

**Action Survey<sup>1</sup> for Tacit Knowledge production in Artistic Research (*format*)**

ACTIONS (Action tree)		MASTER
<i>Description of each of the actions that are part of the chosen fragment / Situation</i>	<i>Familiar or unfamiliar</i>	<i>Polymorphic or Mimeomorphic</i>

Strong Tacit Knowledge production:

---

<sup>1</sup> Collins, Tacit and Explicit Knowledge (2010) p. 173-175

# Action Survey for Tacit Knowledge production in Artistic Research

## Preparation

Selection (or a fragment) of an artistic research project

## Step 0) Artistic experience

Before starting to apply the survey it is important to experience the work. The actual experience of the artistic research is one of the most important elements of the action survey, as the experience will provide the raw material as data for the survey.

## Step 1) Observation: an appropriate way to ascertain what is presented

In context of Artistic Research as Knowledge Production I propose to first observe the work. This is the step after experiencing the work. Observing the work triggers a sensitivity that can be helpful for the next step whereby the actions have to be described.

## Step 2) Description of the actions

After observation, a range of actions is described. A description is given of the perceptible actions or fragments of the work. This implies the tracing of 'rule following' by the artistic researcher and the (visible) consequences of taken decisions. Transparency should be appreciated at this part of the process as it enables a discussion of the given descriptions.

## Step 3) Understanding

Understanding is the next step. To outline the different kinds of tacit knowledge the artistic research first has to be understood. Understanding implies interpretation, giving meaning. To understand the artistic research the unidentified and unrecognized patterns of affects have to be related to the observation of the artistic research, the looking. This is a very delicate moment. In the artistic experience of the artistic research something(s) are understood that should incite 'infinite thinking'. That what is 'understood' by the artistic researcher' is transformed into an outcome that should trigger this process of infinite thinking. If you treat this moment rough (without delicacy) tacit knowledge production may vaporize. It is an 'art' not to apply frames that are familiar (to easily) onto the unidentified patterns of sensation.

## Step 4) Distinction of the actions or traceable decisions

A distinction is made between polymorphic and mimeomorphic actions. This distinction is based on the theory of the shape of actions morphicity (Theory of action morphicity).<sup>2</sup> Mimeomorphic actions are similar as those seen with machines, as they are predictable in cause and effect. Polimorphic actions are context sensitive. Associations play a role in the responded behaviour. Behaviour is linked to the context and meaning. After distinguishing the actions, and tracing back the decisions, the actions have to be separated. Tracing back decisions is tricky as it is the question if it is possible to trace back decisions taken in the process, outside of this particular moment. In *A Thousand Plateaus* Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari argue 'the tracing approach' should not 'overlay the product on the process'. Any

---

<sup>2</sup> Collins (2010) p. 137 *The Shape of Actions What Humans and Machines Can Do*

potential the process may have had of leading to a significantly different product is lost in the overlay of what already is'.<sup>3</sup>

### **Step 5) Assign different kinds of tacit knowledge to the actions**

In the distinguishing process the three kinds of tacit knowledge relational (RTK), somatic (STK) and collective tacit (CTK) knowledge, are discerned.

### **Step 6) Actions of strong tacit knowledge production**

Which actions within the artistic research process are related to the articulation of tacit knowledge production? Which actual action is seen, that is related or connected to observable actions?

### **Interpretation of the model**

These steps might not seem sufficient, but the presentation of artistic research must supply the viewer with an articulation that is sufficiently 'serving' the academic and artistic field with outcomes the artistic research provides.

The actions in the survey that will be distracted from the artistic research are taken from the (visible) process. The question is which actions can be traced back from the outcome. Are there 'unspoken' suggestive decisions? Like for example with humor: the unsaid or the pause or silence. Might this be tacit knowledge? In trying to construct and formulate a hypothesis on tacit knowledge production the suggestion of 'unspoken' for tacit is 'coincident'.

Another point of attention is by going back to a work of art while writing about it, this experience is not the actual artistic experience anymore. The writing and re-experience of the work is not the same as the artistic experience. You can re-experience the work while writing, but this is in a different moment, different time, and it won't be a repetition of the previous experience.<sup>4</sup>

One more point of attention is that in evaluating an artistic research project you are evaluating the artistic experience as well. Do you already bring back a conclusion of this experience before the 'real' or 'proper' evaluation starts? If not, and if the conclusion takes place later, a part of the artistic experience might be left out.

---

<sup>3</sup> Massumi, "Like a Thought." (2002) p. XVIII

<sup>4</sup> Mieke Bal, previous head of Cultural Analysis (ASCA), has written on the reconstruction of aesthetic experience in writing about artworks in A Mieke Bal reader (2006).