



**TEACHING  
ARTISTIC  
RESEARCH**



*edition:* **'Angewandte**

Book Series of the University of Applied Arts Vienna  
Edited by Gerald Bast, *President*

CONVERSATIONS ACROSS CULTURES

# TEACHING ARTISTIC RESEARCH

Edited by  
Ruth Mateus-Berr  
Richard Jochum

DE GRUYTER





**Teaching Artistic Research  
Table of Contents**

**PREFACE**  
Gerald Bast

**9**

**FOREWORD**  
Shaun McNiff

**11**

**INTRODUCTION**  
Ruth Mateus-Berr and  
Richard Jochum

**17**

## #1 ROLE MODELS

**Michael Collins and  
Graeme Sullivan**

**28**

Artistic Research as  
Praxis and Pedagogy

Keywords: digital media, online curriculum,  
networked knowledge, design thinking, reflexivity

**Dylan Gauthier and  
Jen Mazza**

**42**

Like Driving at Night: A Process-Based,  
Learner-Centered Approach to Teaching  
Artistic Research across Disciplines

Keywords: art and design, artistic research,  
art practice, reflective practice, critical thinking,  
university system

**Margarete Jahrman**

**54**

Ludic Games:  
Playful Forms of Insight

Keywords: ludic research method, ludic objects,  
experiments, epistemology

**Stefan Wykydal**

**66**

Nonverbal Words: Investigating  
Artistic Methods and Codes

Keywords: aesthetic availabilities, archive,  
artistic methods, code, nonverbal language

**Manora Auersperg**

**72**

Working In\_between:  
Approaching the Unknown

Keywords: context-related projects, exploratory  
practice, cooperation, experience-based approach,  
communication

**Elisabeth Schäfer**

**84**

Writing as Artistic Research

Keywords: writing as artistic research,  
performance philosophy, deconstruction,  
*écriture féminine*, queer-feminist practices

## #2 HYBRIDITY IN MAKING: RETHINKING THE CURRICULUM

**Richard Jochum**

**98**

After Artistic Research

Keywords: environment of care, role models,  
curriculum and pedagogy, practice-led research

**Pamela Bartar and  
Julia Poscharnig**

**116**

Learning from Socially-Engaged  
Artistic Research Practice

Keywords: socially engaged artistic research,  
arts-based action research, meta-research,  
reflective practice, art and science education

**Silke Pfeifer**

**126**

Identifying as Artists, Researchers  
and Teachers: An Artistic Research Project  
Focusing on Art Educational Identities

Keywords: identities, dialogue, students,  
art educators/mentors, artistic research

**Alexander Damianisch**

**134**

On the Interplay Between Artistic  
Research and Education in the Arts:  
An Experiment in Reflexive Sensitization

Keywords: artistic research, resonance, art research  
driven education, transformation, understanding

### #3 HYBRID PEDAGOGIES: TEACHING FOR INTERDISCIPLINARITY

**Ruth Mateus-Berr**

**144**

Communication, Intuition and Tacit Knowledge: Considerations on Experiences in and with Teaching

Keywords: teaching arts, teaching artistic research, teaching skills, objectives of artistic research

**Pamela Bartar and  
Laila Huber**

**156**

Exploring Intersections in Art Education: A Counter Assessment of Socially Engaged Arts- and Community-Based Research

Keywords: socially engaged arts-based research, community-based research, participation in citizen science, self-assessment

**Diane Carp**

**166**

Three Approaches to Teaching Collaborative Artistic Research

Keywords: artistic research, interdisciplinary collaboration, artist-teacher, authentic arts education, transdisciplinary collaboration

**Fares Kayali, Paul-Reza Klein,  
Oliver Hödl and Naemi Luckner**

**178**

Digital Musical Instruments, Making and Learning

Keywords: digital musical instruments, making, STEAM, digital learning, design

**Patricia Olynyk**

**186**

The Art of Medicine: A New Medical Humanities Gateway Course

Keywords: art and medicine, medical humanities and the arts, art practice as research, art education in medical schools, art and empathy

**Mick Wilson**

**194**

White Mythologies and Epistemic Refusals: Teaching Artistic Research Through Institutional Conflict

Keywords: teacher role, knowledge conflict, group learning process, institutional critique

### AFTERWORD

**Ross W. Prior**

**210**

Towards a Future Paradigm

Keywords: art-based research, art as research, knowing, artist-educator-researchers, exposition



# TEACHING ARTISTIC RESEARCH FOR UNDERSTANDING AND SHAPING SOCIETY

The OECD's *Frascati Manual* defines "research" as "creative and systematic work undertaken to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of humans, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications."<sup>1</sup> The subtitle of this famous and influential publication is *The Measurement of Scientific, Technological and Innovation Activities*. It is significant that the definitions of the terms "research" and "innovation" have shifted in their power: they are now narrowed down so as to only include scientific and technological activities—while the term "creativity" has been hijacked for scientific and technological contexts. This allows no room for something like artistic research; only scientific research is seen to be a source of knowledge. By these terms, the arts can only be an object of (scientific!) research, thereby ignoring the fact that, as art history shows us, artistic development is in many cases a result of research processes in the arts, and not just about the arts.

In "The Prospects of Architecture in Civilisation," one of five lectures from his *Hopes and Fears for Art* (1882), William Morris, one of the founding fathers of the Arts and Crafts movement in England—and one of the fuels of the development of the University of Applied Arts Vienna—declaimed,

Of the art that is to come who may prophesy? But this at least seems to follow from comparing that past with the confusion in which we are now struggling and the light which glimmers through it; that that art will no longer be an art of instinct, of ignorance which is hopeful to learn and strives to see; since ignorance is now no longer hopeful.<sup>2</sup>

Today, fighting ignorance by fueling hope is again essential for survival in extremely challenging times.

The twentieth century has transformed our planet at a rapidly advancing speed into a world of questions and doubts, a world of complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty. The existence of an enlightened society depends on whether and to what extent we succeed in productively dealing with this complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty (as well as skepticism, change and renewal), and if we are able to actively accept these circumstances as constitutive elements of human progress. As a matter of fact, the process of human civilization is strongly connected to the history of the arts. Art history demonstrates that the development of the arts is a result of method-driven processes. Dealing with as well as applying complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty are some of the main methods and strategies artists employ. There is no reason not to name these processes research—*artistic research*. It is systematic work undertaken to increase artistic progress, and thus, art-based knowledge.

The connection between research and teaching is a fundamental principle of this university's self-image. Research-led teaching secures the relevance of university teaching; integrates the younger generation into the application of research methods; and arouses early and lasting interest in research-led work processes. Investing in the future of scientific research is the reason why scientific research methods are taught at universities. In the same way, universities need to school students in methods and strategies of artistic research: applying the tool-set of artistic methodologies is especially relevant to increasing human knowledge, as well as understanding and shaping our society—even beyond the system of the arts.

Gerald Bast

President, University of Applied Arts Vienna

<sup>1</sup> OECD. 2015. *Frascati Manual. The Measurement of Scientific, Technological and Innovation Activities*. doi:10.1787/9789264239012-en. ISBN 978-9264238800.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3773/3773-h/3773-h.htm>



# FOREWORD

---

**Shaun McNiff**

University Professor, Lesley University, Cambridge, MA, USA

---

I welcome *Teaching Artistic Research* and appreciate the opportunity to support Ruth Mateus-Berr, Richard Jochum, and their contributing authors by offering reflections in connection with the broad context of art and research. The book is new and unique in a number of ways: these include being the first generated largely from and published in continental Europe; and the first to involve many authors writing from the perspective of teaching in schools of art and design. I have similarly engaged many fine arts faculty and students in the United Kingdom and Ireland at three international conferences organized by Ross Prior (author of the Afterword to this volume), dealing with art-based research, and feel that they are essential to advancing the use of art-making as research. The now large body of literature in the area of art and research has generally not involved such a strong representation from art and design settings. I am also pleased to witness a joining of the European community in this book and look forward to its ongoing creations within the fast-growing and worldwide art and research discourse. It is also good to be united here with Richard Jochum, Graeme Sullivan, and other prominent contributors from America.

## The Question of definition

In reading the chapters of *Teaching Artistic Research* my attention was drawn to the frequent mention of an absence of definition regarding the “new” subject and its methods of inquiry. Ruth Mateus-Berr precisely states the issue: “There is still little clarity on what exactly constitutes artistic research, how it is distinct from professional art practice in general.” As someone with a long history of dealing with these questions, as both an artist doing research and teaching it, this may be an area where I can contribute.

Before giving a definition of the research process, it might be helpful to reflect on the terms used in this book to describe the subject itself. The title “artistic research” joins others in the literature—art-based research, arts-based research, art as research, artistic inquiry, art practice as research, practitioner research by artists, arts-informed research, et al. And outside this volume, different disciplines are coining terms like drama-based, music-based, and so-forth. I have used many of the language variations in my own writings, thus adding to their propagation. However, I have always favored the words “art” and “artist”—both affirming the endless varieties of artistic expression and practice, and more importantly, uniting them in a community of common purpose. The reference to artistic research completely aligns with these values.

I appreciate how Ross Prior (2018, viii), as a member of the theatre community, emphasizes this “integrality of art” in his *Using Art as Research in Learning and Teaching*. He makes the case for “connectedness” and avoiding the “confusion” caused by too many things—*sehr viele Dinge*—that we see in the ever-growing specializations and divisions permeating the human sciences research community and art as well. A holistic sense of art’s infinite practices informs my books *Art-Based Research* (1998) and *Art as Research* (2013), with the latter (p. xv) using Susanne K. Langer’s statement from 1957 to rest the case: “There is only one concept exemplified in all the different arts, and that is the concept of Art.”

In my own efforts to deal with terminology and especially in relation to the ever-expanding proliferation of research categories and typologies present today in the social sciences, I have emphasized a preference to speak simply and all-inclusively about doing *research*, period, and in my case through art-making. But in order to communicate and deal with the larger issues within the research community when writing the first book on the subject (1998), I have had to give it, albeit reluctantly, a name—*art-based research*.

As a teacher of research and an author, it has also been necessary to define the subject and the process. In various publications I have described art-based research as *the systematic use of art-making as a primary mode of inquiry by the person doing the research, either alone and/or with others* (2011; 2013; 2018a). The fundamental element that distinguishes this kind of research from others is that artistic expression is the vehicle of inquiry

and not just the subject. Art expression is also integral to the presentation and communication of outcomes.

Fortuitously, and just before receiving the manuscript for this book and its questioning of the definition of “artistic research,” I was invited to discuss art-based research with graduate students writing their master’s theses at the Rhode Island School of Design. The professor supervising their research, Paul Sproll, began by describing the challenges of definition that he experiences, in sync with this book, and thus reinforcing the broader significance of the question. As with many of the authors in *Teaching Artistic Research*, Paul is working in a school of art and design, where the scope of artistic expression is broad and varied, and where the primary objective of training is arguably the making of quality art and design as ends in themselves. This focus on the creation of art is not in my view distinct from research. As Picasso said, “Paintings are but research and experiment. I never do a painting as a work of art. All of them are researches.” (Lieberman 1956). Everything in my personal history supports keeping this integral vision.

So how does one distinguish art as art, from art as research? As a practical matter, and not necessarily as an absolute definition, I think it has something to do with objectives. As a painter, and like Picasso, everything I do with artistic expression involves experimentation, investigation, learning, and discovery—all searching for the most effective expression and use of materials and my own gestures. Thus I agree with his all-encompassing approach to the idea of research. I also think that it is consistent with my own definition, intended to address the context where the purpose of the “research” is to serve something other than the art as an end in itself.

Paul Sproll found my definition helpful since he too is dealing with situations where art is serving a purpose that is both *for* itself, but also *beyond* itself. The wording has held up well in terms of what my mentor, Rudolf Arnheim, described as an “operational definition,” in that the unique and necessary feature that distinguishes this approach to research from others is *the making of art, in its infinite forms, to address research questions*. This definition of art-based research is perhaps as basic as describing research as a process of systematic and disciplined inquiry. The former is a way of doing the latter through the making of art.

On the basis of my experience, the confusion regarding definition is an extension of the overall context concerning research related to human experience. Rather than encouraging simple and inclusive operational concepts as I have just suggested, the field of the social sciences—in contrast to that of the physical sciences—has generated myriad categories and stock methods of research, so many in fact that an academic industry has been created in order to study the approaches and then use them in research that often simply reinforces the pre-existing structures. All of this is

far from art, and perhaps even from science in that the methods have not succeeded in generating law-like generalizations regarding human experience.

Art and science are complementary. Where the latter is based on precise replication, art offers the reality of the uniqueness of each thing and moment, as in nature. Artistic expression affirms the absence of predictability in human experience, what John Keats called *Negative Capability*, and offers an alternative to the positivism and scientism that have shaped the ruling paradigm of contemporary research (McNiff 2017).

While proposing a definition, I paradoxically want to affirm this book’s questioning “What exactly constitutes artistic research?” and the maintenance of an imaginative fluidity that is wary of standardized ways of doing research. In my teaching and writing I advocate for research methods that are as vast and open as art itself.

The freedom to create methods, rather than simply using pre-existing and fixed social science procedures, poses yet another challenge to the person conducting research and to those of us who teach it. Art communities are familiar with this dimension of the underlying creative process and are experienced in addressing it. Principles refined through the traditions of studio teaching that encourages authentic and original expression can be directly applied to art-based research. For example, as a teacher and supervisor of research, I have found it necessary to narrow the field of action and encourage an almost radical simplicity; as I say, the simpler, the deeper. In one of my first college painting classes we were asked to work on large surfaces with only black, white, and yellow ochre. These limits allowed for a tremendous variation in our group, while at the same time helping us concentrate on fundamental processes of composition, color, and free expression.

As I say to students, structure liberates. I am not encouraging the absence of it. Experienced teachers know how natural it is to become overwhelmed with the endless possibilities and connections that emerge from the process of inquiry. Thus, minimizing becomes an opening to discovery. It can enhance rather than restrict open-ended artistic inquiry. For example, I have learned that it is necessary to hone research issues or questions and stay close to them within the overall structure of an inquiry. We can then explore the design of artistic methods that will most effectively address the question. Video is universally used to document, examine, identify, and present research processes and outcomes (McNiff 2018a; 2018b); a full discussion of methods is another topic beyond these reflections. Although there are many consistencies of methodology in the research that we do with art, I have always urged students, as artists, to create methods based on the authority of their unique experiences.

## Artistic inquiry is empirical

The mention of working “alone and/or with others” in my operational definition goes contrary to assumptions about the nature of research dealing with human experience. It may not only feed the confusion discussed here, but raise specters of self-absorption. I worked alone in *Art as Medicine* (1992) and *Depth Psychology of Art* (1989), and many of my colleagues and graduate students, too many to list here, have perfected methods of practice experimenting by themselves. I have insisted that this type of solo inquiry, as well as all forms of art-based research, is thoroughly *empirical* (1998) in that the research is being done with physical materials in a particular time and place. I have also described one of the major threats to art-based research as being the perception that the work is purely personal, introspective, or, what is sometimes described erroneously as *heuristic*.

There is of course the possibility that the process becomes “self-absorbed,” beginning and ending with the person doing the research. I have never encouraged this and have addressed it as a “shadow” to be avoided. I have emphasized how art-based research definitely has a personal aspect, but the person of the artist is approached as a necessary part of a larger process addressing issues or questions in ways that can be useful to others. By concentrating on the improvement of artistic practices we also stay clear of abstract and sweeping speculation. Focus on practice keeps the work concrete. As we say, how can we ask other people to do things that we do not do ourselves?

Artistic inquiry certainly has a subjective aspect, but the whole of it is as objective as any other so-called reality in the research of human experience, and in many ways more so, in that the person doing the research is empirically engaged with materials, other people, and places, while pursuing thoroughly physical experimentation that generates considerable “evidence.” It is short-sighted to broad-brush everything connected to art making as exclusively subjective, unless reality is itself defined as what Thomas Berry called an ecological “communion of subjects.”

## Community

As someone who has always worked in groups and communities (McNiff 2019a), my experience resonates closely with the chapters in this book that are concerned with community. I earlier had the opportunity to review Ruth Mateus-Berr’s research with art and dementia that presented its outcomes in artistic forms that might be best described as public art. Both the content and the communication of the work advance art as research. I have always felt that we need to present research in ways that correspond to art and that its impact is significantly diminished when translated into stereotypic social science formats (McNiff 2014a; 2014b). This book’s emphasis on artistic action in communities evokes Kurt Lewin, Arnheim’s teacher at the University of Berlin. Known for his “field theory” emanating from Gestalt Psychology, Lewin wrote a seminal 1946 article on “action research,” which anticipates much of what we do in art and research. Lewin’s action research methods developed during the 1930s and were grounded in egalitarian participation. They were particularly influential at Teacher’s College of Columbia University where Richard Jochum is based. I see Lewin’s contributions to “research” as particularly relevant to all artistic action and especially in public settings.

## Art is the evidence

Finally, the future influence of art as research depends strongly on how we present it. If we follow the current tendency to justify artistic experience by translating it into social science, it will reinforce itself as having only secondary, adjunctive, and marginal status. In order to realize the greatest impact, artistic outcomes must be presented in artistic forms (McNiff 2014a; 2014b), partnered of course with effective text and language. I keep telling my students and readers that they can trust that intelligent decision makers will “get it” when the artistic evidence is presented to them, and they might actually prefer something other than the prosaic and stereotypic research outcomes that dominate today.

My experience has shown that presentations of artistic work have great appeal to people inside and outside the professional arts communities. We must believe in what we can do and how it communicates in ways that transcend, while complementing, linear language and thought. It is not a matter of opposition, but rather a partnership that does not expect art to be anything other than itself.

In this *zeitgeist* of exclusive belief in “evidence based research,” I have been urging my colleagues to affirm how “art is the evidence” of art-based and artistic research (McNiff 2019b), and am supported in Ross Prior’s Afterword here, the two of us serving as “book-ends” holding this conviction. Show then the “artistic research” as effectively and artfully as possible and trust that it will impact and change the world—as art has always done.

## REFERENCES

- Lewin, Kurt. 1946. “Action Research and Minority Problems.” *Journal of Social Issues*, 2 (4), 34–46.
- Liberman, Alexander. 1956. “Atelier of Pablo Picasso.” *Vogue*, November 1956, 156–57.
- McNiff, Shaun. 1998. *Art-Based Research*. Philadelphia and London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2011. “Artistic Expressions as Primary Modes of Inquiry.” *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 39(5), 385–396.
- McNiff, Shaun. Ed. 2013. *Art as Research: Opportunities and Challenges*. Bristol, UK: Intellect Books, and University of Chicago Press.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2014a. “Art Speaking for Itself: Evidence that Inspires and Convinces.” *Journal of Applied Arts and Health*, 5(2), 255–262.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2014b. “Presentations that Look and Feel like the Arts in Therapy: Keeping Creative Tension with Psychology.” *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Arts Therapy*, 9(1), 89–94.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2017. “Philosophical and Practical Foundations of Artistic Inquiry: Creating Paradigms, Methods, and Presentations Based in Art.” In *Handbook of Arts-based Research*, edited by P. Leavy, 22–36. New York: Guilford.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2018a. “Doing Art-based Research: An Advising Vignette.” In *Using Art as Research in Learning and Teaching*, edited by R. Prior, 77–89. Bristol, UK: Intellect and University of Chicago Press.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2018b. “Using Digital Media in Art-based Research.” In *The Handbook of Art Therapy and Digital Technology*, edited by C. Malchiodi, 332–247. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2019a. “Reflections on what ‘Art’ Does in Art Therapy Practice and Research.” *Art Therapy: Journal of the American Art Therapy Association*, 36(3), 162–165, doi: 10.1080/07421656.2019.1649547.
- McNiff, Shaun. 2019b. “Art is the Evidence: Making the Case for Convincing Public Communication.” Keynote presented at “Building Bridges’ in Applied Arts and Health, Education and Community: From the Past to the Present and Future Celebrating 10 Years of the *Journal of Applied Arts and Health*.” Telford, England.
- Prior, Ross. Ed. 2018. *Using Art as Research in Learning and Teaching*. Bristol, UK: Intellect, and University of Chicago Press.





# INTRODUCTION

---

**Ruth Mateus-Berr and Richard Jochum**  
Editors

---

What does it mean to teach art in an expanded field that is saturated with hybrid-making, cross-disciplinary knowledge, and research? Should artists understand themselves as researchers? How do we best prepare students to navigate a complex knowledge economy that demands skills very different from what art schools have taught in the past?

*Teaching Artistic Research* is based on a two-day symposium held in 2018 at the University of Applied Arts Vienna, in collaboration with Teachers College, Columbia University, and part of a series of conferences on teaching and learning studio art in higher education. As we reviewed the papers presented for the book, we decided to expand it by inviting a number of additional voices we felt would complete the volume and make it a rich resource for artists who teach in higher education, and for educators who want to know more about how a changed learning landscape has transformed the education of artists.

Since 2013, the University of Applied Arts Vienna has been collaborating with Teachers College, Columbia University on a series of symposia that look closely at how to educate artists today. The series is part of decades-old research into studio teaching and learning at Teachers College, which, while reporting on changes in the field, studies how art is being taught in art schools in the U.S. and beyond. The topic has gained increasing prominence in recent years in Europe as well, with art schools becoming part of research universities on the one hand, and education becoming professionalized and standardized, as exemplified in the Bologna process, on the other hand. Networks like ELIA and books like *Share* have been important markers for a changing field, and have established frameworks for dialogue accompanying these changes over the past few years. *Teaching Artistic Research* continues to build on this.

The papers presented at the symposium went through a double-blind peer review by both an artist and a scientist. We found it remarkable to see that our reviewers frequently contradicted each other depending on their professional backgrounds. As a consequence, we needed an additional reviewer to help us reach a decision. Whereas the artist-reviewer often requested more insight on artistic methods, the scientist-reviewer called for more theoretical background. At times, the artists also disagreed on innovative approaches, applied artistic methods, or unaddressed issues of the call. All of this made it clear how artistic research is still both contested and fairly new in academia. Evidence-based scientific writing continues to pose a challenge for artists who are not used to carefully developing arguments. This is another reason why we believe it is of great importance to leave the academic turf war about what counts as artistic research behind, and put more attention and careful thought on how it can be taught.

We are thankful to the president of the University of Applied Arts Vienna, **Gerald Bast**, for supporting this research and for his obvious concern for the role of the arts as a means of imaginatively responding to the confounding uncertainty of our times. His statement bemoans a research landscape that is based on a reductionist, and all too narrow notion of inquiry reduced to scientific research as the single source of knowledge. By broadening the base of research and including the arts, we are better equipped to respond to the challenges that lie ahead, and we are more likely to secure both stronger universities and better societies. While acknowledging the seminal role that research plays for teaching, Bast articulates a vision of art education that is grounded in research, too.

We are glad we could solicit **Shaun McNiff** to front our book with a foreword. He has been a seminal voice among scholars interested in art-based research. His particular contributions from the nineties to today lie in the ability to combine scholarly confidence with a very practical view. The discussion about artistic research has lately suffered from the absence of practice, but McNiff offers a definition of art-based research that is specific and concrete enough to be applied in the classroom. He is a strong advocate for art as a form of research-in-practice. Grounding artistic inquiry in empirical data and leaving it open to community engagement, McNiff sees art as the evidence, and artistic research at its best when it presents itself through artistic expression. For artistic research to have “the greatest impact,” he says here, “artistic outcomes must be presented in artistic forms [...] partnered of course with effective text and language.”

We have partitioned the book into **three sections**, which are organized by questions that highlight aspects of the themes that we deem critical. Cognizant that lesser known types of research methodologies incite a desire to look for best practices, we identified **Role Models** as a first strand. While much has been written about artistic research, less is known or published about how it is being implemented in classrooms and studios across both art schools and traditional research universities and beyond.

### **#1 Role models**

Given the wealth of possible approaches to artistic research, each of us may look to a different role model when defining art practice as research. What type of role models can we identify? Why do these succeed? How do we best prepare students to carry out their own artistic research? Why should art be seen as a reflexive practice? What is the relation between artistic research and driving at night? What kind of new interdisciplinary theories and practices should be applied? How can the naming of various artistic methods be useful? Why does artistic research need openness, curiosity, and abductive reasoning? How can teaching writing be established as an artistic research tool? This section aims to ground the publication in examples of existing practices that are successful and distinct.

**Michael Collins and Graeme Sullivan** emphasize the importance of the place from which we speak. Sullivan's well-known advocacy for artistic research is focused particularly on the place artistic research has in studio teaching and learning. Art must be seen as a reflexive practice, which leads to greater conceptual clarity, expanded vocabulary, and audience engagement. As a means of getting to the heart of their pedagogical implications, artistic research for the two authors is both a practice that is done in studio art teaching and learning, as well as a form of pedagogy. In the search for a pedagogy of artistic research, they draw from a case study of an online degree in digital multimedia design at The Pennsylvania State University.

**Dylan Gauthier and Jen Mazza** provide a role model of using a teaching methodology that takes inspiration from E. L. Doctorow, suggesting that artistic research is like driving at night: one can only see as far as one's headlights, but it turns out that one can complete the journey nonetheless. They share examples and exercises developed in their joint teaching of a class. These examples serve as recommendations for similar courses.

**Margarete Jahrmann** proposes a "ludic method" in teaching artistic research. Drawing from two case studies, she aims to create a closer tie between different modalities of research. By inserting play into art, technology, and science, she advocates how games, gaming, and game design can be playfully applied to societies. Essentially, she uses the mechanics of games as a model for an alliance between artistic and scientific research, highlighting their similarities and differences while acknowledging that they are separate pursuits. For her, artistic research inhabits a place within the expanding culture of research and the various research communities opening up around new interdisciplinary theories and practices and *in-between* knowledge systems.

**Stefan Wykydal** operates from the perspective of a painting teacher who finds himself in front of a changed art making landscape willing to take on the challenges the shift to research provides. He shows that naming artistic methods—collage, abstraction, etc.—can function as a self-reflective refinement which, if seen as a form of artistic research, links the traditional practice of compiling inventories with an artistic practice. His teaching approach derives from inventing a proper vocabulary for one's artistic methods. To him, teaching artistic research means a dialogic learning that links

traditional scientific structures, such as assembling bibliographies, topologies, classifications, category systems and the like, with a still very widespread romantic, intuitive art practice.

**Manora Auersperg** believes that learning takes place when a lack of knowledge meets qualities such as openness and curiosity. She introduces various forms of teaching examples: one in an intercultural context in Africa; one at a festival in Austria; and another, the design of a facade for the Integration House in Austria. In her text, she considers the importance of non-verbal communication skills emerging through art. Learning here has no clearly defined objective, but rather, openly approaches manifold learning potentialities, encouraging questioning as a way of seeing the world as it might be.

As writing still appears mainly to be a conceptual meta-discourse within the field of artistic research, **Elisabeth Schäfer** aims to strengthen new approaches towards writing in order to understand artistic research as a demand for a double reading in which one engages rationally as well as affectively with the research one is conducting. Schäfer wants to establish the teaching of writing as an artistic research tool. She outlines a writing practice of a *trans-sensible exposure*. This argument unfolds by means of references to the circulation of sense between matter and the intelligible, as in, for example, Judith Butler, Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva and Jean-Luc Nancy. Finally, writing as artistic research is demonstrated by drawing upon two examples of writing as a performative and subversive practice—those of Hélène Cixous and Didier Eribon—capable of establishing new perspectives for the invention of styles of writing.

## #2 Hybridity in making: Rethinking the curriculum

Given that artistic research takes place in an expanded field, and is often socially engaged, hybrid, and contextual, there is a need to make revisions to the curriculum. What do students need to know in order to engage in meaningful artistic research? And how is teaching “art” and “design” different from teaching “artistic research”? Should artistic research be socially engaged, and what and whom would that benefit? Can artistic research be taught as a given topic, or does it need to be developed through its own intrinsic research questions?

Building on his keynote at the conference, **Richard Jochum** proposes to locate the problem of artistic research in the teaching of it, under the following four considerations: 1) Skill is no longer taught the same way it once was. Transmission of knowledge works differently. Teaching itself has become interdisciplinary. 2) The object of art is now hybrid and, alongside it, the curriculum. 3) The fluidity of knowledge and its specialization and complexity, has consequences—there is no outer viewpoint or philosophy that tells us what to do. We now rely on research as a means to figure things out in incremental steps. Instead of merely groping in the dark, research is the new device that helps us find our way. 4) The changed status and valorized role of the audience with regards to the art object has forced artists to consider their work from the perspective of social practice and remade art making as cultural making, and, as a consequence, allowed it to recapture a once lost aura.

**Pamela Bartar and Julia Poscharnig** explore the methodological otherness of art and science and the variety of protocols that make multifaceted findings. According to Bachelard, there are two equal ways of knowledge production: Science and Artistic Imagination. In their meta-analysis, Poscharnig and Bartar describe experimenting with socially-engaged artistic research within the context of art and science education, using as their example a project implemented by Ruth Mateus-Berr at women's shelters in Vienna. Their workshop, *Epilogue on Social Value*, developed along two concepts rooted in critical practice—the “Theory of the *Dérive*” (Debord 1956) and the playfulness and constructivism of Helga Kämpf-Jansen (2012)—expected participants to become reflective practitioners (c.f. Schön 1983). By placing the spotlight on the transformative potential of textiles and storytelling, Poscharnig and Bartar explore what we can learn from socially-engaged artistic research. Drawing from Thornton's idea of an artist-teacher-researcher, and Donald Schön's concept of reflective practice, the two authors ask: how do textiles lead to new modes of knowledge?

**Silke Pfeifer** engages students, identifying as artists, researchers and teachers, through an artistic research project focusing on art educational identities. She investigates how students prepare themselves to carry out their own artistic research by entering into dialogues with experienced secondary art teachers and reflecting upon them. The research consists of a task given by the tutor instructing students of secondary school education in collecting, mapping, and analyzing these conversations by artistic research means. Findings remain open and it makes one consider if artistic research can be instructed by a given topic or needs to be developed through its own intrinsic research questions. It also raises the question of how these dialogues strengthen the relationship between art educators and students during their internships.

**Alexander Damianisch** focuses on the interplay between artistic research and education in the arts. He believes that art schools should be places that make space for both art and research but acknowledges that not all art schools agree. He considers how artistic research challenges the power structure of art school hierarchies (which Damianisch thinks of as quite strong). In order to overcome long-standing institutional inertia, he suggests a culture of reflective sensitization. Questioning the terms *master*, *class*, and *school*, he aims to provide ideas by which to relate to research and art in a new way.

### #3 Hybrid pedagogies: Teaching for interdisciplinarity

Along with creating a new curriculum, it is necessary to include teachers with different perspectives. Interdisciplinarity among educators and artists is essential to developing a program that is broad, inclusive, engaging, and effective. Given the fact that teachers and students are coming from potentially different backgrounds—art schools or research universities—a flexible approach is key to the success of both students and instructors, as well as the program itself. Questions that can be asked include: How do art schools best educate students to engage with artistic research? What particular abilities and competencies should a teacher of artistic research have? How does a teacher encourage engagement with ideas beyond a market-driven traditional art career? What roles do wonder, curiosity, and aesthetic experience play in this type of research? What are the differences between teaching art and teaching artistic research, and what role does hybridity play there? Why do the arts frequently borrow (and adapt) research methodologies from other disciplines?

Ruth Mateus-Berr's chapter focuses on the perceived differences between teaching art versus teaching artistic research. In a number of interviews with faculty and students at the University of Applied Arts Vienna, she concludes that the question is not easily answered, but it does provoke interesting thoughts. The objective of this paper is to respond to evaluations of the symposium "Teaching Artistic Research" that was held at the university in 2018. Some participants reported that while they had heard much about research itself, what was missing was information regarding the methods and contents of that teaching. This reflects distinctions that result from teaching or being taught artistic research. For exploring such distinctions in teaching, three teachers and three students of the Artistic Research PhD Program (PhD in Art) at the University of Applied Arts Vienna were asked about their perceptions of differences in teaching and learning.

Pamela Bartar and Laila Huber discuss the idea of collaborative knowledge production which has entered the discourse of different disciplinary fields, such as community-based research and socially-engaged artistic research. They consider a broad interdisciplinary background as highly beneficial for any research team (social and cultural scientists, art educators and artists). They collaboratively defined a research question with students of two secondary schools. Their project raised questions of "relevance for the field and other disciplines" in the broader fields of the humanities, social sciences, and the arts. They analyze the arts' frequent borrowing (and adapting) of research methodologies from other disciplines. While "art as enquiry" often becomes a catalyst in questioning the status quo, artistic research tends to support complementary forms of knowing by using artistic methods of discovery. Bartar and Huber advocate artistic research as a methodology to think anew the value of diverse forms of knowledge and ways of knowledge production, and to discuss levels of participation in Citizen Science. For them, art-based educational research methods are mostly situated within the qualitative research tradition and open up possibilities for new creative research methodologies and ways of connecting knowledge from diverse fields (Coemans et al. 2015, 34). They conclude that participatory processes need time, and acknowledge how the lack of time often poses a challenge, especially in educational settings.