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Abstract
Art and design is relatively new to the world of research and continues to claim its place as an academic research activity. To do this it has had to build arguments for how its procedures constitute a disciplinary specific form of inquiry and communicate how its activities constitute something important in the world – an alternative means of thinking and knowing. It has had to do this while not losing sight of its fundamental role as art and design. This paper surveys the ways in which practice-based research is achieving this, connecting key aspects of these efforts to a developing research-oriented pedagogy for undergraduate teaching and learning. I suggest that the development of a research-oriented teaching culture has reinvigorated the undergraduate curriculum, advancing our pedagogical content knowledge. In this respect I outline a number of strategies of importance in assisting students to build more sophisticated conceptions of artistic research.

Introduction
As a new class of research, art and design research has a lot to offer contemporary thinking about how we interpret and understand our world. Barrett and Bolt describe practice-led research as a new species involved in generative
inquiry that “draws on subjective, interdisciplinary and emergent methodologies that have the potential to extend the frontiers of research” (2010: 1). They note the potential reach this steadily developing research beyond its discipline, arguing for the value of practice as research in achieving “a more profound understanding of how knowledge is revealed, acquired and expressed” (2010: 1). They add: “A growing recognition of the philosophical and knowledge-producing role of the creative arts in contemporary society needs to be extended both within and beyond the discipline” (2010: 2).

Compared to many other subjects art and design as research is a fledgling endeavor still in the process of defining its terms and showing how it is important to understanding ourselves and our world. It offers up a host of new considerations and alternative scenarios for the concept of academic research. As Little (2011) suggests: “what is certain is that it [practice based research] requires a new conceptualisation of the idea of research and a re-thinking of the place of artistic practice in the research realm” (Little 2011: 23). The matter of whether art and design practice constitutes a form of research seems at first to hinge on whether or not it can either meet the requirements already laid down by definitions of scholarly research or whether it can develop a convincing case for expanding/re-formulating existing definitions that better accommodate its activity.

As an alternative logic, practice-based research proposes new ideas about the nature and form of knowledge, a flexibility and creativity towards methods and
methodology, and a focus on process. While art and design research can undoubtedly offer insight beyond its disciplinary field, at the same time we need to remain mindful of the purpose that research can serve our own subject. Stephen Scrivener has offered support to this view stating that art research is not primarily a form of knowledge communication, or servant of the knowledge acquisition enterprise, but performs a complementary function. As part of his position that “artworks do not constitute knowledge artefacts (2002: 1) Scrivener argues that “the proper goal of visual arts research is visual art” and warns that “art may loose sight of its own objectives by adopting predefined notions of research” (2002: 1). Identifying, framing and contextualising what we do as research should ideally be a productive and developmental contribution to the work art and design already does in the world. As Carole Gray points out: “Research should not be seen as being in conflict with practitioners methods, but an expansion of them” (1996: 10).

**Art and design as ways of knowing**

All students leaving degree education are advocates for the potential of practice-based research as a mode of knowledge and action and take into the world with them an understanding of the complex experimental, material and social processes involved in the creation and reception of creative work. In order to operate in an increasingly inter-disciplinary world artists and designers need to be aware of their own discipline specific ways of knowing and how these can balance perspectives from other disciplinary contexts. Ways of knowing and
knowledge are concepts tied to both individual experience and wider subject epistemologies, values and beliefs.

The broad question of what artists know and whether artistic practices generate knowledge is a widely debated topic. A well-known counter to the question *what do artists know* is it’s re-framing as *how do artists think*, proposed as a more productive question in the context of research in art. Wesseling has claimed here that:

> “The verb “to know” does not apply to art or to what artists do. To know implies cognition, knowledge, evidence, truth, criteria for certainty, categories that belong to the world of science and to a kind of thinking essentially alien to art… In art, which is a quest for meaning, there is nothing much to know. (Wesseling 2012: 195)

This idea is based on insights acquired by Wesseling from political theorist Hannah Arendt in her book *The Life of the Mind*. From Kant, Arendt distinguishes two kinds of thinking: Reason and intellect. While intellect meets our need for knowledge and cognition, reason is said to transcend the limitations of knowledge and relate instead to our search for meaning.

These points seem critical to the work of defining practice-based research. If we take it that the kind of thinking that is most relevant to art is reason, which has its
origins in our need to ponder questions to which we know there is no answer or verifiable knowledge possible (Wesseling, 2011), then our conception of research for our subject is already at odds with qualities of traditional academic research at a fundamental level. In leaving behind less workable comparisons and criteria from existing terms of academic research and re-connecting with the broader qualities of inquiry – to question, to search, to doubt and to interpret – we come closer to a conceptualisation of research appropriate to artistic practice.

Undergraduate learning is an important time to begin to build a discourse around what might constitute art and design disciplinary thinking and our relationship to the concept of knowledge. Framing her/his work as a mode of inquiry, the practitioner-researcher acknowledges the situation-specific context of practice itself as the logic from which a model of knowing is built. Practitioner-researchers engage in the particularities of artistic practice and this situation is highly significant to a workable conceptualisation of research. But is all practice research, and is all research practice? Scrivener offers an interesting response to this tension. He argues that art making is undertaken in order to create apprehensions [“objects that must be grasped by the senses and the intellect” (2002: 12) but adds additional criteria for art making which is to be considered research:

“…I would argue that the "researcher" intends to generate novel apprehensions (by novel I mean culturally novel, not just novel to the
creator or individual observers of an artefact) by undertaking original creation, and it is this that separates the researcher from the practitioner” (Scrivener 2002: 12-13).

Wesseling (2011) makes a similar observation in relation to the PHD in art:

“When the discussion [art debate] takes place in an academic context, within the framework of research for a PhD, then certain conditions are attached. For example, the research needs to yield fresh insights, not merely into one’s personal work but for art in a broader sense as well” (Wesseling 2011: 4)

These remarks point to a shared understanding that central to a definition of artistic research has been the criterion that the investigations and experiments made through art expand the possibilities of art; that something new is added to the field in some way.

However, in the context of undergraduate teaching and learning an important distinction needs to be made here. Whilst the research remit at graduate level and beyond should seek to meet the criteria of new or original contribution to knowledge, at undergraduate level, inquiry that reveals something new to that learner, and not necessarily something genuinely new is more the goal. This is not to say that work at this level cannot achieve these objectives, but it is to
establish a different aim for early studio learning. As Elton notes: “The outcome of both research and teaching is new learning, wholly new in the case of research and new to the learners in the case of teaching (2001: 45).

Another requirement in relation to the knowledge that is produced through scholarly research is its public dissemination. On these grounds, a distinction between regular practice and research practice has also been established: that artistic research produces a reflection on process/thinking/knowledge that is publically accessible.

Drew (2007) identifies a need for practitioners to visibly engage in debate around their practices as a requirement of practice as research. She notes: “The principal distinction between practice-based research and practice is that in practice-based research, there is a more public engagement of the practitioner with the theories, ideas, etc., underpinning the work (2007: 7). Wesseling uses similar criterion for the artist-as-researcher:

“The artist-as-researcher distinguishes himself from other artists by taking it upon himself to make statements about the production of his work and about his thought processes. The artist-as-researcher allows others to be participants in this process, enters into a discussion with them and opens himself up to critique… The artist-researcher seeks discussion in the public domain” (Wesseling 2011: 3-4).
Referring to the artist who works within a research context, Irene Fortuyn similarly notes that “an additional component is introduced: the artistry and the work that results is not simply practiced but is rendered explicit as well; it is the embodiment and the discussion of it rolled into one” (Fortuyn 2011: 171).

However we might personally or collectively define how or when artistic action is also research, what is critical in the case of research-based teaching and learning is that we find a pedagogical framework that provides a way to effectively engage students in this developing theory and practice. Finding ways that staff can integrate their own experiences as practitioner-researchers is vital here.

**Research-oriented teaching and learning**

Across institutions and within disciplinary sectors, people have different views about how, and if, teaching and research can be linked. As Angela Brew points out, relationships will be based on conceptions of what research is, conceptions of what teaching is, and the nature of research practices within the discipline itself: “Successful integration of research and teaching is dependent upon strategies that take account of varying views of research, teaching, and knowledge, and the nature of scholarship within particular disciplinary areas” (2006: 16). A number of models that embed research into the academic experience for students have been developed, and for the relatively new area of
practice-based research finding our place in relation to these, and/or adapting a scenario that is appropriate for us is still very much in development.

Griffiths (2004) undertook a three year research project to discover good practice in creating productive links between teaching, research and consultancy and found that although research-teaching relationships can be specific in form, much of the time, the research-teaching relationship is more diffuse (Griffiths 2004: 721). Griffiths outlines a series of models based in particular relationships within the research-teaching nexus: research-led; research oriented; research-based; and research informed. Under a research-led model, the curriculum is structured around subject content, and teaching is based on the ‘information transmission’ model. The emphasis is on understanding research findings rather than research processes. In contrast, the research-oriented model places emphasis on understanding the processes by which knowledge in a field is produced. The teaching of inquiry skills and the disposition to engage in research activity is highlighted. Under this model, staff research experiences are incorporated into their teaching a more diffuse way. In research-based teaching the curriculum is designed around inquiry-based activities, and the division of roles between teacher and student is reduced. Research-informed teaching is described as teaching that draws closely on research into the scholarship of teaching and learning.
Of the research-oriented model, Griffiths further notes: "What academics are bringing to the teaching situation is not so much the specific methods, findings and experiences associated with particular research activities, as a more general orientation to the subject, and to the process of knowledge creation, that first-hand participation in knowledge production provides" (Griffiths 2004: 721). Similarly, Angela Brew, in her work on the relationship between teaching and research, describes more dispersed arrangements by establishing that learning is the common activity that links research and teaching. She notes that research-led learning includes “developing a knowledge of what it is to engage in the subject in a research-based way” (2002: 8).

Research-teaching relationships in the art and design disciplinary context can take on any of the above models, and do so at different times. Lecture-based teaching events where staff research is presented to students falls within the research-led scenario. Inquiry-based activities (research-based teaching) are a major feature of the teaching and learning environment. Staff and students often engage collaboratively on projects where divisions between student and teacher are dissolved (setting up student exhibitions, being part of group shows, and employing students as research assistants for example). However, by far the most notable match in terms of the development of pedagogical content knowledge in recent times has been the continued development of a diffuse, research-oriented teaching and learning model in art and design. Similar to ideas of constructivism, research-oriented teaching, with its emphasis on
understanding *how* knowledge is developed, is based on a transformative view of teaching and learning in contrast to a transmission/additive one and thus constitutes a more student-focused approach.

Research can often be presented to students as the communication of ideas through final outcomes – writing, art-works, reports etc., largely detached from the processes from which it has resulted. Brew and Boud (1995) have noted how teaching and research are correlated where they are co-related, i.e. when what is being related are the two aspects of the same activity: learning. Under a research-oriented model, *how* knowledge is created lies at the centre of the teaching-research relationship, and this is where its value as a construct for art and design pedagogy lies. The concept of a research-oriented model focuses extra attention on *process*, in contrast to say a research-led approach, which concentrates on sharing research findings after the fact. Given that a central role of studio education is to help students find out about their own ways of working and to support the development of their individual practices, a research-teaching model whose focus is on process seems a productive and appropriate path. The next sections look at process and the related concept of ‘methodology’ as central to a research-oriented pedagogy.

**Process & Practice**

Both the products and processes of studio-based activity constitute research activity. Both are open to critique, and both represent a site for extending the
discipline through new practices, products and insights. The outcomes, or products of the creative process represent thinking made visible, and are offered to the viewer for interpretation and meaning making. Process is evidence of how we think, and for practitioners and practitioner-teachers a focus on what happens in the studio, or the way artworks are made is their area of authority, reflected in their research contributions within the field. Graeme Sullivan, in his seminal book *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in Visual Arts* quotes Greta Refsum (2002) as saying:

“Artists and the field of visual arts deal primarily with that which happens before artworks are made, this is their specialist arena, what comes afterwards is the arena of the humanistic disciplines. If the field of visual arts wants to establish itself as a profession with a theoretical framework it must, in my opinion, build its theory production on that which happens before art is produced, that is, the processes that lead to the finished objects of art.” (Sullivan 2002: 85).

Artists and designers are using the creative practice PHD and Doctorate degrees as “a method for understanding the creative process, and thus a means to knowledge in itself.” (Scrivener and Chapman 2004: 8). This emphasis on method and process as unique territory for practice-based art and design research is highly significant. Although the creative process is not easily articulated through written and spoken language (reflecting the significance of
‘not-knowing’) the dissemination of information and ideas by artists and designers on matters of process has been of great value to other artists and designers and to the general development of a culture of practice-based research and discourses on creativity. Documentation of process, particularly written accounts, has been a critical part of extending the results further than the personal artistic development of the artist.

A key criterion for practice-based research has been that is it led by practice. Haseman captures this idea as follows:

“Rather than contribute to the intellectual or conceptual architecture of a discipline, these research enterprises are concerned with the improvement of practice, and new epistemologies of practice distilled from the insider’s understandings of action in context” (2006: 3).

The term ‘practice’ can refer to both process and product. It can be used to describe the way one goes about doing the work including mediums, materials, techniques and processes and can include the methods, conceptual approach, influences, and philosophies that inform the work. Because the term practice is such an all-encompassing term, it has been difficult for art and design to separate out research from practice.

Another aspect of practice that defines our research is that it is always in process.
This has to do with the notion of the unfinished as a convention in art. Writing on ‘The Success of Failure’, Joel Fisher pointed out that: “We no longer need to face the unfinished with a negative prejudice. We have begun to look at a work as somehow complete at every point in its development” (Fisher 2000: 157). Most contemporary artists are reluctant to bring their work to any kind of unequivocal conclusion, and many flat out reject the notion of closure or finality. Ideas and concepts are deliberately left open and the work holds the potential to be further developed or reconfigured at some later time. Art and design are ‘open’ research ventures that regularly generate more questions than answers, more potentials and possibilities than final words. Writing about the work of iconic contemporary Belgian artist Francis Alÿs, art critic Russell Ferguson’s notes could easily be applied to many contemporary artists working in a research context today:

“For Alÿs, that flickering, the movement back and forth and around an idea is as productive as a determined path towards a fixed and identifiable goal. In some cases, there may well be no goal beyond the process, which is almost always a series of more or less tentative moves towards an idea” (Ferguson 2010: 196).

This can sit rather uncomfortably with the more traditional aims of academic research to settle matters, to suggest solutions and ultimately to provide answers. Research-oriented approaches to undergraduate teaching reflect this pre-occupation with persistent states of open-endedness, reflected in broad project
briefs, the freedom to determine one’s own working process and the opportunity to develop unique approaches to the concept of methodology.

**Methodology**

Fundamental to the rise of practice-based research in art and design has been the way it has interpreted and built a response to the idea of methodology. The concept of methodology holds a central place in the definition of academic research. It is the general strategy that outlines the way in which a project is to be undertaken and identifies the methods that will be used. It is also concerned with the concepts and theories that underpin particular methods. In selecting a methodology, standard academic advice is that the research itself should dictate the kinds of methodology used. Subject epistemologies also play a part in dictating which methods will be appropriate. In art and design, where research is a term borrowed from other disciplines, associated terms such as methodology also need re-interpretation and explanation.

Methodological development for art and design has centred on strategies that are determined by doing and making, theoretical perspectives employed, and reflection on practice. This aspect of the theory of practice-based research is still in development and at postgraduate researcher level both student and supervisor are put in the position of having to consider both methodology and methodological rigor simultaneously. Scrivener and Chapman note:
“This situation, which is a source of inspiration and anxiety for both supervisor and student, requires a level of critical engagement with the debate on the theory and practice of research not demanded of researchers in those disciplines where shared and agreed research principles and methods have become embedded.” (Scrivener and Chapman 2004: 1).

Characteristically devoid of any uniform approach or standard method the question of methodology challenges the practitioner to respond to questions of motivation, influence, context, environment, intention, meaning and a whole host of other relationships integral to the creation of artistic outcomes. ‘Methods’ come from within and beyond the discipline - almost anything is seen as open for use. Haseman has observed here that:

“Practice-led researchers have used interviews, reflective dialogue techniques, journals, observation methods, practice trails, personal experience, and expert and peer review methods to complement and enrich their work-based practices” (Haseman 2006: 105).

Each practitioner will decide on their own methods and how and why they are appropriate and useful, and this can be a largely unconscious process, especially when one is in the ‘flow’ of the work itself. Intuition and chance inspiration play an
important role in the dynamics of the method and methodologies that motivate creative production.

Following from its job in the world to challenge notions of the way things are, art and design research is taking on the role of provocateur and interpreter with regard to the concept of methodology, challenging traditional understandings of research categories. For example, Haseman describes an emerging method termed the *artistic audit* noting it is “explicitly designed to transform ‘the literature review’ into a more layered and rich analysis of the contexts of practice within which the performative researcher operates” (Haseman 2006: 105). Haseman sees this emerging method as part of a new paradigm titled *performative research* that sits beyond established and approved qualitative and quantitative research methodologies that “fail to meet the needs of an increasing number of practice-led researchers” (2006: 98). He writes that this methodological distinction is aligned with many of the values of qualitative research but is also distinct from it; particularly in the way research is reported. In this paradigm, reporting occurs through presentational forms rather than as written text. Haseman identifies these as the material forms of practice, of still and moving images, of music and sound, of live action and digital code (Haseman 2006).

As a practicing designer, Lisa Grocott undertook a design-oriented research project that specifically questioned how visualising as a research method might interrogate the often only tacitly understood praxis of design. Using this as a case
study to investigate the potential role visual communication could play in communicating the individual practitioner-researcher’s design know-how as substantive knowledge, Grocott developed a design-led research strategy she calls *figuring*, conceived to amplify the back talk of designing in a research context. Similar to Haseman, Grocotts’ work highlights the particularities and characteristics of practice-based research, suggesting strategies, methods and conceptual beginnings outside of mainstream research approaches that better fit the nature of art and design investigation. Grocott states that:

“In valuing that the visual artefact can be productively ambiguous the thesis came to respect the critical value of working towards, rather than fixing, an understanding of the somewhat elusive nature of design knowing. With an emphasis on becoming, the project recognises the value of operating in a suspended state of figuring out, rather than determining a fixed position on how designers' should undertake research” (2012: 3).

Emerging theories and practical examples such as these represent resources that teaching staff can readily draw on to help students develop conceptions of artistic research that are appropriate and useful to their developing practices. What I have observed is that undergraduate teaching is developing a distinctive research-oriented pedagogy based on a collective understanding by its practitioner-teachers that *process, methodology and practice* are critical sites of research action and expertise.
Building sophisticated conceptions of research

In this section I offer a list of strategies important to research-oriented teaching in art and design. Based on material presented above the following is useful in helping students to frame their artistic practice as research:

1. To challenge conceptions of research built by prior learning & experience

Typically our undergraduate students arrive into art & design higher education with a view of research as a particular kind of workflow organised in a mostly linear way. It includes: developing a problem statement, locating resources, gathering information, evaluating material, and presenting findings. They have experienced research, for the most part, as a problem-solving pursuit that uses information skills. As part of their prior art and design learning, research usually describes the processes of gathering and analysing information and perhaps user testing in the case of design.

Many defining qualities of the artistic process are essentially at odds with pre-determining stages and establishing research objectives in advance. Extending students conceptions involves becoming increasingly receptive to the critical role that uncertainty, instability, anxiety and not-knowing play. Unpacking the familiar stages in the generic model of research can be used to bring these differences into focus. The following provides an example:
• establishing the aim of the research
In contrast with research practices that aim to establish clearly defined goals and objectives and proceed in an organised way, artists and designers often don’t know where they are going at the outset of a project. This is seen as a productive state that allows the focus and content of the work to emerge in the process of making.

• hypothesising and establishing research questions
Artistic practice is characterised by problem finding rather than problem-solving. To access new ways of looking at things artists regularly undertake to critique the underlying dimensions of existing situations. As art theorist Graeme Sullivan notes, “The long standing critical function of the arts suggests that as a form of inquiry the role of artistic inquiry in problematizing phenomena is perhaps the most salient feature of artistic research” (2011: 92). In contrast to identifying a question to be investigated artistic inquiry more usually proceeds from a desire or issue that motivates the work in an ongoing, speculative way. In her discussion how artists use failure to propose resistant views of the world, writer Lisa Le Feuvre points out that speculation operates somewhat differently in art than in science and that finality is much less important: “speculation here is not necessarily intent on reaching a goal, questions are no less powerful than answers and the production of ideas has no end point” (2010: 3).
• gathering data / sourcing relevant information

The task of identifying relevant resources and collecting information is characterized by an ad-hoc, pick-up and discard approach dictated by where your practice happens to take you and what you decide is the particular criteria for determining ‘relevance’. This process can often be dictated by quite random events and circumstances – where you happen to be, what you happen to see or who you come into contact with. Artistic research practices also constantly borrow from other disciplines and traditions and it is the special case that artists and designers are able to maneuver within specialist information and knowledge’s without being an expert themselves.

• conclusions and findings

Less concerned with certainty, validity and reliable knowledge, artistic outcomes are more aligned with interpretation and meaning, and with improvements to practice than with achieving conclusive results. Artistic research offers potential and possibility with respect to knowledge, and is interested in contingency rather than resolution or fixed positions.

2. To establish conceptions of research based in a subject-specific epistemology

It is important for students to recognise that the nature, purpose and practice of our subject underlies all artistic action, including research. Considering where subject knowledge lies is important to the work of finding appropriate and
productive ways of framing our work as research. The following are starting points for this discussion:

• the logic of practice
The logic of practice includes the idea that making and thinking are inseparable; that making is thinking and that artworks are thinking made visible (Wesseling 2012). This signifies that the kind of knowledge that might reside in practice is closer to experiential, embodied and affective knowing and that practice-based research may be able to tell us something about the creative process itself. The logic of practice also involves the idea that methodology emerges out of the working process, as one things leads to another and the practice builds in momentum. Practice is a phenomenon is that it is always in process. This recognises the essential ‘open’ state of art and design practice and research.

• the function of artistic research
It is critical that understandings of practice as research are generated on the basis of art and design’s function first and foremost as cultural practices. This is important in avoiding a situation where conventional structures that traditionally define academic research are simply and unquestioningly applied. Related to previous points, this involves acknowledging artistic practices, processes and products as research and recognising that these also constitute its methods, methodology and ways of knowing as a category of academic research.
3. To engage in questions of knowledge and knowing

Knowledge and knowing are the concepts that pre-occupy the world of academic research. Already theoretically complex, they remain problematic to the field of art and design. Connected to certainty and truth they sit awkwardly with much of the philosophical base of art and design where uncertainty, ambiguity and reflexive doubt prevail. Our area of action in the world involves phenomena that remain hard to grasp, reconstruct and articulate.

At the same time, the kinds of things about human knowing that artistic practice foregrounds – the subjectivity of the knower and affective and embodied knowing – are of great interest to developments in theories of knowledge and perspectives on research processes and methods. Artistic creation is an example of a specialist discipline with the potential to methodologically and theoretically open-up and enrich the philosophical pursuit of a theory of knowing (Libre, 2013).

Being familiar with current thinking and debate in this area is important for students as future artistic researchers operating in a domain obsessed by knowledge creation. This learning can be activated through exposure to a range of existing and developing material. Leading ideas at the current moment include:

• reason as a dominant mode of thinking

Representing an alternative culture of knowledge, art and design has been said to use reason as a dominant mode of thinking. This is described as the pure act
of thinking, the kind of thinking associated with a search for meaning rather than reliable knowledge and motivated by questions for which no verifiable knowledge is possible (Wesseling 2012). It is a kind of thinking that proceeds from constant doubt, also applying this attribute to its own results in a self-reflexive way.

• challenges to ‘knowing’ and ‘knowledge’ as the primary outcome of research

Related to the function of artistic research noted above, students need to understand what criteria are applicable (and not applicable) to artistic practice as research including the nature and purpose of its research outcomes. An example of this is the question of ‘knowledge’ as a primary outcome. The very concept of knowledge is challenged in our field. The primary focus in creative research is the process of an experience that has the potential for meaning beyond itself. In this sense the artwork is not considered an end product representing knowledge in itself, but a stimulant for the process of interpretation and meaning by the viewer.

4. To engage in research rhetoric

Utilising the vocabulary of academic research students can begin to share their disciplinary insights, perspectives and values with a wider research community. This is essential to operating in an increasingly interdisciplinary world. For art and design, this rhetoric includes the critical idea that it is the individual artist/designer that determines the particular framing of their work as research.

Conclusion
Our undergraduate students are the next in line to further a position for practice-based research. For those engaging with research in an academic context they will also be required to contribute to a critical dialogue on the theory and practice of research simply as a consequence of being involved in a discipline where widely shared criteria do not yet exist. This experience sets artistic research up to be a voice in developments to academic research at a meta-level. For example, it is easy to see how artist-researchers could contribute to the current critique of the norms associated with qualitative research put forward by educational theorist Elizabeth St Pierre (with others).

Pierre’s work has involved interrogating the limits ethnographic research has placed on itself including those related to the concept of methodology. In short, St Pierre utilises material from the ‘posts’ (postmodernism, post structuralism etc.) to critique the conventional use of humanist qualitative methodology as ‘unintelligible’. She argues that its methods rely on the separation of the human from everything else, maintaining hierarchies and binary oppositions. It is said that this prevents ethnographic research from doing anything new. Pierre draws on the concepts of Deleuze and Guattari to suggest that research start with theories and concepts rather than methods, and that method could be invented differently for each study. The notion that method does not come first but emerges as the work builds is a familiar construct to artistic research. Academia stands to gain from opening itself up to alternative forms of thinking and practice exemplified through art and design research.
The emergence of research-oriented pedagogies in art and design education is reflective of the ongoing establishment of artistic research - the bringing together of art and academia. Connected by the shared motive of learning, studio teaching that offers experience with artistic research principals and practices holds the potential to be of value to both students (those moving on to higher levels of research-based study, and those moving into an interdisciplinary world working across disciplines and contexts), and to research active staff contributing to the ongoing development of the creative arts research domain and its impact on the wider theory and practice of academic research.
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