

Review of practice-led research in art, design & architecture

RUST, Chris, MOTTRAM, Judith and TILL, Jeremy

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/7596/>

This document is the Supplemental Material

Citation:

RUST, Chris, MOTTRAM, Judith and TILL, Jeremy (2007). Review of practice-led research in art, design & architecture. UK, Arts and Humanities Research Council. [Other]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Appendices

Appendix A: Town Meetings.....	2
A.1 Birmingham Town Meeting	3
A.2 London Town Meeting	6
Appendix B: Online Workshop	9
B.1 Workshop Key Facts	10
B.2 Descriptive account	14
B.3 Personal Summaries	23
B.4 Online workshop references	65
B.5 Recipe collection from Online Workshop	74
Appendix C: Research Experience Survey	78
Appendix D: Institutional Research Survey.....	88
Appendix E: Fine Art Workshop.....	97
Appendix F: Case Studies.....	102
F.1 Individual Case Studies	103
F.2 Case study questions mapping analysis	172
F.3 Case study mapping questions.....	180
Appendix G: AHRC Review participation statistics	219

Appendix A: Town Meetings

A.1 **Birmingham Town Meeting**

Understanding & Mapping Practice-led Research Town Meeting Report

Town Meeting Report

Birmingham, 27 Jan 2006

Birmingham Institute of Art and Design, University of Central England

The meeting started with a presentation of the project aims and methods and an initial summary of some issues arising from the literature review. The first breakout session "The Parking Lot" provided an opportunity for participants to raise issues that concerned them.

This was followed by a more detailed description of our mapping methods and data analysis. A second breakout session "Questions, Questions" had been planned but this was replaced by an open discussion to bring out specific questions that the participants hoped to see addressed.

Breakout Session Feedback

A detailed transcript of the outcomes of this session has been produced to inform our work. While the review may not be able to attend to all these issues in detail it is important that it noted them as areas of concern or interest and some may open up questions that we can and should attend to.

Issues raised and discussed included:

- The role and status of writing in Practice-Led Research
- Relevance of Research Training provided by HE institutions
- The "wrench" that takes place when a practitioner becomes a researcher
- How Arts Council and AHRC (for example) interact
- Resolved artefacts vs "continuing" (unresolved) contributions to knowledge
- Status of testability, validation and repeatability in practice-led research
- Terminology - do we have shared understanding of terms within and beyond our fields
- Cynical approaches to research funding - money for art
- Intellectual property tension between owning ideas (research) and owning rights (practice)
- Scope for development of new journals and other research-focused forms of output.
- Role of Images in funding bids - evidencing track record/context/plans?
- Theory and Practice - general impression that these can be confusing terms when used in this context and may be best avoided.

- Eclectic contexts and methods - need to recognise diversity
- Interdisciplinarity - a very common theme in our subjects
- Confidence in and understanding of peer review
- Relation of research to professional practice - communication channels and different understandings of the term "research" between practitioners and academics.
- "Practice-Led" is a self-ghetto-ising term?
- Acceptance of risk - risk is normal in our fields but is that understood in a research context.
- Need for Transferable/durable/accessible outputs

Outcomes of Final Discussion Session

The intention was to discover what questions could be usefully explored in the data analysis and, particularly, in reviewing case examples where one aim was to use opposed pairs of ideas to allow examples to be positioned on several linear scales. The questions are not value-free but at this stage there is no intention to set out tests for inclusion or exclusion of particular work. For example the existence of a hypothesis is of great interest but is not an absolute test of validity.

Questions that might be addressed directly to case examples included:

- Is the artist's or designer's practise being used as a tool in an investigation? Is this intentional and purposeful?
- Does the work serve a research purpose or is it undertaken for some other reason? Has the researcher/practitioner asserted its purpose?
- Is there a hypothesis?
- Does the work meet the purposes of institutions (our research community) or those of the individual practitioner? Is the researcher aware of or acknowledging the institutional purposes of research¹.

Issues

We discussed the role of research and other scholarly activity in the wider institutional picture. One problem identified was whether the term "Research & Scholarship" was a tautology. Practice, Research and Scholarship all inform us in a variety of ways and it seemed to be important that the review unpicks the contributions that funded research, professional practice and individual scholarship make to both teaching and professional practice.

This seemed to be an important point - that research's contribution to knowledge is not self-propelled. The connection to teaching is vital as are connections to practice. In our disciplines it may be that practice-led research will be more accessible in both arenas than "traditional" forms of research and this should be explored.

¹ "Institution" is used here mainly in its wider sense, not referring to specific organisations. However specific institutions such as universities, journals and funding agencies do play an important role and researchers must position themselves in relation to them.

There was concern that in our disciplines we are not good at "speaking the lingo" of research and this might be explored partly through examples of successful research bids and through the questionnaire process. Discussions with peer reviewers would also be useful for this.

We also wondered whether the problem of communicating research plans was further hampered for us by the inter-disciplinary nature of a lot of our work, and the many contexts and methods that might be encountered.

There was some interest in the question of whether institutional regulations for research degrees needed to make special provision for practice-led research although several people commented that this might not be as serious a problem as had been imagined in earlier thinking.

One big question that should be asked of both individual researchers and our whole community was framed as "What's in the methods toolbox?"

There was also some discussion of the Arts Council and their engagement with HE and research and whether there was an unacknowledged but useful symbiosis between Arts Council and HE funding in the arts.

Finally we discussed the question of documenting work. This was seen to be a vital aspect of the picture and it would be useful to identify where it is being used as part of the research process and where it is mainly an outcome.

Chris Rust, Judith Mottram, Mark Elshaw
7 Feb 2006

A.2 London Town Meeting

Understanding & Mapping Practice-led Research

Town Meeting Report

London 16 Feb 2006

Bartlett, University College London

As at Birmingham the meeting started with a presentation of the project aims and methods and an initial summary of some issues arising from the literature review. The breakout session "The Parking Lot" provided an opportunity for participants to raise issues that concerned them.

This was followed by a more detailed description of our mapping methods and data analysis. followed by an open discussion to bring out specific questions that the participants hoped to see addressed.

This was a larger meeting than at Birmingham with a greater proportion of less-experienced researchers, however the mix, as before was a good balance of different backgrounds and experience.

Breakout Session Feedback

A detailed transcript of the outcomes of this session has been produced to inform our work. While the review may not be able to attend to all these issues in detail it is important that it noted them as areas of concern or interest and some may open up questions that we can and should attend to.

Issues raised and discussed included:

Issues raised also in Birmingham

- The role and status of writing in Practice-Led Research
- The difficulties of framing work for different funding agencies
- Resolved artefacts vs "continuing" (unresolved) contributions to knowledge
- Status of testability, validation and repeatability in practice-led research
- Terminology - do we have shared understanding of terms within and beyond our fields
- Confidence in and understanding of peer review, problems of professional standing and peer review
- Relation of research to professional practice - communication channels and different understandings of the term "research" between practitioners and academics.
- "Practice-Led" terminology both problematic and offering opportunity?

- Acceptance of risk - risk is normal in our fields but is that understood in a research context.

Issues arising in London

- Does research contribute sufficiently to practice?
- Research questions - are our questions of a different nature from those in other disciplines?
- Career paths - how does research affect practitioners? how can practitioners engage in mainstream research (where funding is geared to institutional structures)?
- Some inquiries are very pragmatic, others start from a more critical position.
- Great diversity of methods - eg across a particular group of PhD students
- Do Institutional rhythms (eg funding cycles and audits) match the actual patterns of knowledge production?
- Artificial divides between research and teaching are problematic
- How is knowledge communicated in practice-led research?>

Outcomes of Final Discussion Session

As before the aim was to identify useful questions for mapping case studies and other aspects of the research. In this session the results were less focused than at Birmingham, perhaps reflecting the lower proportion of experienced senior researchers. Nevertheless there are some very interesting issues here.

Questions included:

- Does the tangible outcome of the work convey knowledge? How? Is it unambiguous? If it is ambiguous how is it still conveying knowledge?
- Can an artefact **be** knowledge? Clearly the answer is no if knowledge is in the person but maybe the artefact can “embody” identifiable knowledge
- Can the artefact be reverse-engineered?
- Can we define PL research by its aims and issues?
- Are there discipline wide questions as well as specific project questions?
- Can we identify emergent forms of knowledge communication? Relate to changes in forms of literacy and tools?
- How does disciplinary background of researcher affect their thinking/approach to PL research?
- How does research activity reflect govt and other institutional initiatives – eg is interest in the importance of the cultural/creative economy self-fulfilling?
- Does the funding source affect the research activity?
- Where can I see PL research?

The discussion did throw up two new statement pairs for the mapping:

analytical.....generative

Output is artefact.....Output is process

What next?

The next stage of the research was for the steering group to review the two meeting reports and identify questions and issues for the case study analysis (starting 1 April) and online conference (starting 24 April)

Chris Rust, Jeremy Till, Mark Elshaw

17 Mar 2006

Appendix B: Online Workshop

The full archive of the workshop, searchable by author, date and topic can be found at <http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/AHRC-WORKSHOP-PL.html>

B.1 Workshop Key Facts

Contributors

240 people signed up for the online workshop of which 59 made a contribution by posting.

Contributors came predominantly from the UK but 11 other countries were represented. The workshop was dominated by those from fine art and design, with posts heavily dominated by those in 3D design². There were more contributors from creative disciplines outside ADA than from architecture. There was a good balance between contributors who were novices, learners and experienced researchers in their disciplines.


33 contributors posted a personal summary of the workshop. 19 took an active role by posting 5 or more times. The two moderators, Ken Friedman and Chris Rust, accounted for 25% and 11% of the total word count respectively and contributed 19% and 18% of the total posts respectively.

Table 1
Contributors by country

No	Country
38	United Kingdom
7	Australia
3	USA
2	Portugal
2	Turkey
1	Canada
1	Germany
1	India
1	Netherlands
1	Norway
1	Sweden
1	Switzerland

Table 2
Contributors by discipline

No	Discipline
15	Fine art
13	3D design
9	2D design
7	Other within creative arts
4	Unknown
3	Media arts
2	Interior Architecture
2	Architecture
2	Applied arts (crafts)
1	Other outside creative arts
1	Interactive media design



² However it should be noted that 3D design includes Friedman and Rust, the moderators.

Table 3

Discipline	No of posts
3D design	67
Fine art	61
2D design	26
Media arts	23
Interior Architecture	23
Other within creative arts	12
Architecture	9
Unknown	5
Other outside creative arts	2
Applied arts (crafts)	2
Interactive media design	1

N.B. Chart 1 and Table 3 excludes moderators posts.

10 contributors were currently studying for a PhD while 12 stated that they had a PhD. 11 were professors and 4 did not state their level of qualifications. Those with significant experience in art, design or architecture research dominated the online discussion, accounting for more than half the posts.

Table 5

Contributors with most posts (>4)

		Number of posts	Wordcount
Lubomir	Popov	22	12440
Eduardo	Corte-Real	19	8010
Natalie	Dekel	17	
Paul	Reader	13	6032
Rosan	Chow	10	1917
Daria	Loi	9	
Donna	Carty	9	
Kenny	McBride	8	
Tiiu	Poldma	8	4908
Ranulph	Glanville	7	
Christina	Edwards	6	
Traci	Kelly	6	
David	Durling	6	
Donna	Atwood	6	
Owain	Pedgley	6	
Gillian	Wilson	5	
Utku	Omeroglu	5	

Posts and topics

There were 365 posts over the 3 week period, covering a total of 84 topics. Each post was coded according to its content with at least one topic. Many posts discussed or responded to more than one topic, with some relating to 5 or more topics.

Topics were identified in several ways: from a list of key issues and topics identified at the Town meetings; from post subject headings (i.e. a thread); from explicit question stated or answered in a post subject heading or in post content; or from a recurrent area of discussion in the content of a post not otherwise identified. Summaries were identified separately, as were housekeeping and off topic discussion, general chat and misplaced posts.

Table 6

Topic type	No of Topics
Post topic	34
Town meeting topic	18
Post question/answer	13
Post subject header	12
Housekeeping	3
Summary	2
Other	2

Posts covered four main themes:

- **Research** - Practice-led research (definitions and key issues of PLR, future agendas),
- **Structures** - The PhD (defining the doctoral degree, doctoral education and methodology) and The academy (what does it mean to be an academic, working within the HE environment),
- **Disciplines** - Knowledge and Philosophy in ADA (co-ordinating, structuring and presenting research and practice),
- **Context** - Society (the impact on and contribution to society of our research).

The majority of posts were concerned with the first two themes, **Research** and **Structures**. Below is a list of the most popular topics (those which were discussed in 5 or more posts), including the main theme it relates to. Posts relating to housekeeping, summaries and off-topic chat are excluded. It includes the main theme (although other themes may apply).

Table 7

Hot Topics

Topic name	Posts	Theme
Definitions of practice-led research	41	Research
Defining the doctoral degree	39	Structures
Thinking about Picasso	31	Research
Being an academic	29	Structures
Examples (?) of practice-led research	19	Research
Doctoral education in design	18	Structures
Ken's questions <i>[see below for details of Ken's 3 questions]</i>	15	Context
A Provocation: Does our research contribute to our professions and to society?	13	Context

Working within the HE structure	13	Structures
Ken's Qs: What is the difference between the research component of practice-led research and the practice component that supports and leads it?	12	Research
Development / role of art and design in HE system	11	Structures
Research-led practice	11	Research
'Poetic' language in art and design	11	Disciplines
Knowledge	11	Disciplines
Impact of ADA research on society	11	Context
Developing guild knowledge and sharing / transmitting knowledge	10	Research
Models of Research	10	Research
Other Voices? Other Minds?	9	Research
Diddums arty types	9	Research
Connection between avant-garde practice and research practice	8	Disciplines
Ken's Qs: How can research methodology open a fruitful discourse with the constraints and entailments of practice?	8	Research
Ken's Qs: Role of the research narrative in practice-led research	8	Research
Paradigmatic conflicts	8	Disciplines
The role/status of writing in Practice-led research	8	Research
Can you "do" research without being an academic?	7	Structures
Response to science/art	7	Disciplines
PhD Regulations	7	Structures
practice and PhDs	6	Research
Naturalistic inquiry	6	Disciplines
Types of practice-led research	6	Research
Am I right to say that we should look forward to and welcome the day when we never have to say "practice-led"? (Langrish)	5	Research
1, 2, 3 Questions	5	Research
Research after art	5	Research
Relationship between practitioners and academics	5	Research
How appropriate research training is	5	Structures
research methodology	5	Research

B.2 **Descriptive account**

This section gives a descriptive account of the online discussion. While it does not provide an analysis of the posts, it flags some of the key issues which were addressed. It also highlights the range of views, experience, priorities and common misconceptions which emerged as the conference progressed. An archive of the entire workshop can be found at <http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/AHRC-PL-REVIEW.html>.

Definitions of Practice Led Research

Many novice researchers in art and design held the view that research was part of their art or design practice, a tool of the trade. Many viewed research as embedded and impossible to separate from practice. However, more experienced researchers pointed out that this took research to mean a project related information search, or documenting and information collection rather than research in the academic sense. No novice representatives from architecture stated a view.



At the other extreme, a number of research learners from all fields (including some from outside our disciplines) the view that research is the key and that practice is a tool of research. This led to further discussion about defining research and good research.

Occupying a centre ground position, many of the more experienced contributors expressed a view that the term practice led research gave us the space to find our own set of research practices, including taking those from other disciplines. Several learners and experienced researchers from art and design felt that research led practice might be a more useful term.

Another group felt that the creative arts cannot be compared easily to other academic disciplines and should be treated differently. It was pointed out that this could be seen as an othering mechanism for art and design as 'not-proper-research'.

Use of terms

The following tables demonstrate the differences in language used by contributors with different levels of experience. While only a sample of words has been examined, it indicates that those at a different stage in their careers have different priorities, preoccupations or may simply differ in how confident they are in discussing certain aspects of their discipline and research amongst a wide audience in an online workshop.



Novice researchers (who accounted for a fifth of all posts) did not use the word 'goal' in relation to their research or anything else at all in any posts but were much more likely to use words which described their own methods of practice than other researchers. 'Learner' researchers (who accounted for a quarter of posts) were much more preoccupied with discussing the purpose and outputs of research. Experienced researchers (excluding Rust and Friedman) accounted for 14% of posts and, perhaps unsurprisingly since they were chairing the discussions, took the widest views of research by frequent use of words such as goal and purpose. They also used the words research and practice more than anyone.

Being an academic

What does it mean to be an academic?

Friedman set out the four great challenges of academic work:

- Creating new knowledge,
- Preserving existing knowledge,
- Training specialists, and
- Educating citizens

He described how art and design education were traditionally rooted in the crafts guilds and sets out that being an academic in today's world means working with the two great responsibilities of the university:

Structuring an effective learning process that will educate tomorrow's designers and artists. The other is

Contributing to the knowledge the field through basic, applied, and clinical research.

According to Friedman, in both cases, this means developing and transmitting skills on which others can build. To be an academic means having the skills to get on with our own work and to help others develop their work to its fullest. It requires knowing what we do not know. It has to do with teaching and learning for others rather than simply gaining and using proprietary knowledge for our selves, our studios, our companies, or the members of our guild.

In her discussion, MacLeod noted that "what has fascinated philosophers about the Arts, is the development of their capacity to employ the imagination to perceive things differently. This is because practitioners realise their ideas in material form and in this realisation there is a critical return to that which has been established or conceived before the making." She argued that the Arts academic returns us to a closer understanding of what it is to encounter the complexity of experienced propositions, that is propositions which are not solely based on the objective observation and measurement of data but are also based on the imaginative possibilities opened up by material realisations.

The challenge for the arts academic might therefore be to combine research skills and the ability to communicate research findings effectively with the imagination and insight to perceive and explore the material world in a unique way.

Working in Higher Education

Rust believed that there was a feeling that some colleagues regarded "being an academic" as a kind of institutional chore imposed by employers. He suggested If we are academics as well as teachers it is because we have learned to own and take responsibility for what we know, what we transmit to others and how we use our knowledge in the wider world.

Reader wondered, in a bigger discussion about philosophies and research paradigms, whether part of the problem was too much concern for belonging in "academic tradition" in those disciplines that have newly entered from the craft guilds and colleges, when in fact academia and research has moved on in other disciplines.

Dunnet noted that learning the language of the academy might be especially difficult for practitioners who are not used to defining what they and their students did in words or making a true connection between words and doing.

Popov suggested that art education in particular need both artistically talented and conceptually proficient individuals who can drive the professional reproduction forward. He suggested a model for architectural education where Teaching architects should focus on themes and topics that augment their teaching. In most cases this is at theoretical level and is about form, function, and methods. More specific and technical studies should be carried out by full-time research associates.

Sharing knowledge

In response to Rust's question "Can you do research without being an academic?", Friedman replied that you could, that Corporations and corporate researchers do this all the time. The difference lies in whether that knowledge was made public. In the 'guild' tradition, knowledge is shared only amongst its members, while in the academy, knowledge is transmitted, or made public. The difference between academic research and proprietary research involves the intention to publish and the commitment to public engagement.

Peter Johnson claimed that practitioners employed as lecturers should be afforded equal rights and privileges as 'academics' when it came to maintaining and developing their chosen field. He imagined a parallel universe where academics are employed to teach theory yet are required by their institutions to become practitioners in order to validate their outputs.

Donna Carty wondered whether her grandfather's experiments qualified him as either an academic or one of those who did research without being one. It was pointed out that without the intention to transmit that knowledge, he was not undertaking academic research.

Machin felt that the end product of research is not necessarily great art. He wondered whether open source software might provide a model of practice-led research - results are freely available, answers to specific questions and the development is about the creation of contingency.

Teaching research skills

Friedman outlined the problems of researchers without adequate research skills gaining PhDs and then going on to train further PhD students. He was concerned that a number of institutions were awarding what are designated research doctorates for studio projects, without having to qualify why they were actually research. He was also concerned to note the rise in more experienced supervisors needing to be brought in to 'rescue' students at a late stage of their studies because their own supervisors had not provided them with the necessary research skills to complete their PhDs. Friedman argued that a journeyman level of research skills was required by that anyone if he or she were to teach and tutor research students.

Popov identified a problem for academics as having to spend time for professional development in at least two directions. They must get informed about new knowledge and skills developed by others, develop themselves as practitioners, and assimilate the new knowledge and skills. Then they must disseminate these skills. The two functions are interrelated. In order to create good professionals, professors should develop themselves.

Language in Art, Design and Architecture practice and research

The main themes surrounding language in ADA practice and research were the tensions between using language that could adequately describe the practice or research and its ability to communicate clearly to its intended audience. While some found language in ADA at the extreme

deliberately obscure and exclusive, others felt that it was simply one of the tools of the trade, to be learnt and used as necessary.

Donna Carty was the first person to question the 'language' of ADA research used as something other than 'plain' language; she didn't know it but expected to pick it up eventually. This concern about not understanding the language and therefore not 'belonging' and feeling intimidated was voiced by several others, including Gillian Wilson (particularly regarding non-traditional learners) and Natalie Dekel. Dekel felt that, once learned, it could be 'poetic'. Cary argued that "if research is to inform and benefit even those outside academia or the field of art investigated (a part of the justification for public funding), shouldn't the results be accessible to outsiders? Doesn't their expression in non-accessible language inhibit the transfer of the "news" to those outside who might make use of it?" Loi argued that form and language are keys to accessibility and "accessibility is related to the potential for audience receptiveness and response."

Wilson further suggested that "art and design education might prefer to remain in its exclusive ivory tower." She, among others, felt that it was important to recognise it as a language which, like all languages, must be learned and had a particular purpose. Rust felt that many students and colleagues subsume this new language without it appearing to damage the passion and creativity that they bring to all their work. However, he also proposed that philosophic language was sometimes used because we like the way it resonates rather than caring what it means.

Roberts considered language and dialogue as integral aspects of the inquiry, as both theory and method, and her research will demonstrate that writing about the work of living artists is a form of critical and creative practice. Grillner felt that language and writing should be acknowledged as a design medium among others.

Popov argued that one of the roles of Art research is to explicate languages and ideas and to make them accessible to many people. He argues that not all artists should be engaged in theorizing and research, but "some of them need to know a bit about it. They don't need to be as fluent as philosophers of art or art critics, but it would not hurt to acquire a bit of mastery in interpreting our own thoughts, which direct the movement of our hands."

Loi noted an inexorably present language-divide between practitioners and academics, where the 'academic lingo' intimidated practitioners to the point that their voices remained unheard. She felt that that there is much to be learned from 'both parties'. Loi voiced a concern that a lack of shared language in ADA was a barrier to progress in the field of research and felt that places/opportunities to develop and nurture it were necessary. She argued that management, design and fine art use different terms for the same meanings and that it would be helpful to learn from each other and find common ground.

The language of practice and / or research

Tiiu Poldma talked about the language of design research being different to the language of design practice and being something that was learned. Breizek felt that "because our "craft" came first, our first language is our artistic practice. Thus artists would think speak and write about their practices differently than media theorists, art historians etc." Poldma

further stated "If we cannot engage in a common research language and do so with a certain level of rigour and ethics, then we cannot presume to know how to do research, let alone practice-led research."

Words people versus picture people

Paul Reader challenged the idea that knowledge and reality are language based and asserted that PBR could be in the realm of inquiry conducted through pre-linguistic activities that may only later find a voice.

Damian Sutton felt that 'the language of research councils can seem dense, archaic, restrictive and thus intended for 'writing-led research' but felt equally that in artist's statements, other kinds of linguistic restrictions were also being imposed. Haslem felt that "the [design] artefact is poetic. Its language is not fixed; it communicates in a far more manifold way."

HE language

Malcolm Quinn argued that students engaging in practice-led research are in the difficult position of demonstrating proof of professional relevance on the one hand, and of academic rigor on the other. This includes accepting research language, standards and outcomes but he argues that the established doctoral research standards and protocols should be tested against areas of visual arts practice.

Role of writing in practice-led research

Martin Salisbury described two 'camps' of word people (those who feel we should conform to the norms in subject areas where teaching comes from the 'Ologists') and picture people (special definitions for our research because the creative arts are different). He also described some recent collaborations between MA and Med children's literature and illustration courses.

Thea Brejzek noted that for her theatre sciences PhD, her professional opera productions were regarded as publications so they were "eligible" to use as both subject and reference. She feels that because for artists, the "craft" comes first, we look, think, speak and write about our artistic area of expertise differently than media theorists, art historians etc - not better or worse, but differently informed as our first language is our artistic practice. She believed that because of this 'inner voice', we have an opportunity to enter the academic discourse by proposing innovative strategies for theory.

Alan Dunnet felt we must accept the frame in which we find ourselves and learn the new language of research. He feels this is especially difficult for practitioners who are not used to defining or, perhaps, prioritising, what they and their students DO in words/making a proper and true connection between words (saying/writing) and doing.

Diana Roberts' PhD research on contemporary art and design from the South West of Western Australia considered language and dialogue as integral aspects of the inquiry, as both theory and method. She would be demonstrating that writing about the work of living artists is a form of critical and creative practice.

Paul Reader described the difficult transition from practice to words, or words to practice. For him, the conference demonstrates how difficult it is

to elevate the status pre/non-linguistic inquiry in the face of a dominant verbal-logical culture

Current PhD programmes

A new doctorate programme involving media artists, choreographers and curators is being formed, the PAR-Doctorate in Scenography as a cooperation between the University for Applied Arts and Sciences Zurich and the Univ. of Vienna Theatre Studies Zurich/Vienna (Thea Brejzek).

A new, screen-oriented MA is now running at Drama Centre London, Central Saint Martins (Alan Dunnet). While the emphasis is still on the actor's process, they are focussing on areas which are more specific to the medium of the screen rather than stage.

Paradigm conflicts, Thomas Kuhn and the Philosophy of Science discussions

Most of the arguments about art and science, the philosophy of science and Thomas Kuhn are a 2 way conversation between Paul Reader and Ken Friedman. Gavin Melles also contributes (from the position of a designer with a medical sciences background) as does Rosan Chow and Carel Kuitenbrouwer.

Lubmir Popov and Eduardo Corte-Real were key contributors to detailed discussions about philosophy, knowledge, the historical context and the development of art and science in the academy.

See appendices for full details of posts containing the keywords 'science', 'Kuhn' and 'paradigm'. The posts have not been further summarised or analysed since they are not the key focus of this workshop.

Picasso's PhD

A number of contributors (listed below) took part in discussion about whether or not Picasso could / should have earned a PhD. Since this is an old debate and not one which was intended to be a focus for discussion in this workshop, the purpose here is merely to note that the discussion took place and continued right through the workshop. It is also worth noting that although many of the more experienced contributors were familiar with the Picasso's PhD debate, and did not feel that he would have been awarded a PhD, it was predominantly these members of the group who were perpetuating the debate on this occasion.

Table 8

No of posts	Full name	Discipline	Experience
11	Prof Ken Friedman	Management	Experienced
4	Eduardo Corte-Real	3D design	Learner
3	Paul Reader	Fine art	Learner
3	Dr Rosan Chow	3D design	Learner
2	Prof Lubomir Popov	Interior Architecture	Experienced
1	Ranulph Glanville	Unknown	Experienced
1	Prof Chris Rust	3D design	Experienced
1	Prof Carel Kuitenbrouwer	2D design	Learner
1	Oliver Klimpel	3D design	Novice

1	Kenny McBride	Fine art	Novice
1	Jez Bradley	3D design	Novice
1	Dave Beech	Fine art	
1	Daria Loi	3D design	Learner

Beliefs, values and myths

When research is not research

Paul Reader argued that there was an assumption that research was defined by research questions and methodology. He noted that "one long standing distinction between fine art and design, is the idea that fine art is grounded in problem-finding while design is more likely to be problem-solving" and argued that in problem finding the research question is not significant.

Poldma argued that role as a practitioner researcher was to "both 'problem-find' and 'problem-solve'", integrating aspects of aesthetics and design within the research that I do. I also teach design integrating theory with practice, using lived experiences and real situations as the catalyst for learning about objects and interior environments that integrate the aesthetic ideas they have within real, human responses to the object and environment."

Paul Stapleton noted that one of the problems of defining research was the historically shifting/evolving meanings of the words 'research', 'knowledge', 'practice', and 'theory'

Goals of Research

The posts include a range of opinions on the goals and purpose of research in Art, Design and Architecture; is its purpose to develop the discipline or to develop personal practice, or a combination? The assumption is that fine artists are interested in research to further their own practice while the nature of design makes it more likely that design research is intended to develop useful knowledge in the discipline.

Dekel (fine art) spoke about research in terms of personal background, culture and experience. Yasemin Afacan (architecture) spoke of the 'responsibility' of creating buildings and urban fabrics that can communicate with their users.

Rust suggested that the goal of research was knowledge and understanding. Rosan Chow disagreed, believing instead that the goal of research is change and that knowledge is instrumental.

Friedman further believed that the goal of action research is informed action based on knowledge and understanding. "If all action and all practice were informed by knowledge and understanding, we would not need action research, practice-led research, or any other kind of research."

Funding support for research or practice?

Paul Reader noted that "a number of educational researchers who have successfully gained Australian Research Council grants, have quietly admitted to me that a lot of research is already done before they are in a

position to apply for a grant – even though it is a requirement of the grant that it is for new and original research projects."

Judith Mottram gave a descriptive account of the significant changes in funding for practice and research activities in Art, Design and Architecture which put the current lack of clarity into context.

B.3 Personal Summaries

23 members contributed a personal summary of the workshop. These are listed alphabetically below.

Prof Johannes Birringer

Chair in Drama & Performance Technologies, Brunel, United Kingdom

Dear all

After reading some of the excellent summaries to the conversations on this list, and having missed much of the initial discussion, I don't feel it's a cool idea to attempt a summary of so many diverse viewpoints. Rather, coming from the performance, dance and digital art world, and working both as an independent artist as well as a university researcher/lab director, I wish to add just a few observations, especially since the summaries yesterday/today focused on the design field (excepting Sue Thomas's wonderful commentary on transliteracy and writing, & comments [Owain] on research as curating), and not on, say, more physical and performative techniques of creativity which, as in music, theatre, dance and opera require exquisite/specific technical knowledges. I will come to digital knowledge later.

As someone working in choreography and digital design (and here the understanding of "design" relates more strongly to interactive architectures/programming and the emerging forms of wearable technologies, and thus I'd like to also acknowledge some of the important research happening today in our sister arts, fashion, music/performance, interaction design, robotics, etc), the questions discussed here are vexing:

(1) the performing arts are creative practices; performance studies as an academic discipline heavily feature theory and ethnography, emphasizing the critical (and reflexive) rather than the creative/experimental processes of art making or performance making, but many performance studies researchers who advise Phd students and drive innovative cross-disciplinary research methods and investigations to some extent of course also practice an artform or continue the transitional work we see in-between performance art, performance ethnography, visual anthropology, media arts, activist art, curatorial praxis, etc. Although I like ironies, and enjoyed Sue's reference to Flannery O'Connor, the blurred borderlines have caused some challenges, not to what Owain refers to as "dual roles" [artist] + [researcher] & "compound roles" [artist-researcher], but to the ideological settings of disciplinary power/institutions, advising, examining, and thus to the many questions discussed here regarding legitimacy, evaluation, criteria of evaluating new knowledge, and acceptance of, say, embodied performance practice offering new knowledge to the research communities, to the world.

(If dance, say, or other embodied practices in live art, have not been taken as seriously in their contributions to new knowledge, and if the fine arts have not featured heavily in the RAE returns (I am a foreigner, so I don't really know), then the issue of how to evaluate new performance techniques and concepts, as well as traditional performance techniques and concepts, is a crucial one as soon as a devised theatre piece, for example, is declaring itself as a research outcome and is developed as research investigation with a critical apparatus. I agree that we need case studies, publications on such work that is produced and performed in the academic contexts. We may of course see artistic work submitted for a doctorate that has indeed not been produced in academia but in the professional artworld, and I am naturally supporting a constant feedback/cross-over interaction between professional art and art "written up" in a postgraduate center. The "writing up" or critical documentation (the posttheorization) is what is often the

crux.

(2) taking Owain's point: >>It is worth remembering that much (most?) design research is carried out by people who would not profess to be designers. You don't need to design in order to deliver high-quality research, for example, into other people's designing, into the efficacy and desirability of products, or into the effectiveness of newly devised design guidelines>> , it is true that high-level research on performance practices can be done by people who are not creating performances or who can't dance. But at Brunel, NTU, and various other universities in the UK, as well as at art schools and universities in the US, Canada, Brazil, Australia, etc., practice-led research is now understood to imply (a series of) practice components that underlie the critical and contextualising reflections submitted as outcome and resolution of research questions that are articulated in a document (thesis, DVD, documentation).

Here I would be interested in a more sustained discussion, and proposals for research evaluations of aesthetic concepts and articulations, AS WELL AS for rigorous evaluations of dance by non dancers (to use a metaphor) and of strong, poetic, aesthetic writing by researchers who are not derivative (citing theory models or sticking to a formula) but actually generate new knowledge and intellectual thought by their manner of creative writing. This "writing" part of the Phd can, to some extent, also include digital media (film, image-based media, websites, archives, documentation).

(3) Musician/composer Peter Johnson makes an interesting point: <<research already takes a multiplicity of forms, and to exclude what practitioners do on principle would beg all sorts of questions about what art is, what artists do, and what 'a significant contribution to knowledge' actually means. In the RAE this seems to be accepted in principle, but not in practice if practitioners are being required to become second-class academics in order to 'write up' or otherwise justify their work. To illustrate the point, imagine a parallel universe where academics are employed to teach theory yet are required by their institutions to become practitioners in order to validate their outputs. >>

Quite so. I imagine the universe, and I also support Peter's suggestion: >>Of course there is plenty of room for cross-over (mixed research methodologies), and much value in reflecting critically on your work, but that should not take priority over the work itself>> if indeed we work/advise/pursue research in art schools, professional schools, conservatories and think tanks (such as Sue's "Institute of Creative Technologies" or my own DAP-Lab at Brunel University). The work is the creative engine for new methods and practices, and they will need to be reflected, but artistic work does need to be done, supported, facilitated in order for our synergies to flow into the intellectual and the cultural contexts. Research, for me, is also a technique, like dance, and generally I do not distinguish much between the two, although it is sometimes inappropriate to defend uninteresting art as good research.

(4) Finally, a point about hybrid forms today, and the impact of new technologies on research processes and art practices.

I find much of the defining or debating or questioning of what research is, or how it can be explained or legitimated in an academic context and for academic careers, less interesting than the matter at hand, namely what drives challenging art praxis under extended and sustainable research conditions.

I have not always found such sustainable and exciting/challenging research conditions in the academic universe (challenging in the sense in which artistic experimentation and innovation necessarily involve and require a heavy-duty peer to peer context of artists exchanging knowledge and ideas and impelling each other to do new and better work, rehearse with each other, test each other's assumption and subject them to critique and then to the critical eyes of the public. audiences, markets), and thus I often prefer to create them outside. If I'm able to create/sustain the lab I envision at Brunel University, and if we can work there under the conditions I just outlined, perhaps in a year or two from now I will know

more how to contribute: in terms of how institutions could and might evaluate practice centered research, how Phd students experience these processes, what advising means today under such conditions, and how advising and evaluation can be thought through, relying on some set of criteria that help us to possibly agree on the qualities and the outcomes of a research project one that is, say, based on a performance, a film, a music piece, a design. It gets even more interesting, I think, once we come to accept, in the digital and interactive scenario of art making today, or the world in which we see more and more hybrid works, and projects using social relational aesthetic strategies (not market oriented, not professional school and business oriented), that many new works today are created and developed collaboratively, or may involve data bases, bizarre algorithms, and new software/coding, or may involve distributed modes and diffusions (multisite telematic performance, netart).

I'd think there are very few scientific or academic (quantitative and qualitative) criteria available to rely on. The criteria in design may not work for the criteria in live art or in ethnographic documentary film, and so there need to be many differentiations. And so in many cases the research endeavor, we need to acknowledge, if it involves innovation and new prototyping, mixed media and collaborative authoring, provokes its own specific modes of advising, and evaluation and collaborative authorship.

Eduardo Corte-Real

Scientific Board President of IADE School of Design, IADE School of Design, Portugal

Summary 1

Dear all,

Before the proper summary, some clarifying points:

- 1.. Most of what the English-speaking natives call "design" we call "project".
- 2.. The social meaning of Design in non-english speaking countries is integrated in a more general dominion of Art. "Project" is inherent to all human practical activities while Design designates an "artistic way to produce serial artefacts" (opposed to, or complemented by engineering).

My problem with practice-led research and doctoral studies is real. The school where I work will propose a doctoral program next November. The school is a private one (of university level, otherwise couldn't think about it) and must show the pertinence of the program. This workshop is therefore of "political" importance to me. Some of the arguments you all have used will be, after being studied and processed more carefully, useful for constructing our case. In that sense, all was useful, especially those who gave testimony of real work conducing to PhD.

At the Physics Department of The Graduate School of Art and Sciences of the Harvard University prospectus as well as in this workshop I found that the most important thing is to give options to the students. In that specific department of Physics, their choice is to choose between Experimental and Theoretical doctoral research. This was also of some help. I think we are comfortable with the "theoretical" on our field. The "experimental" is more tricky. Anyhow, the important thing is the choice possibility.

As I have said, Portuguese Law gives us certain latitude to define our own doctoral research program. A few years ago (my wife did this) the first university degree had the duration of 5 years and the master's degree 4 years (She did Fine Arts and Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art concluded in 2000). These 9 years are more than what a student can do now to get a PhD or a D in something = 3+2+3

under the Bologna Treaty in Europe.

Once again I have a real problem: How do I "design" a program that will allow people to climb from master to doctor in 3 years minimum. I must start to admit that the meaning of such degree have changed since the middle 1800's otherwise we will only graduate the superwomen and men that we will got lucky to get.

So what do I have?

- 1.. A society that strongly believes that Design is a field of the Arts.
- 2.. No distinction between PhDs or simply Ds. (some amount of research must be embedded in the Ds)
- 3.. Three years of study and dissertation. (I must say that if I would chronometer my doctorate study, research and writing time, it would come about to two years. But this, after 5 years of first degree and three years for a Faculty examination that included a research dissertation and course proposal).

What shall I do?

- 1.. Pay attention to what may be considered today doctoral research and especially practice-led doctoral research in Art&Design for two good reasons: a) I belong to a Design School; b) because practice-led is really a option for us due to three previous conditions.
- 2.. Avoid misconceptions about what our program will be, regarding future candidates and the ministry that will evaluate our proposition.
- 3.. Maybe all the non-superhumans must be integrated in ongoing research projects (so, this deals with the general research policy or oportunities of the school).

In this sense, this workshop, taught me a lot, but the contributions were either highly abstract or highly practical. Somehow, I feel, that I have a lot of sewing to do between the two in order to get a coherent pro-active grip on the subject. Funny enough, the Portuguese Renaissance philosopher Pedro Fonseca, founder of the Jesuit Philosophy course in the Coimbra University defended the existence of a Middle Science (Ciência Média) capable of demonstrate human liberty within the framework that the pure science exists only in God's Intelligence and all world events were in Gods Vision. Desenho, Disegno/Design were the proof of the existence of such "middle science". By the middle science, "God knows the field the futurability, being this word all that the human would do in the multiplicity of circumstances before him/her". (Freely translated from "Pedro Fonseca e os Conimbricenses" in Filosofia Portuguesa, Pedro Calafate accessed 6 july 2006 at: <http://www.instituto-camoes.pt/cvc/filosofia/ren13.html>). Well, the Human was made to the image and similitude of God, so the middle science is manifested in the humans by design.

I have been arguing that this "middle science" or what I called "artificial philosophy" were inherent to the Art Academies deeply rooted on the Modern higher education western systems.

In recent years I have witnessed an on growing expression that the Art & Design are immature disciplines in higher education, research, whatever. This position can only come out of ignorance or distraction, even if well intentioned. Disegno was amongst the first of the Modern Disciplines instituted in Higher Education through Academia, disruptive and revolutionary regarding gremial medieval organisations. In fact the kind of research with the combined use of geometry, maths, natural philosophy synthesized by visual expression was firmly instituted in the Early 1600's long before Medicine and Engineering, for instance. Arts and Crafts "ascended" progressively towards such Academies either by abduction or fusion during the 1800's and early 1900's.

I repeat this: The first institutions to combine the Modern notion of research with professional higher education where the Italian Academies of Disegno (Florence and Rome). Their definition of Disegno covered "1: careful or diligent search [through sketching towards a solution] 2: studious inquiry or examination; especially: investigation or experimentation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of facts, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new facts, or practical application of such new or revised theories or laws [through Pitagoric and Euclidean geometries] 3: the collecting of information about a particular subject [through thorough observation drawing of ruins, corpses, other academicians drawings, etc]"

Eduardo Corte-Real

Scientific Board President of IADE School of Design, IADE School of Design, Portugal

Summary 2

Dear Friends,

I must stress that I only entered this debate in the capacity of doctoral programs apprentice. Nothing that I have said may be interpreted as co-chair for the DRS Wonderland conference.

My summary:

Instead of a summary or of a useful conclusion, responding to Ken's exhortation for contributions from the major research universities, I did some search work and browsed for "research" in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, accessed yesterday at: <http://www.gsas.harvard.edu/programs/degree/index.html> and following subjects quotations of "research" in PhD programs: "History of Art", "Architecture and Urban Planning", "Comparative Literature", "Division of Engineering and Applied Sciences", "English and American Literature and Language", "History of Science",

"Music", "Mathematics", "Psychology", "Philosophy" and "Physics". Results for PhD programs prospecta for the word "research": "Comparative Literature" and "English and American Literature and Language" had no hits. Music had one hit. History of Art, History of Science, Philosophy and Mathematics: three hits Physics and Architecture: over 5 and less than 10 Engineering and Applied Sciences and Psychology: more than 10 From the hits and reading I took brief conclusions:

1. Three departments advertise their doctoral programs without mentioning "research". (Music refers "research" about student's abilities in a European "research language"). Is it, therefore, possible to have a PhD without research?

2. Only Physics mentions "doctoral research" and offers to the student the

possibility of conducting such research through "Experimental" or "Theoretical"

3. When the doctoral program is integrated (meaning that the equivalent to the Masters degree is integrated in the full PhD program, as in Psychology) the stressing in research is on the lower years of study.

4. I didn't account for the Faculty Members "Research Interests" hits. (in Literature and Music they do not advertise it either) It seems that almost everyone must declare some. That will be my following work.

The following are the hits catalogued according to my own interests followed by the quotations from the specialities prospecta. Hope to survive today, Eusebio's tears will be of joy this time.

Natalie Dekel

PhD student, Leeds Met University, United Kingdom

Dear all

it has been an excellent workshop

i have had plenty of insightful posts from all of you, especially from Ken and Lubomir, although i think that most of the posts were rather abstract and i would expect more posts that link theory and practice still very useful and insightful!

I hope that you (Chris and Ken and others) continue with workshops like this one so to praise the debates around practice led research and enable to exchange views, experiences and knowledge

I am also a full time mother for a baby who is a year old next week as well as doing my PhD studies at Leeds Metropolitan University. Loved all the recipes sent by the group.

Christina Edwards

PhD student, UWA (Aberystwyth, United Kingdom)

As a 2nd year PhD student in a small, but supportive and dynamic department, the opportunity to gain insight in to others' working practice/beliefs, opinions and knowledge has been most valuable. I leave with the impression that there is divergence between Fine Artists' and Designers' and Architects' take on 'practice-led research'. Despite many persuasive arguments as to what we should call such research, for me the cap still fits (for the time being anyway!) I would broadly agree with Ken's definition of the 'journeyman' nature of the PhD. I think for me it is imperative that I study alongside a variety of others (post and undergraduates), have opportunities to hone my teaching skills as well as my research skills and practice, working within the structure of an educational establishment. I have been enlightened by many of the posts over the past weeks, despite the occasional diversions (the Picasso debate is not for me), and would like to have heard more examples of what people are working on, as the diversity of areas covered by the cross-section of people participating would be vast - even though we fall under the same 'umbrella' of research.

There are a number of contributors posts that have stuck in my memory including those by Lubomir, Donna, Daria, Paul Reader, Ken, Jez, Kenny, Katy, Judith amongst others too numerous to mention, also Chris's contribution of course! It's been very interesting to read others' verbal sparring! (Even though I've not always felt able to add anything to some of the threads, there have been some valuable points raised). I would have liked to see the workshop continue over a longer period, as it appears as though we just scratched the surface of the original intent, as well as being sidetracked and diverted occasionally! All the very best to everyone, wherever you are, whatever your discipline! I look forward to a 'part two'!

Prof Ken Friedman

Professor of Leadership and Strategic Design, Norwegian School of Management, Norway

Summary 1 - Being an Academic

Dear Friends,

My Thomas Aquinas moment has arrived as I plod through a few thematic summaries. These 1,478 words will address the issue "being academic." Nothing bold here - just a few common sense thoughts to round out the workshop.

1) Perspectives on the academic enterprise

We started the workshop on the issue of being academic. It seems that many of us have an uneasy relationship with universities or academic life. Some of us suggested that life is greener in business, private industry, or design practice -- or even struggling to maintain an artist studio without a steady salary. Having held all these jobs, I find that academic life offers a good balance of responsibility and freedom.

Even so, academic work does not provide the freedom many of us hope for in art, design, or the creative industries. Few jobs do.

Not even art offers freedom for most artists. Fewer than 1% of all practicing artists earn a living making and selling art. The vast majority of individual artists buy artistic freedom by doing something else to subsidize their art.

Professional design is challenging and it offers many rewards. Most designers work for someone and follow directions as employees do in most industries. Design firms follow the old guild patterns. It is no democracy. The master runs the studio. Bryan Byrne and Ed Sands (2002) describe the working life of design studios in a book on the creative industries.

Most of us work in the education sector. Our schools do not pay us directly to work as artists or designers. Even those of us who sometimes live as artists or designers work in academia. We are paid to teach, to help others develop skills, and to do research.

This entails demands and responsibilities. The majority of us in this workshop relate to different industries or professions from positions in academia. We serve the community by teaching aspiring professionals the skills they will need in professional life.

Let's begin by acknowledging that fact.

2) An imperfect life

Large organizations such as universities maintain bureaucracies to meet mandated responsibilities. Adapting to an administrative network one price I pay for the academic freedom I enjoy. I welcome the professional administrators who manage the important activities I am unsuited for. I do my best to support their work.

Is academic life perfect? No. Academic work entails contract responsibilities to employers, students, colleagues, and community. This limits our freedom. Even so, most of us sought the jobs we hold. Some aspects of our jobs have changed in recent years as art and design schools shift from practitioner schools to research schools.

Those who enjoyed the old way of life may not enjoy life after the transition. The change is here to stay. That's the starting point. We cannot go back. This issue is how to move forward.

3) Moving forward and creating change

An important branch of inquiry called "the scholarship of teaching and learning" has blossomed in recent years. (Google that phrase for more information.) The scholarship of teaching and learning involves reflection and reflective practice along with research, interpretation, and other forms of inquiry. This has come to focus on universities and academic life at a time of great change. The Carnegie Commission is active in this area, as it has long been active in higher education. Other organizations and many universities work in the field.

Those who genuinely question university work and academic life might find this inquiry. It offers opportunities to frame problems in ways that open them to solution. It offers ways to understand the nature and rationale behind the activities that have a genuine purpose even though they may seem useless. Moreover, it offers opportunities to examine issues from multiple perspectives, learning from other and adapting their solutions to the genuine problems we face.

Any system requires improvements. This is especially true of systems such as universities and professional schools. These systems accumulate cultural patterns, behavioral artifacts, and rules that seem to take on a life of their own. Nevertheless, we can enact creative change when it matters enough to invest time. Change requires developing a case and building a constituency. An important case has many stakeholders with divergent interests and a high investment in preventing change.

Important changes take time.

Like any system with an opening to representative democracy in a legitimate constitutional structure, action based on expertise and participation goes further than complaint. While I have never lost a major case, I have learned that winning a major case can take as long as five years. If you want institutional change while accepting an institutional salary, you must be ready to work on an institutional time scale.

Life outside the academic world is much tougher than the life most of us live. I have never liked the colloquial expressions contrasting the "real world" with the world of universities. This, too, is a real world. Nevertheless, this real world offers us protections and benefits that few employees have along with a steady salary. Freelance designers and artists have the freedom they want to do as they will. Eating on a regular basis may not come with the job.

Times are changing. Perhaps they should. During the 1970s and 1980s, I observed life at many art and design schools. I saw many cases in which the system worked well for faculty members and badly for students. The old art and design school system failed to meet many important needs. It often failed to provide mandated services and benefits. As we reflect on being academic, I suggest reflecting on our responsibilities as well as demanding our freedoms.

4) How should we manage universities?

Several notes complained about misplaced managerialism in universities. This is a problem for everyone, in all the fields I know. Managerialism represents a serious threat to academic freedom and to university life. This is a serious problem. It is not the point of this workshop. The point of this workshop is a review of practice-led research and our responsibilities as academics in relation to practice led research.

5) Are there too many academics?

One note suggested that there are too many academics in the world. I may be mistaken, but it seems evident that we need more than we have today to serve the growing population of students and scholars that most governments have decided should attend university.

Nevertheless, the question of whether we have too few academics, too many, or just the right number is irrelevant. We work as academics now. This workshop is an opportunity to examine our work for better service to our students, our colleagues, our schools, and our fields.

6) Differences in academic work between studio and research faculty

In "Design Science and Design Education," (available on Chris's web site) I propose a simple solution for university-based art and design schools. Some people should do research. Others should not. Some people should be studio professors or craft masters. This works well when studio specialists and practitioner experts do not control research programs, and it works well when research experts do not control the studio and craft skills programs. The problem in many schools is that studio professors without research skills sometimes attempt to control research programs. This is where problems begin.

Art and design schools routinely see cases where unqualified teachers demand authority over courses where they have no knowledge of subject matter and no expertise in required skills. Several notes in the workshop suggested that some workshop participants do not want academic careers and have no interest in research skills. This puzzles me. Why does anyone who does not want to be an academic wish to debate academic questions? Why does anyone with no interest in research want to debate research problems?

The answer is clear. It involves power, politics, and wealth. Research means access to money, staff positions, and resources. For this reason, many people who have no interest in research want to designate their activities as research to enjoy the benefits of the resources allocated to research.

Nobel laureate Richard Feynman once proposed that researchers should be honest enough to state what they are doing truthfully. If society wants to support what researchers want to do, he said, that is a political choice. Integrity demands that researchers present their work honestly without mislabeling it to secure funds. That is the case here. It goes both ways. If research does not interest you and practice does, you should not demand research funds. You should make the case for the value and importance of your practice.

There is room in academic life for all of us. Our responsibility is being clear and doing well at what we do.

Yours,

Ken

Prof Ken Friedman

Summary 2 - Research

Friends,

These 1,475 words summarize issues on research.

1) Research definitions

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary defines research in a way that clarifies the term as living speakers use it: "1: careful or diligent search 2: studious inquiry or examination; especially: investigation or experimentation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of facts, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new facts, or practical application of such new or revised theories or laws 3: the collecting of information about a particular subject"

(Merriam-Webster's 1993: 1002; for more, see the Oxford English Dictionary).

These definitions cover clinical, applied, and basic research; theoretical and practice-led research; qualitative, quantitative, descriptive, interpretive, logical, mathematical, empirical, positive, normative, hermeneutic, phenomenological, and philosophical research, as well as expressive research.

What distinguishes research from other activities is what Mario Bunge (1999: 251) describes as the "methodical search for knowledge. Original research," he continues, "tackles new problems or checks previous findings. Rigorous research is the mark of science, technology, and the 'living' branches of the humanities." Synonyms for research include exploration, investigation, and inquiry.

2) Clearing up confusions

Discussing practice-led research often generates two confusions, values confusion and category confusion. The first confuses value issues. Research is not "better" than painting, playing football, or feeding the poor. Research is different.

An angry design student once asked me whether research is more important than feeding the hungry as though I could choose between solving a particular mathematical problem and ending world hunger. If I could choose, I would end hunger. I do not get to choose between these two.

(Ending world hunger involves political and economic choices. See, f. ex., Fuller 1981 or Sachs 2005. We do not need to choose between two different social goods, research, and ending hunger. We must persuade our citizens and governments to end hunger for all humans. This takes the kind of research Sachs has been doing.)

The second problem is category confusion that involves the frequent appeal to many ways of knowing. There ARE many ways to know, to learn, and to transmit information.

While there are many ways to know and many kinds of knowledge, not all ways to know or learn constitute research. Theology and comparative religion entail research.

Religious prophecy and divine revelation do not. This is why Dr. Wojtyla and Dr. Ratzinger found no conflict between church doctrine and evolution theory. Guilds transmit knowledge as a form of embodied information and modeling in the master-apprentice relationship. Apprenticeship is not research.

There are hundreds of similar examples. Research is a range of systematic approaches to finding, learning, and knowing. There are others ways to find, know, and learn, and they are valuable. This workshop focused on research.

Definitions help us to understand what we discuss so that we can deepen and improve our fields.

3) Other definitions

At different points, participants posted valuable but limited definitions of research. These are useful. They simply have less covering power than the large-scale definition I use. I prefer to postulate a definition with the greatest covering power.

If you prefer another definition, the way forward is not to say that my postulates are wrong. Present your own articulate definition instead.

Definitions must be reasonable as well as articulate to be useful. Every workshop of this kind elicits definitions of research that are neither accurate nor useful. The common denominator among these is a tendency to label different kinds of non-research activities as research.

In a private note, a doctoral candidate argued against my definition of research by referring to a diatribe against "colonizing research" and "positivism" in a book on "decolonizing methodologies." The book argues that colonizing research includes "having your genealogy and identity (cell-lines) stolen, patented, copied; having the umbilical cord blood of aborted babies 'farmed'; having your cultural

institutions and their rituals patented either by a non-indigenous person or by another indigenous person" and so on (Smith 2002: 100-101). On this basis, the author argues that research is bad.

While these are unethical practices, they are not research. That is rather like saying:

"Dumping raw nuclear waste into the ocean is research. Therefore, research is bad."

some of the practices are based on knowledge derived from research, but they are not research practices. Instead, this resembles the relationship between metallurgy and killing people with swords. The same research that produces swords makes better plowshares. We choose how to use them.

Our focus is research rather than other practices, good or bad.

4) Research goals

One participant stated the goals of research as knowledge or understanding. That fits most definitions, broad or narrow.

5) Research and instrumental knowledge

The goals of knowledge and understanding have many purposes. In contrast, we read an argument for instrumental knowledge that pointed to action research as an example of research where the goal of research is change. This requires a distinction the author did not make.

The notion of instrumental knowledge fails to account for the diversity of research or change built on expanded knowledge and understanding. The year 1905 saw several contributions to basic research that had no practical application at all. The scientist who did the work said that he could imagine no foreseeable use or practical value in his work. The research expanded human knowledge by providing a better model of the physical forces at work in the universe. It had no other purpose. Over the following century, this supposedly useless research opened the way to much of the technology we use today, including the computer technology and Internet technology that you are using to read this summary in a workshop that enables us to meet in real time around the world.

If all research were required to serve instrumental ends, we would live a world where 90% of all human beings worked in farming, fishing, and forestry, rising with the sun and retiring at dusk. Most of the products and services we use today began in some form of basic research. Many of the benefits we enjoy begin in non-instrumental experiments by people who want to see whether things can work in new and different ways.

The demand for immediate application of instrumental knowledge is often associated with narrow political goals. Because the value of instrumental knowledge is always a political decision, history has seen many cases of instrumental research with destructive results. This is particularly common in dictatorships where those who fail to achieve serious research careers become "research politicians" through an ability to argue for instrumental knowledge without the deeper understanding that leads to improvements.

Research works best when our goals are knowledge and understanding. This is even the case when our research has such instrumental goals as feeding the world or making tools work better.

6) Action research

This clarifies the distinction between action research and action without research. The goal of research is knowledge and understanding. The goal of action research is informed action based on knowledge and understanding.

If all action and all practice were informed by knowledge and understanding, we would not need action research, practice-led research, or any other kind of research. Consider, for example, the debate that occurred when practitioner

physicians believed that their social standing required them to make hospital rounds and perform surgery in street clothes. The arguments against Pasteur, Lister, and Semmelweis often posed action against academic theory. "We're surgeons," they argued, "Let's get on with our practice! Invisible 'microbes' have nothing to do with medicine."

Kurt Lewin, Chris Argyris, Donald Schon, and the other founders of action research would have sided with Semmelweis. Semmelweis learned how to save patient lives by practicing the legitimate action research and sound science that medical practitioners opposed.

Action based on knowledge and understanding is the goal of action research. Anyone can "change" things. The point of action research is to know and understand what we change, why we should change it, and how to change it effectively.

The goal of action research is not "change" but "improvement." We must decide what we mean by the term "improvement," but one thing is certain: the word means something better and more desirable than what exists today. Change is something else.

If the difference is not clear, just consider how dramatically George Bush has changed the world during the past six years.

The goal of our workshop is knowledge and understanding for improvement rather than instrumental change established by uninformed political preferences. That is the difference between research and politics.

Yours,

Ken

--

References

Bunge, Mario. 1999. The Dictionary of Philosophy. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.

Fuller, Buckminster. 1981. Critical Path. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Merriam-Webster, Inc. 1993. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Tenth edition. Springfield, Massachusetts.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. 2005. The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time.

Prof Ken Friedman

Summary 3 - Footnote with comment on food and football

Friends,

When Sarah Moss sent her summary [below], I posted it. One of the authors she refers to notes that he did not write the comments under the header.

I was assuming that Sarah was referring to the post by inserting the header, and commenting on the post in her own words.

To read the original post, please use the workshop archive at

<http://www.jjscmail.ac.uk/lists/AHRC-WORKSHOP-PL.html>

Comments remain welcome -- either general or specific, and those who wish to do so may want to break their summaries out by topic as Jacob and I will soon begin to do.

Eduardo writes, "It is sad that we Portuguese, even if some are born gentle of spirit and mind, find pleasantry in mocking the arts." It's more than a Portuguese habit. Many gentle spirits find pleasantry in mocking the arts. As my Fluxus colleague Ben Vautier often says, "Fluxus is a pain in art's ass." I think he was describing me.

But I do not mock Portugal! I am already at work preparing a delightful cold plate to serve as my wife and I cheer the Portuguese on to victory. Jacob will be there, too. At least while the salmon lasts. And I remind you British that Portugal is England's oldest ally. If you can't cheer for your own side, you can cheer for theirs. In the gentlest possible way, of course, lest you be accused of favoritism. It's not the weekend, but we can make an exception tonight on behalf of food, football, and Portugal!

Prof Ken Friedman

Summary 4 - Personal Summary and farewell

Friends,

This is my last summary for the workshop - and, at the end, my farewell until the next time.

My summaries are based on a simple conceptual preference. Clarifying and simplifying issues that can be resolved through systematic analysis frees us to struggle with the difficult and ambiguous issues that remain.

1) Necessary conditions

My Thomas Aquinas moment took me through a discussion of being academic, a definition of research, the nature of the PhD, and research skills. These are more difficult and complex than my summaries make them out to be, but they remain relatively simple. Einstein said that the best models make things as simple as possible but not more so.

Practice-led research must have both necessary and sufficient conditions. The first two summaries establish a number of necessary criteria and conditions for two kinds of practice-led research. By developing these necessary conditions, we clear a lot of ground for the difficult work ahead.

Necessity without sufficiency is incomplete.

Nevertheless, understanding necessity allows us to recognize cases that do not constitute practice-led research. One summary clarified the nature of research. If something does not meet the criteria for all forms research, then it cannot be practice-led research no matter how useful, valuable, or interesting it may be.

The PhD is a research degree and a training program. It prepares those who hold the degree to conduct independent research and it is the first-level qualification for those who will teach research and train and supervise researchers. The specific requirements of a PhD award as demonstration and license means that PhD research projects have additional necessary conditions over and above other forms of research. Even though a project may constitute research, if it does not meet the additional necessary conditions for a serious PhD award, it cannot be a practice-led PhD.

The second two summaries addressed related issues that involve context and skills rather than criteria.

Academic life is neither necessary nor sufficient for practice-led research, but it is the context for the workshop. Moreover, since only universities and university-level school are permitted to award the doctorate, academic life is a necessary condition for PhD studies and PhD awards.

Research skills involve key issues for research in general, and for research education in specific.

There is value in plodding through these necessities. Having done so, we are free to examine the possible and the uncertain.

In this sense, necessity both constrains us and frees us.

2) Postulates

To open a territory for practice-led research, I am going to offer several postulates. While I believe that I can argue them in full, this is a summary. I will therefore postulate these points as the foundation of what follows.

Postulates:

Postulate 1) many forms of meaningful research may be subsumed under the rubric of practice-led research. I will elaborate these in the third part of this summary and consider what they entail. At this time, I postulate many possibilities and examine how they interact with the specific criteria and constraints I have already presented.

Postulate 2) Practice-led research must necessarily meet the conditions for any form of research. This is not true of all forms of practice. Rather, it defines the difference between practice and practice-led research.

Postulate 3) Practice-led research for a PhD award must fulfill the criteria of a PhD. Even though a research project may be excellent in other contexts, the specific nature of the PhD award places special demands on the research project presented for the degree.

Postulate 4) While it is not necessary to demonstrate all research skills in any project or at every moment, mastering a robust range of research skills is necessary for anyone who hopes to practice research at a serious level. Even though some forms of practice-led research will break boundaries and move beyond standard definitions, I postulate that those who engage in practice-led research need to master a full range of research skills to do serious work. The deeper and richer the mastery of research, the better the research.

3) Practice-led research - personal propositions

At one point, the discussion moved toward a very general proposal of practice-led research as some form of research in which the practice of our professional art is necessary either to the research process or to the outcome.

This gives a wide territory for exploration even under the constraints I postulate. It allows for research that leads to improved practice. It covers research on how practice functions in the world or contributes to the world. It may cover research that leads to new kinds of materials, to better processes, or ways to understand how we work. It can cover our products, our relations to the artifacts we create -- industrial products, processes, art, and craft -- or the ways that our products influence others and how they relate to them. In short, practice-led research can probably function in any of the recognizable research modes: qualitative, quantitative, descriptive, interpretive, logical, mathematical, empirical, positive, normative, hermeneutic, phenomenological, and philosophical research, as well as expressive. While much practice-led research functions as clinical research and some as applied research, I am less certain about the conditions under which practice-led research might constitute basic or pure research. Even so, we cannot rule out the possibility.

In an off-list note, Kenny McBride asked me whether I consider The Fluxus Performance Workbook (Friedman, Smith, and Sawchyn 2002) to be an example of practice-led research.

My answer was cautious.

It was a good question. Interesting issues ensued. The first scored collections I organized were working sheets for Fluxconcerts. I assembled them as an artist

and composer conducting a concert of work by colleagues. I organized them for publication as a Fluxus editor.

The 1989 edition of the Fluxus Performance Workbook involved some retrospective research, but this was the kind of research any artist or composer undertakes in organizing past work with a sprinkling of updates. The same was true of the 2003 electronic edition with Owen Smith and Lauren Sawchyn.

The nature of my relationship to the Fluxus event scores and my status as a rights holder with authorization over Fluxus copyrights places this kind of project in a category partly outside curatorial or research ventures, at least with relation to work copyright by Fluxus. It may be research-based and curatorial for work not copyrighted by Fluxus, but the research is not especially tricky, just time consuming. It involves writing or calling everyone to ask for updates and missing scores.

The vast amount of research in every field is clinical and simple. Every time an engineer calculates a load or a power supply requirement, clinical research is involved. Every time an accountant reviews current law to seek the best advantage on a client's tax return, he or she is doing clinical research. Every time a band runs a sound check before a concert, every time a physician tries to find out why a patient is coughing -- he, she, or they do clinical research. The same goes for any kind of historical or archival research that simply seeks to locate or establish unproblematic information such as the content of a score. In that sense, the Workbook required research and it was research-based. While this takes skill, knowledge, and judgment, it is not high-level research. Again, my specific relation to this body of work also adds dimensions that would be different to the work of someone curating or editing if they were not themselves part of Fluxus.

Afterwards, I began to wonder what this research would have been were I not one of the artists.

Then, talking with Chris, I began to wonder why - or how - this should change simply because I am also an artist.

The answer is that I don't know. Nevertheless, the question is good. One reason I went back to school to earn a PhD was the fact that so many art ventures failed to achieve the goals we set for them. I wanted to learn more about creating effective social change. I relate some of the answers I discovered in a recent article on why art networks so often fail to achieve their goals (Friedman 2005). For me and for others in Fluxus, our art involved experimental approaches and research of some kind. Nevertheless, or perhaps because of this, I have always been cautious in the kinds of epistemological claims I make based on research, as opposed to the claims I might allow myself based on intuition, feeling, or revelation.

My hope is that we can all move forward together, making progress by opening new territory in a robust way.

Some of the proposal here delighted and startled me. Lubomir's proposals have me thinking on forms of research that I clearly accept for philosophers, theologians, and sociologists. Artists and designers must surely have the same freedom. Ranulph and Martin describe degree programs that are different to past forms of PhD while clearly offering ground for standing as PhD work. Kristina's doctoral work raises challenging issues that would be impossible without both her crafts practice and her philosophical and social inquiry. Eduardo's conjectures on what a school might do and be are of the same important nature. I could go on, and I will after I read the workshop transcripts carefully. For now, I'm past the 1,500 word summary limit, so I will stop with these examples and make my farewell.

I have been reading Paul Schrader's (1988) book on Transcendental Style in Film. Schrader is a legendary screenwriter (*Taxi Driver*) and director (*Mishima*, *American Gigolo*, *Hard Core*). His art and his intellect both inform the development of this book. Reading it in the context of this workshop, I realized

that it, too, might constitute a form of practice-led research. I would say much the same about books I have mentioned here by Miyamoto Musashi, Yagyu Munenori, or similar books by David Mamet.

Even with the constraints of necessity and clarity, we have much territory left to explore.

The freedom to explore does not allow us to propose false truth claims, to change history, or to avoid the claims of rigor. To the contrary, rigor, discipline, and skill make it possible for us to develop. In some cases, artists and designers have done more to hinder the development of practice-led research than any other group. This is precisely why I follow plodding Aquinas in attempting to develop a systematic approach to these issues.

Richard Feynman, physicist and amateur artist, once said, "Poets say science takes away from the beauty of the stars - mere globs of gas atoms. I, too, can see the stars on a desert night and feel them. But do I see less or more? The vastness of the heavens stretches my imagination - stuck on this little carousel, my little eye can catch one-million-year-old light. A vast pattern - of which I am part. What is the pattern, or the meaning, or the why? It does not do harm to the mystery to know a little about it. For far more marvellous is the truth than any artists of the past imagined it. Why do poets of the present not speak of it? What men are poets who can speak of Jupiter if he were a man, but if he is an immense spinning sphere of methane must be silent?"

(quoted in Gleick 1993: 373) Understanding how things work and why expands the powers of the human mind and soul.

There is important territory ahead of us. I believe that we do not need false truth claims and weak arguments to open this world. There is enough genuine pioneering to be done and enough true chaos to explore.

During the course of the workshop, I've played with Thomas Aquinas, Roger Bacon, and Duns Scotus. I have used Albert Einstein, Richard Feynman, and Ignaz Semmelweis as examples, along with Pablo Picasso and Miyamoto Musashi. Marcel Duchamp has made an appearance, and Soren Kierkegaard should have, since he is both a systematic thinker and a poet.

I'll end with Friedrich Nietzsche, who said, "You must have chaos in your soul to give birth to a dancing star."

This is the emptiness at the center of things that gives all things their use.

Here I end until Chris and I return in 2008 to host our new talk show.

I bid you goodnight and thank you for an excellent three weeks.

Warm wishes,

Ken

Dr Ranulph Glanville

United Kingdom

I was very reluctant to write a summary. Apart from anything else, I've not really felt I've done justice to the debate: the usual lack of time and invasion by pressures I can't control. But it seems so many have said this that perhaps this difficulty is, actually, the main theme of the workshop. So I will try to offer at least something.

This isn't really a summary: it's a response to what I've sampled. But I suppose that's a summary of sorts. Apologies to those who think it's inappropriate, or should have been sent earlier. From what I've managed to read and to keep tabs on, I would first like to thank the contributors and, specially, those who set this

workshop up.

Then, I think I should add something about practice and research. I've noticed that several others have used this opportunity to make points that perhaps should have been made during the debate, so here's another.

Working with Leon van Schaik, I have been involved in developing what is called an invitational masters and PhD by practice programme at RMIT University in Melbourne. That's where Daria writes from, but I merely commute there occasionally. I think I should briefly describe this programme because it seems to me to have a different slant and to offer a meaningful and serious alternative of high quality: I did send some paperwork about it to Chris before the workshop began. I have heard many schools claim to do something similar, but on questioning it turns out they are doing a more traditional thesis with a project that illustrates; or they are doing more of the sorts of projects they did as students, but somehow "bigger". So here's my version of how this particular RMIT programme works.

The essential notion is that the appropriate medium for designers to display their achievement in is their practice: and, indeed, there are many who show masters and may develop doctoral achievement. But they do not have a way of showing that their achievement is a masters or doctorate. The question is how to demonstrate and develop this achievement as a masters or doctorate. This means, to identify and develop the research element, and to articulate it appropriately so that the knowledge generated and tested becomes published.

The way in which we do it at RMIT is through an involvement in a process of continuous reflection. I cannot give a full account of all the intricacies, here and procedures, here, but the main one is by consideration of a body of past work, developing new projects through this reflective consideration. Reflection is presented not only at supervisions, but in twice yearly collegial weekends in which, at the moment, around 100 students present work in public session for review by a team of critics. In other words, there are Juries/crits/reviews. (There are several streams and areas: the one I'm discussing would normally have around 12 to 15 presentations.) The medium is generally drawing, modelling, photography, and, of course, words. Over a period of time, a position is developed from which an argument is made that assembles the insights explored and developed in the work a coherent position and allows it to be expressed as knowledge. Eventually this is examined by a panel of 3 examiners (one local, one from elsewhere in Australia, and one from abroad), in public in a gallery, where the work is left on display for around 10 days. (See below for details.)

The collegiate weekends are enormously draining but also full of energy. They allow for redirection to take place, and a process of continuous guidance from a moderating group (the panel of critics). Their correct name is "Graduate Research Conference." They are big social events for the students and staff, fully catered and with evening events and a plenary summarising session.

The difference between masters and doctorate has two components. The masters is expected to show originality in the work, since that is a major currency of designers. What distinguishes a doctorate is that as well as this, the work is positioned within a context: that is, the originality is demonstrated through positioning the work in relation to other work, demonstrating the originality; and the scale is larger.

The work presented for examination consists of presentation (performance) in an exhibition of the work which directs the viewer towards understanding the connecting argument (thesis) and the original knowledge produced. The exhibition is made up of the projects considered and the outcome projects, presented in such a way that the thesis theme is highlighted. There is a "catalogue" like document of the exhibition, which, in the case of the doctorate, is a substantial document that discusses the work and places it within its context.

Here you find reading lists and so on, that give precedents, surveys of the contemporary situation and so on, as well as the argument expressed in words and images. It is called the "Durable Visual Record" and, with a record of the exhibition and the examination goes into the library as the equivalent of the thesis document. The final, and critical, part of the examination is the presentation of the argument in the exhibition to the panel by the candidate, and the questioning/discussion. In effect, there are three, complementary versions of the work: the exhibition, the Durable Visual Record, and the presentation.

I'm sorry if the masters and doctorate appear confused here. They aren't. I'm just trying to present in a small space a programme that really does work in, through and from practice, but with a level of rigour and examination that is masterly or doctoral.

I believe this is truly a PhD, and has nothing to do with professional doctorates. It requires rigour, articulation, scope, scale, demonstration, testing and publication as would a PhD in any other subject. The difference is that the material is the material of the designer, treated in a manner that both respects it and is sensitive to its particularity.

Althea Greenan

Runs Women's Art Library. Considering studying for PhD, The Women's Art Library (Make), Goldsmith's College, United Kingdom

Three weeks of moderated e-mailings have cultivated a set of voices as familiar as presenters on Talk Radio. I tuned in whenever I could and when I could not keep up with the daily instalments I printed out chunks of correspondence to read at leisure. Thank goodness for the JISC archive of these exchanges.

Despite Inbox overload I welcomed AHRC-WORKSHOP-PL for although moderated these posts were never predictable: some were finely drawn, others baroque, others fired off, typos and all. Ultimately this strategy made the discussion accessible (given a little spare time) to someone who is not formally engaged in research but immersed in it. Work as the de facto curator of a significant research collection meant that keeping the discussion inclusive and yet informed was particularly important to me.

This is why.

I find myself on the sidelines of academia and cultural production and yet drawn to the idea of practice-led research as the only means of consolidating my work. In 2003 this research resource (The Women's Art Library) ceased being a core component of an independent arts organization and was gifted to a research institution to become part of their library's special collections. I was accepted into this institution for my extensive practice-based knowledge of the collection and the general field it informs: contemporary women's art. And ever since, I have been urged to consider formalizing this knowledge by pursuing a PhD. I have nothing more or less than an American MFA in Painting.

My reactions to this suggestion thus far:

[Blush.] Who? Me? Do you really think I'm good enough? Could I really become a Doctor one day?

[Flush.] What! Are you crazy? Sacrificing sanity and solvency just to validate my knowledge in the eyes of the Institution? Forget it. I know what I know and I haven't needed a PhD so far.

[Tremble.] Get away from me! PhD's are the work of the Devil: all Vanity and False Pride. I will content myself with servicing the needs of my honourable researchers and making salmon soup for my children.

[Nod.] Yes you're right, I should, I know, I know, yes you're right, I know, I should. I just haven't had time, too many ideas. Any ideas for a supervisor? No? Yeah well I know I should I know ...

I signed up to the workshop vaguely hopeful for a sign, a cohering idea, and to my surprise along it came. Methodology.

I have been aware of this word ever since I was involved in writing a bid for the AHRC Resource Enhancement grant in 2000. It impressed me as an ugly word then, taunting me from the density of funding grant jargon and describing nothing I could constructively relate to my aspirations for the project. I let my collaborator deal with it (the bid was unsuccessful).

But now in another place, another time, Ken's response to Natalie defined methodology in a way that articulates what I've always had a passion to do, disguised as professional interest. I think I can now conceive of how I might research in a way that is less about accumulating knowledge (I've had enough of being called a walking encyclopedia) than reorienting the research possibilities in my field. I guide researchers at all levels, from the professional curator to the PhD candidate and while it is a pleasure when these visits uncover treasures in the archives, I know that a major subject of the collection, the 'unknown' artist, is being overlooked despite the critical mass of documentation I do have. So at this point it seems that I am duty-bound as a practitioner to step back from my professional engagement because I have reached the point where I need to act on my dissatisfaction with the available methods of working with digitised images of artworks - In other words I need to shape my ongoing and accumulated research on behalf of the research itself.

There lurks within this giddy excitement the idea that the AHRC workshop is suggesting to me that if I do not engage with practice-led research I will no longer have a practice, just a job. Is this good or really the work of the Devil? I recall Josef Albers: "All knowledge, theoretical or practical, is deadwood when it does not result in a positive attitude proved by action.

Back to the workshop: no number of descriptive dictionaries could have revealed methodology to me in this light. It was Natalie's description of her work that engaged my full (including intuitive) attention (I am particularly interested in graphic novels and manga) and this visualization of Natalie's efforts set the stage for Ken's definitions of terms to connect. (Ken invested a lot more than this into the workshop of course, and that remains a given, I trust.)

Other defining moments: Donna Attwood describing her entry into a book arts group as 'ethnographic immersion', Lubomir and the Building Type Guide, David Durling on the rescued researcher, Jez's intervention with Alexei Sayle, Katy McLeod on the idea that the university needs studio practice more than the studio needs the university, Traci Kelly on Kira O'Reilly et al...

Of course there were many gems and the workshop will remain a fragmented experience, perhaps until I articulate the research question that no one else but me will ask. I cherish Ken's reminder: all research begins with private thought. But if you haven't guessed, without the concept of practice-led research I would have rejected the PhD as mere academic accolade. For a start I had no intention of considering a research outcome restricted to the written word, nor do I want to end up with yet another database-to-end-all-databases. But to create a digital project politically, sociologically, historically researched, informed by a methodology with a base line starting with 20 years practice, well, it's no wonder I am getting giddy. Maybe it's the heat, but practice-led research strikes me as a powerful combination, a means towards catalysing changes to the canon.

Where the hell have I been? Methodology. Magic.

Time will tell of course

Many thanks to all, especially Ken, with special thanks to Chris and the moderators behind the scenes...but enough of all that. I've got my prize and I'm off.

With all best wishes

Phillip Hughes

United Kingdom

I have followed this exchange with great interest but have not really been able to participate for several reasons.

1. I am still trying to grips with terms such as "Practice-led research" in relation to art and design, and I really wanted to hear other people talk about it before I made any comment. It's not a term I learnt when at college myself and I recognise that there are a number of issues that I needed explaining before making any comment. Many of my misunderstandings have been addressed by the correspondence.

2. Unfortunately this forum coincides with the graduate shows for most art and design colleges. It is the busiest time of year for many studio tutors such as myself, and I have not really had time to follow the whole correspondence.

However, the issues raised are very interesting. The first issue raised by Chris highlighted a significant challenge for design academics. The most interesting and challenging design work is pursued by practitioners and not by academics. The resources for research, development and construction for big budget contracts like the Millau Bridge are not available to academics - even with an AHRC grant. Pursuing design projects often requires dedicated teams of contractors, engineers, draughtsmen, logistics/project managers and administrative staff. It is a challenge to produce work that has significance in the outside world - when we have teaching commitments and do not have the correct structures to pursue significant projects. Of course, there are lots of examples of successful designers dipping into academia, but these are practitioners who engage occasionally with academia when it suits them - they are usually not academics who are able - between teaching and other commitments - to pursue impactful work outside (Eric Parry being one of the exceptions). It is possible to engage with practice as an academic, but I feel that there are many limitations that constrain the scope of work done inside universities. On the other hand, there is much more time to think about and develop projects over the longer term without an impatient client demanding instant results.

I would like to say that I have enjoyed reading the debate and was very impressed by the patient and inclusive way that it was conducted. There is always a danger that these debates become too focussed around small issues of importance to too few people. Overall, I don't think that has happened. In any case, it is possible to ignore postings that are of marginal interest. Do others agree that the format has worked well? I feel that I have witnessed an interesting debate and yet been able to tune out when I needed to.

Regards

Luís Inácio

Graduate student & Communication Designer, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal

Dear Colleagues

Hope it is not too late.

Because I was not able to follow the discussion in this workshop for the past two weeks I will not follow a summary, but a subjective approach to the little I have read and to what I thought on my own. So please apologise for some misconceptions.

I) The interesting in design research is its extent in research areas/topics, methods, approaches and focus. That is why we have difficulty in clarifying design and its research. This shows us that, from several decades to this point, the research in design is touching almost every area of human knowledge, from computing sciences to social engineering, from medical research to entertainment industries, from nano-technologies to genetic engineering, among others. Even if sometimes the researchers don't recognize it as design.

With that extension of interests, no wonder that we have difficulty in pointing down what kind of research we do, what kind of knowledge we produce, and the method to produce it; it is positive, deductive, inductive, empirical, intuitive? But this sounds limitative for many design researchers, however it is through this traditional epistemological vision (with the science research), which we (despairingly?) try to identify. That happens, in my opinion, because of some complex of inferiority, or more accurately, a "complex of assertion" imbued in various disciplines including design, in order to become recognizable as producers of "true knowledge".

I believe several answers given here in this workshop may be interesting in order to overcome this alleged syndrome. Friedman, in a summary, presented us with some systematic and interesting criteria and classifications on how to endorse research and how should be proposed to funds and help in research, that tries to approach almost every domain in design research. I think this is the way.

II) As I indicate above, we embrace many areas of knowledge even if sometimes the researchers may not recognize that, in those areas, research in design has a significant contribute. That is, it is still dubious for other researchers the value of design research, directly pointing out the problem of how the research is visible to others. In other words, the incapacity of current philosophy of science to give a response to how to classify design in order of knowledge is, in my view, a direct consequence of a not yet encompassed development of philosophy of design, which could approach these problems and be recognizable as discipline by all designers, philosophers and intellectuals.

III) One thing that I think is common to most of the research is teleological approach, whether it is for improve the practice of some disciplines or artefacts, or to invent new approaches to methods, materials, artefacts. To this practice, whether in more artistic, clinical or theoretical in terms (among others), they possess their own language and that is not easily understood for someone that has no idea what is happening, or— as many times happens — even the practitioners of that exact discipline don't understand— or more accurately, don't follow, because is "a waste of time" —, the evolution of that discipline research.

This, in my opinion, has to do with what Wittgenstein called, the "language games", where everything is understood in a particular set of use of the language. A practice-led research language game is accessible and completely understood to the ones who were trained to that language, who are accustomed to the rules and meaning of that language. But that same language is not understood to the ones who are out of that specific "language game". So, research becomes a discourse hermetically close to the ones who speak/understand that "language game". We need to "jump" across other "language games" in order to articulate our discourse to other groups, namely the professionals, and mostly, to a wide audience, to the public in general.

IV) Other problem is that most of the research is independently done in private companies, studios, or stand-alone researchers. And are not easily communicated to fellow practitioners because of the obvious restrictions (this is not only a problem of design research).

I, for example, do my own kind of theoretical research about design, but I am not included in some department of design of some school or in any design firm. Almost like a "freelancer" design researcher. And because I have chosen a theoretical approach, I have felt the need to endorse, in addition to my graduation in communication design, a follow up in my studies in a graduation of

philosophy, in order to consolidated my expertise on this field. A problem to this method is, like to most individual or artistic approaches, the lack of means to an effective communication of the research to the design community.

(Curiously, one thing that I also have perceived during this graduation of philosophy (that is, in a environment disconnected to design in opposition to my latest graduation), is that, at least here in Portugal, design does not evoke any kind of curiosity, or an a priori knowledge, of the problems that design instigates. This does not support the contaminations of various areas of knowledge in order to advance and support better research.)

Daria Loi

Senior Research Fellow (Globalism Institute), Lecturer (Industrial Design Program)

Lecturer (Industrial Design Program, RMIT University), RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

[incredibly, 1075 words....]

Dear colleagues,

Firstly, I would like to reiterate how much I enjoyed and learned from this workshop. It has been an inspiring and refreshing experience, so I wish to thank our lovely hosts/organisers and all colleagues for their contributions. Over the 3 weeks we have followed a number of threads and in this email I will attempt at (not hierarchically) summarising only some.

A first point which was evident in some posts is related to the relationships between conducting practice-led research and improvements in researchers' creativity and research capabilities. This should reassure many, especially those practitioners that are still unsure whether they should or not undertake research endeavours due to assumptions (and related fear) around the nature and practice of research.

Another point relates to the importance of disseminating research and related roles of academia/institutions. Lubomir expressed this very clearly in his summary, so I won't repeat it – he did it brilliantly.

A third point which was identified through a number of posts relates to the 'perils' associated with conducting practice-led research and the need for supportive and purposeful infrastructures. On the other hand however, most contributions balanced various 'perils' by providing encouraging reasons for undertaking this type of research endeavours. This point relates to the first I mentioned.

Then, the hot debate on defining practice-led research and its territory... as one of many relevant contributions, Rosan offered the view that examples are "better viewed as discussion topics that help us come to an agreement". Then Chris highlighted that "the term "practice-led" is a convenience that allows us space to work out the research practices appropriate to our disciplines", adding "I will be very happy if we reach a point when we just say that we are doing research and we have a developing set of theories and practices of research that are appropriate to our disciplines".

Many contributions articulated (explicitly and non-explicitly) that we are (perhaps thankfully) still slightly distant from agreeing on an ultimate set of definitions and related criteria – thankfully as I feel we need more time and opportunities to further clarify and reflect on our understandings of practice-led research (through practice, theory and the space between the two).

This, far from being a negative observation, represents in my view an opportunity to embrace, work and reflect on, play and experiment with... (and the list goes

on).

Then, how can we forget Pablo? Picasso's PhD sparked amazing reactions, although it dragged on for way too long (so I'll stop now about this topic, as we copiously contributed to this debate – way beyond any reasonable digestive system).

The being an academic debate – a maybe 'side-tracking' yet very important area – was discussed by many. Donna and Ken offered for instance very interesting comments on this point. Within this divide (and apologies for the over-simplifications here), some believe that culture is known by the works of its artists, while others stress that, although artists do greatly contribute to culture, their work might not be considered research as such.

Perhaps the divide is not reconcilable – my feeling is that this irreconcilability could be a very healthy thing (but again, I do tend to see possibilities everywhere).

Some discussed their works (although I wished we had more of them) and a wide range of disciplinary and intra-disciplinary perspectives emerged. Examples included for instance Christina Edwards work on 19th century photographic processes and their employment by contemporary practitioners; Natalie Dekel's research on "popular animation films and the way authorship is embedded even in a commercial form of animation"; Gillian Wilson's research interest "not actually grounded in 'creative practice' as such, although I use creative practice as a vehicle through which to develop an understanding about the nature of non-traditional learners and hopefully to encourage them to realise that they are as capable of competing in the art and design arena as anyone else"; and Poldma Tiiu's research using design, but necessarily not to "practice my art".

Apologies here, as I am aware that more examples were provided but I could not re-read all posts (although I actually did try).

Donna raised questions which many felt sympathy for: if research is to inform and benefit even those outside academia or the field of art investigated (a part of the justification for public funding), shouldn't the results be accessible to outsiders? Doesn't their expression in non-accessible language inhibit the transfer of the "news" to those outside who might make use of it? Has anyone else noticed the contrast between how researchers talk about their work in day-to-day face-to-face encounters with each other and how they write about it in "the appropriate journals" and thought the first much more stimulating?

Donna's questions clearly hint at the divide between practice and academia I mentioned earlier (and now I will over-simplify and over-emphasise the divide between 'practitioners', 'academics' and related definitions to make I hope a constructive point).

Each time I participate to debates on practice-led research and related themes, I notice an inexorably present language-divide between practitioners and academics. I too often experienced situations where the 'academic lingo' intimidated practitioners to the point that their voices remained unheard. These can be frustrating experiences for those who believe (as I do) that there is much to be learned from 'both parties' and that both sides are anyway interdependent. (...but maybe my views are a product of the fact that I am a sort of 'hybrid' when it comes to the space between practice and theory – at least this is what I am told).

However, in this workshop practitioners managed to offer some of their views (sometimes 'bite back') and as a result we often achieved a more realistic balance – which I must admit, I was pleased to observe/read.

In any case, my belief around this matter is that the divide should be addressed – by BOTH parties – whatever that means and requires. Of course, my 'should be addressed call' has a meaning only if we share the belief that we need to find meaningful ways to move on and collectively contribute to practice-led research – as a debate and a way of undertaking/thinking about research.

Finally, a note about the workshop as an artifact...

I enjoyed the numerous attempts at making this workshop a human environment, despite its virtual nature. Informal discussions surely helped me to 'fell at home'; together with our hosts' care in ensuring all would respect each other's opinions and ways of articulating themselves.

Once more, thank you.

Lucy Lyons

PhD student, Wimbledon / Sheffield Hallam, United Kingdom

At the beginning of this project, Chris Rust said,

'The aim of the workshop is to gather in ideas about practice-led research in art, design and architecture and to provoke some debate which may move our thinking forward in a more general way.'

Well, it worked. This workshop has given us all the rare opportunity of allowing us as students, established academics, educators and practitioners to contribute and debate on an equal playing field. Equal in contribution, and importantly in accessibility. These three weeks have produced a vast on line database of information, opinions, examples (recipes!) and insights from the broad area termed practice-led research. And it's free. A research student at the very beginning of their PhD studies can be directed to a great source of 'real life' experiences on the subject of practice-led research. This is an incredibly exciting and useful achievement.

The format of moderated debate worked well bringing together challenging and conflicting views as well as fascinating descriptions and references in a more or less chronological order.

On the subject of research itself, Ken Friedman's description of research as being 'the journeyman's licence for research practice,' and as needing to make an original contribution seem very clear and David Durling raised a point similar to my own concerns about the actual term practice-led research. I have never been comfortable with the description practice (will I improve if I keep practising?) and I also wonder if I am engaged with research-led practice rather than practice-led research. And why can't we just say we are undertaking research without the practice-led bit? 'in theory practice follows theory, in practice theory follows practice' (from <http://aces.shu.ac.uk/ahrc/index.php>)

Many aspects of how we do research and opinions on whether they are valid as research have been discussed over the weeks. I'm of the opinion if the tool is right for the job then that's what matters as long as you show it as clear, rigorous and transferable.

But for me, two discussions sum up the diversity and breadth of issues and ideas brought to the debate by such an interesting range of people. That is Jane Austen's knickers and the three page thesis.

The former raised by Martin Salisbury (the topic, not the underwear itself) and the latter by Ken. The idea of wondering if nowadays you might be awarded a PhD, for just for guessing the colour of Jane Austen's knickers when maybe the author herself should be awarded a doctorate, struck a far stronger chord for me than the Picasso's PhD debate. Is there a notion that someone is somehow worthy enough to have a doctorate bestowed upon them? Of course Austen shouldn't receive a doctorate. She wrote novels. That isn't research.

And I am entranced by the notion of the 3 page thesis. The ability to express new knowledge so succinctly and precisely appeals greatly. Now if this was a formula that proved categorically a new system for always being able to precisely

calculate the colour of someones underwear, then maybe a PhD would be given to the underwear investigating researcher, though the ethics of where and how he carried out his tests may come into question.

I am busy preparing for the Research into Practice conference tomorrow so haven't been as detailed as I would have liked. Thank you for a really useful and hugely enjoyable forum. I am curious as to how the information will be used and analysed and in what form this will manifest itself. I look forward to the next instalment...

Thanks

Katy Macleod

School of Art & Performance, University of Plymouth, United Kingdom

Dear Chris,

I have missed the deadline but felt I should attempt to add to the many summary contributions. I shall thank you both now for a terrific, extended conversation.

1. Purposes of the PhD

The main purpose must be to advance knowledge in a specified field. The doctorate must demonstrate that knowledge has indeed been advanced. It is therefore reflexive both internally and within its field. The trickier question, perhaps is how is this to be accomplished. A simple answer might be by recognising its category form, that is its distinguishing form. The definition of the PhD form cannot be permanently fixed.

How can it be? However, the approach taken by Phillips and Pugh (1994 pps 56-60) has been tested out by PhD students I and my colleagues teach here, at the University of Plymouth. P&P state that there are 4 elements to a PhD form: background theory; focal theory; data theory; and contribution. The background theory is the field within which the research is conducted; the focal theory is the particular study being conducted, its precise nature and rationale; the data theory is the validation of the research, that is the substantive evidencing of the value of the study; and the contribution is an account of how the study adds to the field and, as P&P indicate, the development of the discipline. From this, we must deduce that a PhD student needs, (at some point), to know their field, the purposes of their research and its methods of evidencing its value both to that field and to the host discipline.

The research methods adopted must be appropriate to the study; whether there is a survey of a range of methods in the process of adopting one primary method is of less importance than its fitness to purpose, that is its capacity to demonstrate and validate its own purposes.

The primary purpose of the individual PhD study is to have fully understood itself: its own purposes, rationale and outcome(s) in a specified context.

I cannot envisage what the purpose might be of studying a range of research methods, unless the study specifically requires it. This brings to mind a marvellously illuminating PhD methodological statement written by Jim Mooney, entitled:

"Research in Fine Art by Project: General Remarks Toward Definition and Legitimation of Methodologies." (Publication pending, University of Middlesex). It begins by quoting Roland Barthes (1977 p20) "Some people talk avidly, demanding of method; what they want in work is method, which can never be too rigorous or too formal for their taste. Method becomes a Law but since that Law is devoid of any effect outside itself....it is infinitely disappointed; posing as a pure meta-language, it partakes of the vanity of all meta-language....No surer way to kill a piece of research and send it to join the great wastes of abandoned

projects than Method.”

(omissions mine, simply because of limited time!) In this elegant methodological essay, Mooney sets out the purposes, rationale and scope of his doctoral enquiry within both its field and the discipline of Fine Art. I can think of many other examples of doctoral studies which set out their purposes through a methodology devised according to the requirements of the study. Some of them are included in the “Art & Design Index to Theses”. Most of these methodologies are hard won as the methodology has been constructed out of the requirements of the study enquiry.

The purpose of doctoral research is to have fully understood the study undertaken.

The purpose of doctoral research is to have been humbled by your lack of knowledge.

The purpose of doctoral research is to have understood what it is to conduct disinterested enquiry.

The purpose of doctoral research is to join a community of scholars, (the most interesting of whom may well not identify themselves as such).

The purpose of doctoral research is to lose any sense of what it is you’re studying while you search for findings which make sense.

The purpose of doctoral research is to lose your individual, egotistical involvement in order to reveal the objects of your study.

The purpose of doctoral research is to hope that you might add a tiny piece to a jigsaw which is as yet un-configured by someone else.

The purpose of doctoral research is to extend your mind...what could that possibly mean? All of the above and much more, perhaps.

In “The HypoCritical Imagination Between Kant and Levinas” (2000), John Llewelyn, a distinguished Kantian scholar, ponders the extraordinary capacity of the imagination, which might not simply relate to the rational capacity and the moral respect outlined by Kant in his “Critique of Practical Reason” but beyond all three of the “Critiques” to an ethical encounter with that which is experienced in daily living. The PhD takes us beyond ourselves: it marks a critical return to that which we know, or thought we knew.

To imagine in a tight, conceptual frame. Rigour is exercised in tight corners by the passionate enquirer, or so it occurs to me in response to PhDs in the field.

The logic comes after the event. After the rendezvous, as Duchamp would have it, the co-efficient of the gesture (object?) and its interpretation.

What we write reflects how we inhabit our world(s): do we wonder or do we postulate?

Can we do both? Do our enquiries elicit different modes for different times? In the face of postulations I wonder and in the face of wonderings, I am drawn to postulate. What we do is always in relation to what has been done. Can we ever get behind what has been done, in Derridean fashion?

2. To the purpose:

We will learn what the research cultures of Art and Design are by studying what has been produced. All my imaginings of what might be, particularly in relation to the possibilities for writing/art, (an entity of art and writing), are based on what I’ve found out about PhDs, mostly in Fine Art. Each of the PhDs I’ve studied has distinct purposes. The ones I’ve enjoyed studying do have a form which can be aligned to Phillips and Pugh’s model. This does not mean that a piece of string might not also be an encounter with chance.....

To sum up, then, we cannot assume that serious PhD study will find its methodological purposes through studying research methods. We can, however,

assume that serious research study will find its appropriate methodological form because it will be fully cognisant of its purposes. Those purposes will include its contribution to its field and its host discipline. These purposes will be posited, or spelt out. How they are posited will, in my view, remain an open question. That is my absolute and passionate conviction!

Sarah Moss

PhD student, Creativity and Cognition Studios, UTS (Sydney, Australia), Australia

Dear Ken, Chris, Mark,

Congratulations and thanks for the conversation during the past three weeks, although its dominated my inbox i've taken time out whilst I eat, to read the messages. What is it with food and thought? Could be the energy of food and thought combined assists in the digestion of the matter... Regardless, i have enjoyed this process and not felt compelled to add my two bits mainly because i'm shy....and new to the area of practice based research.

I have just started my exploration into art, science and technology in a PhD at Creativity and Cognition Studios, UTS (Sydney, Australia), working with Professor Ernest Edmonds <http://www.ernestedmonds.com>

POSTs I favoured...

From: intuitive@MAC.COM (David Durling)
Subject: Re: [AHRC-WORKSHOP-PL] Day three (with help from Rosan)
Date: 29 June 2006 7:14:55 PM

I enjoyed the debate that centered around the term 'practice-led'. As a 'newbe' i have wondered about those many terms and definitions and if they really intend to offer anything other than the same outcome. Donald A. Schon in his book, 'The Reflective Practitioner. How professionals think in action' (1983) addresses the application of professional knowledge and reflection in action to the reflective practice of creative research PhD's. Now thanks to both Schon and you mob I am closer to considering myself to be an Artist / Researcher who employs a creative practitioner methodology. To become a part of the in-group rather than feel like an 'other' is a grounding place to start. It allows one to become stronger as identity is assured and not diminished.

From: C.Rust@shu.ac.uk
Subject: [AHRC-WORKSHOP-PL] Last Day
Date: 30 June 2006 7:56:58 AM

Candy and Edmonds in their book 'Explorations in Art and Technology' examine "...the creative process in action through the eyes of practitioners and researchers. The book explores the fascinating relationship between artist and technologist through studies of innovative projects that push the boundaries of digital art." In discussing the "toolkit" of research practices" Chris should, I think, include this work as a primary source data. It is definitely a useful resource that describes actual research practices. You may like to have a quick look on our website

<http://www.creativityandcognition.com>

videos explaining our work will appear soon!

Whilst eating and reading i choose various postings to save. I note 5 postings saved in my Methodology folder. Useful stuff. I am wondering how, if i should ever need to, would i reference these postings?

Thanks for asking me what i think. Oh and i enjoyed the banter re soccer - this soccer business has dominated my sleeping schedule and thus my life with it's imposing 3am games - I shall be rather glad when it's over - mind you the older i get the more i find i enjoy the global aspect; the sharing , the communal joy (and sadness). One looks at all the other fools with bags under their eyes and smiles...it's good to share :)

Thanks for sharing and good luck in compiling the data. Please keep us posted.

Cheers,

Sarah

References

Candy, L. and Edmonds, E.A., (2002)'Explorations in Art and Technology'. Springer-Verlag, London

Schon, Donald A. (1983) 'The Reflective Practitioner. How professionals think in action' . New York. Basic Books, Inc.,Publishers

Utku Omeroglu

MA student, Bahcesehir Universiy, İstanbul, Turkey

Dear Drs and All,

Firstly, I would like to reiterate how much I enjoyed and learned from this workshop. It has been an inspiring and refreshing experience, so I wish to thank our lovely hosts/organisers and all colleagues for their contributions. I would like to apologise for not being able to read every post in depth during the conference, like others I have had to dip in and out to maintain strange business as usual.

I know Professor Rust and Friedman and some other doctors were a bit disturbed our back coffie place.

My summarize would provide from Drs and Practitioners Rust,Friedman, Ranulph, Greenan, Dekel, Birringer, Reader, Corte , Donna, Cristina, Daria, Lubamir and others.... just summarize however, i learned more from Friedman's cooking performances that made me think and laugh a lot. and showed me a way of more direct, general,clear and short summarize with Professor Rust.

One of the important parameter is practice-led an/or based design/research,at last speaks for itself and sometimes, Reader wrote in his summarize 'I'm not sure if it's because I work in adult education that I tend to view the context as much as the content, or whether it is something from art, like painting for Whiteley, who believed form was inseparable from content.' Let's dream bank robberers as a part of our life painting, is it out of content? What are the content of these criminals? Answer may not out of context of learning mediums'love potential and production and their's spreading power.

My problem with practice-led research and doctoral studies is real and it is basically depend on mutual learning, sharing and to be able to recognize and produce the potential of love and will to power both immanent and trancedently in interactive and affective way.

I participate in the Johannes Birrringer performing arts are creative practices'observations. Although, handsproje and/or (design) is a methodologic construction as well as artifical philosopy production (as Mr Corte pointed, i remember) is not officially academic design however, the emphasize is the critical (and reflexive) rather than the creative/experimental processes of artmaking or performance making and in my opinion, this critical (and self reflexive) way is coming from academic traditions.

At last, i see the theories lack of practices as many practitioners/designers and i

am engaging to try to make a contribution to some proposed theories. However, this is and/or if accepted can be a transitional work in between art, performance ethnography, visual anthropology, media arts, activist art etc... as again Johannes Birringer pointed and only then we can claim it is at Phd level research. It is clear there is divergence between Fine Artists' and Designers' and Architects' as Dr Edward Pointed. And, i admire these divergences of all of practitioners to learn and understand more about life, art, science and universes.

At last, to realize a design is now more than in between space-time arts and humanities approach, a meeting line with all your contributions which i am still one by one with names collecting in my dossier for my own and hands design future studies...

Yes, It's a meeting...It's a meeting across disciplines, countries, cultures, characters space-times.....

Dr Owain Pedgley

Senior Research Associate, Loughborough University, United Kingdom

[Words: 1328]

Dear Chris, Ken, Mark and List

First off, congratulations on making the AHRC-PL list a success and eliciting from its members such a wide ranging, informed and informative series of postings. Just like others, I do have to admit to being defeated in the latter stages in not being able to keep up.

I will need to return to the archives at some point in the future for a second round of digestion, perhaps accompanied by a serving of Ranulph's fruity fool.

I will take an especially pragmatic perspective in giving my reflection and summary, and will separate it into four reasonably bite-size chunks.

1. Designing and Researching within One Boat I have always understood 'practice-led research' and its cousin 'practice-based research' to refer, very specifically, to research inquiry that utilises the researcher's own design practice (or art practice, architectural practice etc.) for research gain. In other words, how can a researcher design something – carry out a design project – and use his/her design activity (inquiry) and design outcomes (artefacts) to intentionally and demonstrably generate a contribution to a body of knowledge? I offer this as a fair working description of the specific approach to design research that Bruce Archer labelled 'research through design[ing]'. Judging from the postings to the AHRC-PL list, however, this definition is too specific to catch the community's broader interpretation of practice-led research. Many alternatives have been given. But I think broader interpretations, especially those where it is not contingent on a researcher to engage in their design specialism, serve to mute some very powerful messages that need to be more clearly said and understood.

It is worth remembering that much (most?) design research is carried out by people who would not profess to be designers. You don't need to design in order to deliver high-quality research, for example, into other people's designing, into the efficacy and desirability of products, or into the effectiveness of newly devised design guidelines. But where's the continuity, sense, satisfaction, or empowerment in that for a design graduate? Indeed, other specialists, such as social scientists, psychologists and technologists might be better placed to conduct such enquiries.

Sure, designers can bring to the table special insights and perspectives, but to use some aviation metaphors they will need to pack a whole new suitcase of research tools (rather than carry-on luggage) and leave their suitcase of design skills at the research check-in as excess baggage. I'm a firm believer that

through forums such as this, and through on-going dissemination of examples, we can offer a much more attractive and relevant mode of research to trained designers, in which their existent design skills are shown to be integral to the completion and success of their research.

The crux, first mentioned to me by Bob Jerrard at the Birmingham town meeting earlier in the year, is that research through designing – where the researcher carries out a design project subservient to their research aims and objectives – is the means for academic-minded designers to take ownership of design research, and start to complement and challenge research performed by non-designers. This is why I insist that 'practice-led research in art, design and architecture', if it is to be useful as a differentiated term, should refer to research in which the researcher, to a greater or lesser degree, also assumes the role of industrial designer, graphic designer, new media designer, artist, architect etc. Chris's example opened my eyes to the fact that a curator of art (whose practice is, naturally, curating) could also integrate his/her curatorial practices into research in a similar manner. So you can be involved in creative practices that support art and design, but not be a designer or artist, and still participate in this empowering agenda: research through curating.

2. Coordinating Designing and Researching

Once you reach a position of contentedness with designing and researching in the same boat, how you then structure the research to incorporate your own design practice is a matter of fascinating detail. My feet are mostly in the positivist camp. Through the list postings I could detect two broad roles that a researcher could adopt. I have been involved with research (for PhDs) that fit into both categories. My own PhD fits the first.

Dual role = [designer] + [researcher], i.e. involving two nominally separable activities of designing and researching, where a design project is activated and deactivated at will as an agent to meeting research aims and objectives.

Compound role = [designer-researcher], i.e. involving one nominally inseparable activity of designing as researching, tempered (vitality) by responsibilities incumbent on an academic researcher that are not incumbent on a designer.

In reality, and inevitably, for both roles, the designing feeds the researching and vice versa, in a synergistic way. The compound role implies that a synergy is actively sought, even though the mechanism for its achievement is not explicit. These role descriptions are useful as tools for planning research, even if on the ground things are a little less transparent. I'm not convinced the list has seen any examples of people planning, achieving and articulating these synergies though. The paper by Wolfgang Jonas that Rosan Chow pointed out might make some headway in this regard (on the reading list...).

3. Who Are These [Designer]+[Researcher]s and [Designer-Researcher]s?

A very interesting point that was raised in the list concerned the effect of the academic environment on pursuing a design project. This is highly relevant to research through designing and is useful to reiterate.

My experience is that the people who carry out research through designing are trained designers who have chosen their workplace to be the environs of academia, either as teaching/research staff or as students studying for a research degree. Sure, academia is not the place of 'real designers' who live, breathe and make a living from designing things. But as designers within academia, we do strive to keep in touch, to align and develop our design skills with those in contemporary design consultancies, and to generate good designs and critique. Our designing may come with some freedoms not afforded in the commercial world, and this may be arguably good or bad, but in all fairness the design act amongst commercial and academic designers – especially at a cognitive level – is probably not that different. In this respect, we can regard design practice in an academic setting as comparable, though not directly equivalent, to design practice in a commercial setting, and I don't think we need get too hung up about

the authority of academic design practice, so long as we acknowledge the conditioning that inevitably applies.

4. Postscript

Without a larger volume of plain and simple examples of works-in-progress and works completed, we are, quite ironically for a field of inquiry purporting the power of practical action (designing), in danger of falling victim to the saying 'when all is said and done, there's always more said than done' (anyone have the citation?) But I think the AHRC-PL review is extremely timely and well placed to move the legitimacy and acceptance of practice-led research many rungs up the proverbial research ladder. By pulling together examples to be shown on the AHRC-PL website, and by distilling the contributions from the forum and town meetings, Chris and his team can make a clear case that what we're really talking about in all this is simply another legitimate way of doing research that carries its own strengths and weaknesses, just as any other, but which is empowering and engaging for trained designers. Indeed, PL-research in design could help as a catalyst for design-skilled researchers to bring useful new methods of practical inquiry to quite diverse research fields, outside of their original design specialism. Good luck, and thanks again!

And thanks to all the list members who have given their time to read this.

Regards

Owain Pedgley

Prof Tiiu Poldma

Associate professor, School of Industrial Design, University of Montreal, Canada

I really appreciated the workshop, and in particular the openness of the conversations, discussions and insights into the various topics discussed. There are so many varieties of practice-led and /or project-led research that pinning down a set of 'rules' or practices is somewhat difficult. I hope that this is not the goal, as research and knowledge-seeking are open-ended endeavours in my mind.

Although I really enjoyed the discussions (despite my limited time and contributions), I felt that the discussions got bogged down in the theorising and defining of the stance of a particular researcher. I would have liked to have seen a setting of parameters in that regard, and more of an in-depth presentation by the participants of specific examples and projects of practice-led research itself. We had few examples from the various participants – in particular project examples from the students, which is a shame as we could never contextualize our discussions in the more 'concrete' issues of the practice itself. As someone with a keen interest in integrating theory with practice, understanding the 'how' as much as the 'why' is of particular interest. We did get this sense from the fine arts examples, but it would have been nice to get more examples from the diverse fields taking part, including architecture, industrial design, etc....

I realize this happened due to the open nature of the workshop; however, as has been mentioned by many already, the defining of what we do seems to get bagged down in particular stances. While it is vital to set our own particular perspective at the outset, I feel that we should move on and delve into more in-depth research-related issues – why we do what we do, how, etc.

I think that there are still misconceptions about the goals of Ph.D. research as Research in many design and art fields, and as a designer who literally 'learned' how to do Ph.D. level research, I say this with all due respect to all those who

engage in research at all different levels and in all different types of arts-related disciplines.

Perhaps a more in-depth discussion of the underlying values that shape the different perspectives would be a way to get at the issues in a holistic manner, while respecting the varied perspectives involved. A second issue is that of research methods and practices. If we cannot engage in a common research language and do so with a certain level of rigour and ethics, then we cannot presume to know how to do research, let alone practice-led research.

I for one have never used the term 'practice-led' research, even though some of the research that I do does fall into this 'category' – we call this type of research in our institution 'applied' (French translation). I prefer to think of my research in these instances as 'design-driven' or 'design-project led', wherein the design issues drive the research. However, in most of these projects, I try to build in ethical considerations, rigour and practices that stand the test of standard academic research practices – they are never 'works of art' in the fine arts sense. Perhaps this is one of the differences between art and design after all: in design research, I like to think that part of what we do is to aim to create better lived situations for people. As a designer/researcher, I am interested in solving a human problem situated in the interior physical environment and affected by objects and human interactions in space and time. Using research and design to provide/discover ways to change/improve the human condition includes understanding the ethical, moral and human implications, not just aesthetic ones.

This is a personal summary of thoughts and I do hope that this workshop does continue again the future. My kudos to all of the organisers and highly intellectual contributions that made this really interesting and worthwhile!

Prof Lubomir Popov

Associate professor in interior design, architecture, Bowling Green State University, Ohio, United States of America

Dear Friends,

It was an inspiring discussion and a great workshop. I appreciate the new perspectives that were presented and the participation of so many colleagues. For me this is an exciting experience.

I will start with a little envy about the good grant opportunities for art faculty in UK. In this respect, the requirements for engaging in "heavy-duty" research are not that imposing and the institutions are actually pretty sensitive regarding the natural inclinations of visual artists to practice their art rather than talk about it. However, with the present organization of funding, research activities are one major way to get support for academics. This general tendency to engage in research has substantial benefits for art faculty as well: they become more introspective, more apt to develop personal art philosophies, more capable to reflect and to express their philosophy and method and communicate them to their students, and so forth.

The most difficult part is to start. Later, it becomes a second nature, or at least a pretty tolerable responsibility. Several colleagues noticed considerable improvement in their creativity after they started research activities.

Practice-led research is probably one of the best formats for starting art research in academia. It connects in a natural way the artist, the oeuvre, the reflection, the critical position, the explication of personal philosophy and method, etc. Every artist has a personal philosophy and specific method -- they are usually not explicated.

There is a philosopher in every good artist. The issue is to let the philosopher talk.

Many artists have done that and we have their books, in addition to their artwork. We all know that these people have left the strongest marks in the history of art, and in some ways their books have contributed to this as well. (Of course, there are a lot of exceptions, but the exception proves the rule.) Many artists did not publish their work philosophies, but they have disseminated them in the oral tradition of the Paris cafes or other places of artistic communities.

The whole situation boils down to the social necessity for explicating, organizing, and disseminating good practices, passing the achievements of one generation to another. In the modern times, this is the role of academia and the institutions that are created to generate and disseminate knowledge and skills.

A good program of study in art theory and criticism can provide the foundations for scholarly development. Artists who are already in academia have all these chances, although at the price of some sacrifices. Of course, there are some issues of spending time on the requirements of dominant research practices (paradigms). For some people it may seem that these activities are a waste of time. I bet that even physicists have such moments and are not pretty happy with all activities in their research life - there are too many routine and boring tasks. The same is for art faculty – they will have to spend time on a number of courses which will allow them to work according to the required formats of the funding institutions. However, there will be one more benefit, and it will be even more substantial – the higher level of studies will reinforce professional development and will open new ways for envisaging art and artistic practice. I am aware that for some colleagues this process will be painful and they will have to make difficult decisions. However, the present discussion provides a lot of indications that our colleagues are ready to embark on this journey, and for many of them this is already an inspiring experience.

Although there are many ways to begin, the current discussion suggests one very natural and already tested approach for starting the research process. We already saw several websites where artists have displayed their work, and in addition, they have provided text about their concepts, explanations about what they wanted to achieve, as well as personal philosophies of art.

This is the substance -- the creative work is the most important element of faculty development and potential. The programs of study will help to enhance it and reformat it according to the century-long research traditions and the requirements of the funding institutions.

Kind regards,

Paul Reader

Art and Learning Networks, University of New England, Australia

Summary

At first thought a summary seemed very essentialist, but then perhaps I could approach it more as a reflection on a personal journey – a broken journey because time did not allow me to give my full attention to the conference, and I think I still could use more time to go back into the posts and obtain further understanding. I'm not sure if it's because I work in adult education that I tend to view the context as much as the content, or whether it is something from art, like painting for Whiteley, who believed form was inseparable from content.

At the beginning there was a call for examples and these were warmly welcomed. I was a little confused because I had overlooked that fact that the case study area was not generally available, and therefore it was still necessary to make fresh introductions, (which I omitted). It would have been useful to have case studies on the site available, given people had already contributed their case studies (I assume). That would have provided a very different starting point.

The provision of examples slowly began to meet with critique and this led an exploration of “research” and academia right to the farm gate. Having looked again at Kuhn I would still claim the Structure of Scientific Revolutions supports a non-linear view of academic progress, but it is also true that the motive of Kuhn’s inquiry was indeed to stop past science becoming myth. The academic myth to which I referred was not science but more like the textbook histories of science that disguised the nature of scientific revolution.

Anyway, this phase of the conference highlighted for me two paradigms of learning that I saw operating; the tight academic critique and situated learning as people were prepared to take risks and share in the knowledge building. To back track a little, even in the position papers, it was apparent there was a particular approach to “practice led” and “research” central to the way the conference opened. If we take Sullivan’s understanding (p.83) this particular approach was historically born out of identity crisis and the question of whether when artists work in universities, they do research as well as teach.

Ken gave us something of that history too, also underscored by two of the background papers.

As the conference progressed however, discussion seemed to reveal that a view of practice as distinct from research overlooked, or at least de-emphasised, the possibility of art being a mode of inquiry. From some quarters the conference heard that this form of inquiry has not been the experience in art and design institutions, instead we heard of false claims, too easily made for art as research. That in itself does not mean that art cannot be a mode of inquiry, the like of which the review sought to discover in its request for examples.

Towards the end of the conference there were comments that perhaps the conference had only just begun to get to substance of the issue of practice led research, and I would agree. In the last days the conference progressed to a discussion around qualitative research methods and teaching postgraduate researchers such methods. This however still falls short of recognising the possibility of art itself as the means for inquiry into the human condition. Art’s history of inquiry that predates science.

Katy McLeod, pointed directly to the problem of practice based doctorates, which do not distinguish practice based research from professional doctorates as might be issued long serving professionals in other disciplines, who do not do research.

So along the journey I saw (and my vision’s by no means perfect); conflation of practice based degrees, practice based or led research and research degrees and also some teasing out from this conflation, similarly there seemed to be some confusion around research, research inside higher education training and scholarship. The distinction made between the AHRC definition and RAE definition was instructive, because the RAE spells out the relative independence of research, with scholarship being only one aspect.

The conference impressed upon me the different research practice needed in architecture or design from that in art, but also that there is a need to separate out discipline specific research, such as into materials, from shared research interests such as aesthetics. This seemed to relate to Rendell’s abstract also provided in the background papers. By its close the conference was getting towards the question; what type of research is needed in society now? To me it is clear; science has underpinned the success of materialism and capitalism, to the point that materialism has become recognisably pathogenic. Educators, like Edmond O’Sullivan, bell hooks, Finger and Asún and many others say we need to focus on ‘learning our way out’ or ‘remembering ourselves to our sensuous surroundings’ and becoming more intimate with life.

This sounds to me like work for the artist researchers who already have a mandate to inquire into the human condition. As an alternative one could argue that artists in the Renaissance and before were merely visual aids providers for religious instruction, and perhaps that remains part of the problem; some art is

just for looking at, while some art-making is part of serious inquiry. It seems it will be quite a while before artistic inquiry in universities has true parity with science; the post-modern obsession with reality constructed in language probably extenuates the situation. If artistic inquiry can survive a little longer, and if the AHRC can support the study of how artists work - as Sullivan (p.84) suggests, from the insider perspective of the artist - then perhaps in time the capacity of art-making to provide a more useful type of research will come strongly to the fore. In the meantime the shift or doubling up of research from practice to exegesis and via other stratagems will probably have to continue a little longer. As Ken and his colleagues said; "Content makes the PhD thesis a record of research. The medium of transmission can vary" (background paper p12-14) so perhaps there is opportunity yet.

I know that I have a rather divergent style when it comes to these kind of events, and it must at times be infuriating to those who seek to converge on one issue. Likewise I in turn have to resist reading convergence as attempts to shut down questions that I sense should be left open for dwelling on longer. I would also like to apologise for not being able to read every post in depth during the conference, like others I have had to dip in and out to maintain business as usual, if not with my PhD, then with clients (the joys of private enterprise!) I must admit when I signed up for this conference I had no idea I would get so involved, I'm not even sure exactly why I did, but perhaps there is a strong consonance between my own doctoral research into painting as learning within adult education and what is happening with this problem of practice-led research. I would foreshadow my PhD submission by identifying that for adult education painting can be indicative of what I see as a new "silent paradigm" of learning. As Ken has pointed out learning is not research, but I see the possibility of working from a learning paradigm to a research paradigm as probably more a matter of time, and given enough time (though not in my thesis!) there could be a possibility for something like ineffable research, if it does not already exist somewhere.

So I have probably just diverged again, just when I was supposed to be summarizing. (that's two red cards in the same match, but I think you can get away with that in England)

Thanks again for a really insightful conference,

Paul Reader

Picasso Postscript:

I can't leave without another personal insight. In the middle of the conference I did a quick web-search to see if I could find some background on that troublesome Picasso doctorate. Guess what? My research skills were not up to the task in the time available; I couldn't get past the haze of all those other doctorates and honorary awards granted on the back of Picasso's work.

I'm not sure if we should have struggled on into the workspace of the painter in search for meaning behind those coffee table books, but there has to be some limit to divergence. I suspect however there is a new maxim coming from the conference; Don't rattle a Minotaur's cage, if you don't want to create a long thread of unusable posts....

Zoe Sadokierski

PhD student, academic & design practitioner, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Zoe Sadokierski, PhD student at the University of Technology, Sydney; casual academic in the School of Design at UTS; design practitioner (book and graphic)

designer).

Dear Ken, Chris, Mark and contributors,

The past three weeks of discussion have been thought provoking and often enlightening. Like Paul Reader, time restraints mean I haven't followed the posts as regularly as I would have liked, which is why I have hesitated to contribute so far. What I have read has provided some lovely moments of clarity, but also some conversations I have actively ignored (for now) to avoid further muddying my understanding practice-led research; my introduction to this methodology has been through starting a practice-led PhD which, to me, still appears to necessitate slightly a different definition/set of criteria because of the academic context it belongs to.

I think others have provided fantastic summaries, and I can't begin to write my thoughts on all the inspiring posts without turning it into a painfully lengthy rant, so I'm going to (self-indulgently) provide a personal response to why I chose to begin a practice-led doctorate, and share a working example. Please bare in mind that I began in March this year - this is a raw, developing research plan, but I'd welcome any comments posted to me off-list.

One of the first comments that struck me was from Chris Rust, considering practice-led as an 'other-ing' term, and the problem of being considered 'second rate research'. As a graphic designer, I often engage in affable debate with my brother, a mechanical engineer, about the 'value' of visual communications (he provokes me by claiming design is a 'second rate' profession, a not uncommon reaction). It's a joke in my family that I am doing a doctorate to one-up his MA and score a point in the debate. Jokes aside, this begs the question, why start a PhD as a practicing designer? As someone who has hired designers, a PhD isn't necessarily going to secure you a better job; your folio, practical experience and people skills are what count. As pointed out during the workshop, engaging in a PhD is a step towards entering academia, and the contribution to/passing on of knowledge within your field. As a design practitioner, I believe I can provide insights - through reflection and articulation of the design process - that non-practicing theorists cannot. An interest in contributing to a growing field of knowledge and a belief that reflective practice allows me to develop as a design professional, were enough incentive for me to begin. I have been casually teaching and giving lectures at UTS for a couple of years, and the potential to enter academic life full time interests me, but I would never give up practice entirely to do so (as I would not have undertaken research without a 'making' component).

My project:

My research will examine the use of graphic elements - photographs, illustrations and experimental typography - in contemporary adult fiction. Rather than examining books using graphic elements as illustrations of the text, or as a parallel narrative approach (such as comics, graphic novels, picture books), I am interested in books using graphic elements in a manner intrinsic to the writing.

How is this practice-led?

I intend to investigate how this phenomenon can be examined as a way of working rather than a cultural trend; instead of arguing for the legitimacy or longevity of this narrative style (a cultural studies approach), my research will investigate experimental word-image interplay as a way of working (a Visual Communications approach). The body of my research will be through articulated 'making': to explore the potentials of a way of working, it makes sense to experiment in practice.

Through a contextual review (analytical phase), I show that this phenomenon exists by:

A) Identifying a list of relevant examples (eg. Jonathan Safran Foer's *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close*, 2005; Umberto Eco's *The Mysterious Flame of Queen*

Loana, 2005; WG Sebald's *Vertigo*, 1990; Salvador Plascencia's *People of Paper*, 2005.

B) Analyse the use of graphic elements in relation to the text, using self-generated visual mapping models, as well as Martinec and Salway's 'system for image-text relations in new (and old) media' (2005)

C) Examine how the introduction of graphics to a commonly text only format (the novel) has been perceived by analysing professional reviews.

I will then develop a series of briefs to explore different ideas raised from the contextual survey (generative phase). Examples maybe: A) Locate short stories/passages of text with strong visual descriptions and substitute graphics for a recurring visual metaphor; B) Write a short story using uncaptioned graphics as a literary device; C) Collaborating with a writer to create a short piece where text and image develop simultaneously.

From my readings of the online workshop (particularly around Kenny McBride, June 14, Re: Day 3), it occurred to me that the researcher need not be the practitioner; a 'curatorial' role may be taken, so:

Using the reflective analysis from my personal practice (above), I will generate several briefs for others to respond to; A) as a university course between design and humanities students; B) as an open brief posted on a blog; C) for a writing/design group I am involved in co-ordinating.

Finally, I will present my thesis in an appropriate form: as a book, using visual elements as narrative and documentary devices, so the final artefact contains my academic argument in both a scholarly and designerly manner.

One further comment:

As an example of what Owain Pedgley might call "practice-as-research" or "practice-as-investigation" (June 14, Re: example of practice-led research), I generate projects on the side of my commercial design practice that I consider a playground for experimentation. Ways of working and graphics I develop in these projects often bleed into my commercial work, and vice versa. (See Sadokierski, Z. 2006, 'A designer by any other name', *Visual Communication*, Feb:52-63) Most designers I know work like this. I do not consider this 'practice-led research' because it is not academic, in the sense that it does not contribute to a general field of knowledge. It is not publicly articulated. [But it is still a kind of 'practice-as-investigation', so I believe you can "do research without being an academic" (Chris Rust, 14 June, *Being an Academic*)].

Martinec, R. and Salway, A. 2005, 'A system of image-text relations in new (and old) media', *Visual Communication*, Oct. 4:337-371

Martin Salisbury

Course Leader for MA Children's Book Illustration, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, United Kingdom

* Like many contributors, I have found it difficult to find the time to keep up with this debate, coming as it does at a time of Degree Shows and Exam Boards, but I nevertheless found it stimulating and useful. Daria Loi's observation about the language divide between practitioners and academics strikes a chord. As she rightly points out, many practitioners' voices remain unheard as they become increasingly intimidated (or irritated) by the 'lingo'. My own impatience with the recurrent bouts of semantic tennis and self-serving wordiness was rightly ticked off by Ken (who graciously accepted my apologies and asked me to contribute a few more thoughts). Donna Carty's proposition that agreeing to disagree is the way forward seems a logical option in view of some of the contradictory dogma.

* The contributions of practitioners have inevitably tended to be less 'wordy' than most.

* I promised to belatedly describe research projects that I am involved with here. Two students are in the early stages of Research Degrees in children's book illustration, jointly supervised by myself and academics from the Faculty of Education at Cambridge University. Our intention is to develop research into the practice of children's book illustration from the perspective of practitioners rather than 'academics'. Both PhD students are well established, highly regarded practitioners.

This is important. It seems to me that, though PhDs are not awarded purely for advanced practice (Pablo), the level of practice within the research does need to be advanced (is this obvious? I don't recall it being discussed). I have a dread of future PhDs in Art & Design being awarded for good theory around weak practice. One of the two is examining the use and role of animal character/anthropomorphism in children's books, the other is exploring the tensions between creative expression and the constraints of the 'industry' in children's books. The students are both using their own practice as the starting point for their research. The university here provides good support and training for research students.

Prof Sue Thomas

Professor of New Media, De Montfort University, United Kingdom

Dear all

Ken asked me to provide a summary of my responses to the conversations on this list and, like others, I had to reply with some embarrassment that I had not managed to keep up. I did, however, store the mails and plan to go back and read them systematically and also to use them as a resource for my research group. But here is a brief response, along with congratulations. I think this time-limited exercise has been excellent.

Here at De Montfort University we have been busy setting up our new Institute of Creative Technologies. To quote from the website: "The Institute Of Creative Technologies (IOCT) undertakes research work in emerging areas at the intersection of e-Science, the Digital Arts, and the Humanities. It comprises an interdisciplinary laboratory at the heart of an infrastructure grid connecting significant research centres across the university. This network also extends to other universities and to local, national and international entities in the creative industries. The IOCT houses a number of key projects, all of which cross the traditional disciplines. It has a cohort of research students and will soon offer its own Masters programme. Its research work also informs teaching developments, and its publications are lodged in a digital archive. "

The IOCT will launch in September but meanwhile there is a temporary website at <http://www.ioct.dmu.ac.uk> The challenge will be to link practice-based research across a number of disciplines embraced by Computer Science, Humanities and Arts & Design - each one with their distinctive own language and culture. We are aware that this is no easy challenge and to date our research meetings have been, shall we say, interesting!

The tool we have begun using to try to understand each other's practice is the concept of 'transliteracy', by which we mean literacy across a range of platforms and tools, from orality through print, TV and film, to networked media. Transliteracy helps me talk with a computer science colleague about how we might collaborate to create content for his virtual environment, or with an AI researcher about how we study anthropomorphic stories about robots. One of the posts on this list that I found especially pertinent to the transliterate approach was by Lubomir (29 June) in which he proposes that 'although art has its own specifics as a human activity, academic field, and in terms of its research support,

as Eduarde mentioned, the "project" attitude is similar among many professions'

- action research (popular in the social professions and social sciences),
- project-specific research
- applied research
- research & development
- design programming research (design programming is a research type of activity), new product development research, etc.,
- project-led research (Eduardo mention it)
- practice initiated research
- practice inspired research (in the sense that practice posed the problems or created situations to problematized)
- other terms and words that you will suggest.

As someone who has always had trouble fitting into the strongly theoretical environment of English studies, I applaud a focus on practical project-based work.

The IOCT partners all believe very strongly that the project approach is the way to go - with a project we can each develop an area which interests us, whilst at the same time maintaining regular feedback and interaction between the participants. It is essential that all IOCT projects involve partners from at least two faculties, and many of them will involve producing artefacts. In a project-centred approach, the 'four great challenges' of academic work set out by Ken early in the discussion in his post 'Being an academic' can be woven into the entire process:

- 1) Creating new knowledge,
- 2) Preserving existing knowledge,
- 3) Training specialists, and
- 4) Educating citizens

Finally, a lighter note from my own area of writing. I have worked with writers inside and outside universities since the late 1980s: as a writer myself, as a teacher of creative writing, as a researcher, and for ten years as Artistic Director of the recently-deceased trAce Online Writing Centre <http://tracearchive.ntu.ac.uk> . I have therefore often been at the sharp end of the somewhat sore relationship between academia and the practising artist/writer. Universities can make life very difficult for creative writers, but it's also true that writers often have prejudices against universities and are not always easy to deal with. It goes both ways, as in the novelist Flannery O'Connor's well-known remark:

"Everywhere I go I'm asked if I think the university stifles writers. My opinion is that they don't stifle enough of them."

Thanks to all for a very enjoyable and useful discussion which will certainly form part of my research and teaching resources from now on.

Best

Gillian Wilson

Lecturer, Graphic design and Communication, University College for the Creative Arts, United Kingdom

(about 850 words)

Dear Chris, Ken & colleagues

Firstly, just to say how fascinating it has been to read everyone's posts, and to

thank those who have offered interesting references to sources of information I didn't know about, and who have made me reconsider and reflect upon various aspects of my thinking and my practice and that of others. I can't pretend I have understood every contribution within the time-frame (but have retained them for further study), and I speak as one who spent the first six months of a Masters Degree in Education with the dictionary by my side compiling my own glossary of academic terminology, hence my gripe about the accessibility of the language!

As communicability of ideas has been cited in a number of posts as an essential requirement of the PhD [and as the general consensus is that poor old Picasso is denied his academic accolade, I must assume we are talking verbal or written as opposed to visual (don't shout at me I'm being facetious!)], I would just like to summarise my feelings about language in the context of academic tradition.

I didn't respond to all the posts regarding language – mainly because the day job got in the way and I apologise for that, but I would just like to clarify my position. Both personally and as a tutor, I am concerned that academic language should not be exclusive, particularly in my role of encouraging non-traditional students to participate in academic discourse. Equally I do not subscribe to the view that by encouraging more applications from non-traditional students, there should be any compromise in the quality of academic work undertaken, including reporting the outcomes. I am always delighted and excited by the complexities of the language when it enhances meaning and the appreciation of what is learned, and I want to share every part of that with students. I guess I'm just saying that it's necessary to present academic language to students as a language that has to be learned – just the same as Italian or Japanese – and just as I had to do with my dictionary, and that in doing so they will enrich their own life experience in expand the potential for communication with a wider audience. What I would like to avoid is the use of language to obscure rather than clarify ideas or as a political act to retain power within a certain group of people, and Norman Fairclough's excellent book 'Language and Power' illustrates this very well. (Chris/Ken asked that we should 'close' rather than provoke in our summaries, so I'll have to respect any decisions he may make in his role as editor in respect of this rant)

With regard to research-led practice in respect of the PhD, some of the postings would seem to echo my own reservations (though this would make me very unpopular with many of my colleagues) and I can refer specifically to Ken's comment comparing guild and research infrastructures: "Developing an infrastructure that permits us access to both traditions requires mastering both disciplines. This is more work than many practitioners wish to undertake, at least not when they love the practice of art and find it boring to master the specific reading and writing skills that research practice demands. Instead they prefer to demand a PhD for practice by labelling it research". Perhaps that's why there weren't that many examples. So sorry Picasso, I concur.

I would also have liked to respond to one of the original questions – do "real" artists, designers or architect ever pay attention to what happens in universities? I missed that one, but would like to offer a personal perspective now. I was a "real" self-employed graphic designer for twenty years and very rarely considered what was going on in universities during this period of time, apart from keeping a wary eye on the graduating competition. When I finally ventured into art education, the experience of working alongside practitioners from other disciplines and students with fresh ideas and approaches to problem-solving enriched my own design work to the extent that I not only began to enjoy producing work much more, but the quality of the work I produced improved, so art and design professionals - ignore us at your peril!

I apologise for only really responding to areas which especially interest me, or indeed where I hope I've managed to keep up intellectually, and in saying this I'm particularly grateful to Chris for divulging the fact that apparently confident contributors were having crises of confidence in private posts! One of my own issues and certainly that of my students especially those from non-traditional backgrounds is around having the confidence to express ideas, and indeed to

risk being shot down in flames, this empathetic example from such an auspicious group will certainly form part of my teaching portfolio.

I'll stop now as I'm just sampling some excellent (half-price) champagne prior to going for an evening swim in the sea in England, where for once – it's warm enough. Life's a beach.

So to conclude, thanks to all and look forward to more of the same? Hope to meet again.

All the best

Simon Zagorski-Thomas

Musician, London College of Music Thames Valley University, United Kingdom

I've been a lurker for the past weeks – for two main reasons: Firstly, I'm up to my eyeballs in marking at the moment and haven't been able to follow as closely as I'd like. Secondly, I'm a musician.

I'm slightly unusual as a lecturer and as a PhD student. I came to lecturing after 20 years as a composer / sound engineer / record producer and then opted for a practice-based PhD rather than a doctorate in professional practice. I teach at the London College of Music (TVU) and I'm doing my PhD in Electroacoustic Composition at Goldsmiths College, London. I also co-founded a conference on the Art of Record Production and we're in the process of establishing a journal on the same subject – both of which involve a substantial amount of practice led research.

The goals of research are knowledge and understanding – it seemed that many of the discussions in the thread hinged on definitions surrounding the nature of knowledge. Am I engaging in practice led research if I discover how to do something through random variations in the course of my normal practice? Well yes...IF I recognise and identify that knowledge and can communicate it in some way – the dissemination question. The practice is the experiment / observation. I haven't read all the postings yet but I haven't seen a discussion that compares artistic practice in practice led research to experimentation in scientific research, to fieldwork in anthropology, to gathering knowledge about music by listening or playing in musicology. Does getting into a bath constitute research? Sitting under an apple tree?

Here are a few glib summaries that I hope will help me explore the subtleties of the questions when / if I get time to review the workshop material:

Picasso's PhD: you don't get a research degree for knowing something but you can if you know how to explain it.

PhD vs. Doctorate in Professional Practice: the difference is in when you do your observation / experimentation (before or during the degree) but you still have to explain what you learned from it

Apprenticeship is not research: Living in Bali is not research but can be fieldwork. Apprenticeship can be fieldwork / observation / experimentation but does not have to be.

Research as the methodical search for knowledge: Does it have to be methodical? What is an unmethodical search? When we're engaged in methodical search it is sometimes the random element which sparks the discovery – back to the bath and the apple tree.

Research shouldn't be required to serve instrumental ends / Research is seeking knowledge and understanding for improvement: Ken's summary (seemingly a case of wanting to have the cake and eat it) reminded me of several posts about

ethics and my own concerns about the 'usefulness' or otherwise of some research. I haven't seen much discussion about what the aim of the AHRC Review is but presumably, as it will impact on funding decisions, it will be used to evaluate the desirability of practice led research and will thus be considering things such as 'instrumental ends' and 'improvement'.

This workshop has been of enormous value to me despite my peripheral placement (both in terms of engagement and subject specificity)

B.4

Online workshop references

References, Weblinks and Recommended Reading from the Online workshop

References

Author	Description	Cited by:
Becker, C. (1997)	Becker, C. 1997 'The Artist as Public Intellectual' in Education and Cultural Studies: Towards Performative Practice p13-23 [eds. Giroux H and Shannon P. Routledge New York	Paul Reader
Bernstein, Jeremy (1993)	Cranks, Quarks and the Cosmos. New York: Basic Books.	Prof Ken Friedman
Biggs, M. A. (2005)	"The Solution that Works" http://www.herts.ac.uk/artdes/research/tvad/mb/2005a.pdf	Dr Michael Biggs
Blumer, Herbert (1986)	Symbolic Interactionism. Perspective and Method. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Blumer, Herbert. 1969	Symbolic Interactionism. Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.	Prof Ken Friedman
Broadbent, John	"Generations in Design Methodology." Design Journal 6.1	Donna Atwood
Buchanan, Richard	http://www.uiah.fi/binary.asp?path=1866;1919;4257;20994;21145;21153&field=FileAttachment&version=1	Dr Rosan Chow
Bunge, Mario. 1999	The Dictionary of Philosophy. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.	Prof Ken Friedman
Byrne, Bryan, and Ed Sands. (2002)	"Designing Collaborative Corporate Cultures." In Creating Breakthrough Ideas, Bryan Byrne and Susan E. Squires, editors. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey, 47-69.	Prof Ken Friedman
Byrne, Bryan, and Ed Sands. 2002	"Designing Collaborative Corporate Cultures." In Creating Breakthrough Ideas, Bryan Byrne and Susan E. Squires, editors. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey, pp. 47-69.	Prof Ken Friedman
Calvera. A. (2000)	"The PhD program typographic revolutions held by the design department of the University of Barcelona: some thoughts about an experience and some general conclusions concerning research on design." In Design Plus Research. Proceedings of the Politecnico di Milano Conference, 18-20 May 2000. 330-337	Prof Chris Rust
Candy, L. and Edmonds, E.A., (2002)	'Explorations in Art and Technology'. Springer-Verlag, London	Sarah Moss

Cherryholmes, C. (1999)	Reading pragmatism. New York: Teachers College Press	Gavin Melles
Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2004)	Discourse in the professions : perspectives from corpus linguistics. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia, Pa.: John Benjamins	Gavin Melles
Cross, Nigel. 1993	Editorial. Design Studies. Vol. 14, No. 3, 1993, pp. 226-227.	Prof Ken Friedman
Cross, Nigel. 1995	Editorial. Design Studies. Vol. 16, No. 1, 1995, pp. 2-3.	Prof Ken Friedman
Cross, Nigel. 1999.	"Subject: Re: Research into, for and through designs." DRS. Date: Mon, 13 Dec 1999 13:43:18 +0000.	Prof Ken Friedman
D. Fallman (2005)	"Why Research-Oriented Design Isn't Design-Oriented Research" in Nordes – Nordic Design Research Conference, Copenhagen (2005).	Dr Owain Pedgley
Dilnot (1998)	"The Science of uncertainty: The potential contribution of design to knowledge". Proceedings of the Ohio Conference on Ph.D Education in Design. http://tinyurl.com/mupvl	Prof David Durling
Einstein (1949: 684)		Prof Ken Friedman
Einstein, Albert. (1998 [1905])	Einstein's Miraculous Year. Five Papers that Changed the Face of Physics. Edited and introduced by John Stachel. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Feynman, Richard (1989: 236-253)		Prof Ken Friedman
Friedman (1997)	"Design Science and Design Education" http://www.chrisrust.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/design_inquiry/publications/friedmanscience.pdf	Donna Atwood
Friedman (2002, 2003)		Prof Ken Friedman
Friedman, Ken. (2002)	"Towards an integrative design discipline." In Creating Breakthrough Ideas: The Collaboration of Anthropologists and Designers in the Product Development Industry. Susan E. Squires and Bryan Byrne, editors. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey, 200-214.	Prof Ken Friedman
Friedman, Ken. 1997	"Design Science and Design Education." The Challenge of Complexity. Peter McGrory, editor. Helsinki: University of Art and Design Helsinki UIAH, 54-72.	Prof Ken Friedman
Friedman, Ken. 2003	"Design Curriculum Challenges for Today's University." [Keynote conference lecture.] Enhancing the Curricula: Exploring Effective Curricula Practices in Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education. Center for Learning and Teaching in Art and Design. First International Conference at the Royal Institute of	Prof Ken Friedman

	British Architects (RIBA) London, UK, 10th - 12th April 2002. Co-sponsored by ELIA (European League of Institutes of Arts) and ADC-LTSN (The Art, Design and Communication - Learning and Teaching Support Network). London: CLTAD, The London Institute, 29-63.	
Friedman, Ken. 2005	"The Wealth and Poverty of Networks." At A Distance: Precursors to Internet Art and Activism. Annemarie Chandler and Norie Neumark, editors. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 408-422.	Prof Ken Friedman
Frost, Peter J. and M. Susan Taylor, editors. 1996.	Rhythms of Academic Life. Personal Accounts of Careers in Academia. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.	Prof Ken Friedman
Fuller, Buckminster. 1981	Critical Path. New York: St. Martin's Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Fuller, Steve. (2002)	Fuller, Steve. 2002. Thomas Kuhn: A Philosophical History for Our Time. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Fuller, Steve. (2002)	Popper vs. Kuhn: The Struggle for the Soul of Science. Duxford, UK: Icon Books.	Prof Ken Friedman
Gazzaniga M (2006)	Gazzaniga M. The Split Brain Revisited accessed 26.4.2006 http://cwx.prenhall.com/bookbind/pubbooks/morris4/medialib/readings/split.html	Paul Reader
Gedenryd, H. (1998)	"How Designers Work - making sense of authentic cognitive activities" PhD thesis, Lund University, Sweden (http://www.lucs.lu.se/People/Henrik.Gedenryd/HowDesignersWork/index.html)	Prof Chris Rust
Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi, (1976)	"fine art is grounded in problem-finding while design is more likely to be problem-solving"	Paul Reader
Gifford (2002)	"environmental psychology accepts the idea that behaviour is subject to many influences" (p. 12). "patterns of attachment; places which vary in scale, specificity and tangibility; different actors and social relationships and finally temporal aspects (p. 19)	Yasemin Afacan
Gleick, James. 1993.	Genius: Richard P. Feynman and modern physics. London: Abacus.	Prof Ken Friedman
Goldsmith, John A., John Komlos, and Penny Schine Gold. 2001.	The Chicago Guide to Your Academic Career. A Portable Mentor for Scholars from Graduate School through Tenure. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Gould,S.J. (1981)	"The Mismeasure of Man" Revised edition, Penguin Books, 1996. p234	Prof Chris Rust
Guba, Egon G,	Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA:	Prof Ken

and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1989	Sage.	Friedman
Hart, Chris (1998)	Doing a literature review. Releasing the social science imagination. London: Sage Publications.	Prof Ken Friedman
Hart, Chris (2001)	Doing a literature search. A comprehensive guide for the social sciences. London: Sage Publications.	Prof Ken Friedman
Hock, Randolph (2001)	The extreme searcher's guide to Web search engines. A handbook for the serious searcher. Medford, New Jersey: Information Today, Inc.	Prof Ken Friedman
Johnston, S. (1995)	Building a sense of community in a research master's course. Studies in Higher Education, 20(3), 279-291.	Gavin Melles
Knowles and Cole (in Neilsen, L., Cole, A.L. & Knowles, J.G. (Eds.) 2001	The Art of Writing Inquiry. Backalong Books and The Centre for Arts-informed Research	Daria Loi
Kuhn, Thomas S. (2000)	Kuhn, Thomas S. 2000. The Road Since Structure: Philosophical Essays, 1970- 1993, with an Autobiographical Interview. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Langrish, J. (2000)	Not everything made of steel is a battleship." In Doctoral Education in Design. Foundations for the Future. Proceedings of the La Clusaz Conference, July 8-12, 2000. D. Durling and K. Friedman, editors. Staffordshire University Press, 297-305.	Prof Chris Rust
Langrish, John. (2000)	"Not everything made of steel is a battleship." In: David Durling and Ken Friedman, Editors. Proceedings of conference Doctoral Education in Design: Foundations for the Future, 8-12 July 2000, La Clusaz, France. UK: Staffordshire University Press ISBN 1-897898-64-9. Weblink http://www.designresearchsociety.org	Prof Ken Friedman
Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991)	Situated learning : legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.	Gavin Melles
Le Fanu, James	"The Rise and Fall of Modern medicine"	Prof Chris Rust
Lee, D. (1992)	Competing discourses : perspective and ideology in language. London ; New York: Longman	Gavin Melles
Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Egon G. Guba. 1985.	Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage	Prof Ken Friedman
Loi, D (200?),	A suitcase as a PhD? Exploring the potential of travelling containers to articulate the multiple facets of a research thesis. http://www.herts.ac.uk/artdes1/research/papers/wpades/vol3/dlfull.html	Daria Loi

McLeod, K and Holdrige L. [eds] 2006	Thinking Through Art Reflections on Art as Research (Innovations in Art and Design) Routledge, London and New York.	Paul Reader
Merriam-Webster, Inc. 1993	Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Tenth edition. Springfield, Massachusetts.	Prof Ken Friedman
Mooney J. (2006)	'The condition of painting: how is painting doing?' in Thinking Through Art Reflections on Art as Research (Innovations in Art and Design) McLeod, K. and Holdrige L. [eds] p133-138, Routledge, London and New York	Paul Reader
Mottram, Judith, 1988	'Critical Concepts and Change in Painting: the Relationship of Influence to Practice'. PhD (CNAA/Manchester Polytechnic)	Prof Judith Mottram
Musashi, Miyamoto. 1982a	The Book of Five Rings. Gorin No Sho. Translation and commentary by Nihon Services Corporation: Bradford J. Brown, Yuko Kashiwagi, William H. Barrett, and Eisuke Sasagawa. New York: Bantam Books.	Prof Ken Friedman
Musashi, Miyamoto. 1982b	The Book of Five Rings. (With Family Traditions on the Art of War by Yagyu Munenori.) Translated by Thomas Cleary. Boston and London: Shambhala	Prof Ken Friedman
Pallas, A. M. (2001)	Preparing Education Doctoral Students for Epistemological Diversity. Educational Researcher, 30(5), 6-11.	Gavin Melles
Pearson, M. (1996)	Professionalising Ph.D. education to enhance the quality of the student experience. Higher Education, 32(3), 303-320.	Gavin Melles
Pearson, M., & Brew, A. (2002)	Research Training and Supervision Development. Studies in Higher Education, 27(2), 135-150.	Gavin Melles
Penner et al (2005)		Paul Reader
Peters, Robert L. (1997)	Getting What You Came For. The Smart Student's Guide to Earning a Master's or Ph.D. New York: The Noonday Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Richardson, B., & Cooper, N. (2003)	Developing a virtual interdisciplinary research community in higher education. Journal of Interprofessional Care, 17(2), 173-182.	Gavin Melles
Rueegg, Walter, general editor. 1992	A history of the university in Europe. Volume 1. Universities in the Middle Ages. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, editor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Rueegg, Walter, general editor. 1996	A history of the university in Europe. Volume 2. Universities in early modern Europe (1500-1800). Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, editor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press	Prof Ken Friedman
Rugg, Gordon, and Marian Petre.	The Unwritten Rules of PhD Research. Maidenhead and New York: Open University	Prof Ken Friedman

2004	Press.	
Rybczynski (1989)	"making space is social art; and although architecture consists of individual works, these are always parts of a larger context of a landscape, of other buildings, of a street, and finally of our everyday lives" (p. 67).	Yasemin Afacan
Sachs, Jeffrey D. 2005	The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time. London: Penguin Press	Prof Ken Friedman
Schon, Donald A. (1983)	'The Reflective Practitioner. How professionals think in action' . New York. Basic Books, Inc., Publishers	Sarah Moss
Schrader, Paul. 1988	Transcendental Style in Film. Ozu, Brersson, Dreyer. New York: Da Capo Press	Prof Ken Friedman
Sherman, Chris, and Gary Price (2001)	The invisible web. Uncovering information sources the search engines can't see. Medford, New Jersey: Information Today, Inc.	Prof Ken Friedman
Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2002	Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples. London and Dunedin: Zed Books and University of Otago Press.	Prof Ken Friedman
Stahl, Lars-Henrik (2000)	"Artifact versus text in design research", proceedings of Doctoral Education in Design Conference, Las Clusaz, June 2000.	Prof Chris Rust
Stonor-Saunders, F. (1999)	Who Paid The Piper? Granta Books, Great Britain	Paul Reader
Sullivan G. 2005	Art Practice As Research: Inquiry in the visual arts. Sage Publications Thousand Oaks, London & New Dehli	Paul Reader
Sullivan G. 2005	Art Practice As Research: Inquiry in the visual arts. Sage Publications Thousand Oaks, London & New Dehli.	Paul Reader
Swann, Cal (2002)	"Action Research and the Practice of Design." Design Issues 18.1 Winter 2002 pp 49-61 it's available from MIT Press at http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/07479360252756287	Donna Atwood
Wenger, E. (1998)	Communities of practice : learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press	Gavin Melles
Wittgenstein, L., & Anscombe, G. E. M. (1972)	Philosophical investigations (3rd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.	Gavin Melles
Wodiczko, Krzysztof	http://www.highbeam.com/library/docfree.asp?DOCID=1G1:111655800&ctrlInfo=Round20%3AMode20c%3ADocG%3AResult&ao=	Kenny McBride
Yagyu, Munenori. 1982.	Family Traditions on the Art of War. In Miyamoto Musashi. The Book of Five Rings. With Family Traditions on the Art of War by Yagyu Munenori. Translated by Thomas Cleary. Boston and	Prof Ken Friedman

	London: Shambhala.	
Yair, K., Press, P. & Tomes, A. (2001)	Crafting competitive advantage: Crafts knowledge as a strategic resource. Design Studies, Vol. 22, N. 4. http://www.well.com/user/bratwood/craftknowledgeaspowerinid.pdf	Donna Atwood

Weblinks

URL	Description	Cited by:
http://arts.guardian.co.uk/imagineafter/	Imagine After Art	Prof Chris Rust
http://cwx.prenhall.com/bookbind/pubbooks/morris4/medialib/readings/split.html http://cwx.prenhall.com/bookbind/pubbooks/morris4/medialib/readings/split.html	Gazzaniga M. The Split Brain Revisited accessed 26.4.2006	Paul Reader
http://emsah.uq.edu.au/mia/issues/miacp118.html	Media International Australia's Practice-led Research Themed Edition: In particular, Brad Haseman's: A manifesto for performative research.	Paul Stapleton
http://info.uwe.ac.uk/news/UWE_News/article.asp?item=880&year=2006	University of West of England's Investigation into the nature of dreaming	Prof Chris Rust
http://innovationspace.asu.edu/	Innovation Space	Donna Atwood
http://interrogative.org	Interrogative Design	Kenny McBride
http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/sr225/jones.htm	Gustav Metzger 's manifesto of auto-destructive art - nuclear disarmament	Kenny McBride
http://tinyurl.com/odv3q	La Clusaz conference proceedings of the Doctoral Education in Design conference 2000	Prof David Durling
http://wired.com/wired/archive/14.06/start.html?pg=16	University of West of England's Investigation into the nature of dreaming	Prof Chris Rust
http://www.asa.de/research/kontext/	ASA-European and Gerhard Dirmoser's map of practices, disciplines/genres.	Kenny McBride
http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/history/inourtime/inourtime_20060406.shtml	"Goethe, Formation of a German Cultural Icon" podcast, broadcast 6 April 2006. In Our Time archive,	Prof Chris Rust
http://www.bris.ac.uk/parip/	The Practice as Research in Performance (PARIP) 5-Year	Paul

	AHRC-Funded Project:	Stapleton
http://www.chrisrust.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/academic/abstracts/adche%20review.htm	Review of doctoral education	Prof Chris Rust
http://www.chrisrust.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/academic/abstracts/design%20enquiry.htm	Rust, Chris , The role of Practice	Prof Chris Rust
http://www.conspect.de/jonas/PDF/Jonas_wonderground.pdf	Jonas, Wolfgang	Dr Rosan Chow
http://www.gsas.harvard.edu/programs/degree/index.html	Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences	Eduardo Corte-Real
http://www.herts.ac.uk/artdes1/research/res2prac/confhome.html	Upcoming "Research into Practice" conference at Hertfordshire University.	Prof Chris Rust
http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/D RS.html	Picasso's PhD debate, april 2000	Prof Ken Friedman
http://www.lancs.ac.uk/palatine/dev-awards/par-report.htm	short report by Professor Robin Nelson (MMU) and Stuart Andrews (PALATINE) on the regulations and protocols governing 'Practice as Research' (PaR) in the performing arts in the UK leading to the award of PhD:	Paul Stapleton
http://www.lancs.ac.uk/palatine/reports/uclan.htm	Report on the Integrating Practice as Research Conference	Paul Stapleton
http://www.luftgangster.de/gmetzger.html	Gustav Metzger 's manifesto of auto-destructive art - - nuclear disarmament	Kenny McBride
http://www.mollerup-designlab.com/		Prof Ken Friedman
http://www.palatine.org.uk/directory/index.php/res/par/	PALATINE (Subject Centre for Dance, Drama, and Performance) has produced a range of resources:	Paul Stapleton
http://www.performance-research.net/pages/epublications.html	Performance Research e-publications.	Prof Ken Friedman
http://www.sciencemuseum.org.uk/antenna/nano/lifestyle/112.asp?Broadband=Yes	Nano project	Prof Chris Rust
http://www.sfmelrose.u-net.com/	The writings of Susan Melrose:	Paul Stapleton
www.agora8.org		Kenny McBride
www.ahrcreview.aces.shu.ac.uk	AHRC Review	Prof Chris Rust

www.eastartmap.org		Kenny McBride
www.nesta.org.uk	NESTA innovation projects	Prof Chris Rust

Recommended Reading (Prof Ken Friedman)

Author	Description
Anholt, Robert R.H. 1994	Dazzle 'Em with Style. The Art of Oral Scientific Presentation. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
Anttila, Pirkko. 1996	Tutkimisen taito ja tiedon hankinta. Taito-, taide, ja muotoilualojen tutkimuksen tyoevaelineet. Helsinki: Akatiimi Oy.
Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 1995	The Craft of Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Delamont, Sara, Paul Atkinson, and Odette Parry. 1997	Supervising the PhD. A Guide to Success. Buckingham, England, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.
Feibelman, Peter J. 1993. A Ph.D	Is Not Enough! A Guide to Survival in Science. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company
Friedman, Ken, Owen Smith, and Lauren Sawchyn, editors. 2002	Fluxus Performance Workbook.
Huff, Anne Sigismund. 1999	Writing for Scholarly Publication. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications
Peters, Robert L. 1997	Getting What You Came For. The Smart Student's Guide to Earning a Master's or Ph.D. New York: The Noonday Press
Rugg, Gordon, and Marian Petre. 2004.	The Unwritten Rules of PhD Research. Maidenhead and New York: Open University Press.
Silverman, Franklin. 1999	Publishing for Tenure and Beyond. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
Sternberg, Robert J. 2004	Psychology 101 1/2. The Unspoken Rules for Success in Academia. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological

B.5 Recipe collection from Online Workshop

A selection of recipes and ideas for dinner from the AHRC Practice-Led Review Workshop. It was an explicit policy of the moderators to maintain a social element in the discussion to develop a sense of community that would foster confidence and mutual trust in the participants. "Coffee Breaks", the ever present background of the football World Cup and discussions of weekend eating plans all played a part. At weekends the formal discussion was closed but participants were encouraged to discuss more frivolous or social matter.

"I enjoyed the numerous attempts at making this workshop a human environment, despite its virtual nature. Informal discussions surely helped me to 'feel at home'; together with our hosts' care in ensuring all would respect each other's opinions and ways of articulating themselves." Dara Loi

Ranulph Glanville's Fool

Take one large pot of double cream and whisk until thick.

Meanwhile, take a good lot of soft fruit and liquidise it. Add lemon juice and caster sugar as needed. Put through a sieve to filter out the pips. Gently stir in to the whisked cream (you can use the whisk, slowly).

Chill in the fridge and serve.

This is one of the fastest and best of all English puddings, and is absolutely irresistible. It is fabulous in summer, but outstanding in winter (Daria).

You will notice that, as was the style of older cook books, I do not give quantities. But here are some: half a litre or an imperial pint (NOT US, which is only 80% of a proper pint) of double cream, and 250 grams of raspberries. If you want to use hard fruit such as peach or apricot, boil with sugar and lemon until softened, then put through the sieve. You don't need to remove the skin.

Ken Friedman's salmon soup

1 salmon, fresh, or frozen. If frozen, thaw enough to cut the salmon into whole cross-section steaks. (For a rich, tasty soup, you'll want a fish that weighs at least half a kilogram.)

1 leek

2 large yellow onions

1 bunch fresh parley

3-4 carrots

4-6 potatoes

1 bunch fresh celery

2 tablespoons tomato paste

1 sliced salt pickle or dill pickle

--

Skin the salmon and remove the bones.

Remove the stems from the parsley and chop the leaves.

Cook the fish skin, bones, fins, and tail, in two liters of water, along with the leek greens, parsley stems, and one onion chopped in quarters.

Cook it all down until it becomes a good bullion.

Strain off the bullion. Throw away the remains.

While the bullion is cooking, peel carrots and slice into thin, round pieces. Chop celery and the white party of the leek. Dice one onion. Chop potatoes into cubes

Gently fry carrots, celery, leek, potatoes, and diced onion in two tablespoons of butter. When onion has turned transparent and slightly golden, add the bullion.

While the vegetables are frying, slice the salmon into thick cubes.

Add the salmon to the vegetables and bullion.

Simmer gently for half an hour.

Serve the soup in deep bowls with a dollop of crème fraiche or sour cream on top. Sprinkle chopped parsley leaves on the surface. Dust the soup lightly with fresh cracked pepper. The soup should be salty enough because of the fish bullion.

Serve pickle slices, chopped parsley, and extra crème fraiche on the table so that each diner can add pickle slices to taste and extra cream or chopped parsley as wanted.

I recommend serving this with solid white sourdough bread or thick black bread. Serve fresh creamery butter and flaky sea salt for the bread.

Dara Loi's LEPRE IN SALMI' (Salmi of hare)

Firstly, if you are in Australia and find hard to get a hare, you can easily swap it with a rabbit (many of them here, I am afraid) however, I must admit that if you can get a good wild hare is just the right choice... ("la morte sua", as they say in Italy)

Secondly, please note that the preparation of lepre in salmi' starts 2 days before you can eat it... hmmm laborious...

Ingredients:

1 hare, onions, garlic, carrots, celery, parsley, laurel, clove, juniper, sage, rosemary, whole pepper seeds, red wine, butter, pancetta (kind of bacon), oil, anchovy, some flour, 1 glass of cognac or grappa, some tomato paste

Day 1:

Place the hare (clean, deskinning, and cut into pieces) in a terracotta pot with onions, garlic, carrots, celery, parsley, laurel, clove, juniper, sage, rosemary, whole pepper seeds.

Cover the lot with good and red wine (with some 'body'). cover the pot, place it in the fridge and leave it there to rest in peace for the night.

Day 2:

Place butter+oil+pancetta+anchovy in a large pot - we need a golden but softish pancetta, so go slowly with the fire...

While the above occurs, remove the hare from the pot, dry it, dip into flour, place in the pot with the pancetta - brown slowly but well.

Now add the vegetables that 'spent the night' with the hare then add the liquid as well. cook for an hour or so - slowly and covered when cooked, process the vegetables and the liquid to get a sauce-texture now the heat has to go up (need to boil) and you need to add a glass of cognac or grappa - plus a bit of tomato paste, to give it some colour cook it a bit more and when ready: back in the fridge (once cool, of course)

Day 3:

Heat it up and eat it - perfect with some polenta (or mash potato)

Yes I know, no specific amounts plus salt is missing from the ingredients list.... but this is an Italian mama recipe - they are always full of 'but that is an obvious ingredient' missing details... you basically need to try it, following your kitchen gut feelings, maybe fail a couple of times, and master it for future generations.

Some ideas for dinner.....

Ken Friedman's salmon with crème fraiche

Here in our corner of the Oslo fjord, it was salmon filet last night served in a sauce of crème fraiche topped with lightly chopped chives and red caviar.

With it, I prepared fresh boiled broccoli, sautéed cabbage, and a dish of white beans and spring onions in oil and pepper. This was accompanied by Tuborg beer and Linie aquavit -- just back from crossing of the equator twice, once on the way to Australia and once on the way home and to our table.

Chris Rust's pasta with broccoli and pine nuts

I might just nip out and see if the supermarket has some purple broccoli shoots - Pasta, toasted pine nuts, small amount of pesto (fresh if you can get it), some little cubes of dolcelatte, lightly steamed broccoli spears - mix them up it's very good and quick to make.

Chris Rust's Cornish campsite Bruschetta

Bruschetta (invented on a campsite in Cornwall in the southwest of England) which combines feta cubes, olives and garlic cloves (you can buy a little mixed packet in the supermarket cheese dept) with a tomato, olive oil and lemon juice salad. We usually serve it on toasted tomato bread but we didn't have any of that so we crisped up a ciabatta loaf in the oven, then sliced it and toasted it, spread a little tomato puree and butter and a sprinkling of sun-dried tomato then pour on the salad so the juice soaks into about half of the toast leaving the other part crispy.

Chris Rust's slow cooked tomatoes and mushrooms

I've been thinking about Christina's reproof that our recipes offered her little to chew on as a vegan. The best I can manage is to say that this Sunday, for brunch, I will have some tomatoes sliced in half (cut perpendicular to the stalk is best for this) with a little olive oil brushed onto the skin then sat like cups in an oven tray. Some more oil and Oregano sprinkled on top and put in an oven at a medium/low heat for a long time until they have reduced to a very intense small version of what they were. Then I'll take some large mushrooms and give them a similar treatment but not so long in the oven. I was thinking about pancakes as my son loves them on a Sunday morning but, although Christina assured me that you can make pancakes without egg by using arrowroot and/or olive oil, I'm not confident enough about that so I'll either buy or make some Irish potato cakes. Our neighbour Lilian is Irish and she makes beautiful potato cakes so I will try to catch her and get the recipe.

The intensity of the tomato and mushroom flavour cooked this way dispenses with the need for bacon or sausages. If you leave the tomatoes in the oven for long enough and then let them cool they make a wonderful addition to salads.

Appendix C: Research Experience Survey

This questionnaire was conducted using Survey Monkey, a piece of software which provides online numerical analysis and downloadable data. 248 surveys were completed and submitted during July and August 2006.

Research Experience Survey, practice-led research in Art, Design & Architecture

1. Introduction

This survey is part of our review of practice-led research in art, design and architecture on behalf of the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council.

The survey will take around 10-12 minutes to complete (we have timed it). It may take a little longer if some of the concepts are new to you. Your responses will be treated as confidential and we will take care to ensure that you cannot be identified with the data in any of our published results. Its purpose is to understand who is coming into art, design and architecture research, with an emphasis on practice-led work, what opportunities they have and what they are achieving. The results of the review, including this survey, will be in the public domain.

You can find more information about the Research Review and the people involved at www.ahrcreview.aces.shu.ac.uk

Next >>

2. About you

This information will allow us to contact you if we have any further questions arising from the answers you give.

If you prefer not to provide your contact details that is OK but please tell us what country you are in.

You can come back and edit this page and any other part of the questionnaire before you submit it to us.

1. Your Name

2. Your email address

3. In what country are you currently working or studying?

<< Prev

Next >>

3. Your work

4. Your role - Please choose all that apply.

The "not applicable" button is there only to allow you to cancel incorrect entries

Full time

Part time

Not applicable

Academic or
researcher in Higher
Education

Professional
practitioner in art,

design or
architecture
Post-graduate
research student
Other

5. If you are employed in Higher Education, what is your main role?

If your only role in HE is as a research student please do not complete this question even if postgraduates are regarded as employees in your country

- ☐ Researcher or research-only academic, 1-4 years experience
- ☐ Researcher or research-only academic, 5+ years experience
- ☐ Academic engaged in research and teaching, 1-4 years experience
- ☐ Academic engaged in research and teaching, 5+ years experience
- ☐ Senior Academic with management responsibility (e.g. head of department or research centre)
- ☐ Other (please specify)

6. How far would you describe your research as practice-led? (i.e. professional or creative practice is an important and substantial part of your research methods)

- ☐ All of my research is practice-led
- ☐ Some of my research is practice-led
- ☐ None of my research is practice led

7. If you are engaged in practice-led research, please complete this question.

The main aim of my research is:

- ☐ to support my creative practice
- ☐ to add to our understanding of practice
- ☐ to add to our understanding of questions arising outside the immediate concerns of practice.
- ☐ none of these. It is:

8. What is your main discipline in art, design or architecture?

4. Your education

9. What is your highest qualification?

- ☐ PhD
- ☐ MPhil or other research masters degree
- ☐ MA / MSc or equivalent
- ☐ BA / BSc or equivalent
- ☐ No Higher Education qualification
- ☐ Other (please specify)

10. If you have a research qualification (eg PhD or MPhil) was your research for this degree "practice-led" (eg professional or creative practice was an important and substantial part of your research methods for this degree)

- ☐ Yes my research for this degree was practice-led
- ☐ No my research for this degree was not practice-led

11. If you have a PhD, please answer the remaining questions on this page. Otherwise, go on to the next page.

I completed my PhD in

Year

12. Form of Thesis

- ☐ My PhD resulted solely in a conventional thesis
- ☐ My PhD resulted in a combination of conventional thesis and exhibition
- ☐ My thesis was in an unconventional format (please describe it very briefly here)

13. Supervisors

- ☐ My supervisors were all from my own discipline
- ☐ My supervisors were all from outside my discipline
- ☐ I had supervisors from my own discipline and outside it.

14. Examiners

- ☐ My examiners were all from my own discipline
- ☐ My examiners were all from outside my discipline
- ☐ I had examiners from my own discipline and outside it

15. Supervision of your PhD.

The answers you give to this and all the other questions will be treated as confidential. The published data from this review will not allow you, your supervisors or your university to be identified.

- ☐ I was completely happy with my supervision
- ☐ There were some problems with my supervision
- ☐ There were very serious difficulties with my supervision

16. If you wish to describe any problems with your supervision you may do so here

17. Peer support

- ☐ I was a member of a supportive group of postgraduate students
- ☐ I had some contact with other postgraduate students
- ☐ I had very little contact with other postgraduate students

[<< Prev](#) [Next >>](#)

5. Opportunities

This is about opportunities and prospects for researchers in art, design and architecture.

18. If you have a research degree (e.g. PhD or MPhil), please respond to these statements.

	agree strongly	agree slightly	neutral	disagree slightly	disagree strongly	Not relevant to me
My research degree has opened up new work opportunities for me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have a better job as a result of my research degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My research training has benefited my work as a creative practitioner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My research training has benefited my work as a teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
As a result of my research degree, I have become less effective as a creative practitioner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19. Postdoctoral research topics

- ☐ My PhD research has led into postdoctoral research on the same topic or a closely related topic
- ☐ My postdoctoral research has gone in a different direction from my PhD research

20. Postdoctoral research methods

- ☐ My postdoctoral research has made substantial use of the methods developed in my PhD research
- ☐ My postdoctoral research has made little use of the methods developed in my PhD research

21. If you have received funding for research projects (not your own postgraduate research), please complete this section.

Indicate the funding sources that chose your project - ie they were not just passing money on from another source that had already chosen your project.













Tick all that apply.

	Funded by my academic employer	Funded by a research funding body	Funded by a business	Funded by a charitable trust
I have received funding for individual research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have led a funded group project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have taken part in a funded group project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

22. Effect of funding on your research

	Agree Strongly	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable
The availability of funding has stimulated me to carry out new research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The funding has influenced my research direction in a positive way	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The funding has placed inappropriate constraints on my research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The process of applying for funding has been beneficial to my research thinking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Questions about interdisciplinarity, please tick all that apply.

	Within the "creative" disciplines	With researchers in Social Sciences	With researchers in Natural Sciences	With researchers in Humanities
My Doctoral studies brought me into contact with other disciplines				
I have worked on collaborative research projects with other disciplines				
My research is interdisciplinary - different disciplines working together have developed a shared approach that draws on the methods of each member				

24. If you have indicated that you have collaborated with other disciplines please give a list of the main ones.

<< Prev

Next >>

6. Research Careers

25. If your main role is postgraduate or postdoctoral researcher please complete questions 25 and 26. The first set of questions may be difficult to answer but please give your best estimate.

	1 year	2-5 years	6+ years	Not Applicable
I expect to work as a researcher for:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I expect to become an academic (eg lecturer/professor) within:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I expect to leave academic work within:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

26. Future Prospects

	Agree Strongly	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable
I am confident that I will be able to find suitable academic						

work in future						
I would prefer to remain in academic work						
I would prefer to move to professional practice						

<< Prev Next >>

7. Your Experience

27. What age were you when you first became involved in academic research (including post-graduate research)?

- ☐ under 25
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45+

28. How did you become involved in academic research? (please choose one)

- ☐ through Masters degree studies
- ☐ through Doctoral studies
- ☐ by being employed as a researcher.
- ☐ within two years of starting work as a teacher in Higher Education
- ☐ 2-5 years after starting teaching in Higher Education
- ☐ more than 5 years after starting teaching in Higher Education
- ☐ Other (please specify)

29. Please complete this section if you are an academic (for example lecturer, professor or fellow).
(by "department" we mean the group of academics in your broad discipline - eg Art, Design or Architecture)

	below 25%	25%-49%	50%-74%	75% or more
proportion of academics in my department engaged in research				

30. Effect of research on your academic work

	Agree Strongly	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Strongly	Not Applicable
Colleagues in my department value my research						
My employer values my research						

My research has led to new opportunities in my work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My research has made me part of a wider academic community in my university/college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My research has made me part of a wider academic community beyond my university/college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My research has helped me develop connections with practitioners in my field	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My research has helped me develop connections with businesses or organisations outside higher education.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Colleagues who are not active researchers are less able to contribute to the work of our department.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<< Prev

Next >>

8. Impact of your research

31. This is a difficult subject for many people but it is useful to reflect on. By "evidence" we mean any way in which impact might be registered, from measurable results to informal feedback.

My Research has:

	Yes, I have evidence of this	I believe that it has but I have no evidence	Not so far	Not applicable
influenced colleagues in my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
contributed to teaching in my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
influenced other researchers beyond my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
influenced practitioners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
influenced the lives of people outside my	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

academic or
professional
community
contributed to
research
methods in my
field

contributed to
understanding

32. If you have evidence of the effects of your research, please indicate what forms it takes. (please choose all that apply)

- ☐ Requests to carry out further, related research
- ☐ Policy decisions by businesses, public bodies or other organisations influenced by your research
- ☐ Citations in other people's publications
- ☐ Requests to speak about your research
- ☐ Changes in social or professional practices influenced by your research
- ☐ Informal feedback from other researchers or practitioners
- ☐ Requests to advise on other people's research
- ☐ Artworks or designs in the public domain influenced by your research
- ☐ Other (please describe)

[<< Prev](#)

[Next >>](#)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. We may contact you again for more details about some of the answers you have provided.

The answers you have given will be help us to develop a report to the AHRC on practice-led research, the report will be in the public domain through our website together with other materials that we have collected.

All information you have provided will be treated as confidential. Data from this questionnaire will not identify you or any person or institution that you have referred to

If you wish to know more about the Research Review and the people involved you can visit our website at www.ahrcreview.aces.shu.ac.uk which will open automatically when you complete the survey.

Please select "Done" to submit this survey.

Appendix D: Institutional Research Survey

This questionnaire was conducted using Survey Monkey, a piece of software which provides online numerical analysis and downloadable data. 33 surveys were completed and submitted during July and August 2006.

Practice-led research in Art, Design & Architecture

Research Review Project
Practice Led Research in Art, Design & Architecture



Institutional Research Survey

About you and your institution – 1st of 9 pages

1. Where do you work?

- ☐ Monotechnic (Institution specialising in creative subjects, eg College of Art)
- ☐ Broad-based University
- ☐ Broad-based College
- ☐ Other (please specify)

2. What are the main qualifications that you offer?

- ☐ First Degree (BA, BSc)
- ☐ 4-year Integrated Masters (eg MDes)
- ☐ MA or similar
- ☐ MRes, MA Research or other research masters
- ☐ MPhil
- ☐ PhD
- ☐ Professional Doctorate
- ☐ Other relevant qualification (please specify)

3. What is your role?

- ☐ Head of subject or department
- ☐ Head of research for a dept, centre or faculty
- ☐ Senior researcher (eg professor/fellow/reader) with a good oversight of research in your subject
- ☐ Other (please specify)

4. What of these subjects does your institution include?

- ☐ Fine Art
- ☐ Media Arts
- ☐ Applied Arts/Crafts
- ☐ 2-D Design subjects
- ☐ 3-D Design subject
- ☐ Fashion/textile design subjects
- ☐ Interactive Media Design
- ☐ Architecture
- ☐ Landscape Architecture
- ☐ Other (please specify)

5. Please answer the questionnaire for just one of the three broad groups below. If your work includes more than one of these groups please complete a separate questionnaire for each or ask a colleague to answer for the other group/s

Which group are you answering for?

- ☐ Fine Art
- ☐ Design & Applied Arts/Crafts
- ☐ Architecture

Institutional Research Survey

PhD Students' Research - 2nd of 9 pages

The term "practice-led" in this survey refers to research where creative or professional practice in the researcher's discipline forms a significant part of the method.

6. PhD studies

	0	1-4	5-9	10-24	25-49	50+
Approximately how many PhD students do you have in your area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many of these are undertaking practice-led research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 years ago, how many PhD students did you have in your area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 years ago, how many of these students were undertaking practice-led research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Research training - these questions are about the main formal research training that all or most of your PhD students normally receive. It is not about any training arranged for individual students or minor or occasional elements of their training such as university research days.

	True Now	True 5 years ago
Our students take part in a research training designed specifically for their subject area (eg art and design)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our students take part in a research training programme provided by another subject area (eg social science or humanities)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our students take part in institution-wide generic research training programme.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our students' research training includes methods for practice-led research.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our students' research training does not include a shared programme.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Forms of Thesis

Please indicate the forms of thesis used by your students

	Used by all or most students	Used by half or more of our students	Used by less than half of students	Not applicable
Conventional thesis format	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conventional thesis supported by Exhibition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exhibition supported by documentation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. If you have answered "other" in the question above please give a brief description.

10. PhD students' motivation and experience

	True for all or most of our students	True for half or more of our students	True for less than half of our students	Not true
Potential students understand what PhD study entails when they approach us.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Potential students have appropriate research topics when they approach us.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students undertake their PhD to prepare themselves for an academic career	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students undertake their PhD to improve their practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PhD students are able to identify a professional or academic "audience" for their research at an early stage in the PhD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PhD students are able to identify a professional or academic "audience" for their research when they complete their PhD	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Factors affecting growth of PhD study in your subject

	Agree strongly	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Strongly
Graduates in this subject are not aware of the opportunities in academic research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Our masters level courses in this subject include preparation for doctoral studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good graduates in this subject tend to focus on opportunities in professional practice rather than research opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lecturers in this subject are unfamiliar with doctoral research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We have a limited capacity to supervise PhD students in this subject	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Impact of PhD study in your subject area

"disagree" statements will indicate that you believe the opposite

	Agree strongly	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Strongly
Doctoral students are the main source of future academics in this subject	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The growth of PhD studies is having a beneficial effect on professional practice in this subject	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe the PhD will have a beneficial effect on professional practice in future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The growth of doctoral studies has changed the academic culture in this subject in a positive way.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. If you believe that the PhD is changing academic or professional life in your subject area we would be grateful if you could give a brief description of that

Practice-led research in Art, Design & Architecture

Research Review Project
Practice Led Research in Art, Design & Architecture



[Exit this survey >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

Academic staff research - 3rd of 9 pages

These questions will give us an idea of the scale and focus of your staff engaged in research.

14. Academic Staff Numbers (Lecturers, Fellows, Readers, Professors)

	0	1-4	5-9	10-24	25-49	50+
How many academic staff do you have in your area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 years ago, how many academic staff did you have in your area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many academic staff are active researchers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many academic staff are engaged in practice-led research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many academic staff have a PhD?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 years ago, how many academic staff had a PhD?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many academic staff are studying for a PhD?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many academic staff are supervising PhDs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. Numbers of researchers employed (Researcher grades)

	0	1-4	5-9	10-24	25+
How many researchers are employed in your area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 years ago, how many researchers were employed in your area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many researchers have PhD or MPhil Degrees?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many researchers are graduates in creative disciplines?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How many researchers are engaged in practice-led research?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[<< Prev](#)

[Next >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

Nature and impact of research - 4th of 9 pages

16. Nature of research. Please indicate the proportion of all research activity in your area that matches these statements.

	None	1-9%	10-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75%+
The research is practice-led	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research is an individual inquiry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research is a team inquiry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research is funded by external sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research is funded by the institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research is not funded directly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. Development and impact of practice-led research

	Agree Strongly	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Strongly
There is an increasing division between research-active academics and others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Newer academics are more focused on research than their more experienced colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academics today have a much clearer understanding of research than 5 years ago	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academics are confused about the distinction between practice-led research and creative/professional practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research-active academics make a distinctive contribution to curriculum and teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. If practice-led research has made a difference to your subject area it would be helpful if you could give a brief description of ways in which this has happened.

[<< Prev](#)

[Next >>](#)

Practice-led research is highly valued by our collaborators.						
Collaborators have difficulty understanding practice-led research.						
It is difficult to find a supportive collaborator in another discipline.						
We need to look beyond our own institution to find suitable collaborators.						
Collaborators from other disciplines influence our practice-led research methods.						
It is easier to get funding for research with other disciplines.						
Collaborators expect creative disciplines to be subservient to their own (eg providing descriptive accounts of science)						

Institutional Research Survey

SRIF funding - 6th of 9 pages

Questions about Science Research Infrastructure Funding (SRIF)

23. Has your institution applied SRIF funding to your subject?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know

[<< Prev](#) [Next >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

SRIF Funding Continued

You are seeing these questions because you indicated that your institution has applied SRIF funding to your subject area.

24. SRIF investment for practice-led research

- ☐ Has been the main source of investment in our area and made a very significant difference to resources
☐ Has made a useful difference to our resources in some areas
☐ Has made little difference to our resources
☐ Not applicable

25. What kind of resources for practice-led research does this funding support?
(please tick all that apply)

- ☐ New-build
☐ Building refurbishment
☐ Equipment
☐ Communication/computing network facilities
☐ Other (please specify)

[<< Prev](#) [Next >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

HEFCE QR funding (RAE income) - 7th of 9 pages

26. Has your subject received direct income from 2001 RAE?

By direct income we mean money that the research centre or department can spend at its own discretion.

- ☐ As a 5* rated dept
- ☐ As a 5 rated dept
- ☐ As a 4 rated dept
- ☐ Research Capability funding
- ☐ No direct funding
- ☐ Don't know

[<< Prev](#)

[Next >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

HEFCE QR Funding Continued

You are seeing these questions because you indicated that your subject area receives HEFCE QR funding

27. Impact of this funding on practice-led research

- ☐ This funding has been applied in a general way to underpin staff time or resources
- ☐ This funding has been applied to specific practice-led research projects
- ☐ This funding has been applied to specific practice-led research resources
- ☐ The funding has been Used to support practice-led doctoral projects
- ☐ This funding has provided direct support for practice-led research by individual staff
- ☐ This funding has enabled us to start new programmes of practice-led research
- ☐ This funding has primed the pump for successful grant bids for practice-led research
- ☐ This funding has been used in other ways than those listed above (please describe briefly)

[<< Prev](#)

[Next >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

Full Economic Costing (FEC) - 8th of 9 pages

28. Questions about the Full Economic Costing (FEC) system for research grants, which was introduced in September 2005.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Slightly	Neutral	Disagree Slightly	Disagree Strongly
FEC is making us more active in applying for research grants.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FEC makes research council funding more relevant to practice-led researchers in this subject	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FEC is particularly useful to individual researchers in this subject	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FEC stimulates group research projects in this subject	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FEC has taken resources away from researchers and given them to institutions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FEC makes it more difficult to apply for small grants.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29. Do you have any specific comments on the impact of FEC

[Exit this survey >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

About you - last page

Your contribution to the survey will be seen only by the project coordinator and the two project researchers. It will be treated as confidential and any report or data published will be anonymised.

The information requested on this page will help us to contact you if we have any further questions arising from the answers you give.

If you prefer not to provide these details please go on to the next page.

You can come back and edit this page and any other part of the questionnaire before you submit it to us.

30. Your Name

31. Your Job Title

32. Your Institution or Employer

33. Your email address

[Exit this survey >>](#)

Institutional Research Survey

Thank you!

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

If you wish to know more about the Research Review and the people involved you can visit our website at www.ahrcreview.aces.shu.ac.uk which will open automatically when you complete the survey.

Please select "Done" to submit this survey.

(your browser will then open our home page)

[<< Prev](#)

[Done >>](#)

Appendix E: Fine Art Workshop

This event was held in September 2006 with a group of 5 experienced Fine Art academics together with the Review Coordinator. The aim was to examine a number of issues relating to research that did not conform to conventional expectations, as well as reviewing more general issues arising from the review.

The participants are not identified since we wished them to be free to express themselves on controversial issues of problems and preserve confidentiality over institutional policies. Their roles ranged from senior lecturer to head of department and all had been invited because they were recognised as experienced in leading the research community and representing a range of positions. While a wide range of views were expressed, the event was noteworthy for the degree of agreement on important issues as reported below. The discussion was concerned with improving our understanding rather than contesting different views.

Although the discussion was focused on Fine Art, the review group feel that the issues discussed are relevant to design and architecture, even though they may not be experienced so intensely.

Academic Culture and Experience

Discussing academic culture it was felt that the relatively late arrival of Art and Design on the research scene has led to a large proportion of academics that are uncertain about their role in research, but there was a growing community of postgraduates and post-docs who were comfortable with the issues.

Training for doctoral students had received a great deal of attention in recent years, including AHRC funding for a number of inter-institutional schemes. This had produced a strong set of approaches in many institutions, further reinforced by the QAA measures on research degree quality. The main difficulty was the relatively small numbers of doctorates in the field so far and some concerns about whether post-docs are properly understood as candidates for academic posts. Departments tended to value mainstream professional experience over research achievements and there was anecdotal evidence that some institutions may be conflating professional practice with research to allow this to continue even when lip-service is being paid to the need to sustain the research culture.

The main problem, it was felt, was the need to develop a fuller understanding of research in the established academic community. Some institutions have staff mentoring schemes but they lack resources and institutional backing compared to doctoral training and the low proportion

of experienced staff, who also take on the main share of doctoral supervision, have to carry a big burden of peer supervision.

We agreed that the concept of an academic as a developer and custodian of knowledge and a public intellectual was not, in principle, problematic for artists but it can be a problem in practice. It was suggested that the humility required to be a researcher was a particular challenge to artists who might need a different outlook to succeed in professional life.

There was agreement about one very positive aspect of Fine Art research. The professional world has been dominated for many years by a market culture and star system which has emphasised particular kinds of work and values and a form of peer review which may not support the most innovative or enquiring work. The growth of funding for practice-led research has given artists an alternative environment, with its own peer review framework, that allows new thinking to develop in the discipline.

The framework may be problematic in various ways as discussed here but it is having a positive effect and it is highly valued by those who take part. Most academics in Fine Art still need to exhibit in a professional setting but the research culture allows them freedom to innovate.

Methods

In general it was agreed that the principle of question and method do not present fundamental problems for experienced researchers in Fine Art, although they may trouble novices, whereas outcomes or contributions can be very problematic. Outcomes are explored in the next section but there was some useful discussion of methods.

It was observed that many fine art academics find the RAE more addressable than AHRC, not simply because of its more inclusive remit, but because it allows the research to be framed after it is complete. Conventional research funding frameworks expect the research to be determined substantially in advance. In part this problem may be due to inexperience. All disciplines have to contend with the problem of uncertainty in research plans and experienced researchers have pragmatic ways to deal with that by emphasising the aspects of the proposal that can be predicted (or cynically, that they have actually done already) while allowing space for the riskier aspects³.

It was suggested that *"Artists are loath to fit in with any sort of tick box or categorising of what they are doing, they do not want to pin down their process too early. They want to generate space in which something (unexpected) can happen"*. While it is possible to write applications with space in them, and this was seen as a problem of inexperience and shortage of mentoring, it is arguable that we do not yet have a sufficient understanding of how fine art research can operate and that problem is developed in the discussion of outputs and contributions below.

The problem of mentoring was characterised partly by difficulties with peer debate since artists can be very defensive about work in progress⁴. There

³ It is noteworthy that EPSRC criteria for peer review of research bids includes a category for level of risk, with the expectation that too low a risk is as bad as too high. AHRC does not include risk in its criteria.

⁴ It has also been asserted, in other discussions, that artists find it difficult to move between their professional mode of describing their work, which tends to set current

is a need also for processes which allow academics to develop their understanding of research without undermining their standing as teachers. That might include a more explicit apprenticeship model in which academics are able to work alongside experienced colleagues in research supervision but that is difficult to achieve given the increasing pressure on academic time. The participants were aware of examples of formal training in research degree supervision at some institutions and this was seen as a valuable feature although it may not properly address subject-specific problems, especially outside the monotchnics.

Writing was seen as a very big issue for two reasons. Many artists have difficulty with, or are resistant to writing, some believing that it can interfere with their creative practice⁵. A second problem is that art and design graduates are much less experienced with academic writing than most of their peers⁶. AHRC's domain includes some of the most literate disciplines so lack of writing skills may also affect how some individuals compete in the funding arena.

This is not to argue for the abandonment of writing, but it does indicate that some thought should be given the relationship between text and artwork in research, especially where the artwork is the main instrument of the inquiry.

Outcomes and Contributions

The most important problem was that of outcomes, where the members of the workshop felt that the problem was not simply one of interpretation or adaptation of existing research frameworks. For some fine art researchers, the idea of an explicit research output, or contribution to knowledge, that could be neatly recorded in text, was not satisfactory. The most important result of the work might be the impact that the artwork has on other people's understanding which might not be amenable to straightforward description.

A number of variations on this theme were explored in the discussion, eg:

"artists are better at asking questions than providing answers"

"the capacity (for the artwork) to provoke imaginative leaps"

"there are various end points – object, thought, exhibition"

"artists create environment, rather than extending it"

"if you rely on the audience to apprehend the experience etc are you the researcher?"

practice in the context of their own career to date, and presenting research in the context of relevant prior work in the field

⁵ It is common that artists will collaborate with or commission "writers" to provide some form of critique or commentary on their work, for example in catalogues, and the ownership of that analysis must be in doubt. This is not restricted to written contributions, Maude-Roxby (2003) has argued that the role of photographers in interpreting the live art events that they record has been under-estimated consistently.

⁶ In a study of 50 doctoral students in art and design, Hockey and Allen-Collinson (2005) found that only two of the sample (who had completed Masters Degrees) had undertaken a substantial written element in their previous studies and the authors concluded that art and design graduates were very disadvantaged in their ability to understand research processes and develop analytical writing.

“difficulty is that object carries too many functions, in relation to the artworld, and in relation to research, and as site for discussion on knowledge. Too much of a burden”

“to what extent is it important to experience the research (directly)?

“Ideas worked through in material form”

The main result was an agreement that there must be opportunities for research that proceeds through engendering insights or other effects in others and the challenge for the artist/researcher is to develop appropriate ways to own that process and register it, whether through their own research practices or through collaborations with other disciplines. In general doctoral projects are more successful in dealing with this problem.

One feature of this problem is that AHRC's documentation for projects provides a “tick box” listing of types of output and may be encouraging the view that the form of object is the main point rather than its purpose or how it represents or transmits the ideas or outcomes of the research. There was some speculation about how a different approach might draw a much more explicit connection between an output and its role, with benefits for both researcher and reviewer, especially in the end of project review.

It was also agreed that forms of reporting, including the proposal, should use the media most appropriate to the work. At present there are opportunities to include non-text material in bids but there would be value in exploring how the relevant qualities of process and product might be recorded and presented to aid evaluation.

The issue of outcomes and contribution is developed in the main report (**Error! Reference source not found.. Error! Reference source not found.**)

Peer Review

Participants believed that there were a number of opportunities to examine and possibly develop the peer review system. It was noted that peer review is a significant burden on academics, particularly panel members, and this may be a brake on developing a more progressive process since it is arguable that reviewers' workloads are already too high.

Given the relatively small proportion of experienced researchers in our fields, it was agreed that a staged process, which allowed promising proposals to be identified and shortlisted, might be very helpful, especially if it reduced the amount of detailed reviewing and allowed scope for mentoring and richer feedback at each stage. Members reported that some arts funding schemes in the UK and research funding schemes in the USA have a staged approach and this was felt to be very successful in supporting more adventurous work, especially by newer academics. The current scheme was perceived to favour straightforward projects with well-resolved plans using easily recognised methods. There is no single canon of research methods for art and design, which may take in ideas from many disciplines, so it is difficult for reviewers to evaluate novel and hybrid approaches.

Participants were also concerned about the consistency of reviewing, based on the examples of feedback that they had seen and their own experience as reviewers. Some had taken part in the EPSRC mock panel

training scheme and felt that the quality of reviewing encountered there was much more consistent, allowing the panel to concentrate on the ranking and selection process rather than understanding and evaluating individual bids. We recognised that this reflects the relative maturity of the different fields of research involved although it was felt that EPSRC peer review college training was more comprehensive.

Participants' perception of weaker peer reviewers was that they had not recognised the responsibility they were taking on and were inclined to "shoot from the hip" rather than check their assumptions. There were also examples of reviewers failing to recognise when a bid which appeared to fall in their domain (eg by keyword) was in fact dealing with issues outside their knowledge.

AHRC Funding Schemes

Fine Art has received a good proportion of AHRC funding for art and design and AHRC has developed special schemes for the creative disciplines which account for the majority of that funding.

There was some concern about the Fellowship scheme. Participants were not convinced that it contributed to the development of the field in proportion to the resources committed and there was some concern about whether individual fellows were fully engaged with the research agenda and the academic life of the institution that hosted them.

It was agreed that the arrival of Full Economic Costing might make some special schemes less necessary since the FEC model allows for investigators' time to be funded, removing one of the major obstacles to research led by the investigator's own practice.

Miscellany

Other observations included the suggestion that researchers were too inclined to see the practice outcome (eg exhibition) as the end point of the research, and it may be instructive to consider the effect of starting with practice.

Many artists perceive AHRC and the research establishment as more instrumental than is the case. While this is not a serious issue it is clear that some researchers may need help to understand the institutional framework for research (this was a repeated theme in consultation events where "instrumental" was treated by some outspoken individuals as an all-purpose term of abuse, whether the instrumentality involved research methods or the fulfilment of political, social or economic purposes).

Appendix F: Case Studies

F.1 Individual Case Studies

The development of non-periodic patterns

Project Contact: Judith Mottram
Organisation: Clear Art Systems Ltd
Discipline: Design
Email Address: judith.mottram@ntu.ac.uk
Completion Date: 2004
Funded By: Own Institution

Purpose of the enquiry

To develop a software program to generate non-periodic patterns and to determine whether these patterns could be used as designs for weaving Jacquard cloth

Method of research

Experimental trials were the primary means used to work out the interface between the bmp's resulting from the pattern generator and the Jacquard software and its subsequent use on the looms

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Design decisions were taken on which patterns to take to weave trials and further aesthetic and functional decisions were taken on selection of yarn, weave structures and identification of design successes

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The project demonstrated that it was possible to export sections of a non-repeating digital design to a jacquard loom

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

A software program and samples of non-periodic Jacquard weave (ie a self-similar pattern that does not repeat) were produced. A spin-out company was established to explore the further development of the idea. All electronic images files from the trials stage were retained, along with samples of all cloth generated. The process of transferring data between systems was documented in a project report.

Any other comments or observations?

Functional evaluations were implicit in determining whether the research question had been adequately answered.

Publication types General Publication

<p>The project</p> <p>Is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context</p>	<p>where is your project in this range?</p>	<p>i is an investigation of something outside the discipline i arises in an academic context</p>
<p>The Practice</p> <p>is central to the research is site of reflection</p>		<p>i supports the research i is means of production</p>
<p>The Investigation</p> <p>is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions</p>		<p>i is iterative i is secure i is analytical i uses a wide range of theory/methods i challenges orthodoxy i identifies questions</p>
<p>The Outcome or Result</p> <p>product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit</p>		<p>i product understanding of process i open/contingent Outcomes i open to interpretation</p>

Safety of Medical Connectors

Project Contact: Paul Chamberlain

Organisation: Sheffield Hallam University

Discipline: Design

Email Address: p.m.chamberlain@shu.ac.uk

Completion Date: May-04

Funded By: Other National

Purpose of the enquiry

Luer Connectors, used to join tubes carrying drugs into the body, are intrinsically unsafe and joining the wrong two tubes together can kill you. The project set out to discover ways to make these connectors much easier to identify and match up by touch and vision as well as mechanical methods of preventing mis-connection.

Method of research

By developing a set of form concepts the designers provided tools for an initial “quick and dirty” evaluation by anaesthetists to identify promising directions then a more rigorous set of tests of the most promising designs in partnership with cognitive psychologists

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Designing connectors that would be easy to match by sight and feel was perceived as a cognitive problem to be addressed by psychologists but Paul Chamberlain persuaded the research group to let his design team take the initiative. The design practice was essential to envisage the likely outcomes of the project and provide the experimental environment as well as providing the technical knowledge of how an eventual connector would be designed and made.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Method of research

The initial research was in direct response to a tight framework set by the DfES, who provided a wealth of background in terms of strict parameters. The designs developed in a semi-iterative process of draft designs which were then reviewed by client and user groups, often with major revisions arising. The whole process was supported by ongoing literature reviews and precedent

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Design was central to the whole investigation, being used as the means of testing and exposing the research base. Design decisions had to be justified at every stage through explanation of the theoretical basis and rigorous testing against cost, pragmatic and environmental requirements.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The final designs and supporting documentation were collected together with the other architects' work and disseminated at national and international level. The exemplar designs were seen as a major contribution to ways of thinking about school design. The audience was extensive - from teachers to architects, local education authorities to Ministers.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

The main product was a design proposal which was published in a compendium produced by the DfES, and on their website.

Any other comments or observations?

Publication types: Creative/Professional

<p>The project</p> <p>is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context</p>	<p>where is your project in this range?</p>	<p>is an investigation of something outside the discipline arises in an academic context</p>
<p>The Practice</p> <p>is central to the research is site of reflection</p>		<p>supports the research is means of production</p>
<p>The Investigation</p> <p>is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions</p>		<p>is iterative is secure is analytical uses a wide range of theory/methods challenges orthodoxy identifies questions</p>
<p>The Outcome or Result</p> <p>product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit</p>		<p>product understanding of process open/contingent Outcomes open to interpretation</p>

This is not here: Connectedness, remote experience and immersive telematics

Project Contact: Michael Hohl
Organisation: Sheffield Hallam University, UK
Discipline: Fine Art
Email Address: info@hohlwelt.com
Completion Date: in progress
Funded By: AHRC
Web Address: <http://hohlwelt.com/en>

Purpose of the enquiry

Deeper understanding of how live data from remote locations is experienced by participants of an immersive telematic environment. What role does the transformation of this data into other sensorial modalities play? How does the process of collaboration among the participants effect the experiential quality?

Method of research

Practice based, case studies, professional practice. Two studies with participants were conducted examining how they experienced the telematic immersive environment and a screen-based version of it.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Sketching, 2D and 3D modelling, rapid-prototyping during the conceptual phase as a whole were from professional practice. Organising workflow. Communicating with an external programmer consisted of the setup of naming conventions for files and folder and their structure, a version control system that allows management and documentation of the different iterations of the core applications and convenient updates from remote local networks. The set up of a web based change request and bug reporting ("ticket") system that allows convenient report of unexpected or undesired behaviours of the application and also making change requests.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

A novel perspective upon telematic art which is not about "going there" or "meeting in a virtual place" but bringing succinct properties of the remote location in a local display. A novel method of visualising the modalities, media and mediality of data exchanged between remote media art works.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

During the course of the study results were regularly presented at conferences. An online documentation is being continuously updated throughout the research. Radiomap was also exhibited as part of the arts track at the 2004 SIG Multimedia Conference.

Any other comments or observations?

Publication types Academic Publication, General Publication, Creative/Professional, Part of a PhD.

- 1 an investigation of something outside the discipline
- 2 arises in an academic context
- 3 supports the research
- 4 is means of production
- 5 is iterative
- 6 is secure
- 7 is analytical
- 8 uses a wide range of theory/methods
- 9 challenges orthodoxy
- 10 identifies questions
- 11 product understanding of process
- 12 open/contingent Outcomes
- 13 open to interpretation

**course using 3D
design practice**

ogspot.com/

D computer technologies
entional boundaries
ture in order to map the
rt and design to assess
ing.

research questions and
ce. The methodological
cribed as a hybrid
laboratorial practice, and

Justice in the enquiry

ed on collaborative
architectural collaborations
her has produced work
ny 'rootoftwo'

The project	where is your project in this range?	
Is an investigation of the discipline		an investigation of something outside the discipline
arises in a professional/creative context		arises in an academic context
The Practice		
is central to the research		supports the research
is site of reflection		is means of production
The Investigation		
is linear		is iterative
is risky		is secure
is generative		is analytical
uses a single set of theory/methods		uses a wide range of theory/methods
advance an established paradigm		challenges orthodoxy
responds to questions		identifies questions
The Outcome or Result		
product is artefact		product understanding of process
predictable outcomes		open/contingent Outcomes
explicit		open to interpretation

Politicising a Film Practice

Project Contact: Anderson, Gary
Organisation: University of Plymouth, United Kingdom
Discipline: Other
Email Address: gary.anderson@plymouth.ac.uk
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: Own Institution
Web Address: <http://www.eri.mmu.ac.uk>

Purpose of the enquiry

This project has been undertaken in the field of visual arts, specifically moving image research and asks to what extent it is possible to formulate, through experimentation, a radical film practice.

This has focused on the blurring of boundaries between production and reception involving the politicization of the subject matter - my own family and its practices - and the politicisation of the means of film production - in my case Home Movies.

Method of research

Experimentation in film making and viewing practices focusing partly on responses from audiences in non-gallery, non-cinema, non-commercial based contexts. Evolving a changing viewing template for the Home Movie to investigate different constructions of the political in different contexts with different people. This has been informed by a variety of critical readings of cultural production and combines ideas from 'essay' filmmakers and experimental artist film and video in the UK.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

The film practice is twofold. It involves making Home Movies and screening them in non-gallery, non-cinema, non-commercial based contexts. Discussions follow which are documented. The thesis, or the proposition put forward for testing, emerges BETWEEN and BECAUSE OF the film making and the screenings. The role of creative practice is central to the research.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

A collection of reflexive examples of a potentially radical film practice that is cognizant of the contexts of its production and reception. Also, the production of a methodology for the politicisation of elements of immediate contexts through an arts practice. This includes academic contexts with particular reference to the relations between making and writing in doctoral research.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

A series of experimental films were produced and disseminated on DVD by post to those who took part in the screening sessions. Dissemination still continues at home with invited guests, friends and colleagues as well as at academic conferences.

Any other comments or observations?

The research generates reportage drawing in a range of locations including peace protest and arms trade events. These are put into the public domain through mainstream (press) and alternative (peace activist) media. The reception of this work, as well as the experience of producing it, is subjected to analysis in the context of discourses of contemporary and historical war art/ reportage, as well as debates about realism in art theory. A close analysis of theoretical positions on realism over the last 50 years frames and enables this methodology . A framework been developed out of these conflicting theoretical positions by a critical reading of the notion of 'witness' in war art and reportage, as well as activism inspired by religious or spiritual commitment.

	where is your project in this range?			
The project Is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context				is an investigation of something outside the discipline arises in an academic context
The Practice is central to the research is site of reflection				supports the research is means of production
The Investigation is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions				is iterative is secure is analytical uses a wide range of theory/methods challenges orthodoxy identifies questions
The Outcome or Result product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit				product understanding of process open/contingent Outcomes open to interpretation

Design Strategies for the Creation of Universally Designed Built Environments

Project Contact: Yasemin Eren Afacan
Organisation: Middle East Technical University, Turkey
Discipline: Architecture
Email Address: yasemine@bilkent.edu.tr
Completion Date: 2004
Funded By: Other
Web Address: <http://library.metu.edu>

Purpose of the enquiry

The goal of this study is to reread the strategies of formal organization in architecture, which are called “mat-building” and “mat-urbanism”, exploring their potentials to contribute to the creation of universally designed built environments in the 21st century. Today both in Turkey and in other countries around all over the world, there is a crucial need for the equally accessible, adjustable and adaptable built environments. Thus, this research aims to increase the awareness about the significance of universal design approach in the contemporary architecture and urbanism.

Method of research

The question how the seven principles of universal design approach can be brought together with the five characteristics of mat-building is examined. The appropriate universal design principles are in relation to the characteristics of mat-building. The images of the built and proposed projects of both mat building and universal design are introduced and analytical diagrams are formulated by the author in order to bring clarity to the mat-building’s capability of ensuring the creation of the universally designed built environments. Moreover, the whole process was supported by ongoing

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

My contribution with this critical study is not only to explore the potentials of mat-building for universal design’s implementations, but also to open new ways to import creative ideas and design strategies for further research in universal design. The suggested design strategies can be also considered and used as design guidelines to support design practice in an inclusive way.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Today, designers, architects and planners all around the world struggle to create urban environments that are physically, socially and psychologically accessible for all people. In the 21st century’s architecture and urbanism accommodating variation and full participation in the built environment is very important. Therefore, this research can contribute to the realization of the goals of universal design. As the dimensional standards and disability guidelines have important role in universal design, the overall form, the organization of spaces and the whole movement patterns should be also taken into consideration from the point of universal design.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Method of research

The authors have evolved a working method that resists the ubiquitous 'conceptual sketch' or any form of hand drawing during the initial stage of the design process. As we find, it tends toward promoting organisation and function as the defining conceptual narrative. Projects are intensively 'thought through' using a critical approach to place and programme as an intellectual framework to stimulate and constrain thought, and promote dialogue. The aim is to consider the building in all its dimensions simultaneously; we loosely determine its spatial characteristics, its formal and material expression, and, importantly, its 'presence' as a container for the building's programme. A simple proprietary computer drawing package then allows us to develop, manipulate and communicate these ideas simultaneously in plan, section, elevation and, to a degree, in detail.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

The requirement for simultaneity is a determining characteristic of what we term 'active reflection' in practice. Not only as a methodology for progressing individual designs, but also as a method for corroborating and reconciling the range of issues addressed when designing numerous and varied projects in parallel. For the authors, this broad range work, and the professional practice context in which it operates, is a welcome and necessary pressure in the pursuit of a meaningful

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

It is the development of a meaningful and singular language of modern Scottish architecture ('The difficult whole' as Venturi noted) which is the greatest challenge in our emerging research led practice.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Five buildings and projects selected for peer reviewed exhibition at The Royal Scottish Academy of Art and Architecture in December 2005 and April - June 2006. 'Place Programme and Presence' a 2 page illustrated article discussing research led practice in 'Prospect', the journal of The Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland. (next edition). Buildings: Two current projects, in simultaneous design development, are 'The Shed', a new house in an exposed agrarian landscape in Meikle, and a 'Renal and Haematology Unit', connected to an existing pavilion and set within the tight confines of Perth Royal Infirmary. 1. 'The Shed' attempts to master its context and assert a clear and appropriate formal (volumetric) response to the expansive surrounding fields. Its form, although acknowledging a 'traditional' type, is deliberately distorted by the internal disposition of rooms and volumes. The authors argue that the juxtapositions both within the building form; orthogonal and undulous, and through its material expression; hand made and sharply industrial, are abstractions of the building's context and help establish a dialogue between the building and its surroundings. 2. The Renal Unit is a programmatically far more complex problem. Interrelationships are far more prescribed and inflexible. The context is also fixed in that much of the total programme must reuse an existing, characterful, Edwardian pavilion.

Thus, it is the primary characteristics of the Pavilion; its orthogonal plan, layered circulation, articulated black slate and glass roof, which defines a conceptual and literal framework for the new

Any other comments or observations?

It is our intention to produce architecture that may be thought of as communicable art. Its dissemination by published creative critique in

Academic Publications is a primary goal. architectural language. Renal Unit.

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication, Creative/Professional

The project		where is your project in this range?			
Is an investigation of the discipline	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
arises in a professional/creative context	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
an investigation of something outside the discipline					
arises in an academic context					
The Practice					
is central to the research	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
is site of reflection	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
supports the research					
is means of production					
The Investigation					
is linear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
is risky	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
is generative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
uses a single set of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
advance an established paradigm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
responds to questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
is iterative					
is secure					
is analytical					
uses a wide range of theory/methods					
challenges orthodoxy					
identifies questions					
The Outcome or Result					
product is artefact	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
predictable outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
explicit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
product understanding of process					
open/contingent Outcomes					
open to interpretation					

Live Art Garden Initiative

Project Contact: Lauren Goode
Organisation: Independent project. UK
Discipline: Fine Art
Email Address: lauren@liveartgardeninitiative.org.uk
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: Other
Web Address: www.liveartgardeninitiative.org.uk

Purpose of the enquiry

My current experimental practice encompasses two roles – live art practitioner; and artist project director for the Live Art Garden Initiative, an art, architecture and ecology project. Both involve research and development (r&d) that is connected. The Initiative is to conceive of, set-up and develop an art, architecture and ecology project. The project will involve the creation of new garden environments in which site-specific live arts will be created and receive an audience. The practice directions of the Initiative are guided by trans-interdisciplinary research: bio-physics, acoustics and ecology; landscape architecture and sustainability; live art practice and performance-research; contemporary continental philosophy and critical studies. The Initiative commenced in 2004, following related projects since 1994. There are seven associate artists and their backgrounds include: live art, visual art, movement, dance, physical theatre, and interdisciplinary practice.

Context: My concern is with live duration that frames impersonal affects in contrast to representational narratives depicting subjects. I employ

operative devices through movement arts for live affects. Practical work explores improvisation and meditative movement practices.

Explanations, from contemporary physics, of life processes are relevant to problematising 'liveness' in a live art of movement-fields – of the energies of movement-affects rather than of objects. My questions relate to the idea of becoming environment and amplifying a resonance of energy affects. I conduct research in situ to explore energetic conditions unfolding and encompass affects: from seasons and contingent vicinities atmospherics, temperature, light and acoustics. Garden landscape is live ecological architecture of immersive conditioning systems. An aim is to explore the figure as interwoven through speed and not sites as 'settings'. Interactive sonic events involve weather and the pervasive affects of sound energy entrain movement-field entities. An aim is to explore in situ interacting sound vicinities coinciding with movement art.

Environment is an architecture of generative and decaying systems acting on our machinic consciousness. Plant zones provide sensual and erotic habitats and receptivity to these interactions is an issue. Historically gardens have conveyed ideology about loss of innocence, temptation, good and evil. An aim is to problematise gardens as technologies of contemplation and to explore concepts of ontology, non-linearity and open systems. An aim is to pose art as a sensual and uncapturing medium: disrupting knowledge systems from foreclosure to dynamical processes conditioning consciousness.

Artist and project director: Lauren Goode. Associate

artists: Charlotte Bernstein, Claire Keating, Maria Llanderas, Fabrizio Manco, Helen Palmer, Carla

Method of research

R&D has been facilitated through an intensive schedule of live art practice sessions involving in situ exploration at contrasting gardens, parks and other landscape environments. Main activities include: experimentation and piloting of ideas; presentation of new work; creation of publications and resources; site visits; start-up research, planning and fundraising.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Specific performance research practice directions include: Carry out in situ experimentation in contrasting parks, gardens and other outdoor landscapes sensitively engaging with unique environments and contingent events. Consider the site as one's body in extension and inseparable – a connected live architecture unfolding – a multiplicity of actual and virtual dimensions. Work directly with the context and event of the 'live' situation attending to it as a moving phonic surface – of speeds and affects – and not as a representational 'setting'. Evolve the focus of the performance-research from concentrating explorations in the medium of movement: that of the performers in connection with the moving surfaces of spatial and temporal landscape – an energized 'live' canvas. Explore processes that involve establishing movement qualities that embody intensity and poetry. Examples: of movement, include passages, stillness, leaning, rotation and meditation; and, of techniques, are oscillation, repetition, momentum, concentration, improvisation and the breath (to affect propulsion and physiology). Create durational work using intensity to embody connections that are interwoven with unfolding fields of

movement in the specific vicinity. Create performance work that disrupts perception – the performers and the audiences – by a meditative and sensual poetry operating through non-verbal consciousness (although words are not necessarily excluded). Explore ideas that are concerned with dissolving the figural rather than depicting characters or subjective expressivity but remain open to incorporating coincidental narrative and absurdity. Develop the potential, observed in recent video documentation of practice, for new projects to comprise of performance events and film works.

Vendramin. Backgrounds: live art, visual art, movement, dance, video, experimental performance, new technologies, and interdisciplinary practice.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The audience would be those that attended performances or the future garden-environment site project. Currently audiences would include those that visited the web site or resources it makes available. My interests in performance and investigation through experimental performance practice issue from how one might learn from the realm of affects that refuse entry into or some kind of transcription into realms of knowledge.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

On the resources page you can find an education resource that Maria Llanderas and I prepared.

On the project profiles page you can find information about specific projects with downloads of images, eg of the performance events that took place in Greenwich Park (June 2005). Also I have prepared documentation of preliminary performance research on dvd - see project profiles for further info. Forthcoming articles it is intended to publish, include 'Field Foci' (5,500 words). My paper 'Dynamics conditioning a live art of movement-fields' is still in a draft stage and not yet published. Also we have a current web based project called 'This Week' online too. Alongside

Any other comments or observations?

Publication types: General Publication.

	where is your project in this range?		not applicable																																																																																										
The project																																																																																													
Is an investigation of the discipline																																																																																													

Absences- A Digital Re-appraisal of the Highland Clearances

Project Contact: Prof. Kenneth G.Hay
Organisation: The University of Leeds United Kingdom
Discipline: Fine Art
Email Address: k.g.hay@leeds.ac.uk
Completion Date: 2002
Funded By: AHRC
Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

Digital prints and digital CD-Soundtrack for site specific installation in the underground cellars of the Czech National Centre for Experimental Theatre, Brno, Czech Republic. The theme of the work explored forced migration/ethnic cleansing in 18th-century Scotland through digital collages of past/present with a soundtrack of whispered accounts taken from contemporary written sources describing the Clearances. The context relates to Central Europe and World War II clearances as well as current refugee problems in Eastern/Central Europe. Workshops were held with colleagues from Brno University and migrant children in transit through the Czech Republic.

Method of research

Digital Images were produced of Highland Landscapes, combining current landscape with 18th-century imagery of now 'absent' workers, farms, folk-life. Two sets of prints were produced - large-scale laminated landscape prints and small scale digital prints on paper under glass. The Digital CD soundtrack of whispered victims' voices was played through a series of speakers winding through the underground labyrinth of mediaeval Brno and up to the surface of the Theatre to entice participants in. Precedents include site-specific artworks and video/social participatory installations. The research explored new ways to make 'old' history relevant to a modern audience, and to make bridges across cultures based on similar human experience of loss, displacement, tragedy. The challenge was to make artworks which were interesting and engaging whilst simultaneously dealing with painful issues, and to engage a non specialist art-public in contemporary digital arts.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Creative practice involved the production of medium-large-scale digital prints, laminated, smaller scale prints on paper, and a digital CD soundtrack using a variety of filters and sound programmes/technology. Historical research was undertaken to ensure accurate depiction/treatment of the events/places/ characters. The creative process was engaged in unifying, in a satisfactory way, the disparate elements and envisaging how to situate the work and engage with its specific audience- the general and theatre-going public in Eastern Europe.

Previous training and experience in painting, digital media and public participatory art provided the background skills and experience which were developed in this project.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Artworks: * 6 large digital prints comprising contemporary Highland landscapes with superimposed images of 'absent workers'; * A series of 12 smaller scale digital prints on paper collaging contemporary Scottish landscapes with elements deriving from 18th-century prints.* A small catalogue linking this exhibition with three others in Brno organised contemporaneously * A fuller catalogue with documentation and illustrations is forthcoming*Website information available on

Any other comments or observations?

The Exhibition/installation was part of an on-going ten-year collaboration with Masaryk University and Brno Polytechnic University Art Departments which has led to a number of joint exhibitions, publications, exchanges and events. We are currently forming a research network between the UK, Romania, Poland and the UK to explore further these ideas of European integration post -communism, common ground in practice based PhDs, multimedia and digital technology, and contemporary Eastern and Western European approaches to art education and practice. contemporary digital arts. background skills and experience which were developed in this project. and relevant to a wide audience.

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication.

The project	where is your range?		
Is an investigation of the discipline			an investigation of something outside the discipline
arises in a professional/creative context			arises in an academic context
The Practice			
is central to the research			supports the research
is site of reflection			is means of production
The Investigation			
is linear			is iterative
is risky			is secure
is generative			is analytical
uses a single set of theory/methods			uses a wide range of theory/methods
advance an established paradigm			challenges orthodoxy
responds to questions			identifies questions
The Outcome or Result			
product is artefact			product understanding of process
predictable outcomes			open/contingent Outcomes
explicit			open to interpretation

Green and Smart

Project Contact: John Lindsay
Organisation: Kingston University United Kingdom
Discipline: Design
Email Address: lindsay@king.ac.uk
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: Other
Web Address: www.greenandsmart.org

Purpose of the enquiry

What is meant by sustainable transport? How have the agencies of governance responded to the emergence of the issues? What has been the consequence of the white paper on integrated transport of 1997? Is information systems design represented and understood in the transportation industries? How have the artefacts generated by Beck, H. developed since the 1930s? Has there been any more general learning about information systems design? How have the new information and communication technologies been implemented to support sustainable transport? How is walking and public transport recognised and promoted as sustainable transport?

Method of research

The research started by recognising that an Ordnance survey map would not even allow you to identify a railway station, and neither would the A-Z. The first five years were taken up with trying to map the actual public transport routes onto maps. Just around London. At the same time we investigated the Beck diagram and others, collecting a large library. We then attempted to design different notations which would allow for the negotiation of public transport systems and rights of way systems to facilitate walking in the designed landscape. On the basis of this evidence we then attempted to engage more broadly in what might be understood as sustainable transport. The cases from this evidence, or the evidence of these cases has been worked up in a variety of media and is available as appropriate.

This work is ongoing.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

The core professional practice is that of information systems design. But we must be concerned also with the practice of political decision making, the professions of civil engineering, architecture, planning, and others. We would wish to make a broadranging and sweeping statement on the basis of our evidence, that these professions have adjusted hardly at all to the issues of green and smart.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Well, in a short hand form, none. The communities of practice which should be engaged appear completely uninterested. This assertion seems to need support, which feeds into the design process.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Method of research

Thinking and making was the primary method of research, the aim being to model Miesian architecture in the form of a three-dimensional lattice structure made from coloured thread and held in a foam-board support. The challenge of building just the grid only met with a whole series of manufacturing problems however, once these had been sufficiently, if not perfectly, solved it became possible to look and to see what the spatial qualities of the artefact thus produced actually were. Although the idea of the grid is conceptually simple, in its material manifestation what was simple was nowhere to be seen. Sometimes the colourful structure would appear to condense a cloud of radiant plasma, at other times to vibrate, as if an invisible force was acting upon the threads, switching them from on to off.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

A key component of the research was the proposal of The Project of the Cotton Caves; the ambition was to suggest a space of representation for the new town of Stevenage. The actualisation on a large scale of those vibrant optical qualities, derived from Miesian architecture, would stand for the revitalisation of the abstract space of the new town; as if breathing warmth back into the icy cold body of the town without a heart. It was proposed that an array of cave structures be chiselled into the chalk dells that surround the new town, into the hollow volumes of these white shells would be sewn the soft bodies of the colourful lattice structures. Speculating that searching for 'Cotton Grid' would become a magical component of the life of the town and engagement in the experience of looking, curiously stimulating, as if in anticipation of something new that is about to happen.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The investigation adds to knowledge in several ways, firstly it adds to the debate about Modern architecture (as opposed to modernist architecture) offering new insights into the work of one of Modern architecture's leading exponents; secondly it adds to knowledge through the invention of the Cotton Grid. The phenomenon of the Cotton Grid far exceeds the limited objective of modelling Miesian architecture, pointing towards new areas of architectural research: our aim being to develop the phenomenon with a view to constructing a house. This research will be of general interest to students of architecture and of particular interest to students of Miesian architecture. It may also be of some interest to students interested in abstraction in Modern art.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Victoria Watson, 'Mies van der Rohe - drawing in space', Caroline van Eck & Edward Winters (eds), *Dealing with the Visual*, Art History, Aesthetics and Visual Culture, London, Ashgate, 2005

Architectural Design v74, n5, 83/84; v75, n2, 92 & v75, n6, 120/121 On the Bridge, an exhibition at the University of Westminster (September – December 2004)

Any other comments or observations?

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication, Creative/Professional, Part of a PhD.

Project Contact:	Paul Sermon
Organisation:	The University of Salford UK/Taiwan
Discipline:	Fine Art
Email Address:	p.sermon@salford.ac.uk
Completion Date:	Apr-06
Funded By:	Arts Council
Web Address:	http://www.paulsermon

To produce a new telematic media art installation as a result of spending three months at Taipei Artists Village as an artist-in-residence, representing the UK for the Taiwan Visiting Arts Fellowship exchange programme 2006.

The creative development process was undertaken in three phases during the residency programme: 1. Locating and identifying a site specific venue, 2. Combing the specifics of the venue with cultural context of the residency experience, 3. Developing the installation concept as a result of the initial stages and producing the exhibition based on this outcome.

HEADROOM is a juxtaposition of my experiences in Taipei, between the way people live and work, and the way people escape through leisure and spiritual pursuits, as an analogy between the solitude presence in the private space of the home and “divine” telepresent aspirations in the Internet space globally. This is further manifested in much of life in Taipei, such as very basic noodle bars and soup kitchens between KTV clubs (karaoke), 7/11's, high rise office blocks and countless temples devoted countless incarnations of the Buddha.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

This installation is also referencing Roy Ascott's essay, "Is There Love in the Telematic

Embrace?", where Ascott addressed a common concern amongst critics that technology would dehumanise the arts. But if telematic art had the potential to embody love, it would not be paradoxical for art to be electronic and simultaneously serve humanist principles. Reminiscent of Nam June Paik's early Buddha TV installations, HEADROOM is a reflection of the self within the telepresent space, as both the viewer and the performer of this intimate encounter which supports and forwards both Roy Ascott's hypothesis and Paik's transformation of the television into a stage or a portal between the causes and effects that simultaneously take place in the minds of the

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Research diary developed in collaboration with The Presence Project (AHRC funded) at The University of Exeter:
<http://presence.stanford.edu:3455/Collaboratory/500Interactive>
telematic art installation production and exhibition documentation:

<http://www.paulsermon.org/headroom>

Any other comments or observations?

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication.

The project	where is your project in this range?	
Is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context		an investigation of something outside the discipline arises in an academic context
The Practice is central to the research is site of reflection		supports the research is means of production
The Investigation is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions		is iterative is secure is analytical uses a wide range of theory/methods challenges orthodoxy identifies questions
The Outcome or Result product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit		product understanding of process open/contingent Outcomes open to interpretation

Designing the Performative Object: a study in designing mindful interaction

Project Contact: Dr Kristina Niedderer

Organisation: Plymouth University/Falmouth College of Art/Alessi United Kingdom

Discipline: Design

Email Address: k.niedderer@herts.ac.uk

Completion Date: 2004

Funded By: Falmouth College of Art/Alessi

Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

To investigate the potential of design to intentionally cause mindful social interaction, i.e. whether artefacts can stimulate user behaviour by means of their function, and whether this stimulation can cause mindful reflection and interaction. To identify such objects as a separate/new category of design object, called performative object (PO).

Method of research

The activity of proposing the PO as a new category determined the study as a naming and classification study, which required the concept development and testing of the category of PO. The testing was conducted through the conceptual and comparative analysis of examples of design objects.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

The comparison was theoretical in nature; the theoretical development of the conceptual analysis was complemented by some practice. The practice was used to explore the potential of function to cause mindfulness to develop an understanding of the characteristics of POs, and to provide further evidence in terms of examples.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The outcome and contribution of this thesis was that we can identify artefacts with certain characteristics of mindfulness and function as performative objects (POs) and that we can distinguish them as a separate category of definable design objects.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Thesis, conference papers, book chapter:

Designing the Performative Object: a study in designing mindful interaction through artefacts (PhD-thesis, unpublished). Falmouth College of Art / Plymouth University, 2004.

"Exploring the Expressive Potential of Function" in: Jönsson, L. (ed.) Craft in Dialogue: Six Views on a Practice in Change. Gothenburg, Sweden: IASPI/Craft in Dialog, 2005.

"Designing the Performative Object: a study in designing mindful interaction through artefacts" in: Redmond, J., D. Durling, and A. de Bono (eds.) FutureGround, Volume 2 (CD): Proceedings of the Design Research Society International Conference 2004 at Monash University. Melbourne, Australia: Monash University, 2004.

"The Performative Object: Enacting the Humane Dimension within Design" in Electronic Proceedings of the 5th International Conference of the European Academy of Design. Barcelona, Spain: European Academy of Design, 2003. <http://www.ub.es/5ead> A number of artefacts (drinking vessels) to explore the concept of function

See related work on:

<http://www.mdx.ac.uk/subjects/ad/aar/staff/niedderer.htm>)

Any other comments or observations?

My thanks to my supervisors: Prof Gaynor Kavanagh, FCAProf Michael Biggs, University of Hertfordshire Dr Nick Udall, Nowhere Group to my examiner: Prof Bob Jerrard, University of Central England and for support and advice to: Bob Pulley, Principal, West Dean College Alessi Company, Italy

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication, Part of a PhD.

The project	where is your project in this range?					not applicable
Is an investigation of the discipline	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	an investigation of something outside the discipline	<input type="radio"/>
arises in a professional/creative context	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	arises in an academic context	<input type="radio"/>
The Practice						
is central to the research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	supports the research	<input type="radio"/>
is site of reflection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is means of production	<input type="radio"/>
The Investigation						
is linear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is iterative	<input type="radio"/>
is risky	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is secure	<input type="radio"/>
is generative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is analytical	<input type="radio"/>
uses a single set of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	uses a wide range of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>
advance an established paradigm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	challenges orthodoxy	<input type="radio"/>
responds to questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	identifies questions	<input type="radio"/>
The Outcome or Result						
product is artefact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	product understanding of process	<input type="radio"/>
predictable outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	open/contingent outcomes	<input type="radio"/>
explicit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	open to interpretation	<input type="radio"/>

Architectural Models

Project Contact: Bradley Starkey
Organisation: University of Nottingham United Kingdom
Discipline: Architecture
Email Address: Bradley.Starkey@nottingham.ac.uk
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: Self
Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

To investigate the role of the model in architecture in comparison with conceptions and applications of models in other disciplines and contexts. The design project speculatively explores diverging ways of using the model in architecture.

Method of research

Text based research and research by design/design by making. The design-based research involved the construction of a physical architectural model.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

The process of designing through the process of making was central to the investigation. Central to the theoretical intention was the assertion that

To investigate the East African textile named 'kanga' that has received limited analysis regarding design characteristics and symbolism. To produce studio work inspired by the study.

	where is your project in this range?							not applicable
The project								
Is an investigation of the discipline	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	an investigation of something outside the discipline	<input type="radio"/>
arises in a professional/creative context	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	arises in an academic context	<input type="radio"/>
The Practice								
is central to the research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	supports the research	<input type="radio"/>
is site of reflection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is means of production	<input type="radio"/>
The Investigation								
is linear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is iterative	<input type="radio"/>
is risky	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is secure	<input type="radio"/>
is generative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is analytical	<input type="radio"/>
uses a single set of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	uses a wide range of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>
advance an established paradigm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	challenges orthodoxy	<input type="radio"/>
responds to questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	identifies questions	<input type="radio"/>
The Outcome or Result								
product is artefact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	product understanding of process	<input type="radio"/>
predictable outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	open/contingent Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>
explicit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	open to interpretation	<input type="radio"/>

Cultural Literacies and the Production of Identities in Northern Ireland

Project Contact: Prof. Kerstin Mey
Organisation: Interface, School of Art and Design, University of Ulster United Kingdom
Discipline: Fine Art
Email Address: k.mey@ulster.ac.uk
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: AHRC
Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

The proposed investigation focuses on young people within Northern Irish interface communities, that is within those socially, politically, religiously and culturally determined spaces (real, virtual and hybrid), where different 'cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other'. It seeks to identify the specific forms of expression, the complex symbolic languages and layered codes of style through which young people articulate how they see themselves and would like to be seen, how they perceive and live their own lives, what their aspirations and association/belonging to specific social/cultural groupings are and how they participate in society. Consideration will be given to determining factor such as class, age and ethnicity within the framework of this investigation. The project will therefore train an artist-researcher to develop much needed practice-based diagnostic insights, applicable tools and creative strategies in order to:

- identify and apprehend forms of digital cultural practices through qualitative research and case studies
- understand their operation and effects on the construction and transformation of identities
- develop advanced strategies for participatory art practices appropriate for young people in the age of digitisation and the 'networked' society in the specific political and social context of Northern Ireland.

Method of research

The proposed research project is situated within contemporary research in art practice and focuses on the use of digital media. It is based in creative practice, its methods, techniques, skills and outcomes. Forms of expression through digital media are a growing area of cultural and social practices where traditional categories of popular culture and high art are greatly undermined and abandoned for broader, participatory and interactive concepts of creativity, fed by an experimentation with and appropriation of both emerging technologies and symbolic languages. It is an area where the boundaries between what is considered private and what is public are shifting or collapse. Digital environments offer the potential to connect users from diverse social and cultural backgrounds, of different sex, gender and ethnicity as well as age, in communicative interaction, converging real and virtual spaces. They promote the formation of fluid, temporary and more stable communities based on shared perception of reality, values and aspirations (identification processes). Digital practices (can) work across, and integrate a diverse range of significant modes of re-presentation such as image, text, sound, space and bodily gestures. Looking at digital cultural practices and media

	where is your project in this range?			
The project is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context				is an investigation of something outside the discipline arises in an academic context
The Practice is central to the research is site of reflection				supports the research is means of production
The Investigation is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions				is iterative is secure is analytical uses a wide range of theory/methods challenges orthodoxy identifies questions
The Outcome or Result product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit				product understanding of process open/contingent Outcomes open to interpretation

Landscape Gallery

Project Contact:	John Lindsay
Organisation:	Kingston University United Kingdom
Discipline:	Design
Email Address:	lindsay@king.ac.uk
Completion Date:	Work in Progress
Funded By:	Other
Web Address:	

Purpose of the enquiry

To work out the status of the concept of the landscape in the scholarly apparatus; To provide a case for green and smart, which combines public transport, walking, information systems design, into a designed thing, the landscape gallery. To investigate methods of bringing this gallery into being, given we have a national, a portrait, a design, a V&A, and so forth, but not a landscape. See your discipline field above. More to follow.

Method of research

There have been three methods. The first is the setting up of an institutional framework of what might constitute a gallery. The second is the collection of a large amount of material, and its organisation. The third is the intervention into other institutions in order to estimate response.

The project	where is your project in this range?			
Is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context				 an investigation of something outside the discipline arises in an academic context
The Practice	is central to the research is site of reflection			supports the research is means of production
The Investigation	is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions			is iterative is secure is analytical uses a wide range of theory/methods challenges orthodoxy identifies questions
The Outcome or Result	product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit			product understanding of process open/contingent Outcomes open to interpretation

Infallible, Aspects of Fiction in Contemporary Art

Project Contact: Roxy Walsh
Organisation: University of Newcastle United Kingdom
Discipline: Fine Art
Email Address: roxalinerose@yahoo.co.uk
Completion Date: Work in Prog
Funded By: UK Arts Council
Web Address: www.infallible.org.uk

Purpose of the enquiry

This project explored, developed and produced complex and intriguing relationships between fiction and contemporary art.

Method of research

The originality of this project lay in its progressive, compound structure. A pilot exhibition of 18 artists at APT gallery in London was mounted in 2003 with a website funded by the then AHRB. Works in the show had a variety of different relationships to fiction. Three writers were commissioned to respond, in fiction, to the show, and this writing, (including interactive work), was posted during the exhibition on the website. The Arts council Touring exhibition that developed from this pilot built on the model, with writers and audience responding to the exhibitions online.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

11 new pieces of writing were commissioned and 5 of visual art. Creative practice was at the very core of the project, with the research questions being elucidated through the bringing together of existing and commissioned works.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The research shows how models of relationships between art writing, exhibition production and art practice can be expanded and developed. It developed a model of how different audiences could be engaged at different points and levels of a project. This project had a very wide audience - (11,964 people visited the exhibitions), and more came to the project through the book and study day at Tate Britain. The exhibition audience included all age ranges, and had a broad general appeal. On completion of the project I was invited to speak to Art History MA students at Goldsmiths college on the project, and there were educational events for a range of different groups throughout the project. Audiences came to the project with a wide variety of backgrounds, from academic interrogation to a more casual engagement. At the University Gallery venues, academics from different disciplines introduced the project from their own perspective. In the 'audience' for the project, it is important to stress the key role of the post-hoc events that further explored and evaluated the findings of the research.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

4 x Group Exhibitions, (Commissioner / Curator / Artist)• APT Gallery, London (2003)• Mead Gallery, Warwick Arts Centre (2003)• Huddersfield Art Gallery (2004) Hatton Gallery, Newcastle (2005),

To explore the feasibility of mass-individualisation (the industrial production of one-off artefacts) achieved via generative design and digital manufacture. To consider the implications such a model has for the design process, the definitions of mass production and craft production, 'Design for manufacture', the authorship/ownership of design, and the consumer as designer.

The project		where is your project in this range?		not applicable	
Is an investigation of the discipline				an investigation of something outside the discipline	
arises in a professional/creative context				arises in an academic context	
The Practice					
is central to the research				supports the research	
is site of reflection				is means of production	
The Investigation					
is linear				is iterative	
is risky				is secure	
is generative				is analytical	
uses a single set of theory/methods				uses a wide range of theory/methods	
advance an established paradigm				challenges orthodoxy	
responds to questions				identifies questions	
The Outcome or Result					
product is artefact				product understanding of process	
predictable outcomes				open/contingent Outcomes	
explicit				open to interpretation	

alte Marke - neue Märkte (old brand - new markets)

Project Contact: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Jonas
Organisation: University of Kassel Germany
Discipline: Design
Email Address: jonasw@uni-kassel.de
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: Commercial Client
Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

Establishing an innovation culture for an old, family-owned company, which has been active in the area of simple natural healthcare products for a century and which is looking for new markets.

Method of research

Research through design: systemic analysis (organization, corporate culture, portfolio, markets, etc.), user studies of various type, sensitivity modelling (Vester SM-tools), projection (scenarios), synthesis (conceptual prototyping of new products and services).

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Creative practice has the function of a visual medium to communicate concepts of corporate culture, new products, new services, etc.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

A systemic model as a knowledge based tool, usable as an early warning system for sensing market movements. The installation of new product development as a permanent issue in the company. The approach is transferable to other SMEs of similar structure. Enquiry into and development of design as a consultancy competence in new product development contexts.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

A project documentation, which will be developed into a handbook for similar cases...

Any other comments or observations?

The case is situated at the "research through design" pole in my theoretical framework of "research through DESIGN through research", which describes the continuum between design-based / design-driven / project-based / practice-led / ... research and scientific research.

Publication types: Creative/Professional, Part of a PhD?

Project Contact:	Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Jonas
Organisation:	University of Kassel Germany
Discipline:	Design
Email Address:	jonasw@uni-kassel.de
Completion Date:	Work in Progress
Funded By:	Own Institution
Web Address:	

Designing strategies against alimentary obesity in the context of primary school education.

Identifying the issues, which prevent the implementation of existing scientific findings in school environments.

Research through design: Systemic analysis of the system of stakeholders, communications, dependencies, influences, sensitivity modelling (Vester SM-tools), field studies, identification of missing links, points of promising intervention, etc.

Creative practice has the function to explore and generate unexpected new connections in the network and to visualize and communicate the integrated model of food / nutrition education.

Development of an integrated model of food / nutrition education and practice, applicable in comparable school environments. Enquiry into and development of design as a consultancy competence in social development contexts.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Juxtaposition of short video footage in webpages. Presentation to an audience. Observation of audience/self response."Curiosity got the better

of me, and I went in search of the particular Stars Wars footage that I had in mind, and also a free-to air recording that CNN had broad cast. I found the CNN recording and also Ceri Llewellyn's parody/remake of the Star Wars scene I had in mind "Star Wras". I then juxtaposed the two short video clips, initially in separate Web browser windows and eventually in the same window. "Audiences have described the juxtaposition as;

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

The act of taking free to air video and another artist's animation and juxtaposing the two, relates to what I see as "painting" methodology as I apply it in adult education research. In this small project the creative act and practice with multi-media technologies were formative the evolution of the project which became multi-modal, embracing the later stages of presentation and observation of an audience other than myself. Each time I replay the juxtaposed footage with its various possibilities of synchronisation, I see something new that had previously escaped my attention.

Most recently my attention was taken to the CNN commentator's question; 'Who was in those planes?' met by 'Red Three standing by, Red Six standing by, Red Nine standing by, and then the

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

To get to this stage where I can describe my reflection and this juxtaposition in detail, I have had

to replay the individual footage and transcribe the soundtrack, something I have never done before. The question arises what am I researching through the creation of this juxtaposition? Is it an insight into my own quirky mind that makes "politically incorrect" thoughts? Am I trying to understand the phenomenon that Krug has raised and exploring Krug's assumptions. Am I exploring media and politics further? Am I about to compare the Homelands Security legislation with Orwell's "Thought Police"? Am I exploring what it means to juxtapose, as an extension of my painterly enquiry? Am I interested in the learning potential of juxtaposed Web media? Am I interested in my audience reaction to presentation of this particular or any juxtaposed material?

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

The juxtaposition has been performed within broader presentations: "Organising visual learning and research, painters' methodologies in hypermedia" Paul Reader 26-4-2005 PDaL Seminar UNE and Research of Painting Practice Using Hyper-media and its Application for Development of Free-form Web-based Teaching Materials. Designs on E-Learning London Sept 2005

Any other comments or observations?

I have provided this example because it demonstrates that a practice based research act can precede formulation of a research question. It also begs the question as to what constitutes a methodology?

Publication types: Academic Publication.

FreeForm® haptic system) in commercial (Procter and Gamble) and academic contexts. Design practice to translate research findings into

coherent visual and verbal proposals for next-generation digital modelling systems, serving as a catalyst and pointer to future R&D.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Key contributions (and audiences in brackets): articulation of the precise problems of current digital design tools / CAD for practising industrial design and creation of an evidence base for their resolution (HCI hardware/software developers); improved understanding of the nature and role of physical sketch modelling in industrial design (designers, design researchers, design educators).

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Academic publications: PhD thesis; numerous conference papers; numerous journal papers.

Design outcomes: designs and prototypes of consumer goods; internal evaluation report for

Procter and Gamble; illustrations and rationale for next-generation digital design tools for industrial design.

Any other comments or observations?

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication, Part of a PhD.

The project		where is your project in this range?			
Is an investigation of the discipline	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> an investigation of something outside the discipline
arises in a professional/creative context	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> arises in an academic context
The Practice					
is central to the research	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> supports the research
is site of reflection	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> is means of production
The Investigation					
is linear	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> is iterative
is risky	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> is secure
is generative	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> is analytical
uses a single set of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> uses a wide range of theory/methods
advance an established paradigm	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> challenges orthodoxy
responds to questions	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> identifies questions
The Outcome or Result					
product is artefact	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> product understanding of process
predictable outcomes	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> open/contingent Outcomes
explicit	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> open to interpretation

Some problems of designing for AAC users

Project Contact: Dr Jonathon Allen
Organisation: Loughborough University United Kingdom
Discipline: Design
Email Address: jonathon.allen@artdes.monash.edu.au
Completion Date: 2002
Funded By: Own Institution
Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

To advance the design of, and champion new approaches to designing, products for people with severe communication disabilities and physical impairment; the particular focus was users of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) devices.

Method of research

Empirical research 1: practice-led research, in which the investigative-creative act that is designing was adopted as a legitimate research method: research questions were clarified and modified through designing (i.e., through the investigative techniques characteristic of industrial design, including studies of users and product interactions), and were addressed through designing (i.e., through the engagement of industrial design decision-making). Also prior art reviews to properly

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Design practice to directly engage in investigating, understanding, and responding to the research area and research questions, thereby adopting designing as a mode of enquiry.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Key contributions (and audiences in brackets): guidelines in good practice for design approaches/methods and product specifications in the area of AAC devices (designers); improved understanding of how to elicit the needs of people with pronounced disabilities in order to design better products for them (designers, design researchers, design educators).

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Academic publications: PhD thesis; numerous conference papers; numerous journal papers. Design outcomes: fully working prototype communication device.

Any other comments or observations?

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication, Part of a PhD.

	where is your project in this range?			
The project Is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context				 an investigation of something outside the discipline arises in an academic context
The Practice is central to the research is site of reflection				 supports the research is means of production
The Investigation is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions				 is iterative is secure is analytical uses a wide range of theory/methods challenges orthodoxy identifies questions
The Outcome or Result product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit				 product understanding of process open/contingent Outcomes open to interpretation

Industrial designers' attention to materials and manufacturing processes

Project Contact:	Dr Owain Pedgley	
Organisation:	Loughborough University	United Kingdom
Discipline:	Design	
Email Address:	o.f.pedgley@lboro.ac.uk	
Completion Date:	1999	
Funded By:	Own Institution	
Web Address:		

Purpose of the enquiry

To advance understanding of the information, knowledge, skills and values deployed by industrial designers when making decisions on product materials and manufacturing routes.

Method of research

Empirical research 1: practice-led research through a longitudinal design project (the design of a new polymer acoustic guitar); completion of a diary of designing. Empirical research 2: interviews with practising industrial designers, design engineers and applied artists; interview and diary studies with undergraduate designers. Also prior art to properly ground the work.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Design practice to generate case study data comprising documentary evidence of design activity, for subsequent analysis at macroscopic (strategic / resource) and microscopic (trains of thought / rationale) levels. Design practice to provide a vehicle for the development of data collection instruments and research methods suited to documenting design activity.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Key contributions (and audiences in brackets): improved understanding of resources, creativity and decision-making on materials and processes appropriate to practising industrial design (information providers, designers, design educators); development and evaluation of a bespoke diary of designing for documenting practice-led research (designers, design researchers).

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Academic publications: PhD thesis; numerous conference papers; numerous journal papers.

Design outcomes: fully working prototype polymer acoustic guitar (which has subsequently developed into a major university venture - Cool Acoustics - and which in the mean time has received more effort and external recognition than the PhD from which it came - a rewarding and unpredicted situation, but not without its problems!); also DVD, booklet, media attention etc.

Any other comments or observations?

With the benefit of hindsight, and the research discussions that have been held in the period since submitting the PhD, I would now be confident to supervise practice-led design research directed solely at product innovation (e.g. pushing technology for non-wood musical instruments forward).

In 1995, neither I nor my supervisory team were brave enough, informed enough or armed with sufficient examples to take that route. Things have moved on very positively since then.

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication, Creative/Professional, Part of a PhD.

The project		where is your project in this range?			
Is an investigation of the discipline	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
arises in a professional/creative context	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<p>an investigation of something outside the discipline</p> <p>arises in an academic context</p>					
The Practice					
is central to the research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
is site of reflection	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>supports the research</p> <p>is means of production</p>					
The Investigation					
is linear	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
is risky	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
is generative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
uses a single set of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
advance an established paradigm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
responds to questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>is iterative</p> <p>is secure</p> <p>is analytical</p> <p>uses a wide range of theory/methods</p> <p>challenges orthodoxy</p> <p>identifies questions</p>					
The Outcome or Result					
product is artefact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
predictable outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
explicit	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>product understanding of process</p> <p>open/contingent Outcomes</p> <p>open to interpretation</p>					

“Foreplay”: an experimental film developing emblematic uses of narrative and

Project Contact: Richard Wright
Organisation: London Metropolitan University United Kingdom
Discipline: Other
Email Address: richard@dig-lgu.demon.co.uk
Completion Date: 2004
Funded By: AHRC
Web Address: <http://www.futurenatural.net/projects.html#foreplay>

Purpose of the enquiry

The main purpose of this practical research project was to create a filmed equivalent of Bosch's 1500 triptych of "The Garden of Earthly Delights", using it to uncover a historical continuity in the themes of desire and mortality it addresses and finding an appropriate contemporary artistic form in which these themes could be expressed. My previous PhD research aimed to show that the cultural form of the allegory was one that was particularly relevant to the developing aesthetics of digital media, especially in the moving image. An important question then was how to organise the essentially nonlinear allegorical references of the painting into the linear, narrative like allegory of the film, a question which is also related to recent debates on the ways in which image based meaning is straining narrative form in contemporary films like special effects films and digital

Method of research

A strong theoretical influence was Walter Benjamin's description of modern life as "hellish repetition" and of the sex industry as a prime situation in which the human body as commodity is undermined by its own mortality. This led me to concentrate on the porn film as the form in which the modern "tragedy of desire" is played out, usually overlooked as a banal or denigrated popular genre but which nevertheless holds a powerful fascination. There have been many studies of porn but they are almost always limited to a critique of its industry and social status rather than an analysis of its aesthetic or its cultural motifs. I also referred to the theory that film genres reflect the social and cultural concerns of their audience, therefore thwarting audiences genre expectations can be revealing of their underlying values and beliefs. I studied some narrative theory, particularly that which stressed its role as a technique, as a way of interconnecting ideas rather than as the total form of meaning itself. And of course I spent ages peering at Bosch's painting itself, wondering at how he had arranged all those little scenes across the surface of the image in all their hallucinogenic detail.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

My main practical method was in the writing, visual design and conceptual structure of the film. I extracted the most significant features of the porn genre – its repetitive, inexorable overcoding of sexual gratification that always promises more than it fulfils – and used them to write a script and treatment for a film with a structure of endlessly interrupted gratification. To support this process, I drew on films which used similar circular

structures, particularly Bunuel's "Discrete Charm of the Bourgeoisie" and Schnitzler's "La Ronde". After the film had been shot I spent some time with it in postproduction, editing and reviewing the footage and creating extra material and visual effects. The main problem was to employ enough narrative devices to propel the viewer through the film whilst at the same time to avoid the narrative becoming the subject of the film and obscuring the

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The film contributes to knowledge/practice by constructing an interpretation of porn culture as an ongoing historical theme about repetition, desire and mortality that dates back to Bosch's "Garden of Earthly Delights", using this analysis to produce a film that critiques or satirises the porn movie genre, and achieving this by developing ways that narrative devices can be combined with more static conceptual structures (using certain visual elements and effects). Because the historical critique of porn is a specifically cultural and aesthetic critique, it makes sense to demonstrate the research results in an artistic artefact (the film) - to make the form and method appropriate to and in the same terms as the subject of the enquiry. The "Foreplay" film uncovers cultural motifs in the modern porn genre by elaborating, intensifying and transforming its devices and styles to reveal it as a modern vanitas form. "Foreplay" will indisputably look like a porn film yet extract new levels of meaning for its audience by focusing on neglected elements and recontextualising them. The audience for this investigation would be other film makers and moving image artists, critics and media and film theorists. I think this would still be the case whether it was presented in a research context or otherwise.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

The critical essay "Waking Up from Cinema" was published in the Spring 2003 issue of Vertigo magazine, Vol 2, no. 4. The video "Foreplay" was completed at 18 minutes in length, mastered on DV and was screened at a number of national and international film and video festivals and university based research seminars. animation. conceptual structure.

Any other comments or observations?

I wanted to submit this report in order to show how the artistic process of making a film might fit into the purposes of academic research. Fortunately my artistic practice has always been strongly informed by theoretical debate which helps, but it should also be clear I hope, how far practical art and design research diverges from scientific and theoretical research yet I believe nevertheless retains its validity. It was not possible for me to attend the meetings that accompanied this review but I was drawn to questions like "Does the tangible outcome of the work convey knowledge?" I produced a written article as one of my outcomes but as it turned out I don't think it was a necessary one. In the end the written article diverged somewhat from the subject of the film and in any case it would be very difficult to find a publication willing to indulge an artist writing solely about their own work. For me, what really makes it research rather than just a production was that it was openly and systematically pursued and that it was openly and systematically pursued so that it could be expounded and disseminated as research, particularly if you include the project report written for the AHRB. This implies that some kind of contextualising material is often necessary, like a report to tell you how

the work conveys knowledge, to make the practical outcome more fully communicable like an exhibition catalogue does. Or the practical outcome could itself take a more expository format - some artists work is process based, some include working materials, some practices are almost curatorial in scope. A first step would be if bodies like the AHRC made people's research reports publicly available (in addition to peer reviewed outcomes). As it is, without the existence of equivalent "practice-led" academic journals, the field is just too fragmented to get a handle on. We really need a new kind of practice orientated research "publication" format. Art and design practice led-research runs the risk of being stuck at the level of supporting the building of technical instruments and applications purely because their outcomes are easier to assess. Despite the fact that research bodies state that they do not fund art "production", because of their attraction towards funding the techniques that are employed in production they effectively end up funding little else. We end up funding particular technical procedures as art and design research purely because they (coincidentally?) are used by some artists – art and design research without the art and design. We are therefore in danger of focusing art and design research on solving problems in the narrow context of "better" production tools rather than focusing on the artistic context from which those problems derive their meaning and in which the production of the final work finds its real significance as specifically artistic research. A direct engagement with the practical fruits of the research should always be an essential part of a practice-led research project, whether viewing a film, painting or playing with a multimedia piece. The report or written publication alone can never do this justice. Any assumption that an outcome or research "proposition" can be adequately described and communicated without that proposition

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication. .

The project

Is an investigation of the discipline
arises in a professional/creative context

where is your project in this range?

an investigation of something outside the discipline
arises in an academic context

The Practice

is central to the research
is site of reflection

supports the research
is means of production

The Investigation

is linear
is risky
is generative
uses a single set of theory/methods
advance an established paradigm
responds to questions

is iterative
is secure
is analytical
uses a wide range of theory/methods
challenges orthodoxy
identifies questions

The Outcome or Result

product is artefact
predictable outcomes
explicit

product understanding of process
open/contingent Outcomes
open to interpretation

Lavoretti per bimbi: Playful Triggers as keys to foster collaborative practices

Project Contact: Daria Loi
Organisation: RMIT University, Melbourne Australia
Discipline: Design
Email Address: Daria.Loi@ems.rmit.edu.au
Completion Date: 2005
Funded By: Other
Web Address: <http://www.darialoi.com>

Purpose of the enquiry

Organisations increasingly demand spaces capable of fostering and supporting collaborative practices. The discipline of design is constantly acting as a developer/provider of spaces that can address the organisational needs to develop such practices, continuously releasing on the market new options and concepts. There appear to be a search for the perfect space, an ideal environment that due to its specially designed characteristics will allow people collaborate, share and achieve common goals. This thesis looked at the issue of the creation of collaborative practices from the perspective that the existence of a space for collaboration does not necessarily mean that collaborative practices will occur and that collaborative dynamics will be unleashed. The thesis also asked questions related the nature of PhD theses: in what ways can a thesis be a forum where readers experience (rather than simply read) ideas and arguments? What are the

Method of research

Epistemologically and ontologically this thesis is embedded in a constructivist paradigm characterised by multiple realities (relativist ontology) where knower and subject can create understandings (subjectivist epistemology) and a number of naturalistic methodological procedures are employed. The methodological approach adopted in this thesis can be located within arts-informed approaches to qualitative research. In particular, Artistic Inquiry, a constructivist approach adapted to suit art and design domains, has been adopted. This approach is qualitative, naturalistic and pluralist and its methodological 'flexibility' is consistent with the notion of researchers as bricoleurs. The bricolaged methodology adopted in this work employed notions of storytelling, play & experimentations, dialogic research, action learning and creative action.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

As the work is fundamentally about collaborative methods and tools, the opportunities offered by a thesis to become a place for collaborative practices to emerge and for it to be an artifact that readers can physically, emotionally, and conceptually experience have been explored. Practically speaking, the thesis is a complex system housed in a cardboard suitcase that incorporates textual and non-textual elements that use metaphorical, tactile, audio and visual means to express meaning. This thesis aims to engage readers rather than them being passive recipients and it also attempts to give them the chance to asynchronously relate to both the researcher and future readers. In the same way in which people have a

key role in shaping and giving meaning to collaborative practices within an organisation (as proposed and discussed in the work), readers

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Firstly, the work proposed that some design tools, termed Playful Triggers, are one way of developing collaborative practices among the inhabitants of an organisation. As a new form of Cultural Probes, Playful Triggers are designed tools that generate collaborative practices among workers using creative activities and artefacts as generative instruments. Secondly, it was suggested that the collaborative practices facilitated by the use of Playful Triggers equip the inhabitants of an organisation to engage in the co-design of their collaborative workspaces. A participatory design framework to engage in such co-design activities was proposed. Thirdly, the thesis argued that to fully and properly use Playful Triggers, some form of convergence of design and management roles, practices and disciplines has to occur. The thesis proposes that there is a need for a new figure (an enabler) that blurs the boundaries between design and management. It also offered a range of suggestions on how this could occur and overviewed the impacts of such a blurring on both organisations and the practices of design and management. Additionally it was contended (through and within the work) that what constitutes a thesis should be opened up to include non-textual ways of representing ideas.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Loi, D 2005, 'Lavoretti per bimbi: Playful Triggers as keys to foster collaborative practices and workspaces where people learn, wonder and play', PhD thesis, RMIT University.

2. Refereed journal articles, conference papers and book chapters:

Burrows, P & Loi, D 2004, 'A table, a box, and friends in a surrealist encounter - Demonstrating the use of eccentric objects and odd experiences to foster reflective and collaborative learning', 30th OTBC – A Tradition of Teaching, University of Redlands, CA, June 22-26.

Loi, D, Burrows, P & Coburn, M 2002, 'The Pea Project Design Stimulus', in T Binder, J Gregory & I Wagner (eds), PDC02 - Participatory Design Conference 2002, CPSR, Malmö, pp. 415-7. Loi, D 2003, 'Shared work environments as ecologies: consequences of such an approach? have a key role in shaping and giving meaning to this thesis. new ways of working and designing', Techné - 5th European Academy of Design Conference, Barcelona, Spain, April 28-30.

Loi, D 2003, 'Systems that Learn, Evolve and Foster Shared Activities: Shared Work Environments as Ecologies', in T Haslett & R Sarah (eds), Systems in Action – 9th ANZSYS Conference, Australia.

Loi, D 2004, 'A suitcase as a PhD...? Exploring the potential of travelling containers to articulate the multiple facets of a research thesis', Working Papers in Art and Design, vol. 3..

Loi, D & Burrows, P 2004, 'A table, a box, friends and conversation: stimulating collaborative reflection', 3rd Carfax International Conference on Reflective Practice, Gloucester, UK, June 23-25. Loi, D 2005, 'Open the suitcase: readers as active participants', Include 2005 - International conference on Inclusive Design, Royal College of Art, London, UK, 5-8 April.

Loi, D 2005, 'Piazzas where to meet: organisational settings and their unmanageable spaces in-between', Kalantzis, M. & B. Cope (Eds) and Bill Cope International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management, vol. 4, The University Press, Australia.

Loi, D 2005 'Travelling Research: An Arts-informed Thesis-in-a-Suitcase', Promislow, S. (Ed.) Arts-informed, vol. 4, issue 2/3, November, pp. 12-16.

Loi, D & Dillon, P 2006, 'Adaptive educational environments as creative spaces', Cambridge Journal of Education – Special Issue on Creativity in Education, Vol. 36, Issue 3.

Loi, D (forthcoming), 'Can this suitcase be a PhD thesis? Author, readers, academia, multisensorial writing and the story of an anomalous thesis format', in Booth, J. (Ed.) I, We, It They: finding voice in creative research, Common Ground Publishing, Melbourne.

Loi, D (forthcoming), 'A thought per day: my travelling inside a suitcase', in Knowles, J.G. & A. ole (Eds.), Creating Scholartistry: Imagining the Arts-Informed Thesis or Dissertation. Halifax, NS: Backalong Books.

3. A series of presentations and workshops:

Presentation at "I, We, They, It: Finding Voice in Creative Research Symposium", Victoria Uni, 7/10/04, Melbourne.

Presentation at the Association for Qualitative Research, RMIT Business, 10/06/03, Melbourne Australia.

Invited lecture at Telematics Centre, Exeter University UK, 20/09/04.

Corporate workshop, A Conceptual Spa Day for Health Service Managers, RMIT University, 3/12/02, Melbourne Australia.

Workshop, Teaching and Learning Forum, RMIT University, 24/10/02.

Lecture "A suitcase as a PhD? – metaphorical artefacts|play&wonder|multisensorial writing| participation|readers", IDEA Lab, University of Melbourne, 12/08/05, Melbourne, Australia.

Lecture "Bricolaged methodology: an introduction and an example", Symposium Series on the Practice of Research, University of Melbourne, 3/11/05, Melbourne, Australia.

Three workshops "Daria's Suitcase: A Rare Opportunity to Unpack and Explore A New Way of Thinking About Your World", Swinburne University, Australia (Part 1: 14/11/05; Part 2: 17/02/06; and Part 3: 28/04/06).

Seminar, "Thesis in a suitcase: Arts-Based Inquiry and a Discussion on Methodological and Ontological Positioning", School of Graduate Studies, University of Melbourne.

4. Miscellaneous:

Installation at 2nd Annual RMIT Research on Research Conference – Practice Based Research: Recognition, Relevance, Rigour, 2-3 June 2003, Melbourne Australia.

Loi, D (2006), '[my|your|our suitcase]', Interactive Installation, 2006 Participatory Design Conference, University of Trento, Italy, 1-5 August.

Any other comments or observations?

In 2005 a copy of the thesis-as-suitcase was donated to the Centre for Arts-informed Research (University of Toronto) so that practitioners, students and academic from that side of the world can view, play with, learn from and be inspired by the suitcase/thesis.

Publication types: Academic Publication, Creative/Professional, Part of a PhD.

The project	where is your project in this range?												
Is an investigation of the discipline	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	an investigation of something outside the discipline	<input type="radio"/>
arises in a professional/creative context	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	arises in an academic context	<input type="radio"/>
The Practice													
is central to the research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	supports the research	<input type="radio"/>
is site of reflection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is means of production	<input type="radio"/>
The Investigation													
is linear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is iterative	<input type="radio"/>
is risky	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	is secure	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
is generative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	is analytical	<input type="radio"/>
uses a single set of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	uses a wide range of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>
advance an established paradigm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	challenges orthodoxy	<input type="radio"/>
responds to questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	identifies questions	<input type="radio"/>
The Outcome or Result													
product is artefact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	product understanding of process	<input type="radio"/>
predictable outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	open/contingent Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>
explicit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	open to interpretation	<input type="radio"/>

Aesthetic, Creative and Innovative uses for Photosensitive Glass in Art-Glass

Project Contact: Heather May

Organisation: Dept of Design, School of BEAD, United Kingdom, Curtin University of Technology, Australia

Discipline: Design

Email Address: heatherdejager@hotmail.com

Completion Date: Work in Progress

Funded By: Other National Org

Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

Through documentation of planned experiments I hope to answer the question "can the use of photosensitive glass be as innovatively creative in art/glass design and art practice as it has been found to be in contemporary scientific research?"

Method of research

Case Studies Participant Observation Collaboration with glass artists

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Innovative application of the research outcomes in selected traditional areas of glass making techniques will be created. The processes will be documented by the thesis so other art-glass makers will be given information to adapt the findings for their own purposes.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

This project has addressed problems of bicycle theft, a recognized deterrent to urban cycling, via review of the design of bicycle parking. Whilst many UK cities have targets to increase cycle use, including Mayor Livingstone's aim to treble London's bicycle use by 2010, there is no documentation of the role of design in the reduction of crime and 'fear of crime' in relation to cycling and bicycle parking provision. Our research has addressed this gap in knowledge. Fly parking appears to have risen in cities, due to increased bike usage, and indicates that user requirements have not been met by increased parking provision, or when parking provision is available, it is not fit for purpose, often in relation to security. Our research has helped us formulate the following questions and linked

gaps in knowledge that we hope to address if future external research applications are successful. They include:- Extending the questions asked to users regarding their experience linked to security of cycle parking.- Further empirical study linked to identifying user experience of best/worst practice to facilitate effective benchmarking within the field- Further empirical study linked to archiving data of provider experiences as regards effectiveness, of cycle parking provision.- Further empirical study linked to gather information about informing users/and police sources (abuser information) location regarding security performance of facilities – i.e development and dissemination of evolving ‘hot-spot’ information identified by both users and police, which may need to be represented as distinct.- Identification of “new” design related intervention strategies in four main areas, as well as proposals for further design innovation, which may influence the security of cycle parking provision, specifically information environment Surveillance/guardianship Site improvement/

Method of research

No previous research had assessed the balance between ‘ease of use’ and robustness, linked to ‘abuse’ (crime) in relation to cycle parking facilities. Nor was there any account of the relevance of ‘fly parking’ (securing bikes to objects not designed for this) as an indicator as to the nature, appropriate or otherwise, of cycle parking provision before our published research appeared.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Research for pilot Bikeoff project meant we brought many stakeholders together i.e. Met, TfL, DOCA, local councils etc. Our work was initially funded by AHRC and supported by UAL. It continues courtesy of TfL and GOL and we also have a new funding bid into AHRC to develop early pilot work into a more developed portfolio of Design for 21st Century projects.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

The article, ‘Bike Off! Tracking the Design Terrains of Cycle Parking: reviewing Use, Misuse and Abuse,’ based on the research for this project, and the website (linked to ser feedback and dissemination) has been acknowledged and referred to by Transport for London (TfL) and other government sources (Home Office). To create both the article and the website we obtained funding for the AHRC and undertook desk and visual research in London based on examples linked to cycle parking provision from New York, Belgium, Barcelona and Berlin. This enabled us to create a unique and extensive body of photographic imagery and data based information, examples of which were made available on line at www.bikeoff.org and published in the Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal as ‘Bike Off! Tracking the Design

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Exhibitions/ events/ festivals:- Re-inventing the Bike Shed: Crime, Design and Cycles in the City - co-curated by Adam Thorpe, DAC/ Bikeoff. An exhibition with focus on stimulating better design solutions to existing cycle infrastructure and the problem of bicycle theft – taken place at The Arches, Tooley Street, 16th – 25th June 2006.

-Safer Neighbourhoods: the Future of Policing – Bikeoff material exhibited at this conference at Elizabeth II Conference Centre, London on 8th

February 2006. - 5th Annual Bicycle Film Festival - collaboration between Brendt Barbur (Director, Bicycle Film Festival) and Adam Thorpe and Lorraine Gamman of DAC, taken place at the Cochrane Theatre, London, 1st – 3rd September 2005.

- Bikefest - dissemination via Bikeoff stand promoting Bike Off website and 'How to Lock Your Bike' sticker, Trafalgar Square, 14th June 2005.

- The profit cycle: Making Bike Parking Work for you – project findings disseminated via TfL at City Hall, The Queens Walk, London, 7th June 2005.

- Bikeoff material exhibited at Freshers Fayre Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design; London College of Fashion; London College of Communication, and Camberwell College of Arts in October 2004 and October 2005 (Central furniture selection and design User awareness/ provider awareness of security issues and Terrains of Cycle Parking: reviewing Use, Misuse and Abuse\'. Saint Martins) and set up of the University of the Arts London Cycle Group. - Bikeoff material benchmark practice exhibited at the Cycle Show, to promote Bikeoff website (BikeOff literature printed and disseminated in goody bags to 25,000 people), September 2004, Business Design Centre London.

Seminars/ presentations:- Re-inventing the Bike Shed: Crime, Design and Cycles in the City - 2 seminars aimed at crime prevention officers and design advisors. Presentation given by DAC researchers, as well as international speakers (Amsterdam and Barcelona), TfL, bicycle manufacturers and others.- Bikeoff presentation by Adam Thorpe at Improving Community Safety and Reducing Crime by Design DAC/ Perpetuity Group mini-conference/ research liaison, 6th March 2006.

- Bikeoff: Tracking the terrains of secure cycle parking design - presentation by Adam Thorpe, Velorution, 15th March 2006.- Bikeoff: Design Against Crime Strategies on Alternative Transport – presentation by Marcus Willcocks at MA Vehicle and Transport Design course, Elisava School of Design, Barcelona, Spain (February 2006).

Articles/publications:- Bike Off! Tracking the Design Terrains of Cycle Parking – Reviewing Use, Misuse and Abuse - article published in the Crime Prevention and Community Safety Journal (Perpetuity Press) November 2004, distributed to number of industry professionals. Permission granted for PDF digital version of article, which has been disseminated through relevant departments of GLA and other organisations.

- Thwarting Bike Thieves – article by Adam Thorpe for the London Cyclist magazine, December 2005 issue.

- Thwarting Bike Thieves – article by Lorraine Gamman and Adam Thorpe for MAID 2006 catalogue, Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design, May 2006.

Website/ other outputs:- Bikeoff.org - ongoing user-research 'blogging' website, launched September 2004. Bike facts leaflet and bikeoff.org sticker also created to promote the website

- .- Lock the Frame and Both Wheels to the Stand – bike parking advice stickers (created in consultation with Camden Police and TfL, June 2005). Ordered by various local councils. - On Street Bicycle Parking – anti bike

theft leaflet (created in consultation with Camden Police, October 2005).
Ordered by various local councils.

Any other comments or observations?

The AHRC work delivered enabled us to obtain further funding from Camden Council, GOL and TfL for further research. The Holborn Gateway funding started in 2005 and is linked to re-development of a bike parking space and design of stands, and will be completed in 2007.

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication.

The project	where is your project in this range?				
Is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> an investigation of something outside the discipline <input type="radio"/> arises in an academic context
The Practice is central to the research is site of reflection	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> supports the research <input type="radio"/> is means of production
The Investigation is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> is iterative <input type="radio"/> is secure <input type="radio"/> is analytical <input type="radio"/> uses a wide range of theory/methods <input type="radio"/> challenges orthodoxy <input type="radio"/> identifies questions
The Outcome or Result product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> product understanding of process <input type="radio"/> open/contingent Outcomes <input type="radio"/> open to interpretation

Grippa Pilot Project

Project Contact: Prof. Lorraine Gamman
Organisation: Design Against Crime Research Ctre UK
Discipline: Design
Email Address: l. gamman@csm.arts.ac.uk
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: AHRC
Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

This project funded by the AHRC speculative funding scheme 2004/5 set out to create pilot 'anti bag theft furniture' and 'anti bag theft furniture accessories' for bar and restaurant environments and to take up research thesis delivered by previous research projects. The aim was to create and formally user-test effectiveness of new designs for bag-holding devices, in terms of both their ability to help reduce theft from bars, cafés and restaurants and also keep venues tidier and floor space safer from obstruction by 'forgotten' or 'abandoned' bags, while offering convenience to the customer.

Method of research

The project was interdisciplinary. It drew upon and tested the iterative model of design process developed at CSM, which has been adapted to address not just use, but also abuse and misuse of products. It links anti crime to design innovation and addresses aesthetics/ lifestyle/ market issues as well as the functionality of the design of new anti theft products. We developed an iterative design process in regard to delivery of prototypes. This is in conjunction with advice from our Advisory panel (see www.designagainstcrime.com) enabled this research project to address bag theft perpetrator techniques and include crime prevention in the design process, an activity that has not been documented adequately elsewhere.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

The pilot Grippa project emerged from extensive research and design intelligence, gathered by Dr. Lorraine Gamman and the Design Against Crime (DAC) team at Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design (CSM) between 2001-2003 written up as 'In the Bag' CD-Rom and also linked to Stop Thief project. Grippa project sought to create accessories for furniture. Bag theft and pick-pocketing are often viewed as non-serious crime as violence is not involved, but its effects are very serious. Consequently, a broad scope of existing knowledge, including data accessed via victim surveys, police and other research info acted as a base for the project. It also drew upon both established design methodologies (industrial/ product/ information design) and professional knowledge pioneered by industry via leading organisations including Pentagram and IDEO amongst many others, and also crime prevention knowledge, consolidated by criminologists, police and crime science researchers. Research and guidance linked to Situational Crime Prevention (SCP) and to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) have long acknowledged via numerous published academic studies, and via practice, linked to architecture, the opportunities for designing out crime.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Whilst the Grippa evaluation for the pilot project produced by the CSM/JDI team funded by AHRC and other external funding, did not successfully establish all the necessary conditions for the fair test of the Grippa objects under scrutiny, and the crime prevention principles behind them, it did deliver publications about the design processes, design benchmarks as well as a level of intelligence and protocol gathering and can therefore be seen as both successful and useful in terms of future learning. Indeed, there are few other benchmarks that evaluate designing out crime products, and as a pilot study and an evaluation of Grippa designs, the CSM/JDI evaluation and we hope this report offered a significant contribution to knowledge - one that reinforces the idea that further research of this type is appropriate and worthy of dissemination in addition to the outputs the project has already delivered. Our arguments must have been persuasive on this score. Design Against Crime (Prof. Ekblom and Prof. Gamman) are to receive further research funding from AHRC (£366,060), to start a full evaluation Grippa 2 project in November 2006.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

- INDEX: 2005 awards – 'Top nominated design' for Grippa Clips range (Sept 2005).

- Safer Neighbourhoods: the Future of Policing - Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, London (8th February 2006). Small exhibition of Stop Thief! chairs, Karrysafe bags and Grippa clips.
- Magdalena – 7th International Festival of Creative Communication. 'Design Against Crime' presentation given by Dr. Lorraine Gaman and graphic designer Keith Gray.
- EAD 06 (6th International conference of the European Academy of Design), University of the Arts, Bremen, Germany. Paper given: 'Designing Out Crime? Reviewing practice-based Models of the Design Process' by Dr. Lorraine Gamman (March 2005).
- Crime Prevention and Community Safety Journal (Vol 6, No 4) – Dr. Lorraine Gamman, co-editor of special issue and co-author of two articles and book review (November 2004).
- Westminster communication design project - commenced in September 2004.
- In The Bag - designers resource CD-Rom (2000, re-printed 2001 and 2004).

<p>The project</p> <p>Is an investigation of the discipline arises in a professional/creative context</p>	<p>where is your project in this range?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is an investigation of something outside the discipline arises in an academic context
<p>The Practice</p> <p>is central to the research is site of reflection</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supports the research is means of production
<p>The Investigation</p> <p>is linear is risky is generative uses a single set of theory/methods advance an established paradigm responds to questions</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is iterative is secure is analytical uses a wide range of theory/methods challenges orthodoxy identifies questions
<p>The Outcome or Result</p> <p>product is artefact predictable outcomes explicit</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> product understanding of process open/contingent Outcomes open to interpretation

Design Against Crime

Project Contact: Prof. Lorraine Gamman
Organisation: Design Against Crime Research Centre UK
Discipline: Design
Email Address: l.gamman@csm.arts.ac.uk
Completion Date: Work in Progress
Funded By: AHRC
Web Address: www.designagainstcrime.org

Purpose of the enquiry

Design Against Crime (DAC) is a socially responsive, practice-led research initiative which uses the tools, processes and products of design to help resist all kinds of crime and promote quality of life and sustainable living through enhanced community safety. Two of its projects include Stop Thief chairs (2000-2) funded by the Home Office/UAL and Karrysafe bags (2002-4) funded by

Method of research

DAC is a relatively new, interdisciplinary area of enquiry developed through innovative national and international research collaborations, with three overarching aims: 1. To reduce the incidence and adverse consequences of crime through the design of products, services, communications and environments that are 'fit for purpose' and contextually appropriate in all other respects; to this end, 2. To equip design practitioners with the necessary cognitive and practical tools and resources; and 3. To prove and promote the social and commercial benefits of designing out crime to manufacturing and service industries as well as to local and national government, and society at large and communicating these principles via practice led outputs. To realise its aims DAC requires linking two worlds: helping designers to "think thief" and encouraging crime prevention practitioners to "draw on design". Such an approach enables DAC to take its place alongside other established thematic movements such as eco-design. The main theoretical and practical approach informing DAC is situational crime prevention. Instead of trying to control crime through the traditional approaches of 'cops, courts and corrections', or tackling the so-called 'roots of criminality' in children's early experiences or social inequalities, situational prevention simply aims to tackle those causes of criminal events which act through immediate circumstances – i.e. opportunities and temptations for crime. It does so by altering products, places, information and site management procedures to make crime seem more risky, more effort, more guilt-inducing and less rewarding for the offender. The philosophy behind DAC at CSM is linked to a practice-led design research agenda and the understanding that design should address security issues without compromising functionality and other aspects of performance, or aesthetics. DAC at CSM uses an iterative, user-centred approach which has been modified to take additional account of abusers and misusers. In everyday language, secure design has to be user-friendly whilst abuser-unfriendly; but it doesn't have to look criminal or even ugly. DAC research projects aim to "...help designers keep up with the adaptive criminal in a changing world"

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

DAC has been advanced by a number of specific case studies and overview writings and guides aimed at both design practitioners, crime prevention practitioners, manufacturers, service providers and ordinary members of the public (eg empowering them to be more effective preventers of bike theft by warning them of vulnerabilities of bikes and bike parking methods to crime, offenders' modus operandi and how to resist them). At the same time as work was beginning at Central Saint Martins College (CSM), related material was commissioned by the Home Office/ Design Council from Sheffield Hallam, Salford and Cambridge Universities. The distinctive contribution of the CSM work, however, was that it was truly practice-led, in that a range of secure products (Karrysafe bags and accessories) and security furniture (Stop Thief chairs)

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

Ultimately DAC research offers the prospect of doing good design in extremis. Few other fields of design face challenges such as adaptive offenders who continually make countermoves and sometimes even counter-designs; 'troublesome tradeoffs' between security versus convenience, aesthetics, safety, inclusion, privacy etc; and the extreme context-dependence of successful crime prevention (rigid application of simplistic cookbook approaches doesn't work). The requirement is to build the capacity among designers to innovate faster than criminals can. Ultimately, if our designers can still produce good ideas in the face of such demands and such constraints, they can cope with anything! The challenge in developing this capacity is to establish an approach which combines rigour, discipline, application of theory on the one hand with creativity, originality and even playfulness and subversion and challenging of assumptions and values on the other. Audiences include academics in the crime prevention sphere (and perhaps also those interested in co-evolution and complexity), designers, design decision makers in manufacturing and service industries, design educators, police and local government crime prevention/community safety officers and design advisers, planners, regional bodies such as TFL, central government departments such as Home Office and DCLG, and international institutions UAL/Design Council/Fonehouse and GOL(www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/risk.pdf, Ekblom 1997). were created, tested and improved, and in some cases taken to market. such as European Crime Prevention Network.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated??

Exhibitions- SAFE: Design Takes on Risk, The Museum of Modern Art, New York (16th October 2005 – 2nd January 2006). Exhibited work created by DAC Design and Research Team: Stop Thief! chairs, Karrysafe bags and accessories and Puma Bike created by Adam Thorpe (Research Fellow with DAC) and Joe Hunter of Vexed Generation in collaboration with Puma and Biomega.- INDEX: 2005, Town Hall Square, Copenhagen, Denmark (23rd September – 13th November 2005).

Work exhibited: Grippa range of clips and Karrysafe range of bags.

- Safer Neighbourhoods: the Future of Policing. Small exhibition of Stop Thief! chairs, Karrysafe bags and Grippa clips at Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, London (8th February 2006).

- Crossed New Territories of Design, Design Against Crime exhibited in Barcelona, Spain (October 2003 – January 2004).
- Design Against Crime: Anti Crime Wave - Waterloo station, London and Designer's Block, Milan, Italy (April 2003).
- Design Against Crime: Secure Design For Safer Travel - main concourse, Victoria and Waterloo stations. January –April 2003
- Vexed Not Victimised: Karrysafe Bags And Anti-Theft Accessories Not To Die For, University of the Arts London. August 2002
- Karrysafe range of bags and accessories - launched at Design Council with Adam Thorpe and Joe Hunter. June 2003 - Don't Tempt Me exhibition – featured at Milan Furniture Fair and Primavera del Disseny, Barcelona, sponsored by the Design Council (April 2001).
- Design Against Crime - In the Bag and Off the Wall - Design Museum exhibition. Exhibited on 'In the Bag' CD Rom, distributed by Design Council (2000 – 2001).
- Stop Thief - Secure Design Doesn't Have To Look Criminal - exhibited at Designer's Block (October 2000), Design Council (November 2000) and RIBA (December 2000). Publications
- Design Against Crime as Socially Responsive Theory and Practice - paper published by Prof. Gamman and A. Thorpe as part of Design 2006: 9th International Design Conference proceedings, Zagreb, Croatia, May 2006.
- Design Against Crime postcards - communicating DAC concepts in relation to built environment, bag and cycle theft. Disseminated at DAC Centre launch, June 2006.
- Crime web paper - by Prof. Paul Eklom for Foresight Intelligent Infrastructure Futures: the Scenarios
- Towards 2055 – Perspective and Process in Office of Science and Technology' 17-23. London: Department of Trade and Industry.
- www.foresight.gov.uk (2006).- Good practice? Invest in a Framework! – by Paul Eklom for Network News, Spring 2006. Chester: National Community Safety Network (2006).- Making Offenders Richer – by Paul Eklom, in G. Farrell, K. Bowers, S. Johnson and M. Townsley (Eds.), Imagination for Crime Prevention: Essays in Honour of Ken Pease. Crime Prevention Studies: Criminal Justice Press (2006).
- Design Against Crime leaflet - sponsored by the Home Office and used at EU Crime Prevention Network UK Presidency conference, Whitehall (December 2005).
- The Conjunction of Terrorist Opportunity: A Framework for Diagnosing and Preventing Acts of Terrorism
- co-authored by Prof. Paul Eklom for Security Journal (2005).
- Designing Products Against Crime by Prof. Paul Eklom of DAC in N. Tilley (ed.), Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety (2005).
- How to Police the Future: Scanning for Scientific and Technological Innovations which Generate Potential Threats and Opportunities in Crime, Policing and Crime Reduction by Prof. Paul Eklom in M. Smith and N.

Tilley (eds.), *Crime Science: New Approaches to Preventing and Detecting Crime* (2005).

- The 5Is Framework: Sharing good practice in crime prevention – by Paul Ekblom for *Quality in Crime Prevention* (E. Marks, A. Meyer and R. Linssen - Eds.). Hannover: Landespräventionsrat Niedersachsen (2005).

- 'In the Bag – Get Smart Quick About Bag Theft, Pickpocketing and Street Crime' design resource CD-Rom (2001, reprinted in 2002 and 2004).

- *Crime Prevention and Community Safety Journal* – special issue (Seeing is Believing), eds. Prof. Lorraine Gamman and Dr. Tim Pascoe, Perpetuity Press (November 2004). Articles included: Seeing is Believing: Notes Towards a Visual Methodology and Manifesto for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (by Prof. Lorraine Gamman and Dr. Tim Pascoe) and Design Out Crime? Using Practice-based Models of the Design Process (by Prof. Lorraine Gamman and Dr. Tim Pascoe).

- Thinking Thief - article for Royal Academy of Engineering 'Ingenia' magazine, with Ben Hughes (May 2003).

Conferences/ seminars/ workshops

- Reducing Crime by Design seminar, aimed at community safety and urban regeneration professionals, held at Central Saint Martins on 23rd June 2006.

- Light & Crime - Prof. Lorraine Gamman took part in this EDF Energy workshop, London (18th April 2006).

- Ways of Measuring Security – workshop/presentation led by Prof. Paul Ekblom at 'iWant: to Design Secure Products' conference (19-20 April 2006).

- Improving Community Safety and Reducing Crime by Design. DAC/ Perpetuity Group mini-conference/ research liaison. Presentations by Prof. Lorraine Gamman and Adam Thorpe (6th March 2006). - Design Against Crime workshop led by Prof. Lorraine Gamman for BCSC's 'In the Spotlight' conference, Edinburgh (1st February 2006).

- Designing Out Drug Related Crime In Shopping Environments - conference sponsored by BCSC, ATCM, British Retail Consortium and the Home Office. Presentations given: 'Shopping Centres

- Best Crime Prevention Practice' by Prof. Lorraine Gamman and 'Keeping On Our Toes

- Avoiding the Cookbook, Matching to Context, Adapting to Change by Prof. Paul Ekblom, Central Saint Martins, London (20th September 2005).

- Stop Thief – reducing theft and pickpocketing in London, the Metropolitan Police/ Design Against Crime seminar, held at Central Saint Martins (14th June 2005).

Conference papers/ presentations- 9th International Design conference. Presentation given by Adam Thorpe and Lorraine Gamman on Socially Responsive Design,

Dubrovnik, Croatia (May 2006).

- Westminster Briefing on 'Building Safer Communities Through Partnership: Designing Out Crime', Prof Ekblom was Chair and one of

several presenters, London (April 2006). - Conference on Preventing Property Crime Against International Students in London. GOL conference held at Central Saint Martins opened by Prof. Lorraine Gamman's presentation on Design Against Crime (March 2006).

- Japanese Urban Planners visit to Design Against Crime Research Centre- Design Against Crime presentations by Prof. Lorraine Gamman and Prof. Paul Ekblom to delegates from Tokyo University and Police (February 2006).- Design Against Crime – How to Make it Happen?

- password protected downloadable conference paper (<http://www.designagainstcrime.com/web/archive.htm>) presented by Prof. Lorraine Gamman at Centre for Design, Architecture and the Built Environment (Norsk Form), Oslo, Norway (December 2005)

- Salford University Crime Day - presentation on DAC to cross-university seminar given by Prof Paul Ekblom, Salford (November 2005).

- Shopping Centres – Best Design Practice downloadable paper given by Dr. Lorraine Gamman at “Designing Out Drug Related Crime In Shopping Environments” conference at Central Saint Martins (September 2005).

- London Design Festival. Presentation given on ‘Designers Who Make Money from Crime’ by Prof. Lorraine Gamman at the Patent Office, London (September 2005)

- Korean International Development Partnership: Design Value Creator Program - Alternative Approaches to Design Management

– presentation by Prof. Lorraine Gamman given on ‘Design Against Crime’ and Adam Thorpe on Socially Responsive Design at Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design, London (September 2005).

- DOCA conference – paper given by Prof. Lorraine Gamman on ‘Visualising CPTED Principles’, BRE, Watford (July 2005).

- Magdalena: 7th International Festival of Creative Communication – presentation given on ‘Design Against Crime’ by Prof. Lorraine Gamman with graphic designer Keith Gray, Maribor, Slovenia (May 2005).

- SERVE Network. Presentation given on “The Conjunction of Terrorist Opportunity” by Prof. Paul Ekblom, Manchester (May 2005).-

6th International conference of the European Academy of Design (EAD 06) – paper given on ‘Designing Out Crime? Reviewing practice-based Models of the Design Process’ by Prof Lorraine Gamman, Bremen, Germany (March 2005). Downloadable paper on EAD’s CD-Rom.

- LSE Security Colloquium. Presentation given on ‘Designing Crime out of ICT Systems - Mirage or Possibility?’ by Prof. Paul Ekblom, London (February 2005)

- DOCA conference – ‘Seeing is Believing’ presentation given by Prof. Lorraine Gamman at Tally Ho, Birmingham (September 2004).

- Kodak – talk given by Prof. Lorraine Gamma on ‘Reviewing the Iterative Process’, Hemel Hempstead, Herts (March 2003).

- Freq 2 – ‘Stealth Futures: Use, misuse and abuse – looking at what is Design Against Crime’, Prof. Lorraine Gamman with Vexed Generation, Shoreditch, London (November 2002).

Publication types: Academic Publication, General Publication, Creative/Professional.

AFTERIMAGES: Photographs as an External Autobiographical Memory System

Project Contact: Dr Mark Ingham
Organisation: Goldsmiths College United Kingdom
Discipline: Fine Art
Email Address: markingham3@hotmail.com
Completion Date: 2005
Funded By: AHRC
Web Address: <http://www.m-ia.net/>

Purpose of the enquiry

My proposition developed in the research was that photographs have changed the way the past is conceived and therefore the way the past is remembered. Just as the inventions of the telescope and microscope radically changed our understanding of distance and space on a macro and micro level, the invention of the photograph has radically altered our concepts of the past, memory and time.

Method of research

The research began a reflection into my motivation for using this collection and its usefulness to both my written and studio work. I included a short biography of my grandfather, leading me to consider biography and autobiography, and their relation through photography to autobiographical memory. This was followed by an in depth analysis of autobiographical memory and how it differs from other forms and processes of memory. With this I placed a discussion of contemporary ideas on photographs and an analysis of Roland Barthes' Camera Lucida. Finally I looked closely at 'external memory systems' and how these relate to changes in the way autobiographical memory operates in relation to photographs.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

My starting point was a collection of photographs taken by my grandfather, Albert Edward Ingham, which is used both in my studio work and as a basis for my theoretical writing. My concerns as an artist are with the ways in which familiar photographs and their relation to ideas of personal memory can be incorporated in an art practice. Also, how autobiographical memory can be reflected using photographs, and how photographs can have an affect on the autobiographical memory of the spectator.

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

I believe it is the 'disturbance' to our consciousness, as described by Barthes that photographs have created, through their ability to collapse time into a past and present moment, which is partially responsible for the alterations in the way our autobiographical memory works. I have been interested in the effect photographs have had on the way our autobiographical memory functions. I think that photographs have had a profound effect on the way we look at the world and therefore think about the world and, as a consequence of this, the way we remember the world.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

The project is made up of a number of installations, each with their own individual title [i.e. Afterimages: Ships That Pass], that use SLR cameras and a light source to create projection apparatuses that use transparencies from his grandfather's collection of 5,000 photographs and are attempts to create a sense of memories being fuzzy narratives that can constantly change and be changed. These projected photographic images are an exploration into experiences of remembering and forgetting. There are attempts to evoke a form of 'paramnesia', whereby fantasy and reality collapse to create a sense of déjà vu.

Any other comments or observations?

Photographs are, like memories, a testament to our complex and elusive past. This idea that photography has altered our perception of the past, and even the perception of time itself, is central to this work. Photographs are seen as a living ghost of the past, here and not here at the same time, which creates a fundamental shift in the way the world is perceived and conceived. These camera projectors are an attempt to make manifest some of these ideas and will attempt to illuminate further ideas about the relationships between photographs and the construction of our autobiographical memories.

Publication types: General Publication, Part of a PhD.

The project	where is your project in this range?					
Is an investigation of the discipline	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> an investigation of something outside the discipline <input type="radio"/> arises in an academic context
arises in a professional/creative context	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
The Practice						<input type="radio"/> supports the research <input type="radio"/> is means of production
is central to the research	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
is site of reflection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
The Investigation						<input type="radio"/> is iterative <input type="radio"/> is secure <input type="radio"/> is analytical <input type="radio"/> uses a wide range of theory/methods <input type="radio"/> challenges orthodoxy <input type="radio"/> identifies questions
is linear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	
is risky	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
is generative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
uses a single set of theory/methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	
advance an established paradigm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	
responds to questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	
The Outcome or Result						<input type="radio"/> product understanding of process <input type="radio"/> open/contingent Outcomes <input type="radio"/> open to interpretation
product is artefact	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
predictable outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	
explicit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	

Moving City - The Electronic Guidebook

Project Contact: Jonathan Hale
Organisation: University of Nottingham United Kingdom
Discipline: Fine Art
Email Address: jonathan.hale@nottingham.ac.uk
Completion Date: Work in Prog
Funded By: UK Arts Council
Web Address:

Purpose of the enquiry

The project sets out to challenge the conventional methods of presenting exhibitions about architecture through photographs and drawings shown inside a gallery. The project began by literally taking the exhibition outside onto the street, combining the full sensory experience of real spaces with the kind of analytical and interpretive information normally offered by a museum or gallery setting. An earlier version entitled 'Spectacular Spaces' (shown at Architecture Week 2002) used a printed guidebook to provide illustrations of student design projects, together with a map and a written commentary. This formed a 'portable exhibition', with participants able to visit the actual sites used for the projects around the centre of Nottingham. For Architecture Week 2003 the printed guide was developed into a more flexible and re-usable electronic version - a hand-held computer or 'Personal Digital Assistant' (PDA). This device is able to present more dynamic information, including moving images, slideshows, animated text, sound and video.

Method of research

The project combines research and teaching, working with groups of graduate architecture (part 2 and Masters) students to develop and trial presentation methods in various graphic and digital formats. Products were trialled on different user groups, and evaluated through questionnaires and interviews.

Extent and role of creative/professional practice in the enquiry

Different phases of the project have been presented at a range of venues including Nottingham City Museum and Art Gallery (with collaborative input from exhibition staff); Architecture Week (with collaborative input from researchers in Computer Sciences); NottDance06 International Festival (with collaborative input from visiting artist/choreographer Willi Dorner).

Contribution to knowledge/understanding/practice

As well as testing audience reaction to the presentation of architectural and urban culture issues in a public forum, the project is producing valuable data on the nature of various graphic information interfaces, from printed guides, flash cards, PDA, audio, video etc. It is also looking at further technological possibilities, such as location-aware information delivery through GPS tracking, and interactivity through dynamic user feedback. Interest is also growing among artists keen to exploit the potential of the technology as a new communication medium.

What things were produced and how were they disseminated?

Over the last ten years there have been a number of projects involving artists/craftspeople working in industry however they have not had the same specific aims as this project, these include;

The researcher undertook practical investigations involving a range of digital design and production technologies in order to ascertain their appropriateness to the field of ornamental plasterwork. It was considered appropriate to the field that these investigations were integrated into the creative practice of the researcher rather than run as a series of reductive tests.

This research has extended the practice of ornamental plasterwork and contributed to the understanding of how digital technologies can facilitate the development of sustainable practices for designer-makers.

Designer-makers, academics working in the field of art & design, architects, developers & commissioners interested in the integration of art/design into architectural contexts

A series of ornamental plasterwork prototypes were produced and exhibited alongside documentation of the processes developed, in an exhibition entitled 'Coded Ornament', which was held in Bristol during Architecture week 2006.

Papers and articles in appropriate journals to be produced.

The prototypes developed were not only intended to function as possible new products but also embody new design and production procedures which use digital technologies in conjunction with traditional production techniques. It is intended that these new procedures could be employed to produce other plasterwork designs.

[illegible]

Case study questions mapping analysis

Executive Summary

The typical ADA practice-based research project arises from a professional or creative context and is an investigation of its discipline, rather than something outside the discipline. Practice is central to the research (except in a few design cases) and is both a site for reflection and a means of production. Investigations are generally described as iterative, generative, challenging orthodoxy and drawing on a range of theories and methods. Outcomes are likely to be open or contingent rather than predictable but may result in both artefacts and an understanding of process. Design outcomes are likely to be explicit, whilst fine art outcomes are more likely to be open to interpretation.

Case study question pairs

	Questions
PJ1	The Project: Investigation of the discipline....Investigation of something outside the discipline
PJ2	The Project arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context
PR1	The Practice is central to the research....supports the research
PR2	The Practice is a site for reflection.....is a means of production
I1	The Investigation is linear.....is iterative
I2	The Investigation is secure....is risky
I3	The Investigation is generative....is analytical
I4	The Investigation uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods
I5	The Investigation advance an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy
I6	The Investigation responds to questions.....identifies questions
R1	The Outcome or Result: product is artefact.....product understanding process
R2	The Outcome or Result: predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome
R3	The Outcome or Result is explicit.....open to interpretation

Summary of responses to the individual question pairs

The Project: Investigation of the discipline....Investigation of something outside the discipline

The majority of projects were described as being an investigation of the discipline. However, 5 projects were identified which were described as investigating something outside the discipline. Of these 5 cases, all were from design, except for one fine art project.

The Project arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context

All but one project (Pedgeley in design) arose out of a professional / creative context, or were located midway between professional / creative context and academic context. Those located midway are projects in design, architecture or film. Examples from fine art were firmly located within a professional / creative context.

The Practice is central to the research....supports the research

The majority of projects described practice as being central to the research activity. However, a small but significant number described practice as playing a supporting role in the research; these tended to be design projects.

The Practice is a site for reflection.....is a means of production

Projects are fairly evenly spread between reflection and production, but with a significant cluster located in the middle, suggesting that in these cases, practice is considered by the researches as both a site for reflection and a means of production. There appear to be no significant disciplinary trends as the results were fairly evenly spread.

The Investigation is linear.....is iterative

Most investigations are described as being iterative and the disciplinary distribution appears to be fairly even. 4 cases were described as linear. 2 were located in the middle ground between linear and iterative (or containing both linear and iterative elements?) and the other 16 projects were described as iterative.

The Investigation is secure....is risky

Projects appear to be in 3 distinct clusters: either they tend to be located in the middle, suggesting that they have elements of both risk and security (or are neither particularly risky or secure), or else they are located at the extremes of risky or secure. In particular, this pattern is reflected in the design projects. However, significantly perhaps, no fine art investigation was described as being predominantly risky. All but one of the fine art projects were located in the middle area, the remaining project being described as very secure. Thus, design can be seen as more extreme in terms of risk whereas fine art tends to occupy the middle ground. Design also reflects the 3 distinct groupings/clusters that were seen overall.

The Investigation is generative....is analytical

Only 3 investigations are described as being predominantly analytical. A significant cluster occurred around the centre consisting of 8 projects, suggesting that these may have both generative and analytical elements. The remainder of the projects are clustered towards the generative end of the spectrum. There are few disciplinary differences in distribution of the projects.

The Investigation uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods

A significant cluster of projects using a wide range of theory / methods was identified. In addition to this, a small cluster of 3 projects was located

in the middle ground, with only one case stating that a single set of methods was used (Allen - design). This suggests that the overwhelming majority of cases use a wide range of theory / methods in research.

The Investigation advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy

The majority of cases claimed to challenge orthodoxy (14). Only 4 cases claimed to advance an established paradigm, whilst 4 were clustered in the middle ground. This might possibly reflect researchers' aspirations to break new ground and move away from established models of research, rather than develop a firm disciplinary foundation which builds on what has gone before.

The Investigation responds to questions.....identifies questions

Projects are quite evenly spread between cases reportedly responding to questions and those identifying questions. However there are no projects situated at either extreme. Slightly more claim to identify questions, and a significant number are located in the centre (5), suggesting that these cases might both respond to and identify research questions. Design cases were more evenly spread than fine art, which tended to be more focussed on identifying questions rather than responding.

The Outcome or Result: product is artefact.....product understanding process

A significant cluster of 8 projects is located in the middle, indicating in these cases that outcomes include both artefacts and an understanding of process. The remaining projects are divided between artefact and process. However, whilst 3 outcomes are described as being entirely artefact-based, no projects are located at the opposite extreme. This might suggest a reluctance to describe research outcomes in practice-based ADA as being purely process-oriented, or that researchers more readily perceive artefacts as being the "concrete" outcomes of their research. It might simply reflect a pre-occupation with producing artefacts.

The Outcome or Result: predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome

The majority of outcomes were described as open / contingent, with only 4 being located towards the predictable end of the scale. 4 projects were located at the extreme of open / contingent outcome; however 2 of these projects were works in progress. Whilst a cluster of projects were located in the middle of the open / contingent quadrant, suggesting outcomes which are moderately open / contingent in character, only one was located in the centre of the axis i.e. mid-way between predictable and open / contingent. It should be noted that having "predictable" outcomes might be perceived as a negative attribute; thus researchers may not like to describe their work in this way even if it is strictly true.

The Outcome or Result is explicit.....open to interpretation

11 projects are in each quadrant with one located in the middle. The projects having outcomes described as open to interpretation are evenly spread throughout that quadrant. In contrast, the projects described as being more explicit in their outcomes were more tightly grouped. As might be predicted, design outcomes were predominantly located towards the

explicit end of the scale, whilst the opposite was true of fine art, whose outcomes appeared to be open to interpretation. Architecture was more widely spread, with 2 outcomes being open to interpretation and one more explicit.

Some points of interest arising from the map analysis

The Project: Investigation of the discipline....Investigation of something outside the discipline /

The Project arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context

Only 1 project was described as having arisen within an academic context. The majority of cases were described as arising in professional/creative contexts (23). Most of these were investigations of the discipline, however a number of design projects (4) and a single cases in fine art were described as predominantly investigating something outside the discipline.

The Project: Investigation of the discipline....Investigation of something outside the discipline /

The Practice is a site for reflection.....is a means of production

In the majority of projects, practice was considered central to the research, and of these cases, most were described as being an investigation of the discipline.

In 2 design cases (Jonas), practice played a supporting role alongside other methods employed to investigate something outside the discipline. Here Jonas described (design) practice as fulfilling '...the function of a visual medium to communicate concepts...' and also '...the function to explore and generate unexpected new connections...'

The Project: Investigation of the discipline....Investigation of something outside the discipline /

The Investigation is secure....is risky

The cases perceived as being most risky were projects described as investigating the discipline, not projects investigating something outside the discipline. Does this imply that researchers are prepared to undertake work which they perceive to be most risky when they are operating in familiar disciplinary territory? A large number of projects (11) occupied the middle ground between risky and secure. Of the cases described as being most risky, 3 were in design and 1 in film (but no fine art - surprisingly?)

The Project: Investigation of the discipline....Investigation of something outside the discipline /

The Investigation advance an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy

The majority of cases (10) were described as an investigation of the discipline in which, it was claimed, research challenged orthodoxy. Only 2 cases clearly claimed to challenge orthodoxy when investigating something outside the discipline (Does this suggest we are most confident at challenging orthodoxy within our own disciplines, but less inclined to do so when investigating issues outside our disciplinary comfort zone?)

The Project: Investigation of the discipline....Investigation of something outside the discipline /

The Investigation responds to questions.....identifies questions

The majority of cases (9) were investigations of the discipline which responded to questions. Only 2 cases investigating something outside the discipline were described as responding to questions - these were in design. In cases described as identifying questions, there was a fairly even balance and spread between those investigating the discipline (5) and those investigating something outside the discipline (5).

The Project arises in a professional/creative context.....arises in an academic context /

The Practice is a site for reflection.....is a means of production

The cases in which practice was described as being most strongly a site for reflection were in fine art (Goode) and film (Anderson, Wright), whilst the cases where practice was most predominantly a means of production were in design (Chamberlain, May) and architecture (Sadokierski, Wigglesworth).

The Project arises in a professional/creative context.....arises in an academic context /

The Investigation is generative....is analytical

Whilst the majority of projects arose in professional / creative contexts and were described as being largely generative, 2 cases in particular (both design) bucked this trend, but did so in different ways: one arose in a professional / creative contest and was largely analytical (May), the other (Pedgeley) arose in an academic context, its placement suggesting both analytical and generative aspects might be involved in the investigation.

The Practice is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /

The Outcome or Result is explicit.....open to interpretation

The cases in which practice was most predominantly a means production, and which had most explicit outcomes, were in design and architecture (most productive and explicit?). The case (Goode) where practice was most predominantly a site for reflection, and which had an outcome most open to interpretation, was in fine art (most reflective and open to

interpretation?). Only one fine art case was described as having an explicit outcome.

The Investigation is linear.....is iterative /

The Investigation is secure....is risky

The cases described as being both strongly iterative and most risky were in architecture and design. The most iterative cases were also in architecture and design. The most linear case was in fine art (Sermon - is this a particular feature of Sermon's practice?). 2 design cases and one (other) were identified as being (moderately) linear.

The Investigation is linear.....is iterative /

The Investigation is generative....is analytical

The most generative and most iterative cases were in architecture, with a number of design cases also being strongly generative and iterative.

The Investigation is linear.....is iterative /

The Investigation responds to questions.....identifies questions

All 3 architecture projects are described as being strongly iterative, with one largely responding to questions, one identifying questions, and one mid-way, suggesting it might both identify and respond to questions.

The Investigation is linear.....is iterative /

The Outcome or Result: product is artefact.....product understanding process

The fine art cases are to some extent polarised, with two cases being quite strongly iterative and having both artefact and process-oriented outcomes, one case being very strongly artefact-oriented and being midway between linear and iterative, and finally one case quite strongly linear and artefact focussed.

The Investigation is secure....is risky /

The Investigation is generative....is analytical

The two cases which were perceived as being most risky and most generative were in architecture. Other risky and generative projects were in design and film. A significant cluster of 7 cases were centrally located, indicating that these fall in the middle ground between risky and secure, and might contain both analytical and generative elements. The one case described as being strongly analytical was also perceived to be risky.

The Investigation is secure....is risky /

The Investigation uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods

All but one project use a wide range of theory/methods, and of these cases one large group were located in the middle ground between risky and secure - all the fine art projects are located here.

The Investigation is secure....is risky /

The Investigation advance an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy

All small cluster of (4) cases claim both to be risky and to challenge orthodoxy. These cases are in architecture, design, and film (but not fine art).

The Investigation is secure....is risky /

The Outcome or Result: predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome

The majority of cases state that they have open / contingent outcomes, and many of these fall in the middle ground between secure and risky.

The Investigation is generative....is analytical

The Outcome or Result: product is artefact.....product understanding process

A significant number of cases (10) fell in a band mid-way between "process" and "artefact" indicating that for these cases the research outcomes might include artefacts together with an understanding of process. Within this band, 3 projects were identified as being predominantly generative, 3 were predominantly analytical, and 4 were clustered in the middle, indicating that in these cases both generative and analytical aspects might feature in the investigative approach.

The Investigation uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods

The Investigation advance an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy

The majority of cases (14) claim to challenge orthodoxy through investigations using a wide range of theory and methods. Additionally a significant number (7) are described as advancing an established paradigm, and these cases also involve a wide range of theory and methods. The cases most clearly described as advancing an establish paradigm using a wide range of methods were in architecture and design, with one project from fine art also falling in this group.

The Investigation uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods /

The Outcome or Result: product is artefact.....product understanding process

The majority of cases (17) use a wide range of theory/methods, and of these cases, a significant number (9) are located in the middle ground between "artefact" and process", indicating that in these cases research outcomes might include artefacts and an understanding of process.

The Investigation advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy /

The Outcome or Result: predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome

The vast majority of cases claimed to challenge orthodoxy, and that their research resulted in open / contingent outcomes.

The Investigation responds to questions.....identifies questions /

The Outcome or Result: predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome

Cases in which the investigation was described as responding to questions tended also to have predictable outcomes, whereas investigations which were described as identifying questions tended also to have open / contingent outcomes.


The Outcome or Result: predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome

The Outcome or Result is explicit.....open to interpretation

The majority of cases (19) tended towards open/contingent outcomes. Of these, 8 were described as having explicit outcomes (mostly design and architecture, only 1 fine art) whilst the remaining 11 cases had outcomes which were described as being open to interpretation.

F.3

Case study mapping questions



Map PJ1PJ2

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context



Map PJ1PR1

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Practice - is central to the research.....supports the research



Map PJ1PR2

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production



Map PJ111

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative



Map PJ112

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Investigation - is secure.....is risky



Map PJ113

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline/


The Investigation - is generative.....is analytical



Map PJ114

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods



Map PJ115

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy



Map PJ116

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map PJ1R1

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map PJ1R2

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



Map PJ1R3

The Project is - an investigation of the discipline.... an investigation of something outside the discipline /

The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map PJ2PR1

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research



Map PJ2PR2

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production



Map PJ211

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The investigation - is linear.....is iterative



Map PJ212

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The investigation - is secure....is risky



Map PJ213

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The investigation - is generative....is analytical



Map PJ214

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/method



Map PJ215

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy



Map PJ216

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map PJ2R1

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map PJ2R2

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



PJ2R3 Map

The Project - arises in a professional/creative.....arises in an academic context /


The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map PR1PR2

The Practice - is central to the research.....supports the research /


The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production



Map PR111

The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research /


The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative



Map PR112

The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research /


The Investigation - is secure....is risky



Map PR113

The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research /


The Investigation - is generative....is analytical



Map PR114

The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research /


The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods



Map PR115

The Practice - is central to the research.....supports the research /


The Investigation - advances an established paradigm.....challenges orthodoxy



Map PR116

The Practice - is central to the research.....supports the research /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map PR1R1

The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map PR1R2


The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research /

The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome




Map PR1R3

The Practice - is central to the research....supports the research /
 The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map PR2I1


The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /
 The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative



Map PR2I2

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Investigation - is secure....is risky



Map PR2I3

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Investigation - is generative....is analytical



Map PR2I4

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods



Map PR2I5

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodox



Map PR2I6

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map PR2R1

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map PR2R2

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



Map PR2R3

The Practice - is a site for reflection.....is a means of production /


The Outcome or Result is - explicit....open to interpretation



Map I1I2

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative /


The Investigation - is secure.....is risky



Map I1I3

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative /


The Investigation - is generative.....is analytical



Map I114

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative /


The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods



Map I115

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative /


The Investigation - advance an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy



Map I1I6

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map I1R1

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map I1R2

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



I1R3

The Investigation - is linear.....is iterative


The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map I2I3

The Investigation - is secure....is risky /


The Investigation - is generative....is analytical



Map I2I4

The Investigation - is secure....is risky /


The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods



Map I2I5

The Investigation - is secure....is risky /


The Investigation - advance an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy



Map I2I6

The Investigation - is secure....is risky /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map I2R1

The Investigation - is secure....is risky /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map I2R2

The Investigation - is secure....is risky /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome.....open/contingent outcome



Map I2R3

The Investigation - is secure....is risky /


The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map I3I4

The Investigation - is generative....is analytical /


The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods



Map I3I5

The Investigation - is generative....is analytical /


The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy



Map I3I6

The Investigation - is generative....is analytical /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map I3R1

The Investigation - is generative....is analytical /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map I3R2

The Investigation - is generative....is analytical /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



Map I3R3

The Investigation - is generative....is analytical /


The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map I4I5

The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods /


The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy



Map I4I6

The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map I4R1

The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map I4R2

The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



Map I4R3

The Investigation - uses a single set of theory/methods....uses a wide range of theory/methods /


The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map I5I6

The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy /


The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions



Map I5R1

The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map I5R2

The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



Map I5R3

The Investigation - advances an established paradigm....challenges orthodoxy /


The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map I6R1

The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions /


The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process



Map I6R2

The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



Map I6R3

The Investigation - responds to questions.....identifies questions /


The Outcome or Result is -explicit.....open to interpretation



Map R1R2

The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process /


The Outcome or Result is - predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome



Map R1R3

The Outcome or Result is - product is artefact.....product understanding process /

The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation



Map R2R3

The Outcome or Result is -predictable outcome....open/contingent outcome /

The Outcome or Result is - explicit.....open to interpretation

Appendix G: AHRC Review participation statistics

530 people contributed to the AHRC PL Review, by

- attending town meetings,
- completing a questionnaire
- signing up for and / or contributing to the online conference,
- submitting a case study, or
- joining the website

Table 1 Number of participants in each activity

Town meetings	Research Experience Survey	Institutional Research Survey	Workshop member	Workshop contributor	Case study submitted	Website member
44	250	19	240+	59	38	185