

ELIA CÓMHAR CONFERENCE DUBLIN, OCTOBER 2002

Symposium 6: “‘Monstrous Thinking: on Practice-Based’ Research”

Abstract: The PhD in Art & Design

Professor Timothy Emlyn Jones

Deputy Director, Glasgow School of Art, Scotland, UK (to December 2002)
Dean, The Burren College of Art, Ireland (from January 2003)

Not only are PhD programmes important to the students who undertake them, but also to the Art & Design schools that have begun to provide them in recent years. There are currently, however, numerous misconceptions about the “practice-based” PhD which Jones argues give rise to inappropriately ‘monstrous’ perceptions which serve only to obscure the benefits of the PhD to the development of Art & Design research.

This paper seeks to clarify some of this ‘monstrous thinking’ initially by revisiting the idea that Art & Design practice may be research, with regard to how practice may generate new knowledge or understanding in a defined context, and subsequently by considering the doctorate against the historical background of vocational education in British art schools since the 1960’s, contrasted with that of the PhD in the ‘old’ universities. The paper then critically considers issues of the operation of PhD programmes with conclusions on the distinctive knowledge base of Art & Design.

In discussing issues arising from the development of “practice-based” PhDs, he draws upon his experience in doctoral education since 1987. He suggests several learning points about the conduct of PhD’s in Art & Design arising from the different approaches taken within institutions within which he has worked.

Jones argues that rather than a new kind of PhD, what the subject requires is a new kind of PhD supervision and examination regime suited to the distinctive research outcomes of research in Art & Design. In other respects the PhD should be recognised as being standard across all subjects. He discusses some differences between Art & Design and other university subjects and the possibility of a new research-based paradigm for creative practice in Art & Design, which could inform practitioner-referenced academic standards that may be relevant to other university subjects. In this way, he argues, Art & Design education has the capacity for coming of age within the university sector, equal to, different from and valued by other subjects.

The PhD in Art & Design

Professor Timothy Emlyn Jones

Deputy Director, Glasgow School of Art, Scotland, UK (to December 2002)

Dean, The Burren College of Art, Ireland (from January 2003)

The call for papers for this symposium invited monstrous thinking in the development of so-called “practice-based” research, and it occurs to me that I could have written a paper entitled ‘Here Be Monsters’, in memory of so many ancient maps.

Only ten years ago the idea that the generation of new knowledge in Art & Design might be deemed research seemed novel. For many artists and designers research did seem monstrous and maybe it still does for a few. The idea of a doctorate in this subject field where the terminal degree had been the MFA also seemed strange until only recently. Higher Education in Art & Design has rapidly changed over the last decade and thinking about research, whether monstrous or not is central to the continuing change. The subject of where and how research thinking sits in Art & Design is a large one on which, relatively speaking, we have only just begun. In this context any contribution to the debate has to be recognised as provisional and conditional. In this paper I try to tease out key issues emerging from my own experience in the field, which has taught me that, whatever else, there remains a great deal to be done. This then is a sort of work in progress, but one whose perspective is that of an artist and educationist – a practitioner – and not that of a philosopher. Philosophy has much to contribute to this field, but thinking practitioners have an obligation to contribute too, no matter how meagre offerings such as this.

Most art schools and Art & Design university faculties in the UK have by now developed PhD programmes and funded studentships, and there is now a growing number of Art & Design doctors in circulation. Recent graduates no longer think it strange that a doctoral programme might be an option for them on graduation, or at least on completion of a masters, and many of these recognise that the PhD is normal amongst their peers in other subjects. These are significant developments that are not yet widely understood and it seems to me that some misconceptions and therefore reservations about monstrous thinking still remain. The doctorate has had a crucial position in higher education in the last five centuries and it has been a long time coming to Art & Design and to the other creative and performing arts. No wonder that it may seem strange.

In examining these issues in some detail I draw upon my own engagement with promoting, overseeing, managing, supervising and examining doctorates over two decades. In doing this I am grateful for the collaboration and wisdom of my colleagues at Stourbridge College, the University of Wolverhampton, the Wimbledon School of Art, and the Glasgow School of Art in which I have held positions of responsibility for the development of doctoral education, on which I draw in this paper. I am also grateful for the perceptions of my associates at the Hungarian Academy of Fine Art, Budapest and the DRS Symposium (1).

I will now critically consider three monstrous ideas that seem to live on beyond their time; and I then go on to propose a new one.

1. The idea that Art & Design practice may be research is monstrous

The problem about regarding creative practice as research seems to centre on confusion about the place of knowledge in *practice* when seen in distinction from that in *theory*. That Art & Design as well as the performing arts are practical is self-evident, but that does not mean that they are not also simultaneously theoretically based; I am talking about more than ‘know how.’ Donald Schon’s (2) development of the idea of the reflective practitioner involves a distinction between ‘knowledge on reflection’ and ‘knowledge in action’. Knowledge on reflection involves stepping back from practical activity in a way that is widely recognised in the Art & Design undergraduate curriculum, strangely in a normal ratio of 80:20%. But the idea of knowledge in action supposes that practical activity is itself intrinsically intelligent, and it stands against the absurdity of the theory/practice dichotomy which seems to imply that you switch your brain off in order to make art or design (or whatever) and then switch it on again in order to reflect on what you have made. In his pursuit of an ‘epistemology of practice’ Schon argues that,

'universities are not devoted to the production and distribution of fundamental knowledge in general. They are institutions committed, for the most part, to a *particular* epistemology ... that fosters selective inattention to practical competence and professional artistry.' Schon (3) goes some way to theorising intuition in arguing that the mental buzz that is constant throughout creative activity – what he calls 'the dialogue with the situation' – is itself crucial to the generation of new knowledge obtained through practice. This is what makes practice creative practice, and thereby this is what makes creative practice (but not all practice) research, that is to say, the programmatic generation of new knowledge in a defined field. As Paul van der Lem (4) says, this is what distinguishes 'knowledge building' from 'knowledge use'.

That some practical activities of Art & Design are eligible to be counted as research activities in the UK Research Assessment Exercise can be attributed in part to the sustained arguments of Colin Painter, the former Principal of the Wimbledon School of Art. Painter's social constructivist argument (5) was essentially that if research is a process of enquiry that generates new knowledge, then any process of enquiry in a subject that performs that task is eligible for consideration as research, even if it doesn't look like research as it is found in other subjects. Christopher Frayling's (6) distinction of three kinds of research 'into', 'through' and 'for' Art & Design provided some valuable distinctions, but it is not yet fully clear how "practice-based" research should be articulated in relation to 'theory-based', 'history-based' research or research based on other approaches. Perhaps the problem is just that "practice-based" research is too loose a term to be useful. The RAE2001 was more concerned by how the research content of practice is made explicit than in the RAE96, which seemed less analytic of outcomes, but the issue of how new knowledge may be embodied in or represented by Art & Design objects (by which I mean objects-of-attention rather than exclusively material artefacts) remains an alternative way of giving account of practice outcomes as research outcomes. Gilbert Ryle's (7) distinction of 'know how' from the knowledge described as 'know that' does provide for works of art to be seen as evidence of the generation of knowledge, but that is not how we understand works of art or design, which we understand relatively in terms of their meaning or their use. We still need to engage with the object itself and its meaning. Paul Hirst's (8) idea of 'knowledge-of-the-object' goes a long way to propose an account of knowledge appropriate to works of Art and Design, and such a distinction is necessary if we are to understand works of art or design as art or design and not as evidence of something else. Recently, there has been increasing recognition that the characterisation of knowledge embodied in or represented by an object needs to be made explicit within a developing research culture, as evidenced by several recent and planned conferences (9), and more needs to be done.

Whilst much has been published on epistemology of art, both from the perspective of education theory and philosophical aesthetics, and authoritative texts such as Wollheim's (10) are often embedded within taught courses, this material has yet to be fully drawn down to the developing Art & Design research paradigm. There is a need for an authoritative literature review to map this. If art research and design research are not to be distorted to fit the terms of reference of some other discipline such as the social sciences, then we should be explicit about how knowledge may be generated and embodied within the practical dimension of artistic and design production. That research in our field may be forced to adapt to the conventions of other disciplines would be monstrous. There is a need for more theory about practice coming out of what artists and designers actually do methodologically. The requirements of the Arts and Humanities Research Board (11) that research proposals be specified in terms of humanities and social sciences style research questions, in ways that tend to exclude open-ended curiosity, is one indication of how research in our field is being distorted. I consider we need to look further afield than the humanities for useful comparators, the natural sciences and their predisposal for experiment and 'blue skies' research offering many useful points of reference. Regrettably, some art practitioners have been slow to recognise the need for art works have to embody or represent *new* knowledge of something in order to count as research, the formulaic production of works for the market, no matter how chic not counting. Design does seem to be ahead of art in this respect, with the Le Clusaz Conference of 2000 and the DRS discussion list (12) having clarified many of the necessary distinctions. The need for such a forum in Fine Art is immense. This distinction between research-based practice and market-based practice takes us right to the centre of the longstanding problem of how value judgements are made in the production and evaluation of works of Art & Design. An enquiry-based perspective on creative practice will have much to contribute to our larger understanding of Art & Design, and that is why I speak of a new paradigm.

2. The doctorate is a monstrous serpent that has no place in our paradise

The problem about the doctorate is not that it is a doctorate, but that it is relatively new to our subject. Rather than argue that we do not need this creature we would do better to understand its significance across Higher

Education. The doctorate is the key to research-based education at both postgraduate and undergraduate levels. It is just that this may not yet be obvious in Art & Design, for largely historical reasons.

Historically, the doctorate is probably the oldest degree to be awarded in European higher education, having been a licence to practice law or medicine since the thirteenth century, and in many of the ancient universities it has long been a licence to teach. The PhD developed in Germany in the nineteenth century as a research training, and it is now regarded as a pre-requisite to teaching in most Higher Education subjects world-wide. The training of teachers of undergraduate and postgraduate courses in research methods, with the expectation that they will then teach a simplified form of those methods, means that taught courses have an essential research flavour.

The research basis of taught courses in Art & Design is less easy to identify (as many who have struggled to complete high quality RAE submissions (13) will know) since the history of Art & Design research is virtually the inverse of that of the subjects conventionally identified with the ancient universities. Art schools in the UK largely (and not exclusively) grew out of the industrial revolution to meet the craft, design and drawing needs of the emerging industries in the nineteenth century. Ours was initially a vocational education; a craft. Initial training was given degree-equivalent status only in the 1960s, this having been a turning point as it locked Art & Design in the UK into university education in a way not taken up throughout Europe. I think there is no turning back. The BA(Hons) dates only from the 1970s, and postgraduate courses did not proliferate beyond the London Three Schools and a smattering of provincial centres until the late 1980s at which time the first PhDs began to emerge at the CNAAs' behest. The first PhDs to be examined without a modified written thesis emerged only in the late 1990s, and a DFA that is substantially different in more than name from the PhD has yet to materialise in the UK, although it and the DLA has developed in a few countries in Europe. In several European countries Art & Design education remains outside the university system with a different provenance, different expectations and different possibilities. As it is I do not think these are possible in the UK given Art & Design's integration in university education. Only once the doctorate is commonplace and doctors abundant in UK Art and Design schools will the development of higher education research culture within Art & Design education become mature.

3. The PhD is a worse kind of monster, and the "practice-based" PhD the worst

If the PhD does appear monstrous then it may be worth examining the creature we are looking at. This section of the paper deals with issues that seem insufficiently known by many within our subject community although very well known to a few. Until there is widespread common understanding, however, the PhD will remain monstrous to many.

The PhD is a training in research methods and methodology that is achieved through a programme of enquiry, a project, that leads to new knowledge or understanding. That is to say, the learning of how to do research is as indispensable to a PhD as the new knowledge that is generated by means of it. More specifically, I would describe the project as *a self-reflective supervised programme of enquiry leading to new knowledge*. Every PhD has at least the same standard four elements or ingredients: a research question or topic; a programme of study enquiring into that question or topic; supervisory arrangements whereby the student's research is undertaken under the supervision of a senior researcher; and the examination of the conclusions of the programme of research. Conventionally a PhD concludes with a thesis or argument which if persuasive is agreed to represent new knowledge, whatever form it may take. For Art & Design a particular issue arises here, for whilst it may be possible to explain how an object embodies new knowledge of the 'knowledge-of' kind, it is less clear how an object can be said in itself to embody a thesis or argument. It may be appropriate to consider the objects that constitute the conclusions of the project as equivalent to or in lieu of a thesis rather than as a thesis in themselves. Alternatively, it might be possible to argue that an object, particularly in Fine Art does have such an active capacity, but such a case has yet to be argued and won.

I think it is worth filling in the outline I have just sketched, to consider in some detail the issues emerging for Art & Design from each of those four elements.

Firstly, what is meant by a *research question*? A research question may enquire into a problem to be solved; a creative opportunity to be explored or exploited; or an issue to be examined, whether any of these be technical, procedural, philosophical, theoretical, or historical. Whichever of these a research question may be it must also take the form of a query such as: what; what if; how; when; why; why not; for whom; by whom; or any other form of question. How the question may be framed is the real challenge for Art & Design since there has historically

been in taught courses a conservative separation of theory and practice, and where the idea of intrinsically intelligent practice, or praxis, is still relatively new, even if the idea of praxis goes a long way back to Gramsci (14). The need for clarity in the definition of the PhD student's registration of a project becomes subsequently apparent at the time of examination when, for that process to be fair and equitable, that benchmark for the measure of success is required. This should not be difficult in a subject in which most undergraduate and postgraduate learning and teaching is project based, and research degrees could well learn from and refine the idea of working to a self-set brief that is already common in taught courses.

It is also worth considering critically what is meant by a PhD *programme of research*. Here too there is a fairly standard set of ingredients.

- A *review*, sometimes called a literature review, is a scoping of the knowledge current within the field of enquiry undertaken to confirm that the research has not already been undertaken and the PhD therefore unnecessary. This is particularly problematic in Art & Design, notably in fine art where it is simply not possible to determine all that has been done, because not all creative practice of this kind has been externally referenced let alone refereed. We need to develop a consensus of the kind of review that is most appropriate to our subject.
- *Research methods*, which are ways of doing something, and research methodology which is the study of methods, both being equally necessary to the research student. Often the two are conflated as if a methodology was a super-luxury method. This is especially problematic in our subjects since, whilst there is a great deal of literature on quantitative and qualitative research methods in the humanities and sciences, there is little consensus in Art & Design and other creative and performing arts. In my view this is one of the most fertile areas for development in Art & Design research. If we are able to devise explicit ways of describing and analysing how artists, designers, dramatists, choreographers and performers generate new knowledge, then we may have developed a new research-based theorisation of, not only artistic production, but also intuition. In this way there is the possibility of constructing the much needed new paradigm for art; a new aesthetics of method.
- *The Enquiry* is the core of a research programme. Many artists will have problems with characterising what they do as enquiry rather than expression, or social intervention, and whether it is in any way programmatic. However, if our subject is to have a place at the higher levels of higher education then it would seem a necessary pursuit to identify in what ways Art & Design do generate knowledge through enquiry. This issue is an extension of what I have just said about methods and methodology, but on a larger scale, what Schon calls 'an epistemology of practice'. It seems to me that the challenge is to make explicit that which is unique to Art & Design. We need to be more explicit about what is meant by an enquiring mind in our subject.
- *Recording the process* is also a standard element of the PhD and the log book or day book is a conventional means in research yet not one immediately obvious in Art & Design. The term journal in its eighteenth century literary sense was a day-book, or diary – a literary convention. If we return to that age of letters then the sketchbook, as a means of recording a journey such as the grand tour, may provide away of getting to grips with this idea. The purpose of the record in a PhD is to facilitate a dialogue between researcher and supervisor and a point of reference in reviewing progress and reflecting on further development of it. It enables the meta-enquiry, the way in which the process of research becomes a means of learning about research. The challenge here is to make academic rigour explicit within our subjects in ways that have not always been the case.
- The *conclusion* of a PhD presented in appropriate form is crucial to the examination regime. Conventionally an argument or case is described as a thesis, but that the term thesis can also mean a large number of words typed double spaced can confuse the issue. There are many precedents for the submission of practical outcomes that embody or represent new knowledge or understanding for examination demonstrates. Whether practical material should be submitted for examination as a thesis, or in lieu of a thesis is a moot point, but it should embody or represent the new knowledge or understanding in whatever form. What has been achieved should be capable, however, of being described if not summarised in text that together with the documented outcomes is presented in some form that can be accessed by future researchers. Conventionally, such a supplementary text has been

described as a summary, and it may be necessary to use that term rather broadly in the case of Art & Design.

Once the programme is complete it is subject to examination and the way in which the processes and outcomes are examined reveals some key issues. Three elements of the PhD *examination process* may be apparent:

- Value judgement;
- Fulfilment of previously specified criteria;
- Defence of a thesis,

These three quite different forms of engagement might easily be confused. There has yet to develop sufficient custom and practice for there to be in Art & Design a consensus of how these elements inter-relate in a PhD examination. The connoisseurial value judgement would arguably seem out of place as in any criterion referenced educational process, yet a decision as to whether a PhD programme has attained doctoral level does need to be made, and in this it is the opinion of experts in the field that is called upon. The risk that such a judgement could revert to one of taste does exist, and such a value judgement needs to be moderated by an examination for the fulfilment of the criteria specified in the initial registration of the programme of research, that is to say examination of the outcomes against the benchmark of the initial intention. That the PhD student be required to defend his or her thesis provides a moderating factor for the value judgement of the attainment of level and the judgement of outcomes against intentions as specified as criteria. Here the autonomy of what has been achieved by the student is tested for its robustness, and the judgements of value and criteria-fulfilment are set into the context of the project outcomes in their own terms. Thesis defence, therefore, puts the viva-voce examination into a crucial position in the examination process. A proper understanding of what is being examined in a PhD should resolve the perennial dilemma of the relation of material outcomes of artistic or design production to written material.

Early 'practice-based' PhDs, such as those at the University of Wolverhampton and elsewhere gave students some dispensation in the word length of the written thesis that had to accompany the work. The requirement of a body of work and a thesis could have the effect of requiring a double PhD since the outcomes have to be produced and submitted for examination twice, whereas the reduced word count could have the effect of a triple PhD in that it is more difficult to produce a short text than a long one. There is a track record in some universities of these doctorates taking an inordinate amount of time to complete – up to ten years in some cases.

The second generation of 'practice-based' PhDs, such as those initiated at the Wimbledon School of Art, did not prescribe a word count as such and envisioned a sliding scale of portfolio and text, whilst retaining a requirement for the written element. This resolved the duplication of effort previously required (and still required by some universities), and it made the PhD feasible in the same sort of timescale and with the same sort of workload as that expected of PhDs across disciplines. Nevertheless, some ambiguity of the purpose of the written element remained, and the portfolio was regulated as 'in lieu of a thesis' rather than as the thesis itself. Since written material may be required either as examinable research content, or as evidence of the research content for the use of future researchers, or both can lead to the conflation of the two purposes, and this may tend to compromise the epistemological character of the new knowledge generated by a PhD project.

A third generation of 'practice-based' PhDs emerged at the Glasgow School of Art, based on a the distinction of different relationships between material outcomes and textual outcomes, and the different purposes that might be expected of the text. A distinction was also made between the material submitted for examination and the documentation of it for the purposes of future reference to the research content. In this third generation it was possible to say that the difference between an Art & Design PhD and any other PhD is not in the type of doctorate, but in the ways in which the research outcomes are presented for examination.

At Glasgow four categories of submission for examination have been identified in regulations. In providing for the different purposes that might be expected of material and text, the range of these categories was also thought to provide for likely differences in projects in fine art, the decorative arts, and design in a wide range of subjects including visual communication, product design and architecture. These categories suppose different relationships between text and material evidence. These categories were subsequently taken up in modified form by another HEI to provide for music doctorates and they may be more widely applicable. The Glasgow categories are as follows: *A written thesis* which may take any of a number of forms including a theoretical exegesis, an historical analysis, or a report of a project, or whatever. That it is written does not mean that it cannot be "practice-based"

since it may be an account of research conducted by means of practice; *A dissertation and portfolio* which supposes an equal weight given to the visual/material outcomes of practice and the discussion of the knowledge, suited to those instances where the knowledge is intelligible only when considered in the context of what is written, often text of a theoretical character. That there are two elements to the submission supposes that together they represent the new knowledge or understanding and that they do not each do so separately since that would be a double PhD; *A portfolio with commentary* in which the new knowledge is presented largely in its own right but with a body of written information necessary to a full understanding of the portfolio, typically an account of procedural or contextual information; and *A Portfolio with documentation and a summary* (all forms of submission requiring a 'summary') in which the new knowledge is presented in its own right but documented sufficiently clearly, including the use of text, for there to be a record of the research process and its outcomes for future reference.

One learning point across these three approaches has been that the less text that is submitted the more rigorous the thesis defence will need to be. In this way a PhD examination in which the thesis is embodied mainly in a portfolio may be harder than when it is embodied in a long text, contrary to the wishful thinking of some PhD applicants. A further point to emerge is the problem of supervision by subject experts of whom few are formally qualified to supervise. Many institutions adopt a team approach to supervision and while this does provide for the inclusion of non-qualified subject experts alongside qualified supervisors from other disciplines, it can imply the transfer into Art & Design of inappropriate methods in the name of academic responsibility.

In my view, it emerges that the PhD in Art & Design differs from PhDs in other subjects only in terms of the examination regime being adjusted for the inclusion of a portfolio. In all other respects it is the same; a PhD is a PhD. What is needed is an examination regime that will allow for additional or alternative modes of examination of a thesis when it is represented by or embodied in works of Art & Design. What I have just described goes some way to providing for those differences, though in time it will no doubt be improved upon.

In this discussion of the four elements of a PhD, I have tried to outline some of the key developmental issues for the PhD in our subject. What all these issues centre on is a need for clarity in what we mean by new knowledge or understanding in the generation of works of Art or Design. In going on to discuss this further a foundation of my argument is the position advocated by Colin Painter and lucidly argued by Andrew Harrison (15) the basis of Kant that in the knowledge at stake "the medium of communication (of knowledge) must ultimately be works themselves, not descriptions of them or assertions about them."

4 Here is my own monstrous suggestion

If, as a subject community, we are able to share an understanding of how knowledge is generated through enquiry and communicated in or by works of Art or Design, then we should have grounds for confidence in our developing research culture since, I suggest, it is in the forms of knowledge that our subject is different from other subjects. In fact we have a great deal of knowledge about the knowledge basis of Art & Design, but much of our knowing about knowledge is operational and anecdotal, often journalistic in character and not always strongly theorised, and that seems to make us apologetic for not being able to define the knowledge simply; this lack of confidence being unnecessary in my view. Given the theoretical, contextual and practical differences between the wide range of specialisms in Art & Design, and the wide range of perspectives that may be taken of them, it would seem unreasonable to suppose that any single epistemological position can be taken for Art & Design. Would it be reasonable to assume that knowledge associated with a designed artefact such as a kettle, a designed system such as a software package, a work of fine art such as a painting, or an architectural design such as a house should be thought to have the same character or basis? I think not; we need a pluralist approach to knowledge, and one that allows for situation specific circumstances.

If, as well as a shared view of the communication of knowledge, we can also come to a common understanding of how artistic and design knowledge is formed, that is to say by what processes and with what methods, then our confidence should increase, because in that way our subject would have something to contribute to other practice related research fields. We would then have several epistemologies of practice. Again, however, I think we would be looking at a range of positions and not a single art method or design method, although I think it reasonable to say that drawing is likely to figure strongly as a 'practice-based' research method. Because of its explicit engagement with methods and methodology the PhD seems a most appropriate arena in which to develop such an understanding of what Gramsci calls the 'patterns of formation' of knowledge in Art & Design.

If we are able to engage with the knowledge base of our subject pluralistically as I propose, our subject will finally have come of age with its own research paradigm, equal to but different from other university level subjects. We would also have a basis for practitioner-referenced standards that would be relevant to much of the university sector which is struggling to engage with the principle of *learning through doing* which is crucial to the idea of a knowledge economy. Would it not be crazy to take Art & Design in the other direction, to become more like science and technology, just at a time when science and technology are trying to become more like Art & Design with its valuing of value judgements, intuition, imagination and creativity?

I conclude, therefore, with the monstrous suggestion that what our subject community most needs in developing its research culture is greater self-knowledge and self-confidence in its distinctiveness from other subjects; in its own enquiry based paradigm. Never mind that these seem like early days, the task can be achieved over time, but I think we need to recognise the need for it now. If we do not establish our own pluralistic research-based paradigm for Art & Design we will not be able to resist the coercion to fit into the research paradigms of other subjects that are currently more explicit. These are the ways of thinking that have led the way in which research grants are conceptualised. This financial dimension may become irresistible, and as the AHRB develops into a research council it is to be hoped that it will recognise its responsibilities for recognising the differences and diversity of 'practice-based' research alongside other forms of research.

Knowledge in all university subjects is intrinsically problematic and contested in our post-modern world, and we are no different to other subjects in this respect. That we do not have a unitary theoretical stance on knowledge and research in Art & Design should be seen as our strength not our weakness within a new pluralistic paradigm of Art & Design research. We should be re-assured, not frightened by the vigour and rigour of debates and knowledge contests, and the insecurities they generate. The PhD in Art & Design provides an opportunity to get to grips with these issues in building such a new paradigm. In providing a foundation for practice-referenced academic standards this would be to the benefit of our subject and by extension to university education as a whole. What we - as a subject community - can most gain is the ability to give; for it is by our relevance to others and our generosity towards them that our subject will be valued in university education, and by the world beyond.

References

1. Biggs, Michael, John Broadbent, Richard Buchanan, Katie Bunnell, Clive Cazeaux, Rachel Cooper, Edward Cowie, Ken Friedman (moderator), Jacques Giard, Beryl Graham, Paul Gutherson, Timothy Emlyn Jones, Lorraine Justice, Michael Kroelinger, Malcolm LeGrice, Malcolm Miles, Alec Robertson, Chris Rust, Stephen Scrivener, Elaine Thomas, Jonathan Woodham, Martin Woolley. 2002. "practice-based" Doctorates in Design and the Creative and Performing Arts: a Symposium.' (in) *The 'practice-based' PhD, special issue of the Journal of Design Science and Technology*. David Durling, Ken Friedman, and Paul Gutherson, editors. [In preparation.]
2. Schon, Donald. 1983 *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Ashgate Arena.
3. *ibid.* p.vii
4. van der Lem, Paul. 2001. 'The development of the PhD for the visual arts.' (in) *Exchange 2000 Conference*, Watershed Media Centre, Bristol, at www.media.uwe.ac.uk/exchange_online/exch2_article2.php3
5. Painter, Colin. 1991 'Fine Art Practice, Research and Doctoral Awards: Part 1' (in) *Proceedings of the National Research Conference Art & Design in Education*, Brighton, England, Fribble Information Systems Inc Ltd with the National Society for Education in Art & Design. See also Cornock, Stroud. 1991 'Fine Art Practice, Research and Doctoral Awards: Part 2', *ibid*, written in partnership with Painter.
6. Frayling, Christopher. 1991 'Searching and Researching in Art and Design' (in) *Proceedings of the National Research Conference Art & Design in Education*, Brighton, England, Fribble Information Systems Inc Ltd with the National Society for Education in Art & Design.
7. Ryle, Gilbert. 1949, *The Concept of Mind*, Hutchinson; 1984 edition, University of Chicago
8. Hirst, Paul H. 1974, *Knowledge and the Curriculum*, Routledge. Kegan Paul
9. *The Research Into Practice Conference 2002*, University of Hertfordshire and that planned for 2004 consider epistemology and knowledge in art and design. For the 2002 papers see <http://www.herts.ac.uk/artdes/simsim/rtos/> [in preparation]
10. Wollheim, Richard. 1968 *Art and Its Objects*, Harper & Row, New York
11. The Arts and Humanities Research Board, www.ahrb.ac.uk
12. See Durling, David and Friedman, Ken. 2000. *Foundations for the Future, Doctoral Education in Design*. Conference proceedings, La Clusaz, France. Staffordshire University Press, and the email discussion list of the Design Research Society led by Ken Friedman at www.jiscmail.ac.uk/archives/phd-design.html Also of interest in this respect is www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/RTI.html
13. Research Assessment Exercise Submissions may be seen on www.hero.ac.uk/rae
14. Gramsci, Antonio. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Edited and translated by Q. Hoare and G. Nowell-Smith, with 'General Introduction' by Q. Hoare. London and New York: Lawrence & Wishart
15. Harrison, Andrew. 2002. 'Shared Judgements,' (in) *Research Into Practice Conference proceedings*, University of Hertfordshire, on <http://www.herts.ac.uk/artdes/simsim/rtos/> [in preparation]