

The Expos

EDITED BY

ition of Ar

MICHAEL SCHWAB

tistic Rese

AND

arch: Publis

HENK BORGDORFF

hing Art in

Academia

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Exposition
of Artistic Research
Publishing Art in
Academia

Edited by Michael Schwab
& Henk Borgdorff

The publication of this book is made possible by a grant from the University of Arts The Hague.

Cover design and lay-out: Mulder van Meurs, Amsterdam

ISBN 978 90 8728 164 9

e-ISBN 978 94 0060 092 8

NUR 640

© M. Schwab, H. Borgdorff / Leiden University Press, 2014

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

Contents

- 8 Introduction
Michael Schwab & Henk Borgdorff
- 22 **Considering**
- 25 Notes on Media Sensitivity in Artistic Research
Mika Elo
- 39 Artistic Researching: Expositions as Matters of Concern
Ruth Benschop, Peter Peters & Brita Lemmens
- 52 Exposition
Rolf Hughes
- 65 Aesthetic Sensibility and Artistic Sonification
Marcel Cobussen
- 78 **Publishing**
- 81 The Meaningful Exposition
Michael Biggs & Daniela Büchler
- 92 Expositions in the Research Catalogue
Michael Schwab
- 105 Practising the Artistic Research Catalogue
Ruth Benschop
- 118 Artistic Expositions within Academia: Challenges, Functionalities, Implications and Threats
Lucy Amez, Binke van Kerckhoven & Walter Ysebaert

136 Practising

139 'Scaling Parnassus in Running Shoes': From the Personal to the Transpersonal via the Medium of Exposition in Artistic Research
Darla Crispin

153 Integrating the Exposition in Music-Composition Research
Hans Roels

165 When One Form Generates Another: Manifestations of Exposure and Exposition in Practice-Based Artistic Research
Ella Joseph

177 Writing Performance Practice
Siobhan Murphy

192 Placing

195 Distant Voices and Bodies in a Market Square
Andreas Gedin

206 From Wunderkammer to Szeemann and Back: The Artistic Research Exposition as Performative and Didactic Experience
Pol Dehert & Karel Vanhaesebrouck

220 Between the White Cube and the White Box: Brian O'Doherty's *Aspen 5+6*, An Early Exposition
Lucy Cotter

237 Counter-Archival Dissemination
Henk Slager

246 Biographies

256 Index

Expositions in the Research Catalogue

By Michael Schwab

The Research Catalogue (RC)¹ and the *Journal for Artistic Research* (JAR)² are related projects with very different aims and purposes. The RC is a free, online, collaborative and mostly private workspace that also allows for the (self-)publication of artistic research. *JAR* is an academic, peer-reviewed and open access journal for the publication and dissemination of artistic research. *JAR* functions as the first in a series of planned, specialist portals to selected research published on the RC that utilises the latter's technology, including the design interface and the integrated submission and publication workflow. *JAR*'s editorial policy and peer-review procedures are based on the concept of 'expositions' – online objects on the RC that are meant to expose practice as research – which the journal actively promotes (cf. Schwab 2011). While the RC supports the generation of such expositions, it neither limits its users to disseminating their research as expositions nor enforces a particular approach to publication – as long as this is not outside the legal confines of the licence agreement, as will be discussed later. When talking about 'expositions', it would thus appear natural to focus on *JAR*'s editorial policy, since – it may be assumed – this is where the concept must most clearly be defined. At the same time, such a focus potentially misses the less explicit conceptual space that the RC software provides, which both enables and limits expositions in *JAR*. Since *JAR*'s editorial approach may be traced on its website and the editorials that introduce past issues, this chapter focuses on the RC and the particular solution that it offers to the problem of how to expose practice *artistically* as research in an online environment. To do this, I will discuss the technical reality of the RC as part of an enterprise that investigates how artistic research can be published in academia rather than suggesting tight definitions of what may or may not count as exposition.

In general, the exposition of artistic practice is an everyday occurrence – whether in exhibitions, concerts or theatre performances. In fact, one may say that 'exposition' is what artists essentially do, since there is no art without the presentation and the setting forth (from the Latin *exponere*) of their work.³ At the same time, artists have found it very difficult to expose their practice

1. <http://www.researchcatalogue.net>.

2. <http://www.jar-online.net>.

in ways that are acceptable as research. This has raised the fear that while the influence of academia on art academies has increased (through developments such as the ‘Bologna Process’), artistic values may be compromised (cf. Sheikh 2006; Busch 2011). This is particularly the case given that claims towards research are usually made in the form of academic writing through which – amongst other things – academia polices the borders of knowledge (Münch 2011). While the use of the term ‘research’ in everyday language, including in the art world, is commonplace, it is far from easy to define what kind of epistemology may provide a bracket that links it with a more narrow – that is, positivistic – scientific notion of research. Thus epistemologically credible and methodologically explicit expositions of artistic practice as research tend to fall back on such modes of academic writing as are practised in the humanities and which equally expose practice as research, albeit in a non-artistic manner. As I argue elsewhere (Schwab 2012c), it is necessary to extend the definition of academic writing in order to accommodate artistic modes of exposition into what is currently known as ‘enhanced publications’ – media-rich, interactive and socially porous texts that engage with the creation of knowledge outside the confines of propositional language. This is not an issue that is limited to the creative sector; rather, non-propositional modes of communication are of increasing importance in other academic fields as well, whether these modes are the browsing of source data, its visualisation, sonification or interactive modelling, which adds extra layers of meaning to traditional texts or – as may be the case in the arts – which completely replace a central text with non-propositional and artistic modes of argumentation.

The Artistic Research Catalogue (ARC)⁴ project, through which the first version of the RC software was developed, set out to investigate from the bottom up what kind of functionalities artistic researchers needed in order to publish their research online.⁵ It started from the premise that a simple display of media files related to an artwork might represent that work in a museum catalogue or in the archives of a dealer or publisher, but that such representation might fail to bring out the particular knowledge claims that are made in, by or through that work. While digitalising art for upload into the RC, more general questions of documentation need be raised, such as how a particular practice or a work of art can be documented in such a way as to highlight its epistemic relevance.

3. Depending on the context, alternative notions may be the staging, performance, translation, reflection, unfolding, exhibiting or curating etc. of practice as research. Please refer to the introduction for a discussion of the term.

4. The Artistic Research Catalogue (ARC) project was funded by the Dutch government, organised through the University of the Arts, The Hague, and led by Henk Borgdorff and myself. For more information on the context and genesis of the project, see Borgdorff 2012, pp. 214ff.

5. See the chapter by Ruth Benschop on pp. 105ff. for more information on the ARC project.

With regard to digitalisation, for the most part a single depiction or recording may not be sufficient, either because a work is too complex to be represented in a single file or because different modes of documentation will bring out different aspects of what is fundamentally the same work. Furthermore, all those documents that are made in relation to a work or a research project might be produced in different media, which when digitalised often require different file formats. It was thus safest to assume that in the most general case a researcher would approach the RC with a research project and a pile of documents ranging from text to image, video and audio (and potentially vector drawings or complex data sets) with the need to apply some kind of order to those documents during the writing process, where ‘writing’ may in extreme cases be nothing but an ordering process. The RC proposes the following concepts to transform such a pile of documents into the exposition of art as research.

Works and Simple Media

In the context of the RC, a work is a coherent unit of meaning, which is indicated by metadata such as author, title and year of production or publication. In the RC, ‘works’ not only refers to art objects (such as paintings, sculptures or movies) but also to publications (such as journal articles, DVDs or books) and events (performances, exhibitions or conferences). Any number of documents (in any acceptable file format) may be associated with a work. For example, a theatre play (a work) may have associated documents such as recordings of various performances, still photographs, sketches of the set design, the script and potentially comments by the director, actors or even critics. Works on the RC are equivalent to items that one would deposit in a traditional institutional repository, to which suitable documents are attached.

Still assuming a researcher who approaches the RC with such a pile of documents, one would expect that many of these documents can be organised into works and uploaded to the RC. However, during ARC it became clear that not all documents relevant to the publication of a piece of research fit into this category. For example, a piece of text may be written that compares two works, or a video may be made that shows the state of an artist’s studio as an illustration of the context in which a particular piece of research is situated. Rather than forcing all possible documents into the work category, the RC provides in its repository a second category, the *Simple Media*, for all documents that are not seen as belonging to works. In fact, if we were to look, say, at a traditional critical piece of writing, we would expect most of it – the text (including footnotes and references etc.) – to be uploaded as *Simple Media*, while the one or two artworks that are illustrated may find their way into the *Works* repository.

As the beginning of writing, the organisation of a researcher’s docu-

ments into *Works* and *Simple Media* is by no means a trivial matter, nor one that is free of meaning. With works, we do make some form of value judgement, which is the reason why some artists prefer not to organise their material in such way, or, conversely, if they are commercially oriented, desire a clear identity for their products as works. Even if the category of works is accepted, it may be difficult to decide where a work starts or finishes. For example, a sketch made in preparation for a painting may be part of the painting; it may also be a work in its own right, a decision that says much about the significance the artist attributes to the sketch. The situation is even more complex where documents pertaining to research are concerned: they might not be part of the work but intrinsically linked to it, or they might form a work in their own right, depending on how a researcher interacts not only with the notion of work but also with that of research.

These problems of organisation raise the question of why we chose to complicate the repository side of the RC by introducing a notion of works into what is supposed to be a platform for the exposition of practice as research, rather than allowing for a simple collection of documents. The first answer to this question is simple: because works are facts out there in the real world on at least two levels, personal and institutional. On a personal level, it seems that by and large, artists who engage with research do not give up making works, or at least use the category actively to structure their research and practice. On an institutional level, all key players (commercial galleries, art academies and museums) operate with the notion of works that they hold in collections, archives or institutional repositories, in particular if this notion also includes non-artistic outputs, such as journal articles or book publications. In terms of the common ground that exists between artists, such institutions and the RC, an acknowledgement of the work category seemed pertinent, and on a more technical level, it promises interoperability and data exchange with existing online archives that do not foreground research expositions.

This implies a further reason for a focus on works: the work category is needed to differentiate expositions. Although relying heavily on the archiving of documents, the RC is not devised simply as yet another media repository. Its purpose is first of all to expose rather than to archive research. This amounts to saying that the RC's role in the research process is seen as actively enabling – as a research infrastructure – rather than passively registering – as the after-the-fact deposit of research. The conceptual reason for this lies in the fact that if the RC is supposed to deliver the possibility of an *artistic* exposition of practice as research, it needs to be a medium in and through which expositional transformation can take shape; Mika Elo, for instance, discusses this as 'translation' (Elo 2007: 135ff.). When comparing artistic to scientific research, Henk Borgdorff describes this particularity as the primacy of publication, asserting that 'in the case of artistic research [publication] is

the starting point' (Borgdorff 2012: 197f.).⁶ While a work presumably has its life elsewhere, so that it needs to be documented and re-traced on the RC, the life of an exposition is on the RC alone, where practice is enacted as research that engages in some form of reflective doubling.

While this distinction is a good first approximation of the difference between works and expositions, their relationship is in fact much more complex. A focus on the difference between exposition and works also 'liberates' works in the context of the RC rather than rendering them redundant. Documents in the *Simple Media* repository are limited to the exposition to which they belong, but *Works* are accessible in the context of all expositions, including those authored by people other than the artist. While these features are still in development, future versions of the RC may promise that the multiple roles that *Works* may play in different expositional contexts may be traced and that their respective meaning may be compared in order to understand their epistemic potential more fully.

Furthermore, as indicated above, in the RC, the *Works* repository is defined with sufficient breadth to include not only artworks but also general publication output. Since this is the case, an exposition on the one hand contains *Works*, which with the help of *Simple Media* are exposed as research, while at the same time an exposition may also be looked at as a work in its own right. This construction indicates that there is no hierarchy in place, with works as basic units and expositions as 'higher' forms of transformation; rather, the separation between works and expositions is permeable. In the one direction, online expositions are created that are works in their own right and thus not secondary to the art, which is at the core of the artistic challenge to academic writing and publishing. In the other direction, it becomes conceivable that works are made, documented and uploaded that do not require any *Simple Media* or any other additional labour in order to claim expositional status. This has the effect of allowing the notion of exposition to enter the practice of artistic research outside and beyond an online workspace – for instance, in the studio, the concert hall or the museum. Although a distinction between works and expositions cannot in principle be drawn, it may be used to speak about the structure of reflective distancing within the notion of work, if 'work' remains the primary site of research. Conversely, when focusing on the expositional side of the spectrum, making works may become less appealing.

In this section, I have introduced the RC's repository, which is organised in documents held in the *Works* and *Simple Media* repository, in order to

6. In my own writings, I discuss the essential role of what in many places are considered secondary formats, for example in relation to Walter Benjamin's notion of critique (Schwab 2008), the role of supplementation (Schwab 2009a; Schwab 2009b), the differential function of the 'as' in constructs such as 'practice as research' (Schwab 2012a) as well as more specifically in relation to exposition writing (Schwab 2012b).

illustrate that at the core of the RC is the idea of exposing practice as research, and how this is structurally implemented. Based on this, it might appear that the generation of an exposition on the RC requires substantial conceptual investment and a rather steep learning curve for both researchers and readers. This is, however, not the case. For readers, the distinction between *Works* and *Simple Media* in the repository remains completely hidden, because the structure of the archival system does not automatically enter the presentation layer of expositions. For researchers who are preparing an exposition on the RC, the repository may also not be of importance since documents can simply be dragged into an exposition; that they will automatically end up in the *Simple Media* repository need not concern the author. Nevertheless, although appreciating the RC's underlying structure is not instrumental to working with the catalogue, not to do so could lead to misunderstanding it as simply an online, advanced html editor that sits on top of a simple file system.

Pages

Expositions consist of one or more *Pages*. In theory, anything can be arranged on those *Pages*, making it important to stress that there are no technical criteria that can be used to separate expositional from non-expositional contributions. In the context of the RC, this does not really matter, since it is a bottom-up research tool that does not prescribe to its users how it is to be employed. For *JAR*, this is different, since its editorial process as well as its peer-review procedures are there – amongst other things – to evaluate the expositionality of a submission.

It may be argued that it is easier for researchers to create web pages outside of the RC in their preferred html editor and upload those into their own domain or onto their institution's website. While this may be the case, there are a number of major incentives that make the RC a better option. Firstly, the branding and the URL that the RC provides make clear that a particular set of web pages is meant to be looked at as research. The very same pages hosted in a different context may easily be misunderstood as simply showing an artist's work, for example. Thus, the artistic, methodological and epistemological discussions that projects like ARC or the Society for Artistic Research (SAR) – which hosts the RC – provide are crucial contextual activities that support the specific reading of artistic practice as research. Furthermore, having a central site makes the research more accessible, because even if web pages and repository entries pertinent to artistic research are openly available on the Internet, they are usually very difficult to find. Since the RC sustainably preserves research for the future, allowing for stable referencing, it can support the formation of an artistic-research community outside of local contexts, raising the level of criticality and relevance of the field of artistic research through the sheer availability of its outputs.

Expositions and their associated *Pages* are objects that are situated in a researcher's practice and also in the socio-conceptual space that the RC offers.

A researcher literally starts with a first *Page* on which to place his or her documents, and this first *Page* is supported by a complex structure, which largely remains invisible, while whatever is exposed on that *Page* will receive part of its meaning from the context within which it is generated and presented.

Compared with all those conceptual implications and complications, the actual making of an exposition is very simple. After having obtained an account, researchers can simply press the ‘add research’ button on their profile pages to start making an exposition. Following the inputting of the most minimal metadata, the researcher is presented by the RC’s exposition editor with a first *Page* in the middle of the screen and a toolbox and the repository on the left. By selecting a tool – for example, an image – and by dragging it onto the *Page*, the user can add documents in the desired place on the *Page*, repositioning and/or scaling them again, using nothing but clicking and dragging. Multiple *Pages* can be added, and the process of dragging additional tools and documents onto those *Pages* can be repeated until the researcher is happy with the result and proceeds to publish or share his or her exposition.

While the technical process is comparatively simple – although I have to acknowledge that not everybody finds it easy or is willing to learn it – how to actually *write* an exposition is difficult, if not impossible to explain in general terms. As much as the first blank *Page* enables ownership of both form and content of an exposition, it makes getting started awkward, since no guidance can be given as to what to place where so that it will make sense in the context of whatever practice is to be exposed as research as well as in the context of the RC. Such relationship to context or ‘frame’ corresponds to a concern deeply rooted in the history of art, where ‘frame’ is not only relevant in relation to the borders of an art object but also in relation to the borders of art, as is indicated by the debates around avant-garde practices (Bürger 1984; Buchloh 2000) and more recently aspects of contemporaneity (Osborne 2013). From an artistic researcher’s point of view, looking at academic writing as a possible frame, it is essential to negotiate that frame in and through writing, while most other fields of research seem to find the medium through which they present their findings unproblematic, an attitude that cannot be afforded by contemporary artists.

To start with, it may be easiest to imagine an exposition as a set of empty rooms or a blank sheet of paper. When doing this, two extreme attitudes may be taken: researchers could place the above-mentioned pile of documents in the middle of that space and start spreading them out, or could stand back and think about what new objects may best suit the space and their concerns at a given point in time. Most likely, however, one may encounter a mixture between the two, where some existent material is paired with new work in a dynamic relationship in which things may be tried out and developed during the writing process. In fact, this indicates a shift in what is considered to be (academic) writing. In the RC, ‘writing’ is not deemed to be simply the construction of texts that are typed or uploaded into a place on a *Page*; rather, it

starts with the making of this place, since what will be written here may differ depending on where that place is, how it relates to its environment, and even how it is formatted. More radically, even before such writing has commenced, there is strictly speaking no *Page* to write upon. When using the RC for the first time, this is perhaps not immediately clear, since by default a first *Page* is suggested when an exposition is created. On a technical level, however, such an initial *Page* represents a space with zero dimensions, since at no point is the size of that *Page* defined. What decides the size of what we see is the size of the browser window through which the *Page* is displayed. It is easy to misunderstand what we see as the *Page*, a misunderstanding that vanishes once documents are placed outside of what is visible in the window by dragging a tool, for instance, towards the right margin. Suddenly, the *Page* will grow (as indicated by scrollbars that now appear) to contain what is placed within it. In effect, this means that before the researcher places a document on the *Page*, the *Page* strictly speaking does not exist, and that there is no space for writing before writing has started.

The first gesture of writing in the context of an exposition is thus a design gesture and the making of space. There is much to say about how the RC may reflect on the historic relationship between art and design, which is of course difficult to do in the context of this short chapter. Nevertheless, a number of points should be noted in relation to the designing of an exposition. Most important is perhaps the fact that the layout and design of an exposition can be read as an integral part of the meaning that is conveyed and not only as a secondary, transparent and decorative layer through which meaning appears, which is often the site of an additional (corporate) identity that is foreign to the research itself, such as logos or colour schemes. Usually, a project such as the RC displays a styled identity throughout its web pages, disallowing ownership of those pages to the 'providers of content'. While such measures tend to guarantee a professional appearance throughout, artistic engagement is kept at arm's length, relegated to content and limited to a series of pre-sets. On the RC, only pages that are about the RC are styled (such as the initial home page or the profile pages) while *Pages* as part of expositions do not display any permanent evidence of the RC's identity. Traces of the technical framework can naturally be found (for example, in the design of controls), but are kept very general and nondescript. The only clear presence of the RC's identity within the *Pages* of an exposition is a menu bar that appears initially for a few seconds after a *Page* is loaded and every time the mouse pointer is moved towards the top of the window. Outside of this, the RC makes the point of passing ownership of its *Pages* to its users. This has the interesting side effect that on average, RC *Pages* appear under-designed when compared with the usual publication of research in journals or dedicated project pages. This has partly to do with the RC software framework itself, which, in order to act as a sustainable resource, does not provide for specialist scripting. It also has to do with what may be called the skill set of contemporary artists, who tend to outsource graphic and, in particular, web design and who are now challenged to

think through and appropriate a field that is usually left to either their dealers, agents or publishers. As a result, one has to acknowledge that across the various expositions the RC may look messy, hit-and-miss, inconsistent and amateurish – which might, incidentally, support what the defenders of traditional academic standards think of artistic research. However, rather than registering this as a deficit, one can claim that the RC allows the calibration of an exposition, where this calibration forms an essential part of the research's experience and meaning. One might also want to add that a sense of integrity may be given space at the experiential core of a researcher's practice. Conversely, one may question the corporate sites of research – including those of academia – for interfering with the meaning of research through the control of the presentation.

A major trade-off needs to be mentioned, however. Since documents, displayed through tools, are placed at a particular point on the *Page*, which is expressed through the x/y coordinates at the upper-left corner of the tool, their position is absolute. Text is rendered by the browser and with it, the respective operating system. While its upper-left corner is still placed absolutely on the *Page*, line breaks may shift as the text progresses. This produces problems in the line-up of text and other documents (such as images or footnotes, for example) displayed next to a text column. Furthermore, not only might the rendered font differ in size, it might also differ in look, even if the size remains stable. Precise design, as we know it from desktop publishing, is a virtual impossibility on the web, requiring an approach to exposition design on the RC where the possibility of some variations in the appearance of a *Page* across various computer systems is accepted. As with any computer application, there is always the problem when designing on the RC that in comparison to a printed book, for example, output devices cannot be completely controlled. Although this is the case for all web design, it starts to matter more once the design of an exposition is seen as an artistic problem rather than a job passed on to a designer.

Since an author has 'complete' ownership of their *Pages* on the RC, a reader will not know what to expect when a particular *Page* is loaded. *Pages* may display a column of linear text and disregard illustrations; they may be media-heavy and engage with hypertextual, non-linear reading experiences. While the RC does not suggest a preference for the one type over the other, outside of what an author may want to do with a given material, the possibility for non-linear text suggests that not all readers will experience an exposition in the same way, making the exposition of practice as research on the RC at least to some degree a subjective affair even if text rather than media is used. If on top of this, through the use of images or sounds, additional forms of perception play an essential part in a piece of writing, one may wonder how this can still be negotiated in relation to knowledge. While *JAR*'s peer-review process asks reviewers to assess the suitability of a design in relation to the expositional point that is made, in the RC those relations may be much more experimental and open, making the RC a test bed for the possibilities of radically enhanced academic writing.

Sharing and Publication

When the RC was first conceived, emphasis was placed on the *Publication* of research expositions. In the context of the RC, *Publication* is the fixing and the making accessible of a hitherto dynamic and usually private exposition. *Publications* cannot be undone, which allows for the RC to act as a stable reference system for artistic research. During ARC, it soon became apparent that a *Publication* focus was limiting to the RC, since researching and publication appeared to be integrated more strongly than initially assumed and the publication was not simply the endpoint of a research activity. As a consequence, during the later part of ARC, emphasis was placed on the RC as research infrastructure. This has resulted in a more complex permission system.

Before discussing technical implications and possibilities in the context of the RC, it is important to stress that a ‘permission system’ in the form of copyright legislation already applies to material gathered outside of the RC into which it may be uploaded. It is difficult to assess the pros and cons of current legislation (which differs from country to country), but it seems certain that research relying on non-textual references is disadvantaged in comparison. While it is easy and free of charge to quote a section of text, quoting an image, a recording or a movie requires permission from, at times, multiple copyright holders, which, if it is granted at all, may cost a considerable amount of money.

After much debate, SAR, which now hosts the RC, decided to apply a fairly restricted policy in the hope that copyright holders may be persuaded to give permission for the use of protected material. Firstly, a RC user account cannot be created on the fly; rather, a signed copy of the letter of agreement needs to be sent to SAR, including postal address and proof of identity of the user. Secondly, the terms of use⁷ of the RC, which all users (account holders and also readers who simply browse its content) have implicitly agreed to by employing the software, allow the use of materials provided on the RC only in the context of the RC and not outside of it. This will hopefully serve to reassure copyright holders that their material remains protected and cannot be legally distributed across the internet. Thirdly, the RC follows a clear and quick complaints procedure. Should any users believe that there is an infringement of their rights, they can complain and the content will be taken down immediately while arbitration takes place. Nevertheless, despite what SAR can do in the context of the RC, it is not unlikely that a licence to use a specific material may be refused or may be too expensive and that the exposition of practice as research may suffer as a consequence to the point where particular parts of an argument cannot be made. Copyright laws often prevent sharing, which in turn inhibits research.

While this is clearly problematic, there are, however, creative ways of dealing with the issue, which may, in effect, often be more expositional than

7. <http://www.researchcatalogue.net/portal/terms>.

the simple reproduction of a desired material. One possible strategy is the narration or description of a work of art, which highlights details and experiences that are otherwise difficult to convey. A second possible strategy is the sketching of the work, allowing a focus on particular features, such as the composition or key frames. Thirdly and perhaps least desirable, but nevertheless possible, is a simple reference and the suggestion that the work should be looked at in the original.

Assuming that a researcher has obtained an account, when adding new research, he or she starts by default in a private workspace – that is, nobody apart from this user will be able to access the exposition. Since research is often carried out in collaboration, it is, however, possible to add additional collaborators to an exposition who have editing rights and who will appear on the author list, and also to add additional contributors, who can edit while not featuring as authors. This construction supports collaborative work and extends an invitation to additional individuals (such as technicians or proofreaders) either to help with the exposition or simply to see it as it evolves (which may be important for supervisors or artists whose work is referred to).

It is also possible to allow reading access to an exposition beyond a limited group of named individuals by *Sharing* it either with logged-in users on the RC, or publicly with anybody who happens to load the *Page*. A *Shared* exposition may thus be public, but since it is still not fixed and may change it is not (yet) *Published*. While there are always examples on the RC of publicly shared research in progress, a visitor to the site will usually not be able to witness how the RC is used as a research infrastructure while the research is ongoing.

Sharing complicates the initially simplistic focus on *Publication* since it introduces a temporal element and, with it, a change to a publicly accessible exposition. As a consequence, it is now, for example, possible to stagger the process of *Publication* by slowly developing the exposition while inviting people to witness the event. A spacing-out in time may now correspond to a the spacing-out of documents on a *Page*, as discussed above, although at present this cannot be archived since a temporal dimension is not part of the *Publication* process – that is, whatever is done during the *Sharing* stages of an exposition is overwritten by changes made to it. This problem points to the need for technical enhancements to the RC, while also underlining a fundamental problem for the *Publication* of artistic research.

The technical solution is comparatively simple. There is a plan to enhance the RC with a versioning system that allows for the saving of particular states of an exposition. This offers the additional benefit that edits may be undone and that a user may revert back to the most recent saved version. In relation to the *Publication* of research, it would then be possible to publish versions of the same exposition and allow readers to browse through those versions, which, since they are *Publications* in their own right, can serve as sustainable points of reference.

The more fundamental problem, however, has to do with the idea that an exposition may need to terminate in one or more versions of itself and that reading, watching, listening or navigating – in short, the encounter – may be implied but is strangely absent from the experience. *Sharing*, as it were, stops when *Publication* commences. In effect, the notion of *Publication* represents a more or less controlled flow of information from a source (the exposition) to a target (the reader), while a response that can affect the exposition is not really possible. In other words, through a *Publication* focus, the RC may be biased in favour of a traditional presentation of knowledge, where the authority lies with the artist/author or work/text and where there is no space for a suitable and affective co-presence of audience or reader. The commenting system that the RC provides compensates for this to some degree, but it is clear that comments are meant to be about an exposition rather than being part of it.

This is not so much a technical issue of how change over time and activities of both authors and readers may be negotiated and presented as part of an exposition, although technical and more interactive solutions may be required; rather, it is a conceptual issue to do with the relationship between *Sharing* and *Publication* that still needs to be worked out. Personally, I suspect that a more artistic dimension to post-*Publication Sharing* needs to be imagined that would allow for expositions to play with the concept of publication just as they may do with the category of works.

In terms of repository (*Works* and *Simple Media*) and online publishing (*Pages*) the RC provides a research infrastructure that is dedicated to the artistic exposition of practice as research. However, aspects of social media (*Sharing* and *Publication*) require additional debate and development. In general, one can say that the RC attempts to offer differential constructs as a means to provide space for the artistic exposition of practice as research where no form or format is imposed and all choices of form or format may be related to an expositional labour that both brings out and creates knowledge implications within artistic practice.

The RC software framework does not define what an exposition is; rather, it offers a conceptually dynamic space within which expositions of practice as research can be made. The RC may thus illustrate and lend words to the kinds of complexities that need addressing when art is published in academia, while at the same time – as the section on *Sharing* and *Publication* suggests – it may have to be adapted to cater satisfactorily for researchers who choose to challenge existing conceptual and technical constraints. Most importantly, however, these complexities are not limited to an online space, since they are modelled as a response to the real and everyday problem of the making, dissemination and publication of artistic research. It remains to be seen what influence the RC may have on research to be carried out either on- or offline.

References

- Borgdorff, H., 2012. *The Conflict of the Faculties. Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Buchloh, B.H.D., 2000. *Neo-Avantgarde and Culture Industry: Essays on European and American Art from 1955 to 1975*. Cambridge, MA, & London: MIT Press.
- Bürger, P., 1984. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Minneapolis, MN, & London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Busch, K., 2011. 'Generating Knowledge in the Arts – A Philosophical Daydream.' *Texte zur Kunst* (82), pp. 70-79.
- Elo, M. (ed.), 2007. *Here Then: The Photograph as Work of Art and as Research*. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Arts.
- Münch, R., 2011. *Akademischer Kapitalismus: Über die politische Ökonomie der Hochschulreform Originalausgabe*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Osborne, P., 2013. *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art*. London and New York: Verso.
- Schwab, M., 2008. 'First, the Second: Walter Benjamin's Theory of Reflection and the Question of Artistic Research.' *Journal of Visual Art Practice* 7(3), pp. 213-223.
- Schwab, M., 2009a. 'First the Second: The Supplemental Function of Research in Art.' In: *Art and Artistic Research: Music, Visual Art, Design, Literature, Dance*. Zurich Yearbook of the Arts, C. Caduff, F. Siegenthaler, & T. Wälchli (eds.). Zurich: Zurich University of the Arts/Scheidegger & Spiess, pp. 56-65.
- Schwab, M., 2009b. 'The Power of Deconstruction in Artistic Research.' *Working Papers in Art & Design* 5. Available at: http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol5/msfull.html [Accessed 20 November 2012].
- Schwab, M., 2011. 'Editorial.' *JAR* 0. Available at: <http://www.jar-online.net/index.php/issues/editorial/480> [Accessed 20 November 2012].
- Schwab, M., 2012a. 'Between a Rock and a Hard Place.' In: *Intellectual Birdhouse: Artistic Practice as Research*. F. Dombois et al. (eds.). London: Koenig Books, pp. 229-47.
- Schwab, M., 2012b. 'Exposition Writing.' In *Yearbook for Artistic Research & Development*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council, pp. 16-26.
- Schwab, M., 2012c. 'The Research Catalogue as Model for Dissertations and Theses in Art and Design.' In: *The Sage Handbook of Digital Dissertations and Theses*. R. Andrews et al. (eds.). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Sheikh, S., 2006. 'Spaces for Thinking: Perspectives on the Art Academy.' *Texte zur Kunst* (62, June). Available at: <http://www.textezurkunst.de/62/spaces-for-thinking/> [Accessed 20 November 2012].