

Creative Arts Research

Narratives of Methodologies and Practices

Elizabeth Grierson and Laura Brearley

With: Robyn Barnacle, Emma Barrow,
Lisa Dethridge, Peter Downton, Lesley Duxbury,
Trahna Hamm, Kipps Horn and Lyndal Jones



SensePublishers

Creative Arts Research

EDUCATIONAL FUTURES
RETHINKING THEORY AND PRACTICE
Volume 35

Series Editors

Michael A. Peters

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

Editorial Board

Michael Apple, *University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA*

Miriam David, *Institute of Education, London University, UK*

Cushla Kapitzke, *Queensland University of Technology, Australia*

Simon Marginson, *University of Melbourne, Australia*

Mark Olssen, *University of Surrey, UK*

Fazal Rizvi, *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA*

Linda Tuahwai Smith, *University of Waikato, New Zealand*

Susan Robertson, *University of Bristol, UK*

Scope

This series maps the emergent field of educational futures. It will commission books on the futures of education in relation to the question of globalisation and knowledge economy. It seeks authors who can demonstrate their understanding of discourses of the knowledge and learning economies. It aspires to build a consistent approach to educational futures in terms of traditional methods, including scenario planning and foresight, as well as imaginative narratives, and it will examine examples of futures research in education, pedagogical experiments, new utopian thinking, and educational policy futures with a strong accent on actual policies and examples.

Creative Arts Research

Narratives of Methodologies and Practices

Elizabeth Grierson
Laura Brearley

Treahna Hamm
Lesley Duxbury
Robyn Barnacle
Peter Downton
Lisa Dethridge
Emma Barrow
Kipps Horn
Lyndal Jones

*Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University, RMIT, Melbourne,
Australia*



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-8790-995-6 (paperback)

ISBN 978-90-8790-996-3 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-8790-997-0 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858, 3001 AW
Rotterdam, The Netherlands
<http://www.sensepublishers.com>

Printed on acid-free paper

Cover Image: Life River Reflections Through Totems, Acrylic, Treahna Hamm, 2004.

All Rights Reserved © 2009 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	vii
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS.....	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xiii
1. WAYS OF FRAMING	
Introducing Creative Arts Research	1
<i>Elizabeth Grierson and Laura Brearley</i>	
2. WAYS OF KNOWING AND BEING	
Navigating the Conditions of Knowledge and Becoming a Creative Subject.....	17
<i>Elizabeth Grierson</i>	
3. WAYS OF LOOKING AND LISTENING	
Stories from the Spaces Between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Knowledge Systems	33
<i>Laura Brearley and Trehna Hamm</i>	
4. WAYS OF ANALYSING	
From Reverie to Reality	55
<i>Lesley Duxbury</i>	
5. WAYS OF BEING-WITH	
Finding a Way to be with the Work	65
<i>Robyn Barnacle</i>	
6. WAYS OF PROPOSING	
Art as Proposition: From the Darwin Translations	75
<i>Lyndal Jones</i>	
7. WAYS OF ACTING AND REFLECTING	
Researching and Writing the Screenplay	97
<i>Lisa Dethridge</i>	
8. WAYS OF CONSTRUCTING	
Epistemic, Temporal and Productive Aspects of Design Research	111
<i>Peter Downton</i>	

CONTENTS

9. WAYS OF PERFORMING
 Perspectives on Performance and Performativity 129
 Elizabeth Grierson, Emma Barrow and Kipps Horn

10. WAYS OF DECONSTRUCTING
 Risks, Imagination and Reflexivity 149
 Elizabeth Grierson

11. WAYS OF LEARNING FROM CREATIVE RESEARCH
 A Postscript 165
 Elizabeth Grierson and Laura Brearley

INDEX 175

FOREWORD

This collection of essays that emerges from a shared multidisciplinary project at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology in 2006 examines the diversity of creative arts research in terms of its methodologies, practices and guiding philosophies. Taking a lead from Martin Heidegger, the editors frame the collection through consideration of ways of framing, knowing and being, looking and listening, analysing, being-with, proposing, acting and reflecting, constructing, performing, deconstructing, and learning. This wide-ranging ingenious metaphoric device allows the editors and contributors to emphasise a set of fundamental questions concerning epistemologies—ways of knowing, and ontologies—ways of being, and the relations between the two. The lead authors and editors, Elizabeth Grierson and Laura Brearley, refer to Heidegger’s notion of “gathering” and to his proposition “Questioning builds a way ... the way is one of thinking” as a means of linking the different chapters and providing the conceptual space within which to recognise the diversity of practices that count as creative arts research practices. Heidegger’s rich metaphorical philosophical language anchors an endeavour to narrate (and to use narration and narratology) to articulate the diverse ways of conducting creative arts-based research. Heidegger’s notion of “the way”—explicitly mentioned in “On The Way to Language” and developed in “the way of thinking”, “the way of being” and “the way of art”—metaphorises a “path”, a meditative thinking that is open, tolerant and respectful of “what is” and overcomes the dualistic thinking of subject/object, self/world that characterises modern Cartesianism and the overly rational and calculative mode of thinking that characterises it. Heidegger himself explains that “the way” resonates with Eastern traditions that emphasise authentic ways of relating:

The word ‘way’ probably is an ancient primary word that speaks to the reflective mind of man. The key word in Laotse’s poetic thinking is Tao, which ‘properly speaking’ means way (Heidegger, 1959, p. 198).

The metaphor of the path in Heidegger’s thinking also gels with “clearing”, “gathering”, and “sheltering” and develops a poetic philosophical language that can enact “being-historical thinking”. Gray (1970) comments in his discussion of Heidegger’s (1954a) famous invocation of the essence-meaning of the “fieldpath” (Der Feldweg):

The path itself spoke to him, as he writes, encouraged him to decipher the thoughts in the books he found too hard to comprehend. The field path taught him to conceive of thinking itself as a path, and of man’s brief career in time likewise as a path. . . . the field path spoke to him, not he to the field path (pp. 227–28).

Heidegger (1999), as he says in *Contributions to Philosophy*:

enacts a questioning along a pathway which is first traced out by the crossing to the other beginning, into which Western thinking is now entering. This pathway brings the crossing into the openness of history and establishes the crossing as perhaps a very long sojourn, in the enactment of which the other beginning of thinking always remains only an intimation, though already decisive (p. 3).

The scholarly intuitions of the lead authors are perfect not only in term of choosing Heidegger's metaphors to frame and theorise the collection but also because Heidegger's "path of thinking" about art remains one of the most profound on the place of art in modernity, the triumph of the aesthetic conception of art, and the value of the aesthetic experience.

The Heideggerian framing of the collection is the basis for a consideration of the politics of methodology and creative research in the age of knowledge capitalism. The individual essays that follow pick up on a number of themes: gathering as a way of framing the project (Grierson and Brearley); becoming a creative subject (Grierson); relations between Indigenous and Western knowledge systems (Brearley and Hamm); sustainable research design (Duxbury); the researcher's involvement with her work (Barnacle); the relation of art and text (Jones); writing the screenplay (Dethridge); forms of design research (Downton); performing and performativity (Grierson, Barrow, Horn); deconstruction of creative arts research discourses (Grierson); learning from creative research (Grierson and Brearley). This is both a substantial and innovative set of essays that grows out of active engagement with arts practice, pedagogy and research throwing new light on a range of issues that bring artists, designers, and performers into conversation with one another.

This collection is authentic, it speaks to the reader, it raises many questions and it theorises methodologies and practices of creative arts research in ways that the art student, the teacher, the practitioner, and the lecturer will find both philosophical, interesting and methodologically insightful. The collection is to be welcomed as breaking new ground and it will have a deserved readership beyond the confines of the academic art-based community.

REFERENCES

- Gray, J. (1970). Splendor of the simple. *Philosophy East and West*, 20(3), 227–240.
- Heidegger, M. (1959). *An introduction to metaphysics* (R. Mannheim, Trans.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1971). *On the way to language*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, M. (1999). *Contributions to philosophy* (From Enowning) (P. Emad & K. Maly, Trans.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Robyn Barnacle is a Senior Research Fellow in the Graduate Research Office, RMIT University, Melbourne. She is a scholar of research and research education, focusing specifically on alternative approaches to research, research education policy and practice, and ontological accounts of learning. Her work is published in internationally recognised top tier journals and has also been included in numerous edited books on research and higher education. Robyn also teaches in the area of research education, both as supervisor and co-ordinator of professional development programmes. Her PhD was on the nature of thought, drawing on the phenomenological hermeneutics of Martin Heidegger.

Dr Emma Barrow recently completed her PhD at RMIT University, Melbourne, and is a Research Assistant with the RMIT Design Research Institute. Emma is an artist who works with film, sound, land art, drawing and painting. She has worked collaboratively in Europe and with Aboriginal people in Australia on research projects focusing on issues of social histories, the environment, concepts of identity, and the historical context of racial marginalisation in contemporary society. Her work has led to research projects in Indonesia, Turkey, Jamaica, the South Pacific and USA. Her current practice and academic interest is in the transference of meaning through creative expression.

Dr Laura Brearley is Associate Professor of Creative Research in the Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, and Research Director of the Indigenous Deep Listening Project at the Design Research Institute, RMIT University, Melbourne. Prior to her appointment at Monash she was with the School of Education, RMIT University, where she coordinated the postgraduate Koori Cohort. Active in the field of education for thirty years, Laura specialises in creative approaches to research and culturally inclusive teaching, learning and research practice. For many years she has worked closely with members of Indigenous communities in Australia and has developed strategies of working in the spaces between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge systems. Laura is a singer and song-writer, and incorporates her music into her teaching and research.

Dr Lisa Dethridge teaches at the School of Creative Media, RMIT University, Melbourne, and has taught at the American Film Institute; the University of California, Los Angeles; New York University and the Australian Film, TV and Radio School. Lisa has a PhD in Media Ecology from New York University, has written for film, TV, print and the web in Australia and the USA. She has worked with studios and networks including Fox, Warner, Working Title, MTV, CBS, NBC, CNN, Granada, SBS, the Australian Film Commission and ABC Australia and written for magazines and journals including *Vogue Australia*. She is author of *Writing Your Screenplay* (Allen & Unwin, 2003).

Dr Peter Downton is Professor of Design Research, School of Architecture and Design, RMIT University, Melbourne. His research interests include the nature of enquiry in and through designing; the production of knowing and knowledge through designing and making; the role of models in thinking; and the relations of people to their physical environment. He currently supervises PhD research into aspects of designing. He is author of *Design Research* (RMIT Press, 2003), *Studies in Design Research: Ten epistemological pavilions* (RMIT Press, 2004), and Mark Burry, Michael Ostwald, Peter Downton and Andrea Mina (Eds.) *Homo Faber: Modelling architecture* (Archadia Press, 2007).

Dr Lesley Duxbury is Associate Professor and Programme Coordinator of Postgraduate Research at the School of Art, RMIT University, Melbourne. She has held solo exhibitions in Melbourne, Perth and Sydney, and has been included in more than fifty selected group exhibitions in Korea, Hong Kong, New Zealand and Australia, including National Gallery of Australia and National Gallery of Victoria. Her work is held in all major public collections in Australia. She has published papers in several refereed conference proceedings, the online journal *PAN: Philosophy Activism Nature* and a chapter in *Thinking Through Practice: Art as Research in the Academy* (Informit e-Library, RMIT Publishing, 2007).

Dr Elizabeth Grierson is Professor of Art and Philosophy, Head of the School of Art, RMIT University, Melbourne, and Adjunct Professor AUT New Zealand, Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts UK, World Councillor of International Society of Education through Art, executive of Art Education Australia, and Deputy Chair of Australia Council of University Art and Design Schools. She has a PhD in the philosophy of education, serves on several international editorial boards, and is executive editor of *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies*. Elizabeth speaks and publishes widely in philosophy of art and education, aesthetics, culture and globalisation. Publications include *A Skilled Hand and Cultivated Mind* (co-authored, RMIT Press, 2008), *Thinking Through Practice* (co-edited, RMIT Press, 2007), *The Arts in Education: Critical perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand* (co-edited, Dunmore Press, 2003), and author of many book chapters, catalogues and journal articles.

Dr Treahna Hamm is a Yorta Yorta woman from Murray River region, Victoria Australia and a member of the Stolen Generation. In 1996, she received the National Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Heritage Art Award; in 1999, the Missio International Art Award in Germany; and in 2007, she was one of thirty Indigenous artists in */Culture Warriors/* exhibition at the National Gallery of Australia. Her Possum Skin Cloak was worn by the Senior Elder of Canberra who performed the Welcome to Country at Australia's National Apology ceremony, 13 February 2008. Treahna recently received her doctorate, which explored how artwork reveals individual narratives as well as the total community experience.

Dr Kipps Horn is a Senior Lecturer and Program Director of the BA Music Industry at RMIT University, Melbourne. His doctoral research in the field of ethnomusicology investigated fifty years of rebetika music-making in Melbourne. His current research interests involve traditional music of the Greek diaspora and improvisation in the performing arts. Recent publications include contributions to *Ties to the Homeland: Second generation transnationalism* (Cambridge Scholars Press, 2007), *Aesthetics and Experience in Music Performance* (Cambridge Scholars Press, 2005), and *Fifty Years of Rebetika Music Amongst the Greek Diaspora in Melbourne, Australia* (Common Ground Publishers, Victoria, Australia, 2001).

Dr Lyndal Jones is a Professor in the School of Media and Communications, RMIT University, Melbourne, and an artist who focuses on context, place and empowerment through long-term projects involving performance and video installation. She has received a 'Keating' Fellowship (1993–1996), represented Australia at the 2001 Venice Biennale and held a survey exhibition at the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, Melbourne, in 2008. She completed her PhD in 2005. Her works have been in major exhibitions throughout Australia, Europe, Asia and USA. Her current project, *The Avoca Project: Art, Place and Climate Change* addresses climate change action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book represents the input of many people. We wish to thank the community of scholars from the Schools of Art, Education, Creative Media, and Architecture and Design at RMIT University, who contributed to the devising of the Creative Research Strategies course from which this book grew. Also we acknowledge the postgraduate students whose creative projects gave us much insight into different ways of approaching creative research. We thank all the authors for their insightful texts and willingness to have their artworks reproduced, and gratefully thank Treahna Hamm for granting permission to reproduce the image of her painting, *Life River Reflections Through Totems* for the front cover. We thank the contributions of Clare Leporati for the manuscript layout and design, Virginia Grierson for compiling the Index, and Bronwyn Hughes for her support throughout the process of writing the book. Our thanks to Professor Michael Peters for including this book in his series and compiling the Foreword. No project of this scope can be done without institutional resources and thus we acknowledge the financial support of the Intervention through Art programme of the Design Research Institute at Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University. We acknowledge the community of creative researchers whose work inspires and strengthens this emerging field. Finally, as lead authors, we thank our partners Nick and Terry for their enduring support.

1. WAYS OF FRAMING

Introducing Creative Arts Research

AIMS

It is proper to every gathering that the gatherers assemble to coordinate their efforts to the sheltering; only when they have gathered together with that end in view do they begin to gather. (Martin Heidegger, *Logos*, cited in Krell, 1999, p. ii)

This book acts as a “gathering” of sorts. It assembles a range of narratives and case studies of creative research projects and methodologies from a creative community of educational practice in a university setting. The praxis of creative research is our starting point for thinking through the materiality of practice to locate sustainable methodologies through which such practice can be systematically investigated. The purpose of the book is to present a diversity of arts-based and arts-led research projects and methodologies; to critically reflect upon the projects; to examine methodologies appropriate to such research; and to incorporate diverse voices and narratives of researchers in this field. Successful outcomes of research require identifiable methodologies and practical methods, which will be discussed later in this chapter. The pedagogical aims of this collection are to position creativity and creative research as an authentic and robust condition of knowledge, and to reveal how researchers in this field navigate their material to scaffold their research projects.

The book comes from a collective pedagogical event of devising a Creative Research Strategies course for creative arts researchers. This occurred at RMIT University, Melbourne, in 2006, when a group of academics came together on a common pedagogical project from the Schools of Art, Creative Media, Architecture and Design, and Education. The challenge was to activate the politics of difference across these four academic schools, each with its particular lineage of practice and historical attachments to specific pedagogical approaches. It was incumbent upon us to grapple with the diverse frameworks and allow difference its place and scope. One day we were sitting around the table navigating a strategy for conceptual cohesion in this space of difference, and Elizabeth Grierson brought Heidegger into the conversation with his, “Questioning builds a way. ... The way is one of thinking” (Heidegger, 1999a, p. 311), suggesting “Ways of ...” as the conceptual thread. For us all, the concept took flight.

A feature of our methodology in bringing together the different voices from four schools was to activate what Wenger (1998) calls *communities of practice*. This model of educational work registers the significance of practical knowledge through working together with “reciprocal rights and responsibilities between different knowledge partners; and institutional routines, regimes, and strategies” (Peters & Besley, 2006, p. 29). Through this methodology a discursive and interdisciplinary educational practice was made possible within a collaborative model of course development for creative arts research. In Heidegger’s terms a gathering process was at work in assembling multiple voices and building the knowledge practice as a way of sheltering.

This same gathering process of working together in a creative community continues to be at work in devising this book and collating the different narratives of enquiring, constructing, performing, knowing and being. There are several ways of talking about what this book both is and is not. It is a collection of voices, but it is not a mimetic replication of the RMIT creative research course. As a book it has another disposition with a life of its own, and yet its pedagogical principles of multiple ways of knowing resemble those in the course. It is gathering different perspectives together as a way of dwelling in, and furthering, the knowledge field of creative arts-based and arts-led research, but it is neither prescribing a particular methodology nor is it closing down the potential of difference. It is bringing Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives and voices together in the one text, but is not limiting the cultural narratives to one voice or one way of being. With each narrative speaking from a different time, place and lineage, it is aiming to open methodological strategies and intent to enable diverse researchers to find place and purchase for their own creative arts projects.

AUTHORS

The project’s gestation reflects its own form of narrative combining the work of the two lead authors and diverse educators in the creative research field, its methodology coming from communities of practice. As Head of Research in an art and design department of a New Zealand university in the late 1990s to mid 2000s, Elizabeth Grierson worked with arts educators to develop postgraduate research programmes and research methodology courses for postgraduate study. At the time there was a paucity of material to assist the creative researcher, particularly in the area of methodology, and the politics of academic scholarship was demanding something be done to fill the gap. This is where the idea of the book was born. Then with an appointment to the School of Art at RMIT University in Australia, in 2005, Grierson became involved with a new community of arts researchers in the College of Design and Social Context, and with Laura Brearley from the School of Education pursued the project with renewed impetus. Through this collaboration, with each researcher bringing different perspectives and strengths to the project, the proposal went through further iterations and, with a contract secured, the book grew into its present form.

Grierson and Brearley were integral to the devising of the Creative Research Strategies course—they also contributed to the learning and teaching processes through lectures and seminars, working together and with other colleagues. Both draw their vision from the transformative pedagogical potential of the creative arts in their own academic scholarship and research. Elizabeth Grierson brings her experience as an art historian, artist and art educator to the narrative encounters of creative research and methodologies. With a PhD in the philosophy of education on the politics of knowledge in visual arts, her work brings theory and practice together as she weaves her narratives and practices drawing from continental philosophies and poststructuralist perspectives to enhance issues of creativity, identity, difference, site and subjectivity.

With a PhD in management using a creative arts model of enquiry, Laura Brearley led the Indigenous creative arts researchers at the School of Education. The establishment and development of a cohort of Indigenous researchers grew directly out of her own work in arts-based research and multiple ways of knowing. Her interest in working at the epistemological edges of the academy was congruent with the oral tradition of storytelling and the significance of language, identity and country, which has characterised the knowledge systems of the Indigenous peoples of Australia for tens of thousands of years. Members of the Indigenous community heard about the research being undertaken, which made room for Indigenous ways of knowing, and the numbers within the cohort of Indigenous researchers grew. This group of students aptly became known as the Koori Cohort of Researchers.

This collection includes other creative arts scholars who were involved in the Creative Research Strategies course at various stages of its life. Lisa Dethridge was one of the original team members during its planning and development, then taking an active coordinating and lecturing role. Robyn Barnacle, Peter Downton, Lesley Duxbury, Kipps Horn and Lyndal Jones have participated actively in the course; and doctorate candidates, Emma Barrow and Treahna Hamm contributed their first-hand doctorate experiences to lectures and seminars. Each of these scholars brings to the book their particular ways of witnessing the processes of creative research.

In this book, with reference to Heidegger, we could say that the authors are working together as a community of practice as they “assemble to coordinate their efforts to the sheltering” (Heidegger in Krell, 1999, p. ii); and as Heidegger reminds us, as they come together in this way, there is a beginning to the gathering.

AUDIENCES

In light of changing social and political conditions in the first decade of the twenty-first century, this is a pertinent time to be undertaking this work. The traditionally defined categories of various art forms and practices are shifting as divisions between the arts and economic life are blurring. Fine art, photography, theatre, music, design, dance and film, for example, can no longer be thought of in the old disciplinary terms as global circulations of digital, visual, audio and kinaesthetic forms and practices cross borders of historical *habitus* to intervene in cultural and economic lives.

Artists, designers, audiences, writers and readers coalesce as the boundaries between subject and object blur and education opens its practices to wider domains of knowledge. The book is written for those readers who are seeking to be part of those wider domains and those with an interest in creativity as a condition of our times. It is for those practitioner-researchers finding ways to articulate and critically reflect upon embedded practice as a mode of research and to establish a methodology appropriate for their project; and for those educators in the creative arts, design, architecture, media, communications, education, social sciences and humanities tasked with supportive roles. It is for those who are seeking a way to critically reflect upon creative practice as research; for those wanting to establish systematic methodologies that can sustain research questions and themes; and for those in management and governance in universities, communities, government and research funding bodies. Ultimately in demonstrating how artists and creative researchers think, imagine, act and design through practice it is finding a way to legitimate the creative arts as a knowledge field equal to, but different from, the sciences within those settings.

The collection is aiming to activate the relations between writer and reader in the making of new knowledge, but is not intending to be didactic or over-declarative. It is opening the scope of creative research to further discussion and invention, but is not limiting its scope of readership. In the processes of gathering its call is to be accessible for an audience both within and beyond the academy as it carries an invitation to engage with readers and writers at close proximity and distance, those in times and places near at hand and as yet unknown.

RESEARCH

The Politics of Methodology

Confirming the traditional methodologies of research in the social sciences and scientific disciplines there is a global return to empirical research and cognitive, rationalist or instrumentalist approaches to knowledge formulation. This move is consistent with the globalised spread of economic rationalism and managerialism evident in institutions of higher learning with their input-output accountabilities attached to quantifiable measures of investment and funding. Yet it is clear that vested attention to pragmatic and instrumentalised approaches to research may not be suiting the best interests of those in the creative fields of making, performing, inventing. There is a growing need for the articulation of research methodologies appropriate to creative arts practice and diverse cultural knowledge systems. There are inherent challenges to be faced via the methodological approach and choice.

In this book, themes of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations, and issues of identity, difference, knowing and being trace through the text as the politics of creativity find form through actual projects and practices. Creative practice—the practical work of the practitioner-researcher—can be identified by its application and commitment. There are many modes of enquiry such as working through art or aesthetics, musical composition or performance, screen writing or filming, movement or dance, design or digital storytelling and combinations of these. Thus the actual

projects within these pages go beyond empirical case studies; they act as creative narratives or carriers, and through them there is a naming and revealing of diverse methodologies.

To name methodologies appropriate to creative arts projects is to establish a way of claiming alternatives to the more orthodox social sciences or scientific research paradigms. This value is often overlooked in the sheer struggle of grappling with the research questions and available information. Methodologies for creative arts research identify as arts-based and arts-led, or design-based and design-led practitioner research, embodied practice, narrative and heuristic enquiry, grounded and action research, performativity and phenomenology, ethnography and autoethnography, hermeneutics, constructivism and participatory enquiry, reflectivity and reflexivity, propositional practice, critical and discourse analysis, archaeology and genealogy, poststructuralism, deconstruction and Indigenous deep listening. Projects may work with one or combinations of these.

Methodology should not be confused with method; a difference exists. The method is the functional aspect of the research including the organising of materials and media, files and data, timelines and timetables, the division of the chapters, mechanics of performance or exhibition practice, the techniques and arrangements of material: the doing rather than the asking what, why and how we do. On the other hand methodology is the “how” of research, the organising system through which researchers make use and sense of data and ideas, engage critically with theories and literature, reflect on material practices and actions, ask questions and seek answers to weave research in a cohesive and systematic way.

Through the selection of methodology the researcher becomes a political voice. Methodology is never neutral neither is it word-packing to justify the artist-writers’ deepest thoughts. The chosen methodology declares as it discloses. Methodology is the systematic procedure through which to organise research and base its presentation. Like the skeleton on which to build the anatomy of the project, it reveals the epistemological and ontological DNA. The use of methodology is not an idea in itself, but a contextual framework, to which the project can adhere and through which it builds. The selection of methodology will dictate the kinds of questions to ask and therefore the kinds of answers and outcomes. The methodology contains the limits and holds the research strands in place as the researcher weaves the textures of new knowledge.

The Politics of Creative Research

The focus of research is broader than the strictures of any educational setting. Research is about innovative thinking and practice, about making and testing assumptions, performing, proposing, speculating, asking questions and paving the way for new questions or propositions to be made next time. It is about the illumination of new knowledge around an identifiable theme and question, engaging with the known in new ways, constructing, proposing and testing assumptions, with an implicit recognition of the process of analysing systematically to make new discoveries and add to the stock of knowledge in the creative economies of our

times. Research discovers more about ourselves as human subjects, and the ecologies of earth, world and beyond are reevaluated and revealed, even transformed, in new light.

Research involves many ways of knowing or epistemologies. For creative artists the intuitive may work with the empirical, embodied and experiential through material practices and creative innovations. In practices of visual or fine arts, architecture or design, performance or music, dance or film, creative writing, digital media, screen writing or sound, the notion of testing assumptions or presenting and testing hypotheses may be quite foreign. Creative arts-based and arts-led projects involve imagination, invention, speculation, innovation, risk-taking. New knowledge is made possible through the materiality of practice itself. Such practices can be of the most challenging order intellectually and technologically, the most revealing and moving emotionally, the most embodied physically, or the most disquieting politically. Often they expose the cutting edge of imaginative ideas and new forms of thought as they reveal uncertainties in the human condition or subvert known systems of language, text and social practices.

The interest in courses and degree programmes in the creative arts is growing globally. In Australia, where the PhD is accepted as the terminal degree in creative arts practice, academies are aware of the need to drive recognition of this model of research (see Duxbury, Grierson & Waite, 2007, 2008; Barrett & Bolt, 2007; Australia Learning and Teaching Council, 2009). The practice-based doctorate is also the accepted model “in a number of other countries such as Britain, Finland, New Zealand and Japan” (<http://creativeartsphd.com>). There are new investments of attention to creativity and the power of creative knowledge to build stronger economies and establish regional and urban identities. That we inhabit an increasingly applied world of interdisciplinary and practical knowledge is no longer in doubt. As the relations between different forms of knowledge define our present terrain we are obligated to broaden our understanding of knowledge as a relational site to inspire something more than a primary economic agenda.

The creative arts, particularly in frontier technologies of new media and digital formations, are being linked to growth and development for local and global economies. As well as the extraordinary expansion of media landscapes there is exponential growth of cities calling for design as a core of urban thinking, planning and practice. It would seem that the creative arts are well positioned to enhance innovation in such economies. However the terms “creativity” and “innovation” have become so over-used in the globalisation of knowledge transfer that they cease to have much meaning in the communities of practice that claim creativity as their defining *métier*. The American writer, Richard Florida positions creativity in the economic development of cities and regions as a kind of revitalisation model of social and cultural life. Florida opens *Cities and the Creative Class* with this premise, “Cities are cauldrons of creativity” (2005, p. 1), reinforcing the sort of hype that underscores creative economies. This may be so, but the creativity with which this project engages is the very creativity that is too easily bypassed in the firing of these economic cauldrons. Thus we are concerned to return the discourse to the creative practitioner-researchers themselves. We trust that the ways of thinking and

creating within these pages will serve to identify a sustainable creative spirit as a “will to power”, to use Frederic Nietzsche’s term for the creative drive and its eternal return, and to find methodologies appropriate for the calling forth of affective, imaginative and perceptual measures of creative knowledge and action.

New Challenges

While globalised technologies and commercial interests may open the field of the creative arts to new possibilities they also bring new challenges of the “how to” of research in the selection of research questions, and the application of appropriate methodologies and approaches. The fine arts, music, dance, performance, screen or design practitioner needs to consider a different sort of methodology from that of the more empirical paradigms usually associated with social sciences or educational research. The creative practitioners engage technologies, materials, aesthetics and ideas, and the integration of practical, theoretical and philosophical contexts through creative art processes for exhibition, performance or display, as well as constructing an accompanying written exegesis, website, CD or DVD. In a sense there is a doubling of thinking and action. They need both the creative and technological know-how for the creative research production as well as the linguistic and theoretical acumen to write critically engaged and well-considered text. The emphasis is on the making of art image, object, artefact, film, performance et al, coupled with the interpretations, strategies and paradigms by which critical reflection, examination and analysis can take place.

One of the challenges of the book is to illuminate the voices of Indigenous researchers and present methodologies appropriate to Indigenous practices and sensibilities. The incorporation of Indigenous ways of knowing into research raises vital questions about issues of representation, voice, ethics, the construction of knowledge and the nature of research. The active role that members of the Koori Cohort are playing within the academy illuminates many of the epistemological, methodological and ontological issues that have been central to the Creative Research Strategies course. Their contribution to the course as guest lecturers and active participants in the seminars has been a living example of Denzin and Lincoln’s statement that “it is time to dismantle, deconstruct, and decolonize Western epistemologies from within” (Denzin, Lincoln & Smith, 2008, p. ix).

Through multi-vocal narratives this book incorporates Indigenous ways of knowing as a way of enabling the politics of difference in the voices of the researchers themselves. Throughout the political and social processes of colonisation, Indigenous voices, traditions and practices have been silenced, destroyed or omitted too often from authorised history and development. Today Indigenous voices are nudging aside imperialist preoccupations and dominant ideologies in the values and traditions of knowledge to enable new and revised perspectives. In this context we witness the invigoration of methodologies such as oral story telling and testimonies, revisioning and remembering past histories as well as envisioning possible futures, performing and affirming embodied cultural practices, and reclaiming traditional languages and social formations. In her work, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Linda

Tuhiwai Smith speaks of the need for “negotiating and transforming institutional practices” (1999, p. 140) to ensure that Indigenous research design is deemed as legitimate and sustainable.

Smith argues that the term “research” is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. She writes, “The word itself, ‘research’, is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary” (1999, p. 1). These words are the opening quotation of the *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, which Smith co-edits with Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (2008). In their preface, Denzin and Lincoln argue that research does not have to be a dirty word if we think through the implications of connecting Indigenous epistemologies with theories of decolonisation, post-colonialism and the emancipatory discourses of critical theory and pedagogy (Denzin, Lincoln & Smith, 2008, p. ix).

The political nature of the theory and practice of research and the inherent issues of representation, epistemology and self-determination are key concerns within critical Indigenous enquiry (Swadener & Mutua, 2008; Mayer, 2008; Grande, 2008; Bishop, 2008). Russell Bishop articulates a discourse of proactive theory and practice known as *Kaupapa Maori* which resists “the hegemony of the dominant discourse” (2008, p. 439), characteristic of the imperialist research condemned by Linda Tuhiwai Smith. Within a *Kaupapa Maori* discourse, Bishop contends that power is shared, culture counts, learning is interactive and dialogic, connectedness is fundamental to relations and a common vision exists (Bishop, 2008, p. 445).

The significance of respect and reciprocity in relationships within Indigenous research is articulated in Bishop’s research (Bishop, 2005; 2008) and also in the recent work of Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg who argue, “As indigenous peoples tell their stories and rethink their histories, it is the duty of critical multilogical historians to listen carefully and respectfully” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008, p. 147). They advocate for respectful listening as well as for complex ways of seeing, contending that such approaches lead to understanding and transformative practice. They claim that critical exploration of the ways in which knowledge is produced and legitimised and the construction of just and inclusive contexts for academic research are features of transformative practice (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008, p. 148).

There is a great deal of richness in learning from Indigenous ways of knowing to inform research practice. Kincheloe and Steinberg make the important point, however, that Western researchers need to be vigilant to avoid a new wave of exploitative appropriation of Indigenous wisdom. To avoid this, they need to “adhere to a strict set of ethics devoted to self-determination of indigenous peoples; an awareness of the complex, ever evolving ways that colonialism oppresses them; the inter-cultural nature of all research and analysis of indigenous knowledge; and the dedication to use indigenous knowledge in ways that lead to political, epistemological, and ontological changes that support the expressed goals of the indigene” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008, p.14).

FRAMING THE PROJECT

Ways of ...

We are framing this project as “a way” with each chapter opening up different ways of thinking, questioning, and engaging strategically with the overall theme of creative arts research methodologies and practices. In *The Question Concerning Technology* (1999a), Heidegger addresses “the way” when he writes:

Questioning builds a way. We would be advised, therefore, above all to pay heed to the way, and not to fix our attention on isolated sentences and topics. The way is one of thinking. All ways of thinking, more or less perceptibly, lead through language in a manner that is extraordinary (Heidegger, 1999a, p. 311).

There are different forms of language, voices and textures as each researcher gives account of a research project, a contextual concern, a creative practice, a scholarly and academic journey. Heidegger saw thinking as a way of revealing, when not closed by heightened, teleological, means-end, instrumentalist discourses. Of thinking, at the start of *Building Dwelling Thinking* he writes, “As soon as we have the thing before our eyes, and in our hearts an ear for the word, thinking prospers” (Heidegger, 1999b, p. 343). In this essay Heidegger draws a relationship between building and dwelling as a way of “being”. Throughout this collection we find there are similar relationships between the building of projects and the “being” of particular researchers. Thus we could say the researchers in this collection are prospering in their disclosures of creative knowledge as they find a way of dwelling as creative subjects.

The chapters unfold through *Ways of Knowing and Being; Ways of Looking and Listening; Ways of Analysing; Ways of Being-With; Ways of Proposing; Ways of Acting and Reflecting; Ways of Constructing; Ways of Performing; Ways of Deconstructing*, concluding with *Ways of Learning from Creative Arts Research* that reiterates and forecasts, reminding us of the importance of opening the field of qualitative methodologies to wider narratives of enquiry.

Starting the book with this chapter, *Ways of Framing: Introducing Creative Arts Research* provides scope for outlining the project’s gestation and pedagogical position. Elizabeth Grierson and Laura Brearley introduce the aims, authors and audiences, define methodologies and position the creative research field.

Chapter Two, *Ways of Knowing and Being* poses a series of questions to focus on the (un)knowable. Sub-titled *Navigating the Conditions of Knowledge and Becoming a Creative Subject*, the chapter brings knowing and being together in the frames of experience. Elizabeth Grierson considers the constitution of the “creative subject” through the process of research. She engages a genealogical methodology and is careful to “pay heed to the way of language” (Heidegger, 1999c, p. 412), enabling multiple voices to speak through her text. As she traverses the landscape of research, acknowledging the embodied nature of the journey, she calls on Martin Heidegger, Michel Foucault, and the poetic texts of Hélène Cixous to activate

language in the discourses of creativity, the self or subject, and experience. Here the author is also the artist keeping the physicality of the research process alive through her photographic images of walking rough mountain terrain, experiencing “the abyss and its shores”. This chapter shows how methodology matters as the text crafts the methodological journey. A narrative of the author’s doctorate project traces through the text as the reader travels with her from Brighton to Mykinos and follows the scaffolding of her project, with the discourses of experience finding their place and purpose. The voice engages a questioning way to put research to work navigating the conditions of knowledge to become a creative subject. These navigations do not presume fixed conditions, nor do they proclaim a self-contained presence. Ultimately, through telling her narratives of experience, Grierson emphasises that the research subject is being constituted through the process of research in “the knowledge one is forming, the language one is speaking”.

In Chapter Three, *Ways of Looking and Listening: Stories from the Spaces Between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, Laura Brearley and Treahna Hamm use multiple voices to describe their experiences of incorporating Indigenous ways of knowing into research practice, and the inherent richness and challenges of such practice. They describe the underpinning theory of the ways in which they use the Indigenous concept of “deep listening” as a research methodology and as a way of creating community. Deep listening draws on all of the senses and can be used as a research methodology in its own right or can be integrated with other research methodologies such as narrative enquiry, action research, auto ethnography and arts-based research. When applied as a research methodology, it means taking the time to build relationships. The core of deep listening is respect and reciprocity. In this chapter Treahna Hamm uses narratives, paintings, poetry and possum skin cloak making to illuminate the ways in which she incorporated deep listening into her doctoral research. The chapter features work created by Treahna for the Bigana Exhibition held in 2006 at the Melbourne Museum during the Commonwealth Games. Through the creative projects they reveal the workings of the eight moments in research of Denzin and Lincoln (2005), who map the moves from the privileging of positivist and scientific research paradigms to culturally situated approaches of the multi-voiced and uncertain present. The focus of this chapter is on emancipatory models of research that seek to make a difference and the appropriate methodologies through which such research can be undertaken.

Print media artist, Lesley Duxbury explores her own PhD project in Chapter Four, *Ways of Analysing: From Reverie to Reality*, in which she asks some fundamental questions regarding sustainable research design. She explores the distinction between art as research and professional art practice and suggests that there are differences between the ways in which traditional research and art practice as research are undertaken and understood. She examines the ways in which art practice as research is imagined, created and encountered and the process of reverie and imagination in the development of creative work. The roles of self and consciousness within that process are discussed from a phenomenological perspective. She suggests that engaging in reverie is a significant process in following the impulse generated by the not yet known.

Openness to the flow of ideas and associations while remaining alert and receptive is a characteristic of the reflective practice of artist as researcher. A creative arts researcher combines engagement with materials and sustained engagement with ideas leading to the construction of new realities and the creation of new experiences. Lesley Duxbury describes her methodological processes of preparing to undertake a series of artworks on the theme of weather and how it may be interpreted. Her preliminary research includes investigation of primary resource material, reading, art making and walking. She argues that new knowledge is gained and meaning made through the encounter between the artwork and the viewer. The nature of this relationship invites the viewer into a state of reverie and consciousness. In a phenomenological sense, the processes of interpretation and construction of the artwork are ongoing.

In Chapter Five, *Ways of Being-With: Finding a Way to be with the Work*, Robyn Barnacle works through a Heideggerian approach on the role of things and the status of the researcher's involvement in the work. Ultimately this chapter is seeking an alternative model for understanding the relation between research as idea and research as material work. The chapter identifies the contradictions of undertaking and describing creative practice through conventional empirical models of knowledge generation. It proposes a model for undertaking creative research from a hermeneutic-phenomenological tradition in which being in the world comes before knowing the world and in which knowledge production is framed as a process of materialisation.

Robyn Barnacle explores what differentiates a research project in the creative arts from other disciplines and challenges the definitive account of knowledge generation proposed by scientism or positivism. She describes an approach to creative arts research, which combines the Heideggerian concept of "being-with" and John Law's account of material semiotics. In the proposed model, epistemology is in the service of ontology rather than the other way around. It contests the Cartesian definitive account of certainty and proposes instead a dialogue between researcher and researched, focusing on how something works and what it does. Creative arts research within such a model transcends the dualisms of doing and thinking, mind and body and becomes a confluence between artist, artefact and its particular social, historical and spatial context. Barnacle argues that an understanding of research on its own terms can be generated through a process of "letting happen" in which the creative researcher is always already open to the possibilities of being.

Lyndal Jones brings a different perspective to the creative arts research field in Chapter Six with her *Ways of Proposing: Art as Proposition*. In a poetic and inventive way she gives an account of her research in *From the Darwin Translations* playing always with the relations of art and text as she weaves her narrative. The work is transgressive in that it provides a counter argument to the notion of the proposition, taking it beyond "the binary oppositions of form and content, mind and body and the illustration of intention". For this researcher the propositional is a methodological way of presenting new ideas as invitations rather than absolutes. Jones traces her artistic practice over many years as she discloses her primary interest in inviting artists and viewers "to have the courage to become increasingly sensitive to the

effects of artworks on our thoughts and feelings as individuals and as social beings". She takes the reader with her on a journey in time and place to 1983 and to China, acknowledging always "the embrace of the mystery of outcome". She sustains this way of writing through a sequence of actions and creative research projects through the decades of the 1990s and 2000s, including encounters with Charles Darwin, that allow the reader to be part of her writing and research process. In this Jones is, as she says, "evoking a world where the viewer is implicated, involved; where that viewer also experiences themselves moving both literally and imaginatively, where there is an actual sensual experience to be had". She is also succeeding "to lighten intention", as she puts it, and to bring artist or author and reader or viewer together in the "accumulation of moments" of her narrative encounters.

In Chapter Seven, *Ways of Acting and Reflecting: Researching and Writing the Screenplay*, Lisa Dethridge considers what it means to reflect on and engage reflexively with screenwriting as a creative research pursuit. The combination of rational analysis and imaginative reflection is a challenge for the researcher whose project is to write a screenplay and produce an analytical exegesis to situate the creative work in the professional culture of screenwriting. She calls this "the dual research process" and notes that the methodologies she discusses are relevant to the writing of film scripts, storytelling, animation, computer games and performance. Showing how the screenwriter works between the demands of academic research and industry contexts Dethridge presents case studies from the *Spaghetti Western*, the *Romantic Comedy*, *War Movies* and the *Road Movie* to stress the need to mobilise the imagination or vision of the writers in their creation of worlds while holding to the dual focus of screenwriting structure and technique, and also relating to the demands of production and consumption.

The research methodologies of acting and reflexively engaging reveal a demanding process of navigating the disparate needs and requirements of the industry as well as captivating audiences. Positioning the screenplay as "a kind of blueprint for action", Lisa Dethridge offers some practical advice for moving between the imaginative screenwriting and exacting exegesis writing processes. There is a demand for continual relations between the two coupled with an awareness of the need for reflexive understanding of the mutual relationships in which the researcher is embedded.

In Chapter Eight, *Ways of Constructing: Epistemic, Temporal and Productive Aspects of Design Research*, Peter Downton presents the voice of a design practitioner-researcher who works through issues of research for design; research about designing as an investigative activity; and research conducted through the processes of designing. This chapter presents an account of Downton's practice as a maker of design objects and his practice as a researcher. He describes and distinguishes between the concepts of research for design, research about design and research through design. He examines ideas about the embodiment and transmission of design knowledge through his practice of creating design objects known as "pavilions", describing in depth the construction and epistemological implications of two pavilions, the "Music Bridge" and "The Pilgrim Temple of

Canonic Desires”. He argues that the process of making and designing these two models reveals the kinds of knowledge employed by the designer-maker. Within the chapter, the exploration of epistemology embedded and revealed within his pavilions is underpinned by a theoretical examination of design knowledge drawing on the theory and practice of architects, design practitioners and the philosopher Karl Popper to show how designerly knowledge is produced and where it resides.

In Chapter Nine, three authors combine, Elizabeth Grierson, Emma Barrow and Kipps Horn, to examine performance and performative methodologies in music, dance and filmic projects. *Ways of Performing: Perspectives on Performance and Performativity* presents an amalgam of voices from researchers and supervisors in music, performance, dance and film. The chapter begins by discussing the proximal relations between performance and performativity, drawing together their modes of enactment including their potential for place-making, embodiment, participation and communication. The role of performativity is disclosed through the case studies of projects presented by researchers, Richard Frankland and Andy Baylor whose musical work is known to Australian audiences, and Emma Barrow whose art practice is focusing on film work with an Indigenous dancer; with Elizabeth Grierson and Kipps Horn in the role of supervisors. Through her research Emma Barrow is working collaboratively with Indigenous artists of Larrakia heritage in the Darwin region in Australia’s Northern Territory. Her work is co-produced with her Indigenous partners and it is at the intersections of varied perspectives that she finds the acts of cultural translation occurring. Levels of reciprocity with others and reflective engagements with the creative and scholarly potentials are characterising each of the performative projects—evident also in the supervisor-candidate relationships in this chapter. Ways of working with Indigenous projects by Indigenous and non-Indigenous performers, artists and scholars are informing these projects. Ultimately the ways of relating, perceiving, exchanging, participating and understanding become apparent through the exigencies of practice where the potential for transformation lies. The authors note, “In this transformative state, sharing and integrating knowledge and experience creates the potential for performers and audience to bring about social, political and cultural recognition and change.”

In Chapter Ten, *Ways of Deconstructing: Risks, Imagination and Reflexivity* Elizabeth Grierson “constructs a discourse that examines discourses”. With the politics of knowledge in mind, she investigates methodologies and theories of poststructuralism and deconstruction, relating them to creative arts research and revealing the inherent risks in such procedures. Informed by her enquiries into the politics of knowledge in art and education, Grierson “raises questions about institutional thought, organisational limits, and ways of archiving and analysing the discursive formations of which Michel Foucault speaks”. She is seeking to demystify poststructuralism and deconstruction within the applied field of creative research by activating counter-readings in theory and practice. The potential for a Derridean play of difference, or *différance*, reverberates through the text with its images from Grierson’s own creative archive of painting and photography.

Ultimately she is engaging in a radical critique of the present as she calls for an activation of the politics of difference in creative research.

The book concludes with *Ways of Learning from Creative Research: A Postscript* in which Laura Brearley and Elizabeth Grierson review the challenges and defining moments in the preceding texts, and let the voices of their experiences speak through a final poetic and critical text. They reiterate the project's commitment to linking reflexivity and creative action as a process of developing a critical consciousness, and make some predictions for the future of creative arts-led and arts-based research as a way of concluding.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Creative Arts Research: Narratives of Methodologies and Practices is a timely outcome of a dynamic educational project as our educational futures are being shaped by the creative knowledge economies of which we are a part, and it is here that we see our responsibility. Today creative arts researchers are performing the functions of creative worker for local and global economies, transmitting technological, material, cultural, social and historical information through aesthetic means—a realm of affective knowledge operating on many levels of creation and reception in a fast changing world of global connectivity and interdisciplinary merging and exchange. As artists, designers, and other arts practitioners produce artefacts, images, music, sound and performative text, so they interrogate and enliven their practices with active engagement in the social, the cultural, and the political. Theirs is a specific knowledge domain with aesthetic, material, cultural, social and political dimensions. The creative economies depend upon creative thinkers. Thus as educators in the creative arts field we need to bring to the fore the narratives of those creative researchers in order to legitimise their practices within and beyond orthodox methodologies.

As a gathering of researchers the text weaves these dimensions. Each author bears witness to their practical and theoretical placements within the field of qualitative research as they identify and name methodologies for creative arts-based knowledge. Ultimately the project opens the notion of creative methodologies to a wider arena by incorporating epistemological, ontological, genealogical and aesthetic concerns to meet the needs of cultural difference in our globalised educational futures.

REFERENCES

- Australia Learning and Teaching Council (2009). *CreativeArtsPhD. Future-proofing the creative arts in higher education: a scoping project for quality in creative arts research training*. Australia, online <http://www.creativeartsphd.com>
- Barrett, E. & Bolt, B. (Eds.). (2007). *Practice as research: Approaches to creative arts enquiry*. London: I.B Tauris.
- Bishop, R. (2008). Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Maori in mainstream classrooms. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 439–459). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Cixous, H. (2000). Preface. In S. Sellers (Ed.), *The Hélène Cixous reader* (pp. xv–xxiii). London and New York: Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Preface. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. ix–xv). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Duxbury, L., Grierson, E. M., Waite, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Thinking through practice: Art as research in the academy*. Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, Informit e-Library <http://search.informit.com.au>
- Duxbury, L., Grierson, E. M., Waite, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Thinking through practice: Art as research in the academy*. Melbourne: The School of Art, RMIT University (hard copy).
- Florida, R. (2005). *Cities and the creative class*. London: Routledge.
- Grande, S. (2008). Red pedagogy: The un-methodology. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 233–255). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Heidegger, M. (1999a). The question concerning technology. In D. F. Krell (Ed.), *Basic writings: Martin Heidegger* (pp. 307–341). London: Routledge.
- Heidegger, M. (1999b). Building dwelling thinking. In D. F. Krell (Ed.), *Basic writings: Martin Heidegger* (pp. 343–363). London: Routledge.
- Heidegger, M. (1999c). The way to language. In D. F. Krell (Ed.), *Basic writings: Martin Heidegger* (pp. 393–426). London: Routledge.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (2008). Indigenous knowledges in education: Complexities, dangers and profound benefits. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 135–157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krell, M. (Ed.). (1999). *Basic writings: Martin Heidegger*. London: Routledge.
- Meyer, M. A. (2008). Indigenous and authentic: Hawaiian epistemology and the triangulation of meaning. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 217–233). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peters, M. A., & Besley, A. C. (2006). *Building knowledge cultures: Education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Smith, L. T. (2001). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, NZ: Zed Books, Room 400 & University of Otago Press.
- Swadener, B. B., & Mutua, K. (2008). Decolonizing performances: Deconstructing the global postcolonial. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 31–45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

ELIZABETH GRIERSON

2. WAYS OF KNOWING AND BEING

Navigating the Conditions of Knowledge and Becoming a Creative Subject

MAPPING THE QUESTIONS

What are the modes of existence of this discourse? Where does it come from, how is it circulated; who controls it? (Foucault, 1977a, p. 138).

The aim in this chapter is to consider creativity and creative research as a condition of knowing and being, and to see how researchers may navigate the epistemological, ontological and genealogical implications of their project. Fundamental to this project are questions, such as: How am I constituted as a creative subject through the process of research? Where lie the limits of my knowing? How do I hold to my methodology as I construct the project? Does methodology matter? And, where am I in the text?

These are the kinds of questions researchers ask as they work through practice to explore, experiment, experience, construct, discover and analyse the discourses of their subject. New questions continually arise through the exigencies of practice as creative arts researchers engage with the forms their discoveries are taking in the contexts, lineages and genealogies of their practice.

Implicit in the processes or events of knowing are inevitable reflections on processes of self-making through creative actions and activities as one is mediated by, and opens up to one's research process to the point that one "becomes" a subject. Through this discussion I seek a genealogical methodology to discover more about the question of research and the question of being or becoming a creative subject.

Multiple voices are speaking through the text calling forth other dimensions of my/our/your/their subjectivity. The play of pronouns through the text reveals the multi-layered speaking voices of subject, object, author, writer, reader, artist, viewer, in singular and plural, as we (us two or more, you, me, they, he, she, it, one and I) gather "various modes of saying" and witness "a hearing that embraces all apprehending" (Heidegger, 1999, pp. 409, 411). Sometimes the author speaks: but what is she saying and who is she? For what purpose is "the saying itself"? ... and then we hear from Heidegger, "Before we think any further in this direction, let us once again pay heed to the way to language" (1999, p. 412). As we pay heed to the way, and "follow the trail of language" (p. 412), we find there are traces of the writer's narrative voice articulating a space, my space, of enunciation and telling tales of a doctorate research project. It was mine; and travelling with me through

time and text was a concern with processes of legitimation in art and self as subjects, and a scrutiny of the politics of difference in the exigencies of creative practice.

DISCOURSES OF CREATIVITY

Creativity comes from the Latin word *creare*: to grow, to bring (something) into existence, to make new, giving rise to the concept of creativity as a state or process of growth, flux, change, transformation, making something original, or rearranging certain conditions to revisit, renew or reinvent (Grierson, 2007, p. 1).

If one is to undertake creative work there is an implication of new appearances as a fundamental characteristic of the process. This might mean inflecting the old with innovative characteristics or expressions, discovering new relationships, or working through practical action to invent, intervene, imagine or perform an idea, artefact, image, dance, sound or performance. One might ask if this also applies to other disciplines such as the sciences or engineering? After all, the practical pursuits of making and doing are implicit in many fields. However there is a particular kind of making and doing that is at stake in the realm of creative arts as a formalised research practice in the academic setting. It has the components of aesthetics and the potential always of making-new as a defining characteristic; taking intuitive leaps as it engages with its lineages of practice. Thus discourses of creativity are, by implication, generative.

The concept of “discourse” follows Michel Foucault’s definition of discourses “as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault, 1994, p. 49). To understand creativity as a form of communication and knowledge transfer in the present times one must consider the knowledge cultures of globalisation, and the way knowledge is produced and exchanged (see Peters & Besley, 2006). New political and social attention to creativity characterises the early twenty-first century with its global knowledge economies and neoliberal frameworks, frontier technologies of information and communication, fast movement of capital and knowledge exchange, and the constitution of the individual as a market subject. Cultural and creative industries take their place as an identifiable category of economic investment and market focus. Within these global conditions the concept of creativity remains tied securely to neoliberal discourses of the political, social and economic subject whereby the word “creative” is used in variable contexts to mean innovative, entrepreneurial, digital, interactive, networked, and often loosely interchanged with globalised knowledge itself (Grierson, 2007, p. 1).

Within these discourses where do the creative arts lie? Creative researchers work with imagination and insight, engaging knowledge of the histories of their field, as well as skills and technologies of practice as primary research tools. As they imagine, construct, read, write or perform, they work creatively with materials, technologies or bodies (abstract or physical), situating creative moments within the genealogies of practice, and revealing something about the world and themselves in the process. As they construct discourses of creativity they are constructed by those same discourses. In a sense, and following Foucault, their bodies carry the

imprints of their actions: “The body – and everything that touches it: diet, climate and soil ... manifests the stigmata of past experience and also gives rise to desires, failings, and errors ...” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 83). It would seem researchers are embodied in the discourses of knowing and being as they stand before their research subject.



Figure 1. Across the Chasm. Photo. H. Grierson. 1980

METHODOLOGY MATTERS

The body is the inscribed surface of events (traced by language and dissolved by ideas), the locus of a dissociated self (adopting the illusion of a substantial unity), and a volume in perpetual disintegration. Genealogy, as an analysis of descent, is thus situated within the articulation of the body and history. Its task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the process of history’s destruction of the body (Foucault, 1984a, p. 83).

Research is a vast terrain. When standing on the ground of my research, starting the trek across the detritus of unrelated data, how do I stay on track? There are many luring side paths. Without a clear idea of the methodology we can stumble or lose the way, fail to recognise signals and signposts, or worse perish during the journey and never reach the destination. The methodology is like the compass when in the mountains; it indicates orientation. As I stand and look across the chasm it is the compass that can give the bearings on presence as well as absence of foothold. The challenge is to find the methodology appropriate to the particulars of a project, to question constantly, and to recognise overt or covert appeal to a taken for granted worldview and problematise obvious answers.

The idea of worldview is akin to Foucault's notion of "discourse". The dictionary definition of discourse privileges written or spoken communication, but in the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1994) Foucault takes the idea of discourse to a wider terrain when he posits, "discourse is a complex differentiated practice, governed by analysable rules and transformations (Foucault, 1994, p. 211). He also states, "discourses are composed of signs; but what they do is more than use these signs to designate things. It is this *more* that renders them irreducible to the language (langue) and to speech. It is this 'more' that we must reveal and describe" (1994, p. 49). Thus the process of creative arts research seeks the "more" in the discourses of its occurrence, opening the horizons of disclosure to reveal new potentialities in the lines of enquiry.

How do we seek systematically, apply our bodies to this historical task? There is a politic to the selection of methodology. Nothing can be assumed or seen as neutral or appealing to generalised factors of common sense when research material is on the agenda for analysis. As the researcher applies his or her craft, sifts the data, and sorts out what to include and exclude, the difference between method and methodology becomes apparent. The former, method, is the way the work of research is undertaken step by step in the way we engage tools, time and technology; and the latter, methodology, is the systematic way we apply the methods through a sustained and well-articulated process to engage, examine, interrogate and keep the focus. It is the methodology that drives the research and foregrounds the questions in shaping the process. Method is functional action; methodology is a set of principles through which to sustain reflection and analysis allowing us to address the research questions in a systematic way.

Always there is a questioning of the what, how and why of the project in relation to the nub of the problem or theme under investigation; this I call the *coat hook* of the project, the place to hang the properties of ideas, to gather them together in order to test and question. Martin Heidegger wrote, "Questioning builds a way. We would be advised, therefore, above all to pay heed to the way, and not to fix our attention on isolated sentences and topics. The way is a way of thinking" (Heidegger, 1977, p. 3). Working through a questioning way, we can move the research into new thought and new modes of practice, and enliven discursive possibilities as a way of revealing rather than representing the knowledge field. The researcher's task is to find the way.

There are many ways. The range is vast in the creative arts, from narrative, constructivist and participatory enquiry, to action and grounded research, ethnography, archaeology or genealogy, deconstruction, discourse analysis, Indigenous deep listening, performativity, hermeneutics, phenomenology or heuristic processes; and then there are the positivist and empirical methodologies more suited to the sciences. Contributing to the determination of the methodology are a number of considerations including the project aims, the particular subject under examination, the epistemological frameworks of the field, the questions framing the project, and the politics of the researcher, including the researcher's ability or willingness to expose his or her own lineage of beliefs and habits to the test of analysis, to engage what Foucault calls, a "permanent critique of ourselves" (1984b, p. 43).

TITLES AND TEXTS MATTER

One cannot speak the same type of language or use the same literary form on every occasion or for every scene. ... Amongst my languages there is one I prefer, though I shall not say which (Cixous, 2000a, p. xvi).

In framing my PhD project, *The politics of knowledge: A poststructuralist approach to visual arts education in tertiary sites* (Grierson, 2000), I selected carefully each word for the title to ensure it declared the methodology and provided a ready coat hook upon which to gather the subsequent body of knowledge. Throughout the text the language was of a type or literary form that performed its questioning in a way appropriate to the occasion. In aiming to construct a critical history of the present terrain of the politics of knowledge in visual arts in higher education, I worked with a Nietzschean sensibility and specific theoretical frameworks from Michel Foucault, Jean-François Lyotard and Jacques Derrida to find the methodological procedures appropriate to the task, keeping in mind Heidegger's call to questioning as a way of thinking.

The construction of my research project was substantially text-based with the inclusion of images of artworks under discussion. Each chapter was a textual engagement with the archives of my subject—discourses of art and institutional practices. There was a relational process of theory and practice at work to create texts that had an artefactual presence. Texts: they are a form of language, remembering and inscribing. Hélène Cixous speaks of language as "a memory in progress" (2000a, p. xxi); and then says, "So writing then? Yes, it is, from this chorus of songs of the whole of time, making a new song stream forth. Sometimes this is called a style. ... Affair of the ear: it is enough to accord with language for it to deliver its secrets" (Cixous, 2000a, p. xxi).

Language as a living, breathing artefactual poetic of the writer is at stake here. The relations of theory and practice are at stake here. This is an area for discussion and analysis in my doctorate thesis where I address the interrelationships of theory and practice as a generative and performative potential. I make this point because many in the creative arts, in a devotion to privilege material practice over theoretical or textual enquiry, presume that text-based work is somehow less creative than arts practice. However the processes of crafting language and performing text is as

material as the process of crafting clay or paint or metal, or working with musical notation or choreographed movement; the challenges to one's language can be as potent as the challenges to one's selection of appropriate media in art, or rhythms and movements in dance or music. Text performs one's subjectivity as it reveals one's political orientation. I am advocating here a palpable recognition and affirmation of the politics of difference in knowledge practices, rather than substantiating one mode of knowledge through the double negation of the other.

Through engaging poststructuralist theories and methodologies to interrogate questions of judgement, and aware of the politics of language, I set out to disclose the dominant principles at work in the discursive formations of visual arts in higher education, historically and in the present. The project engaged with institutional premises and assumptions in historical and contemporary discourses of art and education, asking questions of the defining structures and practices that register *difference* as a cultural and political need within those discourses.

SCAFFOLDS MATTER

These apparently unconnected texts are in fact related; they share the same hearth; the source of their motives, and of their desires, is the same. All of them speak of the search for the limit, the regret of the limit ... This limit has several 'sites' and names ... (Cixous, 2000b, p. 28).

The design of the project matters; it needs structure to keep the data in place, to search for and test the limits, address the questions, build the argument. How to scaffold effectively was a question I asked myself in 1998 during my PhD journey, which had brought me thus far from The University of Auckland in *Aotearoa* New Zealand to the British south coast where Regency architecture marks the urban spaces and pebbles dress the beach. At the University of Brighton, Faculty of Art and Architecture, my small office in the School of Historical and Critical Studies, known as SHACS, was providing unaccustomed quiet space to pursue my research on the politics of knowledge in art. Across the road stood the opulent Royal Pavilion, designed by John Nash, with its oriental architecture and unabashed face of epicurean delights awaiting the British aristocracy during the reign of King George IV, only to receive later disapproval from Queen Victoria—and this was in spite of the Brighton water's reputation as a cure-all, for there the custom of seaside bathing had first found fashion. British art, architectural and social history were presenting endless interest and a viable source of distraction, as I sought to construct the anatomy of my project. Never far away my escape route to the faculty library and the ten-minute bus ride to the bookshop at the University of Sussex.

The cold winter winds so often blew in from the English Channel bleaching the broken West Pier and across the old red rooftops, at the back of SHACS, I listened to the seagulls wheeling and crying in the way seagulls do, and thought of home. Alone, isolated, it would be fair to say I was in academic crisis as I sought to unearth processes of legitimation of knowledge in the economies of art and institutional practice. This was not an easy task as the textual architecture and scaffolds felt insecure. Mykinos and the Greek Islands suggested an alternative

from the chill of England in December, but there too I found the wind was whistling in from the sea. The homely doors and blue shutters along the grey and white paved lanes were closed for winter. I retreated with my friend into the one smoke-filled taverna down by the port, sat amongst Greek men playing backgammon and listened to the donkeys, laden with produce for the locals, in the cold outside. What I was experiencing was a strange dislocation of place but I was never far, I felt, from the anchorage of my subject.

In 1996 when I began my doctorate journey, I was committed to opening discourses and exposing layers of discursive practice in art by sifting and sorting the knowledge archives, to lay them bare—“their regulatory meanings prized from their shell” (Grierson, 2000, p. 134). The research was grounded in my experiences as an artist and art educator. My interest in working with methodologies and theories of poststructuralist French and German writers took me specifically to Foucault’s genealogy as a methodology, to reveal the normalisations and marginalisations that determine the subject *art*, as well as the *self* or human subject, in the field of art and art education. Patience was required to sift and sort the data. Of genealogy Foucault writes, “Genealogy is grey meticulous, and patiently documentary. It operates on a field of entangled and confused parchments, on documents that have been scratched over and copied many times” (1984a, p. 76).

Around me the thesis was taking shape. I had devised the scaffold of chapters as *Sites*, from Foucault’s demarcation of knowledge as a spatial field. This became my defining structure. In a paper in 2005 I explained, “When lost here is a palpably physical metaphor to return to, of walking across a landscape and planting a pole into the ground to mark the carefully selected archaeological site, then to start digging into the ground for evidence of power relations in the discourses and their layers of discursive practices” (Grierson, 2005, p. 30). It was not a search for origins, nor a “search for descent in an uninterrupted continuity” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 83), but a revealing or disclosing of data in the layers of my subject as I traversed and mined the terrain.

Planting poles began with the *Introduction*, identifying the discourses of interest and summarising the text-to-come; then *Narrative Sites*, giving room to declare my space of enunciation and tell my experiential narrative as artist and art educator upon which to build the research; *Theoretical Sites*, positioning poststructuralist theories and methodologies through Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Jean-François Lyotard; *Institutional Sites*, conceptualising sites of tertiary education as cultural and political texts, and constructing a genealogy of institutional practices of visual arts; *Historical Sites*, tracing defining characteristics that comprise the orders of discourse in my subject; *Curriculum Sites*, locating canonical conditions of classicism and modernity, which legitimated and authorised the disciplines of art and art history, and raising questions of the legitimation of difference in pedagogic practices; *Sites of Culture and Identity*, in which the politics of art, identity and difference come under scrutiny, with particular attention to discourses of bi-cultural pedagogic practices in *Aotearoa* New Zealand, and the neoliberal subject of market forces; *Global Sites*, bringing the focus to local and global politics, and considering influences of globalisation on art and cultural practices, historically

and in the present; and finally a short *Postscript*, in which I confirm the Nietzschean sense of affirmation and validation of the struggle, acknowledging the importance of rigorous scrutiny of the politics of difference in the discourses of art and art education to inform a critical history of the present.



Figure 2. Walking the Terrain. Photo. Elizabeth Grierson. 2006

Through a questioning way it was becoming clear that normalising conditions of discourse demand our attention in the creative arts, and that micro or macro processes of governmentality generate a state of normalisation, constituting a marginalisation at one and the same time. Foucault speaks of these processes as “dividing practices” (Foucault, 2001, p. 326). I was aware now that the way to unearth these politics in the discourses under examination was to consider the politics of difference and the way difference works through the discourses of art, institutional practices and the human subject. Foucault explains that he does not look underneath for some hidden truth of a universalised subject; what he does is “try to grasp discourse in its manifest existence, as a practice that obeys certain rules—of formation, existence,

co-existence—and systems of functioning. It is this practice, in its consistency and almost in its materiality, that I describe” (Foucault, 1989, p. 46). Thus the interrogations of discourses of art as a subject, as well as the self or subject being constituted through art practices, was to lead me to the manifest existence of a wider politic of knowledge.

DISCOURSES OF THE SELF OR SUBJECT

I wonder: when writing, am I transgressing? ... Am I transgressing by writing what I am writing? Or by not writing what I am not writing? Or both? What law(s) am I transgressing? (Cixous, 2000c, p. 97).

It is easy to become lost in the philosophical, theoretical, empirical, material or creative investigations; too many imponderables. Throughout the process of research a question keeps appearing: “Where am I in the text?” (Grierson, 2005, p. 29). But how does this “I” appear, we may ask? And H  l  ne Cixous may answer, “We are not ‘pure’ I. A gesture dictated by humility, and which recalls us to humility” (2000a, p. xviii). We are more than one. Throughout the process of constructing a critical history of the present conditions of my subject I was aware that the question of subjectivity is at play during the process of research. While constituting the subject of my project, I too was being constituted as a research subject—and I was not singular. Poststructuralist methodologies put the unified subject into question. As Mark Poster (1994) points out:

The question of the subject or the self has been a central issue of contention for intellectual movements in the twentieth century. Psychoanalysis, surrealism, existentialism, structuralism, and most recently poststructuralism have sought to differentiate themselves from prevailing positions by putting into question their formulations of the self. The point of disagreement has to some extent been remarkably consistent: the position under attack is said to present a doctrine of the self that is too centred, too unified, too rationalist, in short too Cartesian (Poster, 1994, p. 53).

With the methodology of archaeology and genealogy, from Foucault, as my guiding compass I was interrogating the conditions of subjectivity in art, and in educational practices of art’s pedagogy, by identifying specific and historically contingent practices, dismantling the *Cartesian self*, deconstructing metanarratives of art and its historical practices of (de)legitimation, and the bolstering of meaning making relations in the aesthetic practices of the art object, as poststructuralist questioning pervaded the text. Foucault was my guiding theorist through this process as I crafted an anatomy of legitimating systems in art and subjectivity, constructing a discourse that could problematise discourses, opening them for scrutiny, and putting assumptions to the test. Whereas Foucault’s early concerns were with the power/knowledge equation, his later project was to examine, “The different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 2001, pp. 326–327). This provided the theoretical and conceptual ways for a questioning

of the artist as a self-proclaimed site of intuitive and original knowledge, and considering the artist as a function of discourse.

Working with the theories and methodologies of poststructuralism there is renewed attention on the subject as a process of becoming. Foucault is concerned with how a human being transforms him or herself into a subject (Foucault, 2001, p. 326). This moves us away from the Western Enlightenment narrative of the progress of an *a priori* human subject, already established in its essence through the cause of reason, and coursing through history with the pre-set goal of transcendence of the spirit to a utopian endpoint. Foucault's way moves us towards an understanding of the process of self-constitution through the discursive practices of the constituting discourses. In considering these questions I turn again to Michel Foucault, who poses, "At any historical moment, what kinds of conditions come into play in determining that a particular subject is the legitimate executor of a certain kind of knowledge?" (Foucault, in Faubion, 1998, p. xiv); and it is clear that, following Foucault, it is the conditions constituting the discourses that I must unearth and describe, as I interrogate the present conditions of how the subject art, and how the self as a creative subject, are produced through the knowledge practices of our cultural institutions.

Foucault's work shows that the human subject undertakes a recognisable process of self-constitution. It is a form of self-regulation taking place through the discursive processes of governmentality (the governance of self and others) or regulation of society, and is different from the assumed and essentialist subject of liberal discourses of humanist thought with emphasis on autonomy and identity springing from an essential human nature. In *Technologies of the Self* (1988), Foucault writes of the management of individuals, "This contact between the technologies of domination of others and those of the self I call governmentality" (1988, p. 19). Foucault confessed his interest "in the interaction between oneself and others and in the technologies of individual domination, the history of how an individual acts upon himself, in the technology of the self (1988, p. 19); and elsewhere he speaks of "a pattern of conduct ... (which) commits an individual ... to a certain mode of being, a mode of being characteristic of the ethical subject" (Foucault, 1997, p. xxxviii).

Thus, speaking of the way human beings turn themselves into subjects, Foucault's "technologies of domination" (1988, p. 19) act as external regulators of the human subject as well as internal regulators on the self as a subject. If we apply this process to artists in the field of art, there is an argument to say that, as artists and arts education practitioners authorise their creative processes and outputs, they are implicated in this process of self-regulation. Thus they are regulated by the governance of creativity, just as they self-regulate as creative subjects.

DISCOURSES OF EXPERIENCE

I go, we go. On the way we keep a log-book, the book of the abyss and its shores. Everyone does. My books are thus like life and history, heterogeneous chapters in a single vast book whose ending I will never know. The difference

indicated in the genres of the books I write reproduces the eventful aspect of a life in our century. A woman's life into the bargain (Cixous, 2000a, p. xvi).

The process of my PhD research was based in my experiences as an artist, art educator and art historian, yet within these experiences, I was problematising any assumptions of a pre-given self as I was becoming aware of a self-governing process. The question of the "I" of myself as an agent of experience is open to question. Authorship can be at stake for creative arts researchers who are working through narrative diaries and material practices, and also for those researchers who are dealing with analysis of the creative arts domain and working with performative texts. Where then does authorship lie?

Foucault suggests that the author-function works as a "founder of discursivity", positing that such authors "are unique in that they are not just the authors of their own works. They have produced something else: the possibilities and the rules of formation of other texts" (Foucault in Schrift, 1994, p. 186). There is a move away from the declarations of essentialism, with truth as the voice of our essential human nature (see Nietzsche, 1956). The move is towards a model of human thought that takes present conditions as the starting point and traces the archives of the past from the ground of the present terrain to examine the layers of discursive processes that make up the power relations of a particular knowledge at a given time. In this process the discursive narratives of experience play a part in the constitution of knowledge and self as a knowing subject.

Subjects of the arts and education (human subjects and disciplinary subjects of knowledge) are constituted through what is said and what is done in the name of knowledge of these fields, thus the process of research is as ontological as it is epistemological. Part of the ontological, or genealogical in Foucauldian terms, is the way the subject, the researcher, experiences their domains of knowledge, and the way they and their knowledge project discursively relate and come into appearance.

The word experience derives from Latin, *expiriri* (to test, to try, to prove) and Greek, *peirô*, *pera* and *peraô* (crossing, passage, beyond). There is a sense of trial and movement here; something active and participatory. The value of experience has long been recognised as crucial for the creative arts practitioner. However when the conditions of creative practice are situated in the research environment then the truth claims that are made in the name of experience are exposed to question. In his work on systems of punishment, Foucault shows how the classification of the individual exercises a "mechanics of power" over individuals to make them behave a certain way until they become "docile bodies" and thus useful to society (1977b, p. 138). Thus their experience is mediated by the systems of governance in which they are situated. This same process of regulatory power is exercised in educational research and in the creative arts, in spite of researchers' and artists' claims for freedom and independence from regulating devices. There is an official practice in research within which the researcher is already implicated.



Figure 3. Experiencing the Abyss and its Shores. Photo. Elizabeth Grierson. 2006

In telling the narratives of experience the connection to methodology becomes paramount in determining *how* to tell the narratives. If the methodology is phenomenological then the narratives could be told through the embodied processes of experience in the moments when knowledge of something in the world becomes present to consciousness. If it is genealogical then the narratives would be constructed through sifting and sorting the data and debris in the archaeological digs in the bodies of knowledge of the life-world, with its many voices and layers and positions in the conditions of their existence. If it is performative then the researcher will thread traces of text and experience as an enfolding or interweaving construction.

In writing this chapter I am reminded of Foucault’s thesis that “the local and the particular ... are always inserting their differences” (McHoul & Grace, 1995, p. 2) as I situate my narrative voice, tracing experiences in the discursive practices of my exploration. There was a time as an artist and art educator when I became

politicised—or was it simply becoming aware of something, one knows not what? Perhaps it was as a young student at university when the gendering of knowledge and social attitudes became apparent to those of us who questioned. These narratives and those narratives do not attempt to advance any historical causes but perhaps they mark a particular space of enunciation within the discourses under construction in this text.

CONCLUDING WITH DISCURSIVE PRACTICES

(T)here is no knowledge without a particular discursive practice; and any discursive practice may be defined by the knowledge that it forms (Foucault, 1994, p. 183).

In this chapter my aim has been to navigate the conditions of knowledge in research and to explore ways of knowing as one becomes a creative subject within and through the knowledge one is forming, the language one is speaking. There is always the search for legitimisation in journeys of experience, as they mitigate and dictate, situate and constitute, perform and enunciate their function in discourses and concrete practices. Through this process the researcher self-regulates while negotiating irregularities in the archives of self and the knowledge field.

So it is not enough to say that the subject is constituted in a symbolic system. It is not just in the play of the symbolic that the subject is constituted. It is constituted in real practices—historically analysable practices. There is a technology of the constitution of the self which cuts across symbolic systems while using them (Foucault, 1997, p. 277, in Olssen, 2006, p. 153).

Thus the formation of the subject is occurring through the processes of social and cultural practices, material practices, textual practices, embodied, discursive, aural and kinaesthetic practices that exist in sites of difference. This subjective position, this person, this self, is not pre-given before the research takes place; it is in the practices of the research itself that the creative subject is being constituted. “For Foucault, the self is constituted discursively and institutionally ... (through) *technologies of power* and *practices of self*”, explains Olssen (2006, p. 32).

The implications of both of these mechanisms have been running through my texts in this chapter as I have sought to construct a critical history of present conditions in our ways of knowing and being through processes of research. The technologies of power are at work in the institutional practices of putting research to work; and the practices of self become apparent through “the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 1985, p. 208).

The narrative voice tracing through the text echoes the questions and ways of thinking in the archives of one doctorate project. The language carries its memories and does not seek its mastery. Tracing through the narrative there is the implicit problematisation of norms, the dismantling of assumptions and legitimisation of the radicality of a questioning way, as art, societal and institutional practices are put to the test. Thereby the researcher opens the horizons of disclosure to bring a rigorous and poetic scrutiny to the present by navigating the conditions of knowledge and

becoming a creative subject. And in apprehending the self, myself, I hear Cixous (2000a, p. xxii) speaking on the hither side of being:

My kingdom is the instant, and of course I am not its queen, only its citizen. I always work on the present passing ...

REFERENCES

- Cixous, H. (2000a). Preface. In S. Sellers (Ed.), *The Hélène Cixous reader* (pp. xv–xxiii). London and New York: Routledge.
- Cixous, H. (2000b). First names of no one. In S. Sellers (Ed.), *The Hélène Cixous reader* (pp. 25–33). London and New York: Routledge.
- Cixous, H. (2000c). The art of innocence. In S. Sellers (Ed.), *The Hélène Cixous reader* (pp. 93–104). London and New York: Routledge.
- Faubion, J. D. (Ed.). (1998). *Michel Foucault: Aesthetics, method, and epistemology* (R. Hurley et al., Trans.). *Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984* (Vol. 2). New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1963/1994). *The archaeology of knowledge*. (A. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). London: Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1977a). What is an author? In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (pp. 113–138). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977b). *Discipline and punish* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1984a). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76–100). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1984b). What is enlightenment? In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 32–50). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1985). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 18–49). Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *Foucault live: Interviews, 1966–84* (J. Johnston, Trans.). In S. Lotringer (Ed.), *Semiotext(e)*. New York: Columbia University.
- Foucault, M. (1997). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. (R. Hurley & others, Trans.). In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethics, subjectivity and truth, the essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984* (Vol. 1, pp. 281–301). London: The Penguin Press.
- Foucault, M. (2001). The subject and power. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Power: The essential works 3*. London: Penguin.
- Grierson, E. M. (2000). *The politics of knowledge: A poststructuralist approach to visual arts education in tertiary sites*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy thesis, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Grierson, E. M. (2005). An art educator's narrative: Where am I in the text? In J. Brandon (Ed.), *Te Whakare: Navigating through the arts in the pacific* (pp. 29–37). Proceedings of the ANZAAE Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Art Educators Conference, Palmerston North, NZ. April 18–21, 2004. Palmerston North: Massey University College of Education.
- Grierson, E. M. (2007). Creativity and the return of a political will: Art, language and the creative subject. In *Creativity, enterprise, policy—new directions in education*. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia (PESA) Conference, Te Papa Museum of NZ, Dec. 5–9, 2006. Retrieved Oct. 25, 2008, from <http://www.pesa.org.au/html/04papers.htm>
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *The question concerning technology and other essays* (W. Lovitt, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.

- Heidegger, M. (1999). The way to language. In D. F. Krell (Ed.), *Basic writings: Martin Heidegger* (pp. 393–426). London: Routledge.
- McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (1995). *A Foucault primer: Discourse, power and the subject*. London: UCL Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1887/1956). *The genealogy of morals*. Garden City: Anchor Books/Doubleday, Doran and Company Ltd.
- Olssen, M. (2006). *Michel Foucault: Materialism and education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Peters, M. A., & Besley, A. C. (2006). *Building knowledge cultures: Education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Poster, M. A. (1994). *Critical theory and poststructuralism: In search of a context*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Schrift, A. D. (1994). Reconfiguring the subject: Foucault's analytics of power. In R. Miguel-Alfonso & S. Caporale-Bizzini (Eds.), *Reconstructing Foucault: Essays in the wake of the 80s* (pp. 185–199). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Rodopi.