edge.

Molly: Has anyone done this before?

Esther: It's a long way down!

Molly: I'll catch you.

Esther: Look at the view!

Reflecting back on our individual and shared journey over the past few years, we argue it has been through our engagement in collaborative art making and performance that, together, we have disrupted, dismantled, and created new edges in supervision and research practice. As a collective body of researchers we have been sustained through moments of vulnerability and loss, we have been supported and challenged to take risks. We have taken hold of each other's hand. Through these shared, performed experiences, our knowledge of creative research practice has deepened; it is an embodied knowledge. And so we end on another edge. CRUAT's collaborative arts based workshops helped to establish a very different set of conditions for postgraduate research. As the students featured in this articles move into new phases of their research, and new students join the research unit, we are yet to see what these conditions will produce next.

Email conversation:

Esther:

I lean…between…the edge and my imagination
I fall…and dream……and play…and create
Another edge

Peter:

Finding the edge again.
Walls, silence, complicity.
I can find them.

But edges?

Esther:

Edges disappear
When you are with friends.
You can fly.
You can dream.
You can imagine.

Peter:

Here there were no edges,
We had to etch our own,
A place to leap
From.
It's not friends on the edge.
It's us,
Fellow artists.
Friends are the bonus

Act Two

In progress

References

Belliveau, G. (2015). Performing identity through research-based theatre: Brothers. *Journal of Education Enquiry, 14*(1), 5-16.

Condrad, L. (2007). Developing the intellectual and emotional climate for candidates. In C. Denholm, & T. Evans (Eds.), *Supervising Doctorates Downunder: Keys to Effective Supervision in Australia and New Zealand* (pp. 36-44). Camberwell, Vic, Australia: ACER Press. Retrieved from http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=361939187713566;res=IELHSS.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Spectres of Marx: The state of the debt, the work of mourning, and the new international.* (P. Kamuf, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Devenish, R., Dyer, S., Jefferson, T., Lord, L., van Leeuwen, S., & Fazakerley, V. (2009). Peer to peer support: the disappearing work in the doctoral student experience. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(1), 59-70.

10.1080/07294360802444362

Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of the mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Finley, S. (2011). Critical arts-based inquiry: The pedagogy and performance of a radical ethical aesthetic. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fitzpatrick, E. (2014). A conversation with Steinbeck: finding my way to postcritical ethnography. In C. Mutch, & J. Rath (Eds.), *Emerging critical scholarship in education: Navigating the doctoral journey*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholar Press.

Fitzpatrick, E. (2015). It's a tricky business: Performing poetry with the ghost. In P. O'Connor, & M. Anderson (Eds.), *Applied Theatre Research: Radical Depratures* (Vol. 207-225). London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Fitzpatrick, E., & Fitzpatrick, K. (2014). Disturbing the divide: Poetry as improvisation to disorder power relationships in research supervision. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 10.1177/1077800414542692

Getsy, D. J. (2011). *From diversion to subversion: games, play, and twentieth-century art*. Pennsylvania, P: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Grant, B. M. (2010). Improvising together: The play of dialogue in humanities supervision. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 9*(3), 271-288. 10.1177/1474022210379376

Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2013). The metaphors we study by: the doctorate as a journey and/or work. *HERDSA, 31*(5), 765775. 10.1080/07294360.2013.777031

Lahman, M. K. E., & Richard, V. M. (2014). Appropriated poetry: Archival poetry in research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(3), 344-355. 10.1177/1077800413489272

Lahman, M. K. E., Rodriguez, K. L., Richard, V. M., Geist, M. R., Schendel, R. K., & Graglia, P. E. (2011). (Re)Forming research poetry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*(9), 887-896. 10.1177/1077800411423219

Maddison-MacFayden, M. (2013). This white women has journeyed far: Serendipity, counter-stories, hauntings, and ekphrasis as a type of poetic inquiry. *Morning Watch Journal of Educational and Social Analysis, Special Edition: Narratives of becoming a researcher, 40*.

Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical Ethnography: method, ethics, and performance* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Madison, D. S. (2014, 26-28th November 2014). *The politics of the performing body across private and public ethnographic spaces*. Paper presented at the meeting of Contemporary ethnography across the disciplines, Waikato University, New Zealand.

Prendergast, M. (2004, July, 2004). *Ekphrasis and inquiry: Artful writing on arts-based topics in educational research*. Paper presented at the meeting of Second International Imagination in Education Research Group Conference, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. http://www.ierg.net/pub_conf2004.php

Richardson, L., & St Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3 ed., pp. 959-978). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Schoone, A. (2015). Finding Maximus in fragments of playful intensity. In P. O'Connor, & M. Anderson (Eds.), *Applied Theatre Research: Radical Departures* (pp. 123-144). London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Spry, T. (2011a). *Body, paper, stage: Writing and performing autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast

Spry, T. (2011b). Performative autoethnography: critical embodiements and possibilities. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publishers.

Traue, J. (1990). Ancestors of the mind: a Pakeha Whakapapa. Retrieved from http://www.recreationaccess.org.nz/files/traue_ancestors.pdf

Verney, H., Van Lith, T., Rumbold, E. J., Morris, D., Fegan, S. M., Rankin, B., . . . Brophy-Dixon, J. (2014). Losing, and finding, spaces to learn in the university. *Emotion, Space and Society, 11*(May), 36-42. 10.1016/j.emospa.2013.03.003

Waite, S., & Davis, B. (2006). Developing undergraduate research skills in a faculty of education: motivation through collaboration. *Higher Education Research & Development, 24*(4), 403-419.